ST/LEG/SER.E/14

MULTILATERAL TREATIES DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Status as at 31 December 1995

UNITED NATIONS

MULTILATERAL TREATIES DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Status as at 31 December 1995

UNITED NATIONS
New York, 1996

ST/LEG/SER.E/14

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION
Sales No. E.96.V.5

ISBN 92-1-133508-6

ISSN 0082-8319

INTRODUCTION

1. The present publication continues that entitled *Multilateral Treaties in respect of which the Secretary–General Performs Depositary Functions,* the last issue of which appeared in 1980 (ST/LEG/SER.13) with data up to 31 December 1979. This volume, the fourteenth of the Series *Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary–General* (ST/LEG/SER.E/ – a supplement to the second volume was issued to cover actions from 1 January to 31 December 1983 under reference ST/LEG/SER.E/2/add.1) consolidates the information (signatures, ratifications, accessions, miscellaneous notifications, reservations, declarations, objections, etc.) relating to all multilateral treaties covered up to 31 December 1995.

2. The previous publication consisted of a main part (comprehensive list of signatures, ratifications, etc.) printed annually, and of an annex entitled *Final Clauses* (ST/LEG/SER.D/1.Annex and *Supplements)* in loose–leaf form providing for each treaty deposited with the Secretary–General the text of formal and participation clauses. The annex was updated by annual supplements as required.

3. The present publication corresponds to the main part of the previous one. Under paragraph 6 of resolution 36/112 adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1981, the final clauses of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary–General are to be re–issued as part of a new publication entitled *Handbook of Final Clauses.*[1]

A. Treaties covered by this publication

4. Like its predecessors, this publication covers (1) all multilateral treaties the original of which is deposited with the Secretary–General[2] (2) the Charter of the United Nations, in respect of which certain depositary functions have been conferred upon the Secretary–General (although the original of the Charter itself is deposited with the Government of the United States of America) (3) multilateral treaties formerly deposited with the Secretary–General of the League of Nations, to the extent that formalities or decisions affecting them have been taken within the framework of the United Nations, and (4) certain pre–United Nations treaties, other than those formerly deposited with the Secretary–General of the League of Nations, which were amended by protocols adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

5. Multilateral treaties formerly deposited with the Secretary–General of the League of Nations, by virtue of General Assembly resolution 24 (I) of 12 February 1946 and of a League of Nations Assembly resolution of 18 April 1946[3], were transferred, upon dissolution of the League of Nations, to the custody of the United Nations. The Secretariat of the United Nations is now responsible for the performance of the functions formerly entrusted to the League of Nations; since those functions are of a *de facto* depositary nature, the treaties concerned have been included in the present publication.

B. Division into parts and chapters

6. The publication follows the order adopted in previous ones. Thus, the material is so arranged into two parts: Part I is devoted to United Nations multilateral treaties and Part II to League of Nations multilateral treaties. For ease of reference, those League of Nations treaties and other pre–United Nations treaties that were amended by protocols adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations are included in Part I, so that the lists of States which have become parties to the amending protocol and to the treaty as amended are followed immediately by a list showing the status of the treaty as at the time of its transfer to the custody of the United Nations.

7. Part I is divided into chapters related to given themes, and within each chapter the treaties are listed in the chronological order of their conclusion. Part II, which is not divided into chapters, lists the treaties in the order in which they first gave rise to formalities or decisions within the framework of the United Nations.[4]

C. Information provided in respect of each treaty

(a) United Nations treaties

8. After the full title, particulars are given in respect of each treaty regarding its entry into force and its registration under Article 102 of the Charter. References are also given concerning the publication of the text of the Treaty and its annexes, (as well as that of amendments and adjustments) in the United Nations *Treaty Series* or, if it has not yet been published in the *Treaty Series*, the reference to United Nations documentation where its text may be found. A note below the title briefly recounts how the treaty was adopted.

9. Participants are listed alphabetically, along with the dates of their signature and deposit of their instrument of ratification, accession, etc..[5] The presentation for each treaty reflects the provisions in the final clauses of that treaty regarding methods of participation. The number, as at 31 December, of signatories and parties to each treaty appears at the beginning of each treaty, which number includes the participants which apply the treaty provisionally but does not include those States which have ceased to exist. The name of those participants, date of signature and date of the formality effected thereafter, appears in a footnote. Those participants having denounced the treaty are not included in that count either; their name and the date of the formality effected is placed in brackets and the information regarding the denunciation appears in a footnote as well.

10. The texts of declarations, reservations and objections are normally given in full, either in special sections or in footnotes, after the list of participants. The same applies to communications of a special nature such as declarations recognizing the competence of committees such as the Human Rights Committee or the Committee against Torture and notifications under article 4 (3) of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and also to notifications of territorial application. Related communications, *inter alia*, declarations with respect to objections, appear in footnotes, the corresponding indicator being inserted in the original communication. Unless shown in quotation marks, the text is a translation (by the Secretariat) and unless otherwise indicated the reservations or declarations were made upon accomplishment of the final formality (ratification, accession, etc.).

(b) League of Nations treaties

11. The information provided is essentially based on the official records of the League of Nations – in particular, on the last official League of Nations publication of the list of signatures, ratifications and accessions in respect of multilateral treaties concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations. This accounts for the difference in format as compared with treaties deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

12. The list of signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., in respect of each of the League of Nations multilateral treaties covered by this publication is divided into two sections. The first section reflects the position as at the time of the transfer of those treaties to the custody of the United Nations, without implying a judgement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the current legal effect of the actions as to which information is provided, or on the status of any of the last official list of the League of Nations. The second section gives a list of actions subsequent to publication in respect of the United Nations multilateral treaties.

13. Detailed explanations concerning the content and arrangement of material in the last official list of the League of Nations are given in the introduction to the publication containing that list. It will be sufficient to note that the procedure of "*signature ad referendum*" (under which a signature is not considered to have been definitively affixed until it has been confirmed) was somewhat more frequent in League of Nations days.

D. Information of a general nature

14. On the occasion of treaty formalities, issues of a general character (mostly with regard to representation or territorial application) are sometimes raised. An effort has been made to regroup under chapter I.1 and 2 (where a list of all States members of the United Nations is set out) all such issues as may pertain to the States concerned: thus General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971 restoring all rights to the People's Republic of China is reproduced under the first mention of China, on page 3. Similarly, Part I, chapter I.1 and 2 contains information transmitted by communications from Heads of States or Governments or Ministers for Foreign Affairs informing the Secretary-General of changes in the official denomination of States or territories, etc.. In the case of States that are not members of the United Nations or in the case of intergovernmental organizations, the information appears in notes corresponding to the formalities that gave rise to the issue. Cross-references are provided as required.

15. More detailed information regarding the previous publications is given in the Introduction to *Multilateral Treaties in respect of which the Secretary-General Performs Depositary Functions* (ST/LEG/SER.D/13).

NOTES:

[1] For the time being, the texts of the final clauses in multilateral treaties covered by the last volume of *Multilateral Treaties in respect of which the Secretary–General Performs Depositary Functions* (ST/LEG/SER.D/13) will be found in document ST/LEG/SER.D/1.Annex and *Supplements* 1 to 11.

[2] For reasons of economy and size, and in order to maintain this publication in its present format, it will no longer be possible to include the comprehensives status of superseded commodity agreements herein. Consequently, for the complete status of the superseded agreements, see *Multilateral Treaties Deposited With The Secretary–General, Status as at 31 December 1994 (ST/LEG/SER.E/13)*.

[3] League of Nations, *Official Journal, Special Supplement No. 194*, p. 57.

[4] The first 26 treaties are listed in the order in which they appear in the last League of Nations publication of signatures, ratifications and accessions: see League of Nations, *Official Journal, Special Supplement No. 193*, Supplement to the Twenty–first List, Geneva, 1946.

[5] The following main symbols are used: *a*, accession; *A*, acceptance, *AA*, approval; *c*, formal confirmation; *d*, succession; *P*, participation; *s*, definitive signature (entailing those rights and obligations provided for in the treaty); *n*, notification (of provisional application, of special undertaking, etc.). Unless otherwise indicated the date of effect is determined by the relevant provisions of the treaty concerned.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CORRECTIONS OR MODIFICATIONS SHOULD BE COMMUNICATED TO:

Office of Legal Affairs
Treaty Section
United Nations
New York, N.Y. 10017
United States of America

e.mail: treaty@un.org
Fax: (212) 963-3693

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(SEE ALSO INDEX ON PAGE 991)

Part I. United Nations Treaties

Part I

United Nations Multilateral Treaties

CHAPTER I. CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Signed at San Francisco on 26 June 1945

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 October 1945, in accordance with Article 110.
STATUS: 185[1]. [51 original Members appearing in list below and 135 Members having been admitted in accordance with Article 4 (see list under chapter I.2 hereinafter)].

Original Members of the United Nations which, having signed the Charter[2], deposited their instruments of ratification with the Government of the United States of America on the dates indicated

Participant	*Ratification*	*Participant*	*Ratification*
Argentina	24 Sep 1945	Iraq	21 Dec 1945
Australia	1 Nov 1945	Lebanon	15 Oct 1945
Belarus[3]	24 Oct 1945	Liberia	2 Nov 1945
Belgium	27 Dec 1945	Luxembourg	15 Oct 1945
Bolivia	14 Nov 1945	Mexico	7 Nov 1945
Brazil	21 Sep 1945	Netherlands[8]	10 Dec 1945
Canada	9 Nov 1945	New Zealand	19 Sep 1945
Chile	11 Oct 1945	Nicaragua	6 Sep 1945
China[4]	28 Sep 1945	Norway	27 Nov 1945
Colombia	5 Nov 1945	Panama	13 Nov 1945
Costa Rica	2 Nov 1945	Paraguay	12 Oct 1945
Cuba	15 Oct 1945	Peru	31 Oct 1945
Czechoslovakia[1]	19 Oct 1945	Philippines	11 Oct 1945
Denmark	9 Oct 1945	Poland	24 Oct 1945
Dominican Republic	4 Sep 1945	Russian Federation[9]	24 Oct 1945
Ecuador	21 Dec 1945	Saudi Arabia	18 Oct 1945
Egypt[5]	22 Oct 1945	South Africa[10]	7 Nov 1945
El Salvador	26 Sep 1945	Syrian Arab Republic[5]	19 Oct 1945
Ethiopia	13 Nov 1945	Turkey	28 Sep 1945
France	31 Aug 1945	Ukraine[11]	24 Oct 1945
Greece[6]	25 Oct 1945	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	20 Oct 1945
Guatemala	21 Nov 1945	United States of America	8 Aug 1945
Haiti	27 Sep 1945	Uruguay	18 Dec 1945
Honduras	17 Dec 1945	Venezuela	15 Nov 1945
India	30 Oct 1945	Yugoslavia	19 Oct 1945
Iran (Islamic Republic of)[7]	16 Oct 1945		

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia was an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf on 26 June 1945 and 19 October 1945, respectively, until its dissolution on 31 December 1992. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] All States listed herein signed the Charter on 26 June 1945, with the exception of Poland on behalf of which it was signed on 15 October 1945.

[3] Formerly: "Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic" until 18 September 1991.

[4] *Signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China.*

China is an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf, on 26 June and 28 September 1945, respectively, by the Government of the Republic of China, which continued to represent China in the United Nations until 25 October 1971.

On 25 October 1971, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted its resolution 2758 (XXVI), reading as follows:

"*The General Assembly,*

"*Recalling* the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

"*Considering* that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is essential both for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter,

"*Recognizing* that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and that the People's Republic of China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council,

"*Decides* to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it."

The United Nations had been notified on 18 November 1949 of the formation, on 1 October 1949, of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Proposals to effect a change in the representation of China in the United Nations subsequent to that time were not approved until the resolution quoted above was adopted.

On 29 September 1972, a communication was received by the Secretary-General from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China stating:

"1. With regard to the multilateral treaties signed, ratified or acceded to by the defunct Chinese government before the establishment of the Government of the People's Republic of China, my Government will examine their contents before making a decision in the light of the circumstances as to whether or not they should be recognized.

"2. As from October 1, 1949, the day of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Chiang Kai-shek clique has no right at all to represent China. Its signature and ratification of, or accession to, any multilateral treaties by usurping the name of 'China' are all illegal and null and void. My Government will study these multilateral treaties before making a decision in the light of the circumstances as to whether or not they should be acceded to."

All entries recorded throughout this publication in respect of China refer to actions taken by the authorities representing China in the United Nations at the time of those actions.

[5] By a communication dated 24 February 1958, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the establishment by Egypt and Syria of a single State, the United Arab Republic. Subsequently, in a note dated 1 March 1958, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic informed the Secretary-General of the following: "... It is to be noted that the Government of the United Arab Republic declares that the Union henceforth is a single Member of the United Nations, bound by the provisions of the Charter and that all international treaties and agreements concluded by Egypt or Syria with other countries will remain valid within the regional limits prescribed on their conclusion and in accordance with the principles of international law."

In a cable dated 8 October 1961, the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic informed the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations that Syria had resumed her former status as an independent State and requested that the United Nations take note of the resumed membership in the United Nations of the Syrian Arab Republic. This request was brought to the attention of Member States by the President of the General Assembly at its 1035th plenary meeting on 13 October 1961. At the 1036th plenary meeting which took place on the same date, the President of the General Assembly stated that no objection having been received on the part of any Member State the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has taken its seat in the Assembly as a Member of the United Nations with all the obligations and rights that go with that status. In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 19 July 1962, the Permanent Representative of Syria to the United Nations communicated to him the text of *decret-loi* No. 25 promulgated by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic on 13 June 1962 and stated the following:

"It follows from article 2 of the text in question that obligations contracted by the Syrian Arab Republic under multilateral agreements and conventions during the period of the Union with Egypt remain in force in Syria. The period of the Union between Syria and Egypt extends from 22 February 1958 to 27 September 1961."

Finally, in a communication dated 2 September 1971, the Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that the United Arab Republic had assumed the name of Arab Republic of Egypt (Egypt), and, in a communication dated 13 September 1971, the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the official name of Syria was "Syrian Arab Republic".

Accordingly, in so far as concerns any action taken by Egypt or subsequently by the United Arab Republic in respect of any instrument concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, the date of such action is shown in the list of States opposite the name of Egypt. The dates of actions taken by Syria prior to the formation of the United Arab Republic are shown opposite the name of the Syrian Arab Republic, as also are the dates of receipt of instrument of accession or notification of application to the Syrian Province deposited on behalf of the United Arab Republic during the time when the Syrian Arab Republic formed part of the United Arab Republic.

[6] On 25 January 1995, the Secretary-General received a communication dated 20 January 1995 from the Government of Greece which reads as follows:

The Government of the Hellenic Republic declares that the accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Conventions deposited with the Secretary-General to which the Hellenic Republic is also a contracting party does not imply recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia by the Hellenic Republic.

This statement shall apply to all Conventions or other international Agreements deposited with the Secretary-General to which the Hellenic Republic and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are parties.

[7] By a communication received on 14 November 1982, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran notified the Secretary-General that the designation "Iran (Islamic Republic of)" should henceforth be used.

[8] By a communication received on 30 December 1985, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that "the island of Aruba which was a part of the Netherlands Antilles would obtain internal autonomy as a separate country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands as of 1 January 1986". The said change would have no consequence in international law. The treaties concluded by the Kingdom which applied to the Netherlands Antilles, including Aruba would continue, after 1 January 1986 to apply to the Netherlands Antilles (of which Aruba is no longer a part) and to Aruba.

[9] By a communication dated 24 December 1991, the President of the Russian Federation notified the Secretary-General that membership of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in the United Nations is being continued by the Russian Federation.

The Government of the Russian Federation subsequently informed the Secretary-General that as at 24 December 1991, the Russian Federation maintains full responsibility for all the rights and obligations of the USSR under the Charter of the United Nations and multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General and requested that the name "Russian Federation" be used in the United Nations in place of the name "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".

[10] Formerly: "Union of South Africa" until 31 May 1961.

[11] Formerly: "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" until 23 August 1991.

2. Declarations of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations

(Admission of States to membership in the United Nations in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter)[1]

STATUS: See "STATUS:" under chapter I.1.

Decision of the General Assembly			*Registration and publication of the Declarations*[2]			
			Registration		*United Nations Treaty Series*	
Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of adoption*	*Date*	*Number*	*Volume*	*Page*
Afghanistan[1]	34 (I)	9 Nov 1946	14 Dec 1946	7	1	39
Albania	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3043	223	23
Algeria	1754 (XVII)	8 Oct 1962	11 Oct 1962	6336	442	37
Andorra	47/232	28 Jul 1993	28 Jul 1993	30158	1728	
Angola[3]	31/44	1 Dec 1976	1 Sep 1978	16920	1102	205
Antigua and Barbuda	36/26	11 Nov 1981	11 Nov 1981	20564	1256	47
Armenia	46/227	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28686	1668	
Austria	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3044	223	27
Azerbaijan	46/230	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28691	1668	
Bahamas	3051 (XXVIII)	18 Sep 1973	18 Sep 1973	12760	891	109
Bahrain	2752 (XXVI)	21 Sep 1971	21 Sep 1971	11351	797	77
Bangladesh	3203 (XXIX)	17 Sep 1974	17 Sep 1974	13543	950	3
Barbados	2175 (XXI)	9 Dec 1966	9 Dec 1966	8437	581	131
Belize	36/3	25 Sep 1981	25 Sep 1981	20408	1252	59
Benin[4]	1481 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5357	375	91
Bhutan	2751 (XXVI)	21 Sep 1971	21 Sep 1971	11340	796	295
Bosnia and Herzegovina	46/237	22 May 1992	22 May 1992	28937	1675	
Botswana	2136 (XXI)	17 Oct 1966	17 Oct 1966	8357	575	151
Brunei Darussalam	39/1	21 Sep 1984	21 Sep 1984	23093	1369	81
Bulgaria	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3045	223	31
Burkina Faso[5]	1483 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5359	375	99
Burundi	1749 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6303	437	149
Cambodia[6]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3046	223	35
Cameroon[7]	1476 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5354	375	79
Cape Verde	3363 (XXX)	16 Sep 1975	16 Sep 1975	14309	981	345
Central African Republic[8]	1488 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5363	375	115
Chad	1485 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5361	375	107
Comoros	3385 (XXX)	12 Nov 1975	12 Nov 1975	14414	986	239
Congo[9]	1486 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5362	375	111
Côte d'Ivoire[10]	1484 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5360	375	103
Croatia	46/238	22 May 1992	22 May 1992	28935	1675	
Cyprus	1489 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	9 Jun 1961	5711	397	283
Czech Republic[11]	47/221	19 Jan 1993	19 Jan 1993	29466	1703	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	46/1	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28363	1649	
Djibouti	32/1	20 Sep 1977	1 Sep 1978	16922	1102	213
Dominica	33/107	18 Dec 1978	18 Dec 1978	17409	1120	111
Equatorial Guinea	2384 (XXIII)	12 Nov 1968	12 Nov 1968	9295	649	197
Eritrea	47/230	28 May 1993	28 May 1993	30068	1723	
Estonia[12]	46/4	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28368	1649	
Fiji	2622 (XXV)	13 Oct 1970	13 Oct 1970	10789	752	207
Finland	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	19 Dec 1955	3055	223	69

Participant	Decision of the General Assembly: Resolution	Decision of the General Assembly: Date of adoption	Registration and publication of the Declarations[2]: Registration: Date	Registration: Number	United Nations Treaty Series: Volume	United Nations Treaty Series: Page
Gabon	1487 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	7 Nov 1960	5436	379	99
Gambia	2008 (XX)	21 Sep 1965	21 Sep 1965	7928	545	143
Georgia	46/241	31 Jul 1992	31 Jul 1992	29076	1684	
Germany[13]	3050 (XXVIII)	18 Sep 1973	18 Sep 1973	12759	891	105
Ghana	1118 (XI)	8 Mar 1957	8 Mar 1957	3727	261	113
Grenada	3204 (XXIX)	17 Sep 1974	17 Sep 1974	13544	950	7
Guinea	1325 (XIII)	12 Dec 1958	12 Dec 1958	4595	317	77
Guinea-Bissau	3205 (XXIX)	17 Sep 1974	17 Sep 1974	13545	950	11
Guyana	2133 (XXI)	20 Sep 1966	20 Sep 1966	8316	572	225
Hungary	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	15 Dec 1955	3054	223	65
Iceland[1]	34 (I)	9 Nov 1946	14 Dec 1946	8	1	41
Indonesia[14]	491 (V)	28 Sep 1950	28 Sep 1950	916	71	153
Ireland	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	29 Nov 1956	3594	254	223
Israel	273 (III)	11 May 1949	11 May 1949	448	30	53
Italy	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	9 Apr 1956	3217	231	175
Jamaica	1750 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6304	437	153
Japan	1113 (XI)	18 Dec 1956	18 Dec 1956	3626	256	167
Jordan	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3048	223	43
Kazakstan	46/224	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28687	1668	
Kenya	1976 (XVIII)	16 Dec 1963	16 Dec 1963	7015	483	233
Kuwait	1872 (S-IV)	14 May 1963	14 May 1963	6705	463	213
Kyrgyzstan	46/225	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28688	1668	
Lao People's Democratic Republic[15]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3049	223	47
Latvia[16]	46/5	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28369	1649	
Lesotho	2137 (XXI)	17 Oct 1966	17 Oct 1966	8358	575	155
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya[17]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3050	223	51
Liechtenstein	45/1	18 Sep 1990	18 Sep 1990	27554	1578	
Lithuania[18]	46/6	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28367	1649	
Madagascar	1478 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5356	375	87
Malawi[19]		1 Dec 1964	1 Dec 1964	7496	519	3
Malaysia[20]	1134 (XII)	17 Sep 1957	17 Sep 1957	3995	277	3
Maldives[21]	2009 (XX)	21 Sep 1965	21 Sep 1965	7929	545	147
Mali	1491 (XV)	28 Sep 1960	28 Oct 1960	5412	377	361
Malta[19]		1 Dec 1964	1 Dec 1964	7497	519	7
Marshall Islands	46/3	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28366	1649	
Mauritania	1631 (XVI)	27 Oct 1961	26 Mar 1963	6576	457	59
Mauritius	2371 (XXII)	24 Apr 1968	24 Apr 1968	9064	634	217
Micronesia (Federated States of)[22]	46/2	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28364	1649	
Monaco	47/231	28 May 1993	28 May 1993	30067	1723	
Mongolia	1630 (XVI)	27 Oct 1961	17 Jul 1962	6261	434	141
Morocco	1111 (XI)	12 Nov 1956	12 Nov 1956	3575	253	77
Mozambique	3365 (XXX)	16 Sep 1975	16 Sep 1975	14310	981	349
Myanmar[23]	188 (S-II)	19 Apr 1948	19 Apr 1948	225	15	3

	Decision of the General Assembly		*Registration and publication of the Declarations*[2]			
			Registration		*United Nations Treaty Series*	
Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of adoption*	*Date*	*Number*	*Volume*	*Page*
Namibia[24]	S–18/I	23 Apr 1990	23 Apr 1990	27200	1564	
Nepal	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3051	223	55
Niger	1482 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5358	375	95
Nigeria	1492 (XV)	7 Oct 1960	8 May 1961	5688	395	237
Oman	2754 (XXVI)	7 Oct 1971	7 Oct 1971	11359	797	225
Pakistan[1]	108 (II)	30 Sep 1947	30 Sep 1947	112	8	57
Palau[25]	49/163	15 Dec 1994	15 Dec 1994			
Papua New Guinea	3368 (XXX)	10 Oct 1975	10 Oct 1975	14377	985	51
Portugal	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	21 Feb 1956	3155	229	3
Qatar	2753 (XXVI)	21 Sep 1971	21 Sep 1971	11352	797	81
Republic of Korea	46/1	17 Sep 1991	17 Sep 1991	28365	1649	
Republic of Moldova	46/223	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28692	1668	
Romania	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3052	223	59
Rwanda	1748 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6302	437	145
Saint Kitts and Nevis[26]	38/1	23 Sep 1983	23 Sep 1983	22359	1332	261
Saint Lucia	34/1	18 Sep 1979	18 Sep 1979	17969	1145	201
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	35/1	16 Sep 1980	16 Sep 1980	19076	1198	185
Samoa	31/104	15 Dec 1976	15 Dec 1976	15164	1031	3
San Marino	46/231	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28694	1668	
Sao Tome and Principe	3364 (XXX)	16 Sep 1975	16 Sep 1975	14311	981	353
Senegal	1490 (XV)	28 Sep 1960	28 Sep 1960	5374	376	79
Seychelles	31/1	21 Sep 1976	21 Sep 1976	15022	1023	107
Sierra Leone	1623 (XVI)	27 Sep 1961	27 Sep 1961	5876	409	43
Singapore	2010 (XX)	21 Sep 1965	21 Sep 1965	7930	545	151
Slovakia[11]	47/222	19 Jan 1993	19 Jan 1993	29465	1703	
Slovenia	46/236	22 May 1992	22 May 1992	28936	1675	
Solomon Islands	33/1	19 Sep 1978	19 Sep 1978	17087	1106	137
Somalia	1479 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	23 Feb 1961	5577	388	179
Spain	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3053	223	63
Sri Lanka[27]	995 (X)	14 Dec 1955	14 Dec 1955	3047	223	39
Sudan	1110 (XI)	12 Nov 1956	12 Nov 1956	3576	253	81
Suriname[28]	3413 (XXX)	4 Dec 1975	1 Jun 1976	14784	1007	343
Swaziland	2376 (XXIII)	24 Sep 1968	24 Sep 1968	9252	646	177
Sweden[1]	34 (I)	9 Nov 1946	14 Dec 1946	9	1	43
Tajikistan	46/228	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28690	1668	
Thailand[1]	101 (I)	15 Dec 1946	16 Dec 1946	11	1	47
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[29]	47/225	8 Apr 1993	8 Apr 1993	29892	1719	
Togo	1477 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	20 Sep 1960	5355	375	83
Trinidad and Tobago	1751 (XVII)	18 Sep 1962	18 Sep 1962	6305	437	157
Tunisia	1112 (XI)	12 Nov 1956	12 Nov 1956	3577	253	85
Turkmenistan	46/229	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28693	1668	
Uganda	1758 (XVII)	25 Oct 1962	25 Oct 1962	6357	443	47
United Arab Emirates	2794 (XXVI)	9 Dec 1971	9 Dec 1971	11424	802	101
United Republic of Tanzania[30]	1667 (XVI)	14 Dec 1961	14 Dec 1961	6000	416	147

	Decision of the General Assembly		*Registration and publication of the Declarations*[2]			
			Registration		*United Nations Treaty Series*	
Participant	*Resolution*	*Date of adoption*	*Date*	*Number*	*Volume*	*Page*
Uzbekistan	46/226	2 Mar 1992	2 Mar 1992	28689	1668	
Vanuatu	36/1	15 Sep 1981	15 Sep 1981	20385	1249	167
Viet Nam[31]	32/2	20 Sep 1977	1 Sep 1978	16921	1102	209
Yemen[1, 32]	108 (II)	30 Sep 1947	30 Sep 1947	113	8	59
Zaire[33]	1480 (XV)	20 Sep 1960	2 Jan 1962	6020	418	157
Zambia[19]		1 Dec 1964	1 Dec 1964	7498	519	11
Zimbabwe	11/1 (S-XI)	25 Aug 1980	25 Aug 1980	19058	1197	323

NOTES:

[1] The Provisional Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly (rules 113–116), under which the first six new Members were admitted to membership in the United Nations, namely, Afghanistan, Iceland, Pakistan, Sweden, Thailand and Yemen, stipulated that the membership, in case of a favourable decision of the General Assembly, shall become effective on the date on which the applicant State presented to the Secretary-General an instrument of adherence. Accordingly, the membership of Afghanistan, Iceland and Sweden became effective on 19 November 1946, that of Thailand on 16 December 1946 and that of Pakistan and Yemen on 30 September 1947.

By resolution 116 (II) of 21 November 1947, the General Assembly adopted new rules governing the admission of new Members. Under these rules (135–139), a declaration, made in a formal instrument accepting the obligations contained in the Charter, shall be submitted to the Secretary-General by an applicant State at the same time as the application for membership. The membership becomes effective, if the application is approved, on the date on which the General Assembly takes its decision on the application. Accordingly, for all Members other than the six mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the membership became effective on the respective dates of adoption as indicated in the third column of the table.

[2] The declarations are registered *ex officio* with the Secretariat on the effective dates of membership. However, since the registration did not start until 14 December 1946, when the General Assembly, by resolution 97 (I), adopted the regulations to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the declarations of Afghanistan, Iceland and Sweden were registered on that date. Furthermore, in some instances, where the declaration accepting the obligations contained in the Charter was submitted to the Secretary-General together with the application in cabled form or emanated from a representative other than the Head of State or Government or the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the registration was not effected until the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the confirmation of the declaration in the formal instrument bearing the signature of one of those authorities. (For the text of the Regulations to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by General Assembly resolution 97 (I) of 14 December 1946 and modified by resolutions 364 B(IV), 482 (V) and 33/141 A of 1 December 1949, 12 December 1950 and 18 December 1978, respectively, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 859, p. VIII.)

[3] The non registration of the declaration by Angola on 1 December 1976, the date of its membership, results from an administrative oversight.

[4] Formerly: "Dahomey" until 2 December 1975.

[5] Formerly: "Upper Volta" until 4 August 1984.

[6] As from 3 February 1990, "Cambodia". Formerly, as follows: as from 6 April 1976 to 3 February 1990 "Democratic Kampuchea"; as from 30 April to 6 April 1976 "Cambodia"; as from 28 December 1970 to 30 April 1975 "Khmer Republic".

[7] As from 4 February 1984 Cameroon (from 10 March 1975 to 4 February 1984 known as "the United Republic of Cameroon" and prior to 10 March 1975 known as "Cameroon".

[8] In a communication dated 20 December 1976, the Permanent Mission of the Central African Empire to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that, by a decision of the extraordinary Congress of the Movement for the Social Development of Black Africa (MESAN), held at Bangui from 10 November to 4 December 1976, the Central African Republic had been constituted into the Central African Empire.

In a communication dated 25 September 1979 the Permanent Representative of that country to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that, following a change of regime which took place on 20 September 1979, the former institutions of the Empire had been dissolved and the Central African Republic proclaimed.

[9] In a communication dated 15 November 1971, the Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of the Congo to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that their country would henceforth be known as the "Congo".

[10] Formerly: "Ivory Coast" until 31 December 1985.

[11] In a letter dated 16 February 1993, received by the Secretary-General on 22 February 1993 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Czech Republic notified that :

> "In conformity with the valid principles of international law and to the extent defined by it, the Czech Republic, as a successor State to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of 1 January 1993, i.e. the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, by multilateral international treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party on that date, including reservations and declarations to their provisions made earlier by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.
>
> The Government of the Czech Republic have examined multilateral treaties the list of which is attached to this letter. [The Government of the Czech Republic] considers to be bound by these treaties as well as by all reservations and declarations to them by virtue of succession as of 1 January 1993.
>
> The Czech Republic, in accordance with the well established principles of international law, recognizes signatures made by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic in respect of all signed treaties as if they were made by itself."

Subsequently, in a letter dated 19 May 1993 and also accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, received by the Secretary-General on 28 May 1993, the Government of the Slovak Republic notified that:

> "In accordance with the relevant principles and rules of international law and to the extent defined by it, the Slovak Republic, as a successor State, born from the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak

Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of January 1, 1993, i.e., the date on which the Slovak Republic assumed responsibility for its international relations, by multilateral treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party as of 31 December 1992, including reservations and declarations made earlier by Czechoslovakia, as well as objections by Czechoslovakia to reservations formulated by other treaty-parties.

The Slovak Republic wishes further to maintain its status as a contracting State of the treaties to which Czechoslovakia was a contracting State and which were not yet in force at the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, as well as the status of a signatory State of the treaties which were previously signed but not ratified by Czechoslovakia as listed in the Annex to this letter."

In view of the information above, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e. signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the former Czechoslovakia prior to dissolution, in respect of treaties to which the Czech Republic and/or Slovakia have succeeded, will be replaced by the name of "Czech Republic" and/or "Slovakia" with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote will indicate the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" as the case may be.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by the former Czechoslovakia and not listed in the notification of succession by either the Czech Republic or Slovakia, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "*Participant*". See also note 1 in chapter I.1.

[12] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 8 October 1991, the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia informed the Secretary-General that "Estonia does not regard itself as party by virtue of the doctrine of treaty succession to any bilateral or multilateral treaties entered into by the U.S.S.R. The Republic of Estonia has begun careful review of multilateral treaties in order to determine those to which it wishes to become a party. In this regard it will act on a case-by-case basis in exercise of its own sovereign right in the name of the Republic of Estonia."

[13] In a communication dated 3 October 1990, the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"... Through the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany with effect from 3 October 1990, the two German States have united to form one sovereign State, which as a single Member of the United Nations remains bound by the provisions of the Charter in accordance with the solemn declaration of 12 June 1973. As from the date of unification, the Federal Republic of Germany will act in the United Nations under the designation 'Germany'."

The former German Democratic Republic was admitted to the Organization on 18 September 1973 by Resolution No. 3050 (XXVIII). For the text of the declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter dated 12 June 1973 made by the German Democratic Republic (registered under No. 12758), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 891, p. 103.

Consequently, and in the light of articles 11 and 12 of the Treaty of 31 August 1990 (Unification Treaty) between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e. signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the Federal Republic of Germany will now appear under "Germany" and indicate the dates of such formalities.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities had been effected by both the Federal Republic of Germany and the former German Democratic Republic prior to unification, the entry will similarly indicate in the corresponding table the type of formality effected by the Federal Republic of Germany and the date on which it took place, while the type of formality effected by the former German Democratic Republic and the date thereof will appear in a footnote.

Finally, as regards the treatment of treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by the former German Democratic Republic alone, article 12, para. 3 of the Unification Treaty contains the following provision: "Should the united Germany intend to accede to international organizations or other multilateral treaties of which the German Democratic Republic but not the Federal Republic of Germany is a member, agreement shall be reached with the respective contracting parties and with the European Communities where the latter's competence is affected". Accordingly, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former German Democratic Republic will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "*Participant*".

[14] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 20 January 1965, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that "Indonesia has decided at this stage and under the present circumstances to withdraw from the United Nations". In his reply of 26 February 1965, after noting the contents of the letter from the Indonesia, the Secretary-General expressed "the earnest hope that in due time [Indonesia] will resume full co-operation with the United Nations". For the text of the letter from Indonesia and the Secretary-General's reply, see document A/5857 and Corr.1 and A/5899.

In a telegram of 19 September 1966, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that it "has decided to resume full co-operation with the United Nations and to resume participation in its activities starting with the twenty-first session of the General Assembly". For the text of that telegram, see document A/6419.

At the 1420th plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 28 September 1966, the President of the General Assembly, referring to the above-mentioned correspondence and to the decision of the Government of Indonesia "to resume full co-operation with the United Nations", stated, *inter alia*, that "it would appear, therefore, that the Government of Indonesia considers that its recent absence from the Organization was based not upon a withdrawal from the United Nations but upon a cessation of co-operation. The action so far taken by the United Nations on this matter would not appear to preclude this view. If this is also the general view of the membership, the Secretary-General would give instructions for the necessary administrative action to be taken for Indonesia to participate again in the proceedings of the Organization ... Unless I hear any objection, I would assume that it is the will of the membership that Indonesia should resume full participation in the activities of the United Nations and the Secretary-General may proceed in the manner I have outlined." There having been no objection, the President invited the representatives of Indonesia to take their seats in the General Assembly (See *Official Records of the General Assembly Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 1420th meeting.*)

[15] Formerly: "Laos" until 22 December 1975.

[16] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 26 February 1993, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Latvia informed the Secretary-General that "Latvia does not regard itself as party by virtue of the doctrine of treaty succession to any bilateral or multilateral treaties entered into by the former USSR."

[17] By two communications dated 1 and 18 April 1977, respectively, the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Secretary-General that the official designation "Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" (short title: "Libyan Arab Jamahiriya") should be substituted for "Libyan Arab Republic". (Before 6 January 1971: "Libya".)

[18] On 23 June 1995, the Secretary-General received a letter, dated 22 June 1995 and signed by the Permanent Representative of the Government of Lithuania to the United Nations, transmitting a note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs declaring the following :

".... The Republic of Lithuania was occupied by the USSR on the 15th of June 1940. Many Western countries did not recognize the incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the USSR.

Having restored its independence on the 11th of March 1990, the Republic of Lithuania neither is nor can be the successor state of the former USSR. The Republic of Lithuania can not take the

responsibility for the treaties concluded by the former USSR, for it neither participated in making those treaties nor influenced them. Therefore the Republic of Lithuania can not take the responsibility for the past treaties concluded by the USSR...."

19 The decision to admit Malawi, Malta and Zambia to membership in the United Nations was taken by the General Assembly during its nineteenth session at the 1286th meeting held on 1 December 1964.

20 On 16 September 1963, the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary–General the following communication:

"By the Constitutional process of Amendment provided for in Article 159 of the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya carried out recently in both Houses of Parliament with the requisite two–thirds majorities, the name of the State as set out in Article 1 thereof has been changed from 'Federation of Malaya' to 'Malaysia'.

"This Mission has therefore from this date assumed the name of 'Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations'.

"I shall be grateful for your having this change noted and also for your bringing it to the notice of all Missions accredited to the United Nations."

Subsequently, the Government of Malaysia confirmed to the Secretary–General that all multilateral treaties, in respect of which he acts as depositary and to which the Federation of Malaysia has become a party either by succession or by ratification or accession, continue to be binding on Malaysia, and that henceforth Malaysia should be listed in the relevant United Nations publications as a party to those treaties.

21 In a letter of 14 April 1969, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Maldives to the United Nations informed the Secretary–General that "after the change from a Sultanate to a Republican Administration, the Maldivian Government has decided that the country be known as 'Maldives' instead of 'Maldive Islands' and that the full title of the State be called 'Republic of Maldives'".

22 On 11 August 1992, the Secretary–General transmitted the following declaration dated 22 May 1992 emanating from the Secretary of External Affairs of the Federated States of Micronesia to the Secretary–General "setting out the position of the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) with regard to international agreements entered into by the the United States of America and made applicable to the FSM pursuant to the United Nations Trusteeship Agreement for the former Japanese Mandated islands":

"On November 3, 1986, the application of treaties and international agreements to the Federated States of Micronesia by virtue of the application of treaties by the United States of America to the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, ceased. With regard to all bilateral treaties validly concluded by the United States on behalf of the Federated States of Micronesia, or validly applied or extended by the former to the latter before November 3, 1986, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia declares that it will examine each such treaty and communicate its view to the other State Party concerned. In the meantime, the Federated States of Micronesia will continue to observe the terms of each treaty which validly so applies and is not inconsistent with the letter or the spirit of the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia, provisionally and on a basis of reciprocity. The period of examination will extend until November 3, 1995, except in the case of any treaty in respect of which an earlier statement of views is or has been made. At the expiration of that period, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia will consider such of these treaties that could not by the application of the rules of customary international law be regarded as otherwise surviving, as having terminated.

It is the earnest hope of the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia that during the afore–mentioned period of examination, the normal processes of diplomatic negotiations will enable it to reach satisfactory accord with the States Parties concerned upon the possibility of the continuance or modification of such treaties.

With regard to multilateral treaties previously applied, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia intends to review each of them individually and to communicate to the depositary in each case what steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation or termination, confirmation of succession or accession. During such period of review, any party to a multilateral treaty that has, prior to November 3, 1986, been validly applied or extended to the Federated States of Micronesia and is not inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia may, on a basis of reciprocity, rely as against the Federated States of Micronesia on the terms of such treaty."

Further, on 15 November 1995, the Secretary–General circulated a communication dated 2 November 1995 from the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia indicating that it has decided to extend the period of examination of the bilateral treaties indicated in its letter of 22 May 1992 for two additional years or until 3 November 1997.

23 Formerly: "Burma" until 17 June 1989.

24 Formerly: "Namibia (United Nations Council for Namibia)" until independence (21 March 1990).

25 In a letter dated 10 November 1994, the President of the Republic of Palau stated, *inter alia:*

"... With regard to multilateral treaties previously applied, the Government of the Republic of Palau intends to review each of them individually and to communicate to the depositary in each case what steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession or accession. During such period of review, any party to a multilateral treaty that has, prior to termination of the Trusteeship Agreement with respect to the Republic of Palau may, on a basis of reciprocity, rely as against the Republic of Palau on the terms of such treaty."

26 Formerly: "Saint Christopher and Nevis" until 28 December 1986.

27 Formerly: "Ceylon" until 29 August 1972.

28 Formerly: "Surinam" until 23 January 1978.

29 See note 6 in chapter I.1.

30 The People's Republic of Zanzibar was admitted to membership on 16 December 1963 by Resolution No. 1975 (XVIII). For the text of the Declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter dated 10 December 1963 made by Zanzibar (registered under No. 7016), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 483, p. 237.

In a note addressed to the Secretary General on 6 May 1964, the Ministry of External Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania informed him that, following the signature and ratification of the Articles of Union between the Republic of Tanganyika and the People's Republic of Zanzibar, the two countries had been united on 26 April 1964, as one sovereign State under the name of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The Ministry further asked the Secretary–General "to note that the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar declares that it is now a single Member of the United Nations bound by the provisions of the Charter, and that all international treaties and agreements in force between the Republic of Tanganyika or the People's Republic of Zanzibar and other States or international organizations will, to the extent that their implementation is consistent with the constitutional position established by the Articles of the Union, remain in force within the regional limits prescribed on their conclusion and in accordance with the principles of international law".

In communicating the above–mentioned note, in accordance with the request contained therein, to all States Members of the United Nations, to the principal organs of the United Nations and to the subsidiary organs of the United Nations to which Tanganyika and Zanzibar had been appointed, and to the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Secretary–General stated that he "is taking action, within the limits of his administrative responsibilities, to give effect to the declaration in the attached note that the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar is now a single Member of the United Nations bound by the provisions of the Charter. This action is undertaken without prejudice to and pending such action as other organs of the United Nations may take on the basis of the notification of the establishment of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar." No objection was raised in this regard in any of the organs concerned.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary–General on 2 November 1964, the Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar informed him that "the United Republic of Tanganika and Zanzibar shall, with immediate effect, be known as the United Republic of Tanzania".

Subsequently, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania confirmed to the Secretary–General that the United Republic of Tanzania continues to be bound by multilateral treaties in respect of which the Secretary–General acts as depositary and which had been signed, ratified or acceded to on behalf of Tanganyika.

[31] The Democratic Republic of Viet–Nam and the Republic of South Viet–Nam (the latter of which replaced the Republic of Viet Nam) united on 2 July 1976 to constitute a new State, the Socialist Republic of Viet–Nam (Viet–Nam).

[32] In a letter dated 19 May 1990, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Yemen Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen informed the Secretary–General of the following:

"...The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic will merge in a single sovereign State called the Republic of Yemen' (short form: Yemen) with Sana'a as its capital, as soon as it is proclaimed on Tuesday, 22 May 1990. The Republic of Yemen will have single membership in the United Nations and be bound by the provisions of the Charter. All treaties and agreements concluded between either the Yemen Arab Republic or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other States and international organizations in accordance with international law which are in force on 22 May 1990 will remain in effect, and international relations existing on 22 May 1990 between the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic and other States will continue."

As concerns the treaties concluded prior to their union by the Yemen Arab Republic or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Republic of Yemen (as now united) is accordingly to be considered as a party to those treaties as from the date when one of these States first became a party to those treaties. Accordingly the tables showing the status of treaties will now indicate under the designation "Yemen" the date of the formalities (signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the State which first became a party, those eventually effected by the other being described in a footnote.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was admitted to the United Nations by Resolution No. 2310 (XXII) of 14 December 1967 registered under No. 8861. For the text of the declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations made by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 614, p. 21. The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was successively listed in the previous editions as "Southern Yemen", "People's Republic of Southern Yemen", "People's Democratic Republic of Yemen" and "Democratic Republic of Yemen".

[33] Formerly: "Democratic Republic of the Congo" until 27 October 1971.

3. Statute of the International Court of Justice

(annexed to the Charter of the United Nations)

PARTIES: All members of the United Nations.[1]
Switzerland as from 28 July 1948.[2]
Nauru as from 29 January 1988.[3]

NOTES:

[1] See chapter I.1 and I.2. Before becoming Members of the United Nations, Japan, Liechtenstein and San Marino were parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice from 2 April 1954 to 18 December 1956, from 29 March 1950 to 18 September 1990 and from 18 February 1954 to 2 March 1992, respectively; for the text of the declaration by the Government of Japan accepting the conditions determined to that effect, upon the recommendation of the Security Council, by the General Assembly in resolution 805 (VIII) of 9 December 1953 (registered under No. 2524), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 188, p. 137; for that made by Liechtenstein accepting the conditions determined, upon recommendation of the Security Council, by the General Assembly in resolution 363 (IV) adopted on 1 December 1949 (registered under No. 758), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 51. p. 115, and for that made by San Marino accepting the conditions determined, upon recommendation of the Security Council, by the General Assembly in resolution 806 (VIII) of 9 December 1953 (registered under No. 2495), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 186, p. 295.

[2] Upon the recommendation of the Security Council, adopted on 15 November 1946, the General Assembly by resolution 91 (I) adopted on 11 December 1946, and in pursuance of Article 93, paragraph 2, of the Charter, determined the conditions upon which Switzerland could become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. On 28 July 1948, a declaration accepting these conditions was deposited with the Secretary-General on behalf of Switzerland (registered under No. 271, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 17, p. 111) and accordingly on that date Switzerland became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

[3] Upon the recommendation of the Security Council, adopted on 19 October 1987, the General Assembly by resolution 42/21 adopted on 18 November 1987, and in pursuance of Article 93, paragraph 2, of the Charter, determined the conditions upon which Nauru could become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. On 29 January 1988, a declaration accepting these conditions was deposited with the Secretary-General on behalf of Nauru (registered under No. 25639) and accordingly on that date Nauru became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

4. Declarations recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court

Declarations under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court as implemented by Security Council Resolution 9 (1946) of 15 October 1946 are deposited with the Registrar of the Court. For those declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, or the *Yearbooks* of the Court.

Note: The declarations recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice deposited with the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala, Thailand and Turkey were made for specified periods of time which expired. For the text of those declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 49 (Guatemala); vol. 15, p. 221 (Brazil); vol. 16, p. 207 (Bolivia); vol. 65, p. 157 (Thailand), and vol. 191, p. 357; vol. 308, p. 301; vol. 491, p. 385, and vol. 604, p. 349 (Turkey).

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 April 1967, the Government of South Africa gave notice of withdrawal and termination, with effect from that date, of the declaration of 12 September 1955. For the text of the said declaration, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 13 September 1955, and for the notice of termination, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 216, p. 115, and vol. 595, p. 363, respectively.

A declaration recognizing as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice had been deposited on 26 October 1946 with the Secretary-General on behalf of the Republic of China (for the text of that declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 35). In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 5 December 1972, the Government of the People's Republic of China indicated that it does not recognize the statement made by the defunct Chinese government on 26 October 1946 in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice concerning the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 10 January 1974, the Government of France gave notice of the termination of the declaration of 20 May 1966. For the text of that declaration and for the notice of termination, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 562, p. 71 and vol. 907, p. 129, respectively.

In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 7 October 1985, the Government of the United States of America gave notice of the termination of its declaration of 26 August 1946.[1] For the text of the declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 9.

In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 21 November 1985, the Government of Israel gave notice of the termination of the declaration of 17 October 1956.[2] For the text of the declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 252, p. 301.

States which have made declarations under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice or whose declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice are deemed to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice[3]

Australia	Dominican Republic[4]	India	Netherlands	Somalia
Austria	Egypt	Japan	New Zealand	Spain
Barbados	El Salvador	Kenya	Nicaragua[4]	Sudan
Belgium	Estonia	Liberia	Nigeria	Suriname
Botswana	Finland	Liechtenstein	Norway	Swaziland
Bulgaria	Gambia	Luxembourg[4]	Pakistan	Sweden
Cambodia	Georgia	Madagascar	Palau	Switzerland
Cameroon	Greece	Malawi	Panama[4]	Togo
Canada	Guinea-Bissau	Malta	Philippines	Uganda
Colombia[4]	Haiti[4]	Mauritius	Poland	United Kingdom
Costa Rica	Honduras	Mexico	Portugal	Uruguay[4]
Cyprus	Hungary	Nauru	Senegal	Zaire
Denmark				

Texts of the declarations

(The date shown after the name of the State indicates the date of deposit of the declaration.)

(a) ***Declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice***

AUSTRALIA

17 March 1975[5]

"*Whereas* on the first day of November one thousand nine hundred and forty-five Australia ratified the Charter of the United Nations of which the Statute of the International court of Justice is an integral part; and

"*Whereas* Australia made a declaration under paragraph 2 of Article 36, of the said Statute on the sixth day of February, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-four; and

"*Whereas* Australia desires to withdraw the said declaration;

"The Government of Australia hereby *withdraws* the said declaration and *declares* for and on behalf of Australia that it recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to withdraw this declaration.

"The Government of Australia further *declares* that this declaration does not apply to any dispute in regard to which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement.

"*In witness whereof*, I, Edward Gough Whitlam, Prime Minister acting for and on behalf of the Minister of State for

Foreign Affairs of Australia, have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the Minister of State for Foreign Affairs.

"*Dated* this thirteenth day of March, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-five.

(*Signed*) Edward Gough Whitlam
Prime Minister acting for
and on behalf of the Minister
of State for Foreign Affairs
of Australia"

AUSTRIA

19 May 1971[6]

I hereby declare that the Republic of Austria recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State which accepts or has accepted the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

This Declaration does not apply to any dispute in respect of which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to other means of peaceful settlement for its final and binding decision.

This Declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until it will be terminated or modified by a written declaration.

Done at Vienna on 28 April 1971.

(*Signed*) Franz Jonas
The Federal President

BARBADOS

1 August 1980[7]

"I have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of Barbados that –

"The Government of Barbados accepts as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 [of the Statute] of the Court until such time as notice might be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the declaration is made, other than:

(a) disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
(b) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;
(c) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Barbados;
(d) disputes arising out of or concerning jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by Barbados in respect of the conservation, management or exploitation of the living resources of the Sea, or in respect of the prevention or control of pollution or contamination of the marine environment in marine areas adjacent to the coast of Barbados.

"Accept, Sir, the assurance of my highest consideration.

(*Signed*) H.deB. Forde
Minister of External Affairs"

BELGIUM

17 June 1958[8, 9]

I declare on behalf of the Belgian Government that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court, in legal disputes arising after 13 July 1948 concerning situations or facts subsequent to that date, except those in regard to which the parties have agreed or may agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

This declaration is made subject to ratification. It shall take effect on the day of deposit of the instrument of ratification for a period of five years. Upon the expiry of that period, it shall continue to have effect until notice of its termination is given.

Brussels, 3 April 1958

(*Signed*) V. Larock
Minister of Foreign Affairs

BOTSWANA

16 March 1970[10]

"I, Sir Seretse Khama, President of the Republic of Botswana, have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Botswana, that it recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

"This Declaration does not extend:

"(a) to disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another means of peaceful settlement; or
"(b) to disputes relating to matters which, by international law, are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Botswana."

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

"Done at Gaborone this 14th day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy.

(*Signed*) Seretse M. Khama
President"

BULGARIA

24 June 1992[11]

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria, I have the honour to declare that in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice the Republic of Bulgaria recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes arising out of facts and situations subsequent to or continuing to exist after the entry into force of the present Declaration, concerning:

1. the interpretation of a treaty;
2. any question of international law;
3. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
4. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation,

except for disputes with any State which has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute less than twelve months prior to filing an application bringing the dispute before the Court or where such acceptance has been made only for the purpose of a particular dispute.

The Republic of Bulgaria also reserves the right at any time to modify the present Declaration, the modifications taking effect six months after the deposit of the notification thereof.

The present Declaration shall be in force for a period of five years from the date of its deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. It shall continue in force thereafter until six months after a notice of its denunciation is given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Sofia, 26 May 1992

(*Signed*) S. Ganev
The Minister of Foreign Affairs of
the Republic of Bulgaria

CAMBODIA

19 September 1957[12]

On behalf of the Royal Government of Cambodia I have the honour to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State Member of the United Nations, accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all legal disputes, other than:

1. Disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
2. Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Cambodia;
3. Disputes relating to any matter excluded from judicial settlement or compulsory arbitration by virtue of any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which the Kingdom of Cambodia is a party.

This declaration is valid for ten years from the date of its deposit. It shall remain in force thereafter until notice to the contrary has been given by the Royal Government of Cambodia.

Phnom-Penh, 9 September 1957

(*Signed*) Sim Var

CAMEROON

3 March 1994[13]

By order of the Government of the Republic of Cameroon, I have the honour to declare that:

The Government of of Cameroon, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes.

This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years. It shall then continue to have effect unless the Government of the Republic of Cameroon makes a statement to the contrary or submits a written amendment hereto.

(*Signed*) Ferdinand Léopold OYONO
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

CANADA

10 May 1994[14]

"On behalf of the Government of Canada,

(1) I give notice that I hereby terminate the acceptance by Canada of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice hitherto effective by virtue of the declaration made on 10 September 1985 in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

(2) I declare that the Government of Canada accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this declaration, other than:

   (a) disputes in regard to which parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
   (b) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a member of the Commonwealth, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;
   (c) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Canada; and
   (d) disputes arising out of or concerning conservation and management measures taken by Canada with respect to vessels fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area, as defined in the Convention on Future Multilateral Co–operation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, 1978, and the enforcement of such measures.

(3) The Government of Canada also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added."

New York, May 10, 1994

(*Signed*) Louise Fréchette
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative

COSTA RICA

20 February 1973[15]

The Government of Costa Rica recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes of the kinds referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. This Declaration shall be valid for a period of five years and shall be understood to be tacitly renewed for like periods, unless denounced before the expiration of the said period.

(*Signed*) Gonzalo J. Facio
Minister for Foreign Affairs

CYPRUS

29 April 1988[16]

I have the honour on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus to declare, in conformity with paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that the Republic of Cyprus accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, over all legal disputes concerning:

a) the interpretation of any treaty –
   I. to which the Republic of Cyprus became a Party on or after 16 August 1960 or
   II. which the Republic of Cyprus recognises as binding on it by succession;
b) any question of international law;
c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided that this declaration shall not apply:

a) to disputes relating to questions which fall within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Cyprus;

b) where the declaration recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited with the General of the United Nations less than six months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw this Declaration or any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

(*Signed*)
George Iacovou
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Nicosia, 19th April, 1988.

DENMARK

10 December 1956[17]

In conformity with the Royal Decree of 3 December 1956, I have the honour, on behalf of the Danish Government, to make the following declaration:

Pursuant to Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Kingdom of Denmark recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement the jurisdiction of the Court in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, for a period of five years from 10 December 1956 and thereafter for further periods of five years, if this declaration is not denounced by notice of not less than six months before the expiration of any five-year period.

New York, 10 December 1956

(*Signed*) Karl I. Eskelund
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Permanent Representative to the United Nations

EGYPT

2 July 1957[18, 19]

"I, Mahmouds Fawzi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Egypt, declare on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Egypt, that, in accordance with Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice and in pursuance and for the purposes of paragraph 9 (b) of the Declaration of the Government of the Republic of Egypt dated April 24, 1957 on the 'Suez Canal and the arrangements for its operation', the Government of the Republic of Egypt accept as compulsory, *ipso facto*, on condition of reciprocity and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes that may arise under the said paragraph 9 (b) of the above Declaration dated April 24, 1957, with effect as from that date.

18th July, 1957

(*Signed*) Mahmoud Fawzi"

EL SALVADOR

26 November 1973[20, 21]

In my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs and on behalf of the Government of the Republic of El Salvador,

Considering that Article 36, paragraph 5, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice provides that a declaration made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice makes the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice compulsory in accordance with the terms of the original declaration,

Considering that the Government of El Salvador, in accordance with the Agreement of the Executive Authority of 26 May 1930, ratified by the Legislative Authority in accordance with Decree No. 110 of 3 July 1930, made a declaration recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, with the reservations set forth in the same document and on the basis of the Political Constitution of the Republic which, at the time, was that promulgated on 24 August 1886,

Considering that, after the notification of that declaration, other Political Constitutions of the Republic have been promulgated, the latest being that currently in effect as from 24 January 1962, and that moreover, after that declaration, the United Nations Charter was adopted on 26 June 1945 and the Charter of the Organization of American States on 30 April 1948, revised by the Protocol of Buenos Aires in 1967;

Considering that consequently, the terms of the declaration must be adapted to accord with those postulated in the Political Constitution currently in effect, and with the present circumstances; bearing in mind, furthermore, the texts of similar declarations made by other States Members of the United Nations,

I therefore:

Make the following declaration:

In accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, El Salvador recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;.
(b) Any question of international law;
(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration shall apply solely to situations or facts that may arise after this date; it is made on condition of reciprocity in relation to any other State party to any dispute with El Salvador and is subject to the following exceptions, on which El Salvador does not accept the Court's compulsory jurisdiction:

(I) Disputes which the parties have agreed or may agree to submit to other means of peaceful settlement;
(II) Disputes which, under International law, fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of El Salvador;
(III) Disputes with El Salvador concerning or relating to:
(1) The status of its territory or the modification or delimitation of its frontiers or any other matter concerning boundaries;
(2) The territorial sea and the corresponding continental slope or continental shelf and the resources thereof, unless El Salvador accepts the jurisdiction in that particular case;
(3) The condition of its islands, bays and gulfs and that of the bays and gulfs that for historical reasons belong to it or are under a system of joint ownership, whether or not recognized by rulings of international tribunals;
(4) The airspace superjacent to its land and maritime territory;
(IV) Disputes relating to or connected with facts or situations of hostilities, armed conflicts, individual or

collective actions taken in self-defence, resistance to aggression, fulfilment of obligations imposed by international bodies, and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which El Salvador is, has been or may at some time be involved;

(V) Pre-existing disputes, it being understood that this includes any dispute the foundations, reasons, facts, causes, origins, definitions, allegations or bases of which existed prior to this date, even if they are submitted or brought to the knowledge of the Court hereafter; and

(VI) Disputes that may arise over the interpretation or implementation of a multilateral treaty unless (i) all the parties to the treaty are also parties in the case before the Court, or (ii) El Salvador expressly accepts the Court's jurisdiction in that particular case.

This declaration revokes and replaces the previous declaration made before the Permanent Court of International Justice and will remain in effect for a period of five years from this date. The above shall not prejudice the right which El Salvador reserves to be able at any time to modify, add to, clarify or derogate from the exceptions presented in it.

This declaration is made in compliance with Executive Agreement No. 826 of 24 November 1973, ratified by the Legislative Authority under Decree No. 488 of 26 November 1973.

(*Signed*) Mauricio A. Borgonovo Pohl
Minister for Foreign Affairs of El Salvador

ESTONIA

21 October 1991[22]

I, Arnold Rüütel, Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia, declare on behalf of the Republic of Estonia and in accordance with the Resolution of September 26, 1991 of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia, that the Republic of Estonia recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, provided that this declaration shall not apply to disputes, the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

Tallinn
10 October 1991

(*Signed*) A. Rüütel

FINLAND

21 June 1958[23]

On behalf of the Finnish Government, I hereby declare that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years from 25 June 1958. This declaration shall be renewed by tacit agreement for further periods of the same duration, unless it is denounced not later than six months before the expiry of any such period. This declaration shall apply only to disputes arising in regard to situations or facts subsequent to 25 June 1958.

New York, 25 June 1958

(*Signed*) G. A. Gripenberg
Permanent Representative of Finland
to the United Nations

GAMBIA

22 June 1966[24]

"In accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, I declare, on behalf of the Government of Gambia, that the Gambia recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising in the future concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
"(b) Any question of international law;
"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

"with the reservation, however, that this declaration does not apply to

"(a) Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed to a settlement other than by recourse to the International Court of Justice;
"(b) Disputes with any country in the Commonwealth;
"(c) Disputes which, by international law, fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Gambia.

Bathhurst, The Gambia
14th June, 1966

(*Signed*) A.B. N'jie
Minister of State for External Affairs"

GEORGIA

20 June 1995[25]

I have the honour on behalf of the Republic of Georgia to declare that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Republic of Georgia recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

Tbilisi, June 16, 1995

(*Signed*) Alexander Chikvaidze
Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Georgia

GREECE

10 January 1994[26]

I declare, on behalf of the Greek Government, that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. However, the Greek Government excludes from the competence of the Court any dispute relating to defensive military action taken by the Hellenic Republic for reasons of national defence.

This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years. Upon the expiry of that period, it shall continue to have effect until notice of its termination is given.

Athens, 20 December 1993
(*Signed*) Karolos PAPOULIAS
Minister for Foreign Affairs

GUINEA-BISSAU

7 August 1989[27]

On behalf of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau, I have have the honour to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph

2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Republic of Guinea-Bissau accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute thereof.

This declaration will remain in force until six months following the date on which the Government of Guinea-Bissau makes known its intention of terminating it.

Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration.

(*Signed*) Raul A. de Melo Cabral
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

HONDURAS

6 June 1986[28]

The Government of the Republic of Honduras, duly authorized by the National Congress, under Decree No. 75-86 of 21 May 1986, *to modify* the Declaration made on 20 February 1960 concerning Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice,

Hereby declares:

That it modifies the Declaration made by it on 20 February 1960 as follows:

1. That it recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:
   (a) The interpretation of a treaty;
   (b) Any question of international law;
   (c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
   (d) The nature and extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.
2. This Declaration shall not apply, however, to the following disputes to which the Republic of Honduras may be a party:
   (a) Disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed or may agree to resort to other means for the pacific settlement of disputes;
   (b) Disputes concerning matters subject to the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Honduras under international law;
   (c) Disputes relating to facts or situations originating in armed conflicts or acts of a similar nature which may affect the territory of the Republic of Honduras, and in which it may find itself involved directly or indirectly;
   (d) Disputes referring to:
      (i) Territorial questions with regard to sovereignty over islands, shoals and keys; internal waters, bays, the territorial sea and the legal status and limits thereof;
      (ii) All rights of sovereignty or jurisdiction concerning the contiguous zone, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf and the legal status and limits thereof;
      (iii) The airspace over the territories, waters and zones referred to in this subparagraph.
3. The Government of Honduras also reserves the right at any time to supplement, modify or withdraw this Declaration or the reservations contained therein by giving notice to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
4. This Declaration replaces the Declaration made by the Government of Honduras on 20 February 1960.

National Palace, Tegucigalpa, D.C., 22 May 1986.

(*Signed*) José Azcona H.
President of the Republic
(*Signed*) Carlos López Contreras
Secretary of the State for Foreign Affairs

HUNGARY

22 October 1992[29]

"The Republic of Hungary hereby recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court in all disputes which may arise in respect of facts or situations subsequent to this declaration, other than:

a) disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

b) disputes in regard to matters which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Hungary;

c) disputes relating to, or connected with, facts or situations of hostilities, war, armed conflicts, individual or collective actions taken in self-defense or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any resolution or recommendation of the United Nations, and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which the Republic of Hungary is, has been or may in the future be involved;

d) disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purpose of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect of six months of such notification to amend, add to or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

This declaration shall remain in force until the expiration of six months after notification has been given of its termination.

Budapest, October 7, 1992

(*Signed*) Géza Jeszenszky
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Hungary"

INDIA

18 September 1974[30]

I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of India, that they accept, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate such acceptance, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, and on the basis and condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice over all disputes other than:

(1) disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method or methods of settlement;
(2) disputes with the Government of any State which is or has been a Member of the Commonwealth of Nations;
(3) disputes in regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of India;

(4) disputes relating to or connected with facts or situations of hostilities, armed conflicts, individual or collective actions taken in self-defence, resistance to aggression, fulfilment of obligations imposed by international bodies, and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which India is, has been or may in future be involved;

(5) disputes with regard to which any other party to a dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice exclusively for or in relation to the purposes of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of a party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

(6) disputes where the jurisdiction of the Court is or may be founded on the basis of a treaty concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations, unless the Government of India specially agree to jurisdiction in each case;

(7) disputes concerning the interpretation or application of a multilateral treaty unless all the parties to the treaty are also parties to the case before the Court or Government of India specially agree to jurisdiction;

(8) disputes with the government of any State with which, on the date of an application to bring a dispute before the Court, the Government of India has no diplomatic relations or which has not been recognized by the Government of India;

(9) disputes with non-sovereign States or territories;

(10) disputes with India concerning or relating to:
  (a) The status of its territory or the modification or delimitation on of its frontiers or any other matter concerning boundaries;
  (b) the territorial sea, the continental shelf and the margins, the exclusive fishery zone, the exclusive economic zone, and other zones of national maritime jurisdiction including for the regulation and control of marine pollution and the conduct of scientific research by foreign vessels;
  (c) the condition and status of its islands, bays and gulfs and that of the bays and gulfs that for historical reasons belong to it;
  (d) the airspace superjacent to its land and maritime territory; and
  (e) the determination and delimitation of its maritime boundaries.

(11) disputes prior to the date of this declaration, including any dispute the foundations, reasons, facts, causes, origins, definitions, allegations or bases of which existed prior to this date, even if they are submitted or brought to the knowledge of the Court hereafter.

2. This declaration revokes and replaces the previous declaration made by the Government of India on 14th September 1959.

(*Signed*) Swaran Singh
Minister of External Affairs

JAPAN

15 September 1958[31]

"I have the honour, by direction of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to declare on behalf of the Government of Japan, that in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Japan recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation and on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, over all disputes which arise on and after the date of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date and which are not settled by other means of peaceful settlement.

"This declaration does not apply to disputes which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to refer for final and binding decision to arbitration or judicial settlement.

"This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until it may be terminated by a written notice.

New York, 15 September 1958

(*Signed*) Koto Matsudaira
Permanent Representative of Japan
to the United Nations"

KENYA

19 April 1965[32]

"I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Kenya, that it accepts, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice until such time as notice may be given to terminate such acceptance, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, and on the basis and condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction over all disputes arising after 12th December, 1963, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to that date, other than:

1. Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method or methods of settlement;

2. Disputes with the Government of any State which, on the date of this Declaration, is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations or may so become subsequently;

3. Disputes with regard to questions which by general rules of International Law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Kenya;

4. Disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of the Republic of Kenya have accepted obligations.

The Government of the Republic of Kenya reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to add to, amend, or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations. Such notifications shall be effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

12th April, 1965

(Signed) Joseph Murumbi
Minister for External Affairs"

LIBERIA

20 March 1952[33, 34]

"On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Liberia, I, Gabriel L. Dennis, Secretary of State of Liberia, subject to ratification declare that the Republic of Liberia recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State, also a party to the Statute pursuant to Article 93 of the United Nations Charter, which accepts the same obligation (i.e., subject to reciprocity), the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes arising after ratification concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

"(b) Any question of international law;

"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

"This declaration does not apply:
"(a) To any dispute which the Republic of Liberia considers essentially within its domestic jurisdiction;
"(b) To any dispute in regard to which the parties have agreed or may agree to bring before other tribunals as a result of agreements already existing or which may be made in the future.

"The present declaration has been made for a period of 5 years as from the date of deposit of the ratification and thereafter until notice of termination is given.

"Done at Monrovia this 3rd day of March 1952.

(*Signed*) Gabriel L. Dennis
Secretary of State"

LIECHTENSTEIN

29 March 1950[35, 36]

The Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein, duly authorized by His Serene Highness, the Reigning Prince François Joseph II, in accordance with the Order of the Diet of the Principality of Liechtenstein dated 9 March 1950, which came into force on 10 March 1950,

Declares by these presents that the Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
(b) Any question of international law;
(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The present Declaration, which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall take effect from the date on which the Principality becomes a party to the Statute and shall have effect as long as the Declaration has not been revoked subject to one year's notice.

Done at Vaduz, 10 March 1950.

On behalf of the Government of
the Principality of Liechtenstein
(*Signed*) A. Frick
The Head of the Government

MADAGASCAR

2 July 1992[37]

On behalf of the Government of Madagascar, I declare, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that Madagascar accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, and until such time as notification is given of the withdrawal of this acceptance, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

- the interpretation of a treaty;
- any question of international law;
- the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration does not apply:

- to disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed to have recourse to another means of settlement;
- to disputes relating to matters which, by international law, are within the exclusive jurisdiction of Madagascar.

The Government of Madagascar also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the date of receipt of said notification by the Secretary-General, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations.

Done at Antananarivo on 12 May 1992.

(*Signed*) Césaire Rabenoro
Minister for Foreign Affairs

MALAWI

12 December 1966[38]

"On behalf of the Government of Malawi, I declare under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice that I recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes which may arise in respect of facts or situations subsequent to this declaration concerning–

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
"(b) Any question of international law;
"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of international obligation;

"Provided that this declaration shall not apply to–

"(i) Disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Malawi as determined by the Government of Malawi;
"(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties of the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; or
"(iii) Disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation.

"The Government of Malawi also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to add to, amend, or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added. Such notifications shall be effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

"Given under my hand in Zomba this 22nd day of November 1966.

(*Signed*) H. Kamuzu Banda
President and Minister for External Affairs"

MALTA

6 December 1966

The Government of Malta accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes other than:

(i) disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
(ii) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of

Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iii) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Malta;

(iv) disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of Malta have accepted obligations;

(v) disputes arising under a multilateral treaty unless (1) all Parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also Parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the Government of Malta specially agrees to jurisdiction;

(vi) disputes relating to any matter excluded from compulsory adjudication or arbitration under any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which Malta is a party;

(vii) disputes in respect of which arbitral or judicial proceedings are taking, or have taken place with any State which, at the date of the commencement of the proceedings, had not itself accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; and

(viii) disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of Malta also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

29 November 1966.

(*Signed*) G.,Felice
Minister ad interim

2 September 1983[39]

I have the honour to refer to the Declaration made by the Government of Malta on 29 November 1966, and notified on 6 December 1966, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and to give notice that, with effect from the moment this notification is received by Your Excellency, the acceptance of the Government of Malta of the jurisdiction of the Court shall be limited to all disputes with Malta other than –

(1) the disputes mentioned in paragraphs (i) to (viii), both inclusive, of the Declaration; and

(2) the following categories of disputes, that is to say:

"disputes with Malta concerning or relating to:

(a) its territory, including the territorial sea, and the status thereof;

(b) the continental shelf or any other zone of maritime jurisdiction, and the resources thereof;

(c) the determination or delimitation of any of the above;

(d) the prevention or control of pollution or contamination of the marine environment in marine areas adjacent to the coast of Malta."

The Government of Malta also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

(*Signed*) Alex Sceberras Trigona
Minister of Foreign Affairs

MAURITIUS

23 September 1968[40]

"I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of Mauritius, that Mauritius accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes other than:

"(i) Disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

"(ii) Disputes with the Government of any other country which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

"(iii) Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Mauritius;

"(iv) Disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of Mauritius has accepted obligations;

"(v) Disputes relating to any matter excluded from compulsory ajudication or arbitration under any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which Mauritius is a party;

"(vi) Disputes in respect of which arbitral or judicial proceedings are taking, or have taken place with any State which, at the date of the commencement of the proceedings, had not itself accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; and

"(vii) Disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

"The Government of Mauritius also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter by added.

Port Louis, 4 September 1968

(*Signed*) S. Ramgoolam
Prime Minister
and Minister for External Affairs"

MEXICO

28 October 1947[41]

In regard to any legal dispute that may in future arise between the United States of Mexico and any other State out of events subsequent to the date of this Declaration, the Mexican Government recognizes as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without any special agreement being required therefore, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the said Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is, on condition of strict reciprocity. This Declaration which does not apply to disputes arising from matters that, in the opinion of the Mexican Government, are within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of Mexico, shall be binding for a period of five years as from 1 March 1947 and after that date shall continue in force until six months after the Mexican Government gives notice of denunciation.

Mexico, D.F., 23 October 1947

(*Signed*) Jaime Torres Bodet
Secretary of State for External Relations

NAURU

29 January 1988[42]

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Nauru I declare that it accepts as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the international Court of Justice, in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court, and stipulate that the acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction shall extend to all disputes to which the Republic is or may be a party, other than any dispute with respect to which there exists a dispute settlement mechanism under an agreement between the Republic of Nauru and another State.

I further declare that the present Declaration shall be in force for a period of five years from the date of its deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In witness whereof under my hand and the Common Seal of the Republic of Nauru, *dated* this thirtieth day of the month of December, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty-Seven.

(*Signed*)
Hammer Deroburt
President and
Minister for External Affairs
Republic of Nauru

NETHERLANDS

1 August 1956[43, 44]

I hereby declare that the Government of the Kingdom of The Netherlands recognizes, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with effect from 6 August 1956, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all disputes arising or which may arise after 5 August 1921, with the exception of disputes in respect of which the parties, excluding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, may have agreed to have recourse to some other method of pacific settlement.

The aforesaid obligation is accepted for a period of five years and will be renewed by tacit agreement for additional periods of five years, unless notice is given, not less than six months before the expiry of any such period, that the Government of the Kingdom of The Netherlands does not wish to renew it.

The acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Court founded on the declaration of 5 August 1946 is terminated with effect from 6 August 1956.

New York, 1 August 1956

(*Signed*) E. L. C. Schiff
Acting Permanent Representative
of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
to the United Nations

NEW ZEALAND

22 September 1977[45]

"(I) The acceptance by the Government of New Zealand of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by virtue of the Declaration made on 1 April 1940 under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, and made applicable to the International Court of Justice by paragraph 5 of Article 36 of the Statute of that Court, is hereby terminated;

"(II) The Government of New Zealand accepts as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Court over all disputes other than:

"1 Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement:

"2 Disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute: or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court:

"3 Disputes arising out of or concerning the jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by New Zealand in respect of the exploration, exploitation, conservation or management of the living resources in marine areas beyond and adjacent to the territorial sea of New Zealand but within 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.

"This Declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years from 22 September 1977 and thereafter until the expiration of six months after notice has been given of the termination of this Declaration provided that the Government of New Zealand reserves the right at any time to amend this Declaration in the light of the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in respect of the settlement of disputes.

(*Signed*) M.J.C. Templeton
Permanent Representative
of New Zealand to the
United Nations"

NIGERIA

3 September 1965[46]

"Whereas under Article 93 of the United Nations Charter all Member States are *ipso facto* parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice:

"And Whereas the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria has decided to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the

International Court of Justice and it is necessary to make a declaration in terms of Article 36 (2) of the Statute of the Court:

"Now therefore, I, Nuhu Bamali, Minister of State for External Affairs hereby declare that the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court.

"Done at Lagos, this 14th day of August, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-five."

(*Signed*) Nuhu Bamali
Minister of State for External Affairs"

NORWAY

2 April 1976[47]

"I hereby declare on behalf of the Royal Norwegian Government that Norway recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years as from 3 October 1976. This declaration shall thereafter be tacitly renewed for additional periods of five years, unless notice of termination is given not less than six months before the expiration of the current period; provided, however, that the Royal Norwegian Government, having regard to Article 95 of the Charter of the United Nations, reserves the right at any time to amend the scope of this Declaration in the light of the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in respect of the settlement of disputes.

(*Signed*) Ole Algard
Permanent Representative of Norway
to the United Nations"

PAKISTAN

13 September 1960[48]

"I have the honour, by direction of the President of Pakistan, to make the following declaration on behalf of the Government of Pakistan under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice:

"The Government of Pakistan recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes after the 24th June, 1948, arising, concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
"(b) Any question of international law;
"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

"Provided, that the declaration shall not apply to:

"(a) Disputes the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future; or
"(b) Disputes relating to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan;
"(c) Disputes arising under a multilateral treaty unless
"(i) All parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also parties to the case before the Court, or
"(ii) The Government of Pakistan specially agree to jurisdiction; and

"provided further, that this Declaration shall remain in force till such time as notice may be given to terminate it."

Pakistan Mission to the United Nations
New York, September 12th, 1960

(*Signed*) Said Hasan
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of Pakistan
to the United Nations"

PALAU

14 November 1994

"In connection with the application by the Republic of Palau for membership in the United Nations, I have the honour, on behalf of the Republic of Palau and in my capacity as Minister of State, to declare that the Republic of Palau accepts the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and solemnly undertakes to fulfil them.

(*Signed*) Andres UHERBELAU
Minister of State"

PHILIPPINES

18 January 1972[49]

"I, Carlos P. Romulo, Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of the Philippines, hereby declare, under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that the Republic of the Philippines recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes arising hereafter concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
"(b) Any question of international law;
"(c) The existence of any fact which, if established would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

Provided, that this declaration shall not apply to any dispute:

"(a) In regard to which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement; or
"(b) Which the Republic of the Philippines considers to be essentially within its domestic jurisdiction; or
"(c) In respect of which the other party has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction was deposited or ratified less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court; or
"(d) Arising under a multilateral treaty, unless (l) all parties to the treaty are also parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the Republic of the Philippines specially agrees to jurisdiction; or
"(e) Arising out of or concerning jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by the Philippines:
"(i) In respect of the natural resources, including living organisms belonging to sedentary species, of the sea-bed and subsoil of the continental shelf of the Philippines, or its analogue in an archipelago, as described in Proclamation No. 370 dated 20 March 1968 of the President of the Republic of the Philippines; or
"(ii) In respect of the territory of the Republic of the Philippines, including its territorial seas and inland waters; and

"*Provided further*, that this declaration shall remain in force until notice is given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of its termination.

Done at Manila this 23rd day of December 1971.

(Signed) Carlos Pi Romulo
Secretary of Foreign Affairs"

POLAND

25 September 1990[50]

"The Republic of Poland recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation and subject to the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes other than:

a) disputes prior to the date of this declaration or disputes arisen out of facts or situations prior to the same date;

b) disputes with regard to the territory or State boundaries;

c) disputes with regard to pollution of the environment unless the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice results from the treaty obligations of the Republic of Poland;

d) disputes with regard to foreign liabilities or debts;

e) disputes with regard to any State which has made a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

f) disputes in respect whereof parties have agreed, or shall agree, to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

g) disputes relating to matters which, by international law, fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the State.

This declaration shall be valid for a period of five years and be automatically prolonged thereafter for further periods of one year if not denounced by notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations taking effect after six months from the moment of such notification.

The Government of the Republic of Poland also reserves its right to add, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and taking effect after six months from the moment of such notification, new reservations or supplements, or to amend or withdraw, any of the foregoing reservations.

Done at Warsaw on 21 September 1990.

(Signed) Krzysztof SKUBISZEWSKI
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

PORTUGAL

19 December 1955[51]

"Under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, I declare on behalf of the Portuguese Government that Portugal recognizes the jurisdiction of this Court as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, as provided for in the said paragraph 2 of Article 36 and under the following conditions:

"1) The present declaration covers disputes arising out of events both prior and subsequent to the declaration of acceptance of the 'optional clause' which Portugal made on December 16, 1920, as a party to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

"2) The present declaration enters into force at the moment it is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations; it shall be valid for a period of one year, and thereafter until notice of its denunciation is given to the said Secretary-General.

"3) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to exclude from the scope of the present declaration, at any time during its validity, any given category or categories of disputes, by notifying the Secretary-General of the United Nations and with effect from the moment of such notification."

Portuguese Embassy,
Washington, D.C., 19 December 1955

(Signed) L. Esteves Fernandes"

SENEGAL

2 December 1985[52]

I have the honour, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Senegal, to declare that, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, it accepts on condition of reciprocity as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes born subsequently to the present declaration concerning:

— the interpretation of a treaty;
— any question of international law;
— existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
— The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration is made on condition of reciprocity on the part of all States. However, Senegal may waive the competence of the Court in regard to:

— disputes concerning which the parties have agreed to have recourse to some other method of settlement;
— disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall within the exclusive competence of Senegal

Lastly, the Government of the Republic of Senegal reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, to add, to amend or to withdraw the foregoing reservations.

Such notification shall be effective on the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General.

(Signed) Ibrahim FALL
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Senegal"

SOMALIA

11 April 1963[53]

"I have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of the Somali Republic that the Somali Republic accepts as compulsory *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such times as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all legal disputes arising other than disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

"The Somali Republic also reserves the right at any time by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

Mogadishu
March 25, 1963.

(*Signed*) Abdullahi Issa
Minister for Foreign Affairs"

SPAIN

29 October 1990[54]

The Kingdom of Spain accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, in legal disputes not included among the following situations and exceptions:

a) Disputes in regard to which the Kingdom of Spain and the other party or parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement of dispute;

b) Disputes in regard to which the other party or parties have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute in question;

c) Disputes in regard to which the other party or parties have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

d) Disputes arising prior to the date on which this Declaration was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations or relating to events or situations which occurred prior to that date, even if such events or situations may continue to occur or to have effects thereafter.

2. The Kingdom of Spain may at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, add to, amend or withdraw, in whole or in part, the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added. These amendments shall become effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. The present Declaration, which is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 4, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall remain in force until such time as it has been withdrawn by the Spanish Government or superseded by another declaration by the latter.

The withdrawal of the Declaration shall become effective after a period of six months has elapsed from the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the relevant notification by the Spanish Government. However, in respect of States which have established a period of less than six months between notification of the withdrawal of their Declaration and its becoming effective, the withdrawal of the Spanish Declaration shall become effective after such shorter period has elapsed.

Done at Madrid on 15 October 1990.

(*Signed*) Francisco Fernandez Ordoñez
Minister for Foreign Affairs

SUDAN

2 January 1958[55]

"I have the honour by direction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to declare, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of the Sudan, that in pursuance of paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice the Government of the Republic of the Sudan recognize as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, until such time as notice may be given to terminate this Declaration, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes arising after the first day of January 1956 with regard to situations or facts subsequent to that date concerning:

"(a) The interpretation of a treaty concluded or ratified by the Republic of the Sudan on or after the first day of January 1956;

"(b) Any question of International Law;

"(c) The existence of any fact, which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; or

"(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation;

"but excluding the following:

"(i) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

"(ii) Disputes in regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of the Sudan as determined by the Government of the Republic of the Sudan;

"(iii) Disputes arising out of events occurring during any period in which the Republic of the Sudan is engaged in hostilities as a belligerent.

30 December, 1957

(*Signed*) Yacoub Osman
Permanent Representative of the Sudan
to the United Nations"

SURINAME

31 August 1987[56]

"I have the honour by direction of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Suriname, to declare on behalf of the Government of Suriname:

The Government of the Republic of Suriname recognizes, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with effect from the seventh September 1987, as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the said Court in all disputes, which have arisen prior to this Declaration or may arise after this Declaration, with the exception of:

A. disputes, which have arisen or may arise with respect to or in relation with the borders of the Republic of Suriname;

B. disputes in respect of which the parties, excluding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, have agreed to settlement by means of arbitration, mediation or other methods of conciliation and accomodation.

This declaration shall be binding for a period of five years and shall continue in force after that period until twelve months after the Government of the Republic of Suriname has given notice of its termination.

(*Signed*) W.H.Werner Vreedzaam
Chargé d'Affaires of the Permanent
Mission of the Republic of Suriname
to the United Nations"

SWAZILAND

26 May 1969[57]

"I, Prince Makhosini Jameson Dlamini, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Swaziland to whom His Majesty has delegated responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs, have the honour to declare on behalf of the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland, that it recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and with-

out special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

"This Declaration does not extend:

"(a) To disputes in respect of which the parties have agreed to have recourse to another means of peaceful settlement; or

"(b) To disputes relating to matters which, by international law, are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the Kingdom of Swaziland.

"The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland also reserves the right to add to, amend or withdraw this Declaration by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, with effect as from the moment of such notification.

Mbabane, 9th May, 1969

(*Signed*) Makhosini Jameson Dlamini
Prime Minister
and Minister for Foreign Affairs"

SWEDEN

6 April 1957[58]

On behalf of the Royal Swedish Government, I declare that it accepts as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the said Court for a period of five years as from 6 April 1957. This obligation shall be renewed by tacit agreement for further periods of the same duration unless notice of abrogation is made at least six months before the expiration of any such period. The above-mentioned obligation is accepted only in respect of disputes which may arise with regard to situations or facts subsequent to 6 April 1957.

New York, 6 April 1957

(*Signed*) Claes Carbonnier
Permanent Representative *a.i.* of Sweden
to the United Nations

SWITZERLAND

28 July 1948[59, 60]

The Swiss Federal Council

Duly authorized for that purpose by a Federal Order which was adopted on 12 March 1948 by the Federal Assembly of the Swiss Confederation and entered into force on 17 June 1948,

Hereby declares

That the Swiss Confederation recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

a. The interpretation of a treaty;
b. Any question of international law;
c. The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
d. The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice shall take effect from the date on which the Swiss Confederation becomes a party to that Statute and shall have effect as long as it has not been abrogated subject to one year's notice.

Done at Berne, 6 July 1948.

On behalf of the Swiss Federal Council,

(*Signed*) Celio
The President of the Confederation
(*Signed*) Leimgruber
The Chancellor of the Confederation

TOGO

25 October 1979[61]

The Togolese Republic,

Represented by His Excellency Mr. Akanyi-Awunyo Kodjovi, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of Togo to the United Nations,

Acting pursuant to the provisions of Article 36, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, annexed to the Charter of the United Nations,

Guided by its constant concern to ensure the peaceful and equitable settlement of all international disputes, particularly those in which it might be involved, and desiring to contribute to the strengthening of the international legal order based on the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations,

Declares that it recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is, subject to reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;
(b) Any question of international law;
(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The present declaration has been made for an unlimited period subject to the power of denunciation and modification attached to any obligation assumed by a sovereign State in its international relations. It will enter into force on the day on which it is received by the United Nations Secretariat.

New York, 24 October 1979

(*Signed*) Akanyi-Awunyo Kodjovi

UGANDA

3 October 1963[62]

"I hereby declare on behalf of the Government of Uganda that Uganda recognises as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, and on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

New York, 3rd October 1963

(*Signed*) Apollo K. Kironde
Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Uganda
to the United Nations"

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

1 January 1969[63]

"I have the honour, by direction of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, to declare on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland that they accept as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36

of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the 24th of October 1945, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date, other than:

"(i) any dispute which the United Kingdom

"(a) has agreed with the other Party or Parties thereto to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement; or

"(b) has already submitted to arbitration by agreement with any State which had not at the time of submission accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

"(ii) disputes with the Government of any other country which is a Member of the Commonwealth with regard to situations or facts existing before the 1st of January, 1969.

"(iii) disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

"2. The Government of the United Kingdom also reserve the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations.
New York, 1 January 1969

(*Signed*) L. C. Glass"

ZAIRE

8 February 1989[64]

By order of the State Commissioner (Minister) for Foreign Affairs of Zaire, I have the honour to make the following declaration on behalf of the National Executive Council (Government) of the Republic of Zaire, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice:

The Executive Council of the Republic of Zaire recognizes as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

(a) The interpretation of a treaty;

(b) Any question of international law;

(c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;

(d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

It is understood further that this declaration will remain in force until notice of its revocation is given.

(*Signed*) Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Zaire
to the United Nations

(b) *Declarations made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. which are deemed to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice*

(All data and footnotes concerning these declarations are reprinted from the *International Court of Justice Yearbook*, 1971-1972.)

COLOMBIA[65]

30.X.37

The Republic of Colombia recognizes as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, in accordance with Article 36 of the Statute.

The present Declaration applies only to disputes arising out of facts subsequent to January 6th, 1932.
Geneva, 30 October 1937.

(*Signed*) J. M. Yepes
Legal Adviser of the Permanent Delegation
of Colombia to the League of Nations

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

30.IX.24

On behalf of the Government of the Dominican Republic and subject to ratification, I recognize, in relation to any other Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention.
Geneva, 30 September 1924.

(*Signed*) Jacinto R. de Castro

The instrument of ratification was deposited on 4 February 1933.

HAITI

4.X.21

On behalf of the Republic of Haiti, I recognize the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice as compulsory.

(*Signed*) F. Addor
Consul

LUXEMBOURG[66]

15.IX.30

The Government of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg recognizes as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.
Geneva, 15 September 1930

(*Signed*) Bech

NICARAGUA[67]

24.IX.29

On behalf of the Republic of Nicaragua, I recognize as compulsory unconditionally the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Geneva, 24 September 1929

(Signed) T. F. Medina

PANAMA[68]

25.X.21

On behalf of the Government of Panama, I recognize, in relation to any other Member or State which accepts the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without any special convention. Paris, 25 October 1921

(Signed) Ri A. Amador
Chargé d'Affaires

URUGUAY[69, 70]

Prior to 28.I.21

On behalf of the Government of Uruguay, I recognize in relation to any Member or State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory, *ipso facto* and without special convention.

(Signed) B. Fernandez Y Medina

NOTES:

[1] Registered under No. 3; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 9. A declaration of 6 April 1984 modifying the said declaration was registered on that date under No.3. For the text of the declaration as modified, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1354, p. 452.

On 7 October 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United States of America a notification of termination of the said declaration of 26 August 1946. The notification of termination, dated 7 October 1985, was registered on that same date (see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1408, p. 270).

[2] The declaration of 17 October 1956 replaced that of 4 September 1950, which was published in the United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 108, p. 239.

An amending declaration was received on 28 February 1984 and registered on that date under No. 3571. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1349, p. 326.

The notification of termination of the declaration of 17 October 1956 received from the Government of Israel on 21 November 1985 (dated 19 November 1985), reads as follows:

"On behalf of the Government of Israel, I have the honour to inform you that the Government of Israel has decided to terminate, with effect as of today, its declaration of 17 October 1956 as amended, concerning the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

Benjamin Netanyahu
Ambassador

[3] See paragraph 5 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

[4] State having made a declaration under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

[5] Registered under No. 13809; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 961, p. 183. This declaration replaces that of 6 February 1954 registered under No. 2484; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 186, p. 77.

[6] Registered under No. 11092; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 778, p. 301.

[7] Registered under No. 19017; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1197, p. 7.

[8] Registered under No. 4364; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 302, p. 251. The previous declaration, valid for a period of five years, was deposited by Belgium on 13 July 1948: see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 16, p. 203.

[9] The instrument of ratification was deposited on 17 June 1958.

[10] Registered under No. 10359; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 721, p. 121.

[11] Registered under No. 29000; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1678.

[12] Registered under No. 3998; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 277, p. 77.

[13] Registered under No. 30793.

[14] This declaration replaces that one made on 10 September 1985, registered under No. 23508, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1406, which replaced that one made on 7 April 1970, registered under No. 10415; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 724, p. 63. For the original declaration made on 20 September 1919, see *Yearbook of the International Court of Justice 1968-1969*, p. 46.

[15] Registered under No. 12294: see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 857, p. 107.

[16] Registered under No. 25909; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1502.

[17] Registered under No. 3646; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 257, p. 35. This declaration replaces that of 10 December 1946; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 45.

[18] Registered under No. 3940; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 272, p. 225.

[19] The declaration dated 24 April 1957 was registered under No. 3821; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 265, p. 299.

[20] Registered under No. 12837; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 899, p. 99. With respect to this declaration the Secretary-General received on 3 July and 9 September 1974, respectively, a declaration from the Government of Honduras and a second declaration from the Government of El Salvador (those declarations also registered under No. 12837 on the respective dates of their receipt, and published in volumes 942 and 948 of the United Nations *Treaty Series*).

In a notification received on 27 November 1978 the Government of El Salvador informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to extend for a period of 10 years as from 26 November 1978 its acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The said notification contains the following declaration: El Salvador still reserves the right at any time to modify, add to, explain or derogate from the exceptions under which it accepted such jurisdiction. The extension was registered on 27 November 1978 under No. 12837 and published in United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1119, p. 382.

[21] For the declaration recognizing the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice, see *Yearbook of the International Court of Justice 1972-1973*, p. 39.

[22] Registered under No. 28436; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1653.

[23] Registered under No. 4376; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 303, p. 137.

[24] Registered under No. 8232; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 565, p. 21.

[25] Registered on 20 June 1995.

[26] Registered under No. 30624.

[27] Registered under No. 26756; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1543.

[28] Registered under No. 24126, this declaration replaces that one made on 20 February 1960 and received by the Secretary-General on 10 March 1960. For the text of that declaration, registered under No. 236, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 353, p. 309. For the declaration of 19 April 1954, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 15, p. 17, and vol. 190, p. 377.

[29] Registered under No. 29191; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1692.

[30] Registered under No. 13546; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 950, p. 15. The declaration of 14 September 1959, deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date and superseded by the declaration reproduced herein, is reproduced in United Nations *Treaty Series*, vol. 340, p. 289.

[31] Registered under No. 4517; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 312, p. 155.

[32] Registered under No. 7697; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 531, p. 113.

[33] Registered under No. 2145; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 163, p. 117.

[34] The instrument of ratification was deposited on 17 April 1953.

[35] Registered under No. 759; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 51, p. 119.

[36] Liechtenstein became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on 29 March 1950; see note 1 in chapter I.3.

[37] Registered under 29011; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1679.

[38] Registered under No. 8438; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 581, p. 135.

[39] This declaration completes that one made on 6 December 1966 (registered under No. 8423 and published in United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 580, p. 205) and replaces the one communicated on 23 January 1981. For the text of the declaration of 23 January 1981, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1211, p. 34.

[40] Registered under No. 9251; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 646, p. 171.

[41] Registered under No. 127; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 9, p. 97.

[42] Registered under No. 25639; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1491. Renewed and extended for a period of 5 years as from 29 January 1993.

[43] Registered under No. 3483; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 248, p. 33.

[44] The declaration of 5 August 1946 was registered under No. 2; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 7, and vol. 248, p. 357.

[45] Registered under No. 15931; see United Nations *Treaty Series*, vol. 1055, p. 323. This declaration replaces the one of 8 April 1940, made under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice. For the text of that declaration, as well as the text of the notice of termination given on 30 March 1940 in respect of a previous declaration of 19 September 1929, see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CC, pp. 490 and 491. For the text of the declaration of 19 September 1929, see *ibid.*, vol. LXXXVIII, p. 277. For the text of a reservation formulated on 7 September 1939 in respect of the declaration of 19 September 1929, see *Permanent Court of International Justice*, Series E, No. 16, p. 342.

[46] Registered under No. 7913; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 544, p. 113.

[47] Registered under No. 15035; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1024, p. 195. This declaration replaced that of 19 December 1956 registered under No. 3642; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 256, p. 315.

[48] Registered under No. 5332; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 374, p. 127. This declaration replaces that of 23 May 1957, in respect of which the Government of Pakistan gave notice of termination on 13 September 1960; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 269, p. 77, and vol. 374, p. 382. For the declaration of 22 June 1948 and the notice of its termination, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 16, p. 197, and vol. 257, p. 360.

[49] Registered under No. 11523; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 808, p. 3. This declaration replaced that of 21 August 1947, in respect of which a notice of withdrawal was given on 23 December 1971; for the text of that declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 229.

[50] Registered under No. 27566; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1579.

[51] Registered under No. 3079; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 224, p. 275.

[52] Registered under No. 23644. This declaration replaces a previous declaration which was received on 3 May 1985 and registered on that date under No. 23354, and which was identical in essence to the new declaration received on 2 December 1985, except that this last declaration applies only to disputes born subsequently to the said declaration.

[53] Registered under No. 6597; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 458, p. 43.

[54] Registered under No. 27600; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1581.

[55] Registered under No. 4139; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 284, p. 215.

[56] Registered under No. 25246; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1480.

[57] Registered under No. 9589; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 673, p. 155.

[58] Registered under No. 3794; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 264, p. 221. This declaration replaces that of 5 April 1947, which was made for a period of ten years; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2, p. 3.

[59] Registered under No. 272; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 17, p. 115.

[60] Switzerland became a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on 28 July 1948; see note 2 in chapter I.3.

[61] Registered under No. 18020; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1147, p. 189.

[62] Registered under No. 6946; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 479, p. 35.

[63] Registered under No. 9370; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 654, p. 335. This declaration replaces that of 27 November 1963, in respect of which notice of withdrawal was given on 1 January 1969; for the text of that declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 482, p. 187. For declarations preceding that of 27 November 1963, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 211, p. 109; vol. 219, p. 179; vol. 265, p. 221, and vol. 316, p 59.

[64] Registered under No. 26437; see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1523.

[65] An instrument of ratification was deposited on 30 October 1937. Ratification was not required under the terms of the Optional Clause, the act of signature itself sufficing to make the undertaking binding except where the declaration had been made expressly subject to ratification. Nevertheless, certain States, which had signed without any such reservation, subsequently ratified their declaration.

[66] The Government of Luxembourg had in 1921 signed the Optional Clause subject to ratification. That declaration was, however, never ratified.

[67] According to a telegram dated 29 November 1939, addressed to the League of Nations, Nicaragua had ratified the Protocol of Signature of the Statute of the *Permanent Court of International Justice* (16 December 1920), and the instrument of ratification was to follow. It does not appear, however, that the instrument of ratification was ever received by the League of Nations.

[68] An instrument of ratification was deposited on 14 June 1929 (in this connection, see remark in note 65 above).

[69] An instrument of ratification was deposited on 27 September 1921 (in this connection, *mutatis mutandis*, see remark in note 65 above).

[70] The date (prior to 28.I.21) is the date on which this declaration (undated) was first published in a League of Nations document.

5. Amendments to the Charter of the United Nations

(a) Amendments to Articles 23, 27 and 61 of the Charter of the United Nations

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolutions 1991 A and B (XVIII) of 17 December 1963[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 31 August 1965 for all Members of the United Nations, in accordance with article 108 of the Charter.[2]
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1966, No. 8132.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 557, p. 143.
STATUS: Ratifications: 108.

Participant[3]	*Ratification*
Afghanistan	25 Feb 1965
Albania	7 Dec 1964
Algeria	26 Mar 1964
Argentina	15 Mar 1966
Australia	9 Jun 1965
Austria	7 Oct 1964
Belarus	22 Jun 1965
Belgium	29 Apr 1965
Benin	17 Sep 1965
Bolivia	19 Jan 1966
Brazil	23 Dec 1964
Burkina Faso	11 Aug 1964
Bulgaria	13 Jan 1965
Burundi	23 Aug 1965
Cambodia	20 Jan 1966
Cameroon	25 Jun 1964
Canada	9 Sep 1964
Central African Republic	6 Aug 1964
Chad	2 Nov 1964
Chile	31 Aug 1965
China[4]	
Colombia	10 Oct 1966
Congo	7 Jul 1965
Costa Rica	7 Oct 1964
Côte d'Ivoire	2 Oct 1964
Cuba	22 Dec 1964
Cyprus	1 Sep 1965
Denmark	12 Jan 1965
Dominican Republic	4 Nov 1965
Ecuador	31 Aug 1965
Egypt	16 Dec 1964
El Salvador	1 Dec 1964
Ethiopia	22 Jul 1964
Finland	18 Jan 1965
France	24 Aug 1965
Gabon	11 Aug 1964
Ghana	4 May 1964
Greece	2 Aug 1965
Guatemala	18 Aug 1965
Guinea	19 Aug 1964
Honduras	9 Oct 1968
Hungary	23 Feb 1965
Iceland	6 Nov 1964
India	10 Sep 1964
Indonesia	30 Mar 1973
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	12 Jan 1965
Iraq	25 Nov 1964
Ireland	27 Oct 1964
Israel	13 May 1965
Italy	25 Aug 1965
Jamaica	12 Mar 1964
Japan	4 Jun 1965
Jordan	7 Aug 1964
Kenya	28 Oct 1964
Kuwait	28 Dec 1964

Participant	*Ratification*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	20 Apr 1965
Lebanon	27 Sep 1965
Liberia	21 Sep 1964
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	27 Aug 1964
Luxembourg	22 Oct 1965
Madagascar	14 Dec 1964
Malawi	2 Jun 1965
Malaysia	26 May 1965
Mali	23 Sep 1964
Malta	23 Jun 1965
Mauritania	29 Jan 1965
Mexico	5 May 1965
Mongolia	10 Mar 1965
Morocco	9 Nov 1964
Myanmar	3 Jun 1965
Nepal	3 Dec 1964
Netherlands	14 Dec 1964
New Zealand	26 Aug 1964
Niger	8 Sep 1964
Nigeria	5 Dec 1964
Norway	17 Dec 1964
Pakistan	25 Mar 1965
Panama	27 Jul 1965
Paraguay	17 Aug 1965
Peru	2 Dec 1966
Philippines	9 Nov 1964
Poland	8 Jan 1965
Romania	5 Feb 1965
Russian Federation	10 Feb 1965
Rwanda	17 Nov 1964
Saudi Arabia	17 Jun 1965
Senegal	23 Apr 1965
Sierra Leone	25 Mar 1965
Somalia	6 Oct 1965
Spain	5 Aug 1965
Sri Lanka	13 Nov 1964
Sudan	7 May 1965
Sweden	18 Dec 1964
Syrian Arab Republic	24 Feb 1965
Thailand	23 Mar 1964
Togo	19 Aug 1964
Trinidad and Tobago	18 Aug 1964
Tunisia	29 May 1964
Turkey	1 Jul 1965
Uganda	10 Feb 1965
Ukraine	17 May 1965
United Kingdom	4 Jun 1965
United Republic of Tanzania	7 Oct 1964
United States of America	31 Aug 1965
Venezuela	1 Sep 1965
Yemen[5]	7 Jul 1965
Yugoslavia	9 Dec 1964
Zaire	20 May 1966
Zambia	28 Apr 1965

(*b*) Amendment to Article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 2101 (XX) of 20 December 1965[6]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 June 1968 for all Members of the United Nations, in accordance with Article 108 of the Charter.[2]
REGISTRATION: 12 June 1968, No. 8132.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 638, p. 308.
STATUS: Ratifications: 93.

Participant[3]	*Ratification*
Afghanistan	16 Nov 1966
Albania	12 Oct 1966
Algeria	30 Apr 1969
Argentina	12 Apr 1967
Australia	27 Sep 1966
Austria	29 Sep 1966
Belarus	21 Sep 1966
Belgium	29 Jun 1966
Benin	29 Jun 1966
Bolivia	28 Jul 1966
Botswana	12 Jun 1968
Brazil	12 Jul 1966
Bulgaria	2 Jun 1966
Burkina Faso	18 Jul 1966
Canada	11 Jul 1966
Chile	22 Aug 1968
China[7]	
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Jan 1968
Cuba	17 May 1976
Cyprus	31 May 1966
Denmark	31 May 1967
Dominican Republic	4 May 1966
Ecuador	5 May 1966
Egypt	23 Jan 1967
Ethiopia	28 Jul 1966
Finland	11 Jan 1967
France	18 Oct 1967
Gabon	24 Dec 1968
Gambia	11 Jul 1966
Ghana	8 Sep 1966
Greece	17 Oct 1969
Guatemala	16 Jun 1966
Guyana	31 Jan 1968
Hungary	4 May 1967
Iceland	21 Jun 1966
India	11 Jul 1966
Indonesia	30 Mar 1973
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13 Jan 1967
Iraq	12 Jan 1967
Ireland	20 Sep 1966
Israel	29 Aug 1966
Italy	4 Dec 1967
Jamaica	12 Jul 1966
Jordan	25 Mar 1966
Kenya	16 Jun 1966
Kuwait	26 Oct 1967
Lao People's Democratic Republic	21 Oct 1966

Participant	*Ratification*
Lebanon	20 Mar 1969
Liberia	1 Jul 1969
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 Aug 1967
Luxembourg	12 Dec 1967
Madagascar	23 Jan 1968
Malawi	11 Apr 1966
Malaysia	28 Apr 1966
Maldives	5 Sep 1968
Malta	30 Jun 1966
Mexico	18 Apr 1967
Mongolia	17 Apr 1969
Morocco	27 Dec 1966
Myanmar	8 Jun 1967
Nepal	20 Jul 1966
Netherlands	5 Jan 1967
New Zealand	20 May 1966
Niger	28 Apr 1966
Nigeria	15 Jun 1967
Norway	29 Apr 1966
Pakistan	10 Aug 1966
Paraguay	7 Aug 1967
Philippines	2 Oct 1967
Poland	22 May 1967
Romania	12 Jan 1967
Russian Federation	22 Sep 1966
Rwanda	9 Sep 1966
Saudi Arabia	11 Dec 1968
Sierra Leone	24 Jan 1968
Singapore	25 Jul 1966
Spain	28 Oct 1966
Sri Lanka	24 Aug 1966
Sudan	24 Apr 1968
Sweden	15 Jul 1966
Syrian Arab Republic	8 Dec 1967
Thailand	9 Jun 1966
Togo	14 May 1968
Trinidad and Tobago	22 Apr 1966
Tunisia	23 Aug 1966
Turkey	16 Mar 1967
Uganda	15 Apr 1969
Ukraine	1 Nov 1966
United Kingdom	19 Oct 1966
United Republic of Tanzania	20 Jun 1966
United States of America	31 May 1967
Venezuela	9 Nov 1967
Yugoslavia	13 Mar 1967
Zaire	9 Jun 1966

(c) Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971[8]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 September 1973 for all Members of the United Nations, in accordance with Article 108 of the Charter.[2]
REGISTRATION: 24 September 1973, No. 8132.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 892, p. 119.
STATUS: Ratifications: 107.

Participant[3]	*Ratification*
Afghanistan	20 Sep 1973
Albania	22 Mar 1974
Algeria	21 Jun 1972
Argentina	19 Mar 1973
Australia	16 Nov 1972
Austria	12 Jan 1973
Bahrain	22 Aug 1972
Barbados	12 Jun 1972
Belarus	15 Jun 1973
Belgium	26 Mar 1973
Benin	5 Feb 1973
Bhutan	13 Sep 1972
Bolivia	29 Jun 1973
Botswana	12 Feb 1973
Brazil	7 Sep 1972
Bulgaria	5 Jun 1973
Cameroon	12 Dec 1972
Canada	28 Sep 1972
Chad	11 May 1973
Chile	23 Jul 1974
China	15 Sep 1972
Colombia	20 May 1975
Costa Rica	14 Aug 1973
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Feb 1973
Cuba	17 May 1976
Cyprus	26 Jun 1972
Denmark	23 Jan 1973
Dominican Republic	29 Nov 1972
Ecuador	20 Apr 1973
Egypt	28 Dec 1972
Ethiopia	27 Feb 1974
Fiji	12 Jun 1972
Finland	30 Mar 1972
France	1 Jun 1973
Ghana	8 Jan 1973
Greece	15 Jan 1974
Guatemala	3 Oct 1972
Guinea	27 Jun 1973
Guyana	22 May 1973
Hungary	12 Jul 1973
Iceland	6 Mar 1973
India	5 Jan 1973
Indonesia	30 Mar 1973
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Mar 1973
Iraq	9 Aug 1972
Ireland	6 Oct 1972
Italy	25 Jul 1973
Jamaica	6 Oct 1972
Japan	15 Jun 1973
Jordan	2 Jun 1972
Kenya	5 Oct 1972
Kuwait	20 Jun 1972
Lebanon	2 Jul 1973
Lesotho	30 May 1973
Liberia	4 Dec 1972
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	12 Apr 1973
Luxembourg	5 Jun 1973
Madagascar	19 Jul 1973
Malawi	15 Sep 1972
Malaysia	16 Jun 1972
Mali	30 Aug 1973
Malta	22 Feb 1973
Mauritius	29 Jun 1973
Mexico	11 Apr 1973
Mongolia	18 May 1973
Morocco	26 Sep 1972
Nepal	24 Nov 1972
Netherlands	31 Oct 1972
New Zealand	19 Jul 1972
Nicaragua	17 Jul 1973
Niger	22 Aug 1972
Nigeria	17 Oct 1973
Norway	14 Mar 1973
Oman	23 Jun 1972
Pakistan	21 Aug 1973
Panama	26 Sep 1972
Paraguay	28 Dec 1973
Peru	26 Jun 1973
Philippines	14 Nov 1972
Poland	19 Sep 1973
Qatar	15 Jun 1972
Romania	26 Feb 1973
Russian Federation	1 Jun 1973
Rwanda	6 Nov 1973
Senegal	25 Jan 1973
Sierra Leone	15 Oct 1973
Singapore	18 Apr 1972
Spain	26 Jul 1973
Sri Lanka	6 Dec 1972
Sudan	4 Oct 1972
Sweden	22 Dec 1972
Syrian Arab Republic	21 Aug 1974
Thailand	19 Jul 1972
Togo	29 Oct 1973
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Sep 1972
Tunisia	8 Nov 1972
Uganda	12 Jun 1972
Ukraine	16 May 1973
United Arab Emirates	29 Sep 1972
United Kingdom	19 Jun 1973
United Republic of Tanzania	4 Apr 1973
United States of America	24 Sep 1973
Venezuela	29 Oct 1974
Yemen[9]	15 Jun 1972
Yugoslavia	23 Oct 1972
Zaire	16 Aug 1973
Zambia	13 Oct 1972

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighteenth Session, Suppement No. 15* (A/5515), p. 21.

[2] As depositary of the amendments to the Charter, the Secretary-General drew up a protocol of entry into force of these amendments and communicated it to all Member States.

[3] Czechoslovakia had ratified the amendments of 17 December 1963 to articles 23, 27 and 61, on 19 January 1965; the amendment of 20 December 1965 to article 109, on 7 October 1966 and the amendment of 20 December 1971 to article 61, on 4 February 1972. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] Ratification on behalf of the Republic of China on 2 August 1965. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pointing out that in the annex to the said protocol, which contains a list of States Members of the United Nations having deposited instruments of ratification of the amendments, there is a reference to an instrument of ratification by China, stated that their Governments did not recognize any authority other than the Government of the People's Republic of China as entitled to represent and act on behalf of China and that, therefore, they considered the said instrument as having no legal force whatsoever. They noted, however, the position in this matter of the Government of the People's Republic of China, which had announced that it would not object to the introduction of the amendments to the relevant Articles of the Charter even before the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the communication from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mentioned above, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a permanent member of the Security Council, had ratified the amendments and deposited the instrument of ratification with the Secretary-General on 2 August 1965 and that, therefore, there could be no question that the protocol of entry into force of the amendments was valid in its entirety. He further stated that the allegations made by the Soviet Union were untenable both in law and in fact and could in no way affect the validity of the protocol and the entry into force of the amendments.

[5] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[6] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 14* (A/6014), p. 90.

[7] Ratification on behalf of the Republic of China on 8 July 1966. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Albania, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia stated that the only Government entitled to represent and to assume international obligations on behalf of China was the Government of the People's Republic of China and that, therefore, they did not recognize as valid the said ratification.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of the Republic of China stated that the allegations contained in the above-mentioned communications are untenable both in law and in fact and could not in any way affect the requirements of Article 108 of the Charter or the validity of the amendments to the Charter duly ratified under the said Article.

[8] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 29* (A/8429), p. 67.

[9] The Yemen Arab Republic had ratified the amendment to Article 61 of the Charter on 7 July 1972. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

CHAPTER II. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

1. REVISED GENERAL ACT FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 28 April 1949[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 September 1950, in accordance with article 44.
REGISTRATION: 20 September 1950, No. 912.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 71, p. 101.

Participant	*Accession*	*Extending to*
Belgium	23 Dec 1949	All the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).
Burkina Faso	27 Mar 1962	All the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).
Denmark	25 Mar 1952	All the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).
Estonia	21 Oct 1991	All the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).
Luxembourg	28 Jun 1961	All the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).
Netherlands[2]	9 Jun 1971	The provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (chapters I and II), together with the general provisions dealing with these procedures (chapter IV).
Norway	16 Jul 1951	All the provisions of the Act (chapters I, II, III, and IV).
Sweden	22 Jun 1950	The provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (chapters I and II), together with the general provisions dealing with these procedures (chapter IV) subject to the reservation on disputes arising out of facts prior to this accession.

NOTES:

[1] Resolution 268 A (III), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part II* (A/900), p. 10.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

CHAPTER III. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR RELATIONS, ETC.

1. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 February 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: For each State, on the date of deposit of its instrument of accession, in accordance with section 32.
REGISTRATION: 14 December 1946, No. 4.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1, p. 15, and vol. 90, p. 327 (corrigendum to vol. 1).
STATUS: Parties: 136.

Participant	*Accession, succession (d)*
Afghanistan	5 Sep 1947
Albania	2 Jul 1957
Algeria	31 Oct 1963
Angola	9 Aug 1990
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina	12 Oct 1956
Australia	2 Mar 1949
Austria	10 May 1957
Azerbaijan	13 Aug 1992
Bahamas	17 Mar 1977 *d*
Bahrain	17 Sep 1992
Bangladesh	13 Jan 1978 *d*
Barbados	10 Jan 1972 *d*
Belarus	22 Oct 1953
Belgium	25 Sep 1948
Bolivia	23 Dec 1949
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	15 Dec 1949
Bulgaria	30 Sep 1960
Burkina Faso	27 Apr 1962
Burundi	17 Mar 1971
Cambodia	6 Nov 1963
Cameroon	20 Oct 1961 *d*
Canada	22 Jan 1948
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	15 Oct 1948
China	11 Sep 1979
Colombia	6 Aug 1974
Congo	15 Oct 1962 *d*
Costa Rica	26 Oct 1949
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 *d*
Croatia	12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	9 Sep 1959
Cyprus	5 Nov 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[2]	22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	10 Jun 1948
Djibouti	6 Apr 1978 *d*
Dominica	24 Nov 1987 *d*
Dominican Republic	7 Mar 1947
Ecuador	22 Mar 1956
Egypt	17 Sep 1948
El Salvador	9 Jul 1947
Estonia	21 Oct 1991
Ethiopia	22 Jul 1947
Fiji	21 Jun 1971 *d*
Finland	31 Jul 1958
France	18 Aug 1947
Gabon	13 Mar 1964
Gambia	1 Aug 1966 *d*
Germany[3, 4]	5 Nov 1980
Ghana	5 Aug 1958
Greece	29 Dec 1947
Guatemala	7 Jul 1947
Guinea	10 Jan 1968
Guyana	28 Dec 1972
Haiti	6 Aug 1947
Honduras	16 May 1947
Hungary	30 Jul 1956
Iceland	10 Mar 1948
India	13 May 1948
Indonesia	8 Mar 1972
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 May 1947
Iraq	15 Sep 1949
Ireland	10 May 1967
Israel	21 Sep 1949
Italy	3 Feb 1958
Jamaica	9 Sep 1963
Japan	18 Apr 1963
Jordan	3 Jan 1958
Kenya	1 Jul 1965
Kuwait	13 Dec 1963
Lao People's Democratic Republic	24 Nov 1956
Lebanon	10 Mar 1949
Lesotho	26 Nov 1969
Liberia	14 Mar 1947
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	28 Nov 1958
Liechtenstein	25 Mar 1993 *a*
Luxembourg	14 Feb 1949
Madagascar	23 May 1962 *d*
Malawi	17 May 1966
Malaysia	28 Oct 1957 *d*
Mali	28 Mar 1968
Malta	27 Jun 1968 *d*
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	26 Nov 1962
Mongolia	31 May 1962
Morocco	18 Mar 1957
Myanmar	25 Jan 1955
Nepal	28 Sep 1965
Netherlands	19 Apr 1948
New Zealand[5]	10 Dec 1947
Nicaragua	29 Nov 1947
Niger	25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria	26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	18 Aug 1947
Pakistan	8 Jan 1948
Panama	27 May 1947
Papua New Guinea	4 Dec 1975 *d*
Paraguay	2 Oct 1953
Peru	24 Jul 1963
Philippines	28 Oct 1947
Poland	8 Jan 1948

Participant	Accession, succession (d)
Republic of Korea	9 Apr 1992
Republic of Moldova	12 Apr 1995
Romania	5 Jul 1956
Russian Federation	22 Sep 1953
Rwanda	15 Apr 1964
Saint Lucia	27 Aug 1986 *d*
Senegal	27 May 1963 *d*
Seychelles	26 Aug 1980
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore	18 Mar 1966 *d*
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia	6 Jul 1992 *d*
Somalia	9 Jul 1963
Spain	31 Jul 1974
Sudan	21 Mar 1977
Sweden	28 Aug 1947
Syrian Arab Republic	29 Sep 1953
Thailand	30 Mar 1956
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[6]	18 Aug 1993 *d*
Togo	27 Feb 1962 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago	19 Oct 1965
Tunisia	7 May 1957
Turkey	22 Aug 1950
Ukraine	20 Nov 1953
United Kingdom	17 Sep 1946
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Oct 1962
United States of America	29 Apr 1970
Uruguay	16 Feb 1984
Viet Nam	6 Apr 1988
Yemen[7]	23 Jul 1963
Yugoslavia	30 Jun 1950
Zaire	8 Dec 1964
Zambia	6 Jun 1975 *d*
Zimbabwe	13 May 1991

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession or succession.)

ALBANIA[8]

The People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of section 30, which provide that any difference arising out of the interpretation or application of the present Convention shall be brought before the International Court of Justice, whose opinion shall be accepted as decisive by the parties; with respect to the competence of the Court in disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention, the People's Republic of Albania will continue to maintain, as it has heretofore, that in every individual case the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is required in order that the dispute may be laid before the International Court of Justice for a ruling.

ALGERIA[8]

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by section 30 of the said Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the case of differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. It declares that, for the submission of a particular dispute to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary in each case. This reservation also applies to the provision of the same section that the advisory opinion given by the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BELARUS[8]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of section 30 of the Convention which envisages the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court and, in regard to the competence of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will, as hitherto, adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provisions contained in the same section, whereby the advisory opinion of the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.

BULGARIA[8, 9]

CANADA

"With the reservation that exemption from taxation imposed by any law in Canada on salaries and emoluments shall not extend to a Canadian citizen residing or ordinarily resident in Canada."

CHINA[8]

The Government of the People's Republic of China has reservations on section 30, article VIII, of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2, 8]

HUNGARY[8, 10]

INDONESIA

"Article 1 (b) section 1: The capacity of the United Nations to acquire and dispose of immovable property shall be exercised with due regard to national laws and regulations.

"Article VIII, section 30: With regard to competence of the International Court of Justice in disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of Indonesia reserves the right to maintain that in every individual case the agreement of the parties to the dispute is required before the Court for a ruling."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

1. Laotian nationals domiciled or habitually resident in Laos shall not enjoy exemption from the taxation payable in Laos on salaries and income.

2. Laotian nationals who are officials of the United Nations shall not be immune from National Service obligations.

MEXICO

(a) The United Nations and its organs shall not be entitled to acquire immovable property in Mexican territory, in view of

the property regulations laid down by the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.

(b) Officials and experts of the United Nations and its organs who are of Mexican nationality shall enjoy, in the exercise of their functions in Mexican territory, exclusively those privileges which are granted them by section 18, paragraphs (*a*), (*d*), (*f*) and (*g*), and by section 22, paragraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*f*) respectively, of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, on the understanding that the inviolability established in the aforesaid section 22, paragraph (*c*), shall be granted only for official papers and documents.

MONGOLIA[8, 11]

NEPAL[8]

"Subject to the reservation with regard to section 18 (*c*) of the Convention, that United Nations officials of Nepalese nationality shall not be exempt from service obligations applicable to them pursuant to Nepalese law; and

"Subject to the reservation with regard to section 30 of the Convention, that any difference arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention to which Nepal is a party, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the specific agreement of His Majesty's Government of Nepal."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

[The Government of the Republic of Korea declares] that the provision of paragraph (c) of section 18 of article V shall not apply with respect to Korean nationals.

ROMANIA[8]

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of section 30 of the Convention which provide for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention; with respect to the competence of the International Court in such differences, the Romanian People's Republic takes the view that, for the purpose of the submission of any dispute whatsoever to the Court for a ruling, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provisions contained in the said section which stipulate that the advisory opinion of the International Court is to be accepted as decisive.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[8, 12]

The Soviet Union does not consider itself bound by the provision of section 30 of the Convention which envisages the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court, and in regard to the competence of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Soviet Union will, as hitherto, adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provision contained in the same section, whereby the advisory opinion of the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.

SLOVAKIA[2, 8]

THAILAND

"Officials of the United Nations of Thai nationality shall not be immune from national service obligations".

TURKEY[13]

With the following reservations:

(*a*) The deferment, during service with the United Nations, of the second period of military service of Turkish nationals who occupy posts with the said Organization, will be arranged in accordance with the procedures provided in Military Law No. 1111, account being taken of their position as reserve officers or private soldiers, provided that they complete their previous military service as required under Article 6 of the above-mentioned Law, as reserve officers or private soldiers.

...

(*e*) Turkish nationals entrusted by the United Nations with a mission in Turkey as officials of the Organization are subject to the taxes payable by their fellow citizens. They must make an annual declaration of their salaries in accordance with the provisions set forth in chapter 4, section 2, of Law No. 5421 concerning income tax.

UKRAINE[8]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of section 30 of the Convention which envisages the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court and, in regard to the competence of the International Court in differences arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will, as hitherto, adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case. This reservation is equally applicable to the provision contained in the same section, whereby the advisory opinion of the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"(1) Paragraph (*b*) of section 18 regarding immunity from taxation and paragraph (*c*) of section 18 regarding immunity from national service obligations shall not apply with respect to United States nationals and aliens admitted for permanent residence.

"(2) Nothing in article IV, regarding the privileges and immunities of representatives of Members, in article VI, regarding the privileges and immunities of United Nations officials, or in article VI, regarding the privileges and immunities of experts on missions for the United Nations, shall be construed to grant any person who has abused his privileges of residence by activities in the United States outside his official capacity exemption from the laws and regulations of the United States regarding the continued residence of aliens, provided that:

"(*a*) No proceedings shall be instituted under such laws or regulations to require any such person to leave the United States except with the prior approval of the Secretary of State of the United States. Such approval shall be given only after consultation with the appropriate Member in the case of a representative of a Member (or member of his family) or with the Secretary-General in the case of any person referred to in articles V and VI;

"(*b*) A representative of the Member concerned or the Secretary-General, as the case may be, shall have the

right to appear in any such proceedings on behalf of the person against whom they are instituted;

"(c) Persons who are entitled to diplomatic privileges and immunities under the Convention shall not be required to leave the United States otherwise than in accordance with the customary procedure applicable to members of diplomatic missions accredited or notified to the United States.

VIET NAM[8]

1. Disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement only with the consent of all parties concerned.

2. The opinion of the International Court of Justice referred to in article VIII, section 30, shall be merely advisory and shall not be considered decisive without the consent of all parties concerned.

NOTES:

[1] Resolution 22 A (I). See *Resolutions adopted by the General Assembly during the First Part of its First Session* (A/64), p. 25.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 7 September 1955 with a reservation to section 30 of the Convention. The reservation was subsequently withdrawn by a notification received on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 214, p. 348. See also 8 note below and 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 4 October 1974 with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 950, p. 354. See also note 8 below and note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on the dates indicated, the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (9 November 1981):

The declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany when depositing the instrument of accession, to the effect that the said Convention shall extend to Berlin (West), is incompatible with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. That Agreement, as is generally known, does not grant the Federal Republic of Germany the right to extend to West Berlin international agreements which affect matters of security and status. The above-mentioned Convention belongs precisely to that category of agreement.

In particular, the 1946 Convention regulates the granting of privileges and immunities to United Nations organs and officials in the State territory of countries parties to it, including immunity from legal proceedings and immunity from arrest or detention. Thus, the Convention concerns sovereign rights and obligations which cannot be exercised by a State in a territory which does not come under its jurisdiction.

In view of the foregoing, the Soviet Union considers the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany on extending the application of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations to Berlin (West) to be illegal and to have no legal force.

German Democratic Republic (23 December 1981):

"Concerning the application of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations on 13 February 1946 to Berlin (West) the German Democratic Republic states in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, that Berlin (West) continues not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and cannot be governed by it.

"The declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that the said Convention shall be extended to Berlin (West) is contrary to the Quadripartite Agreement in which it is stipulated that international agreements affecting matters of security and status of Berlin (West) cannot be extended by the Federal Republic of Germany to Berlin (West).

"In view of the foregoing, the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany will have no validity."

France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (8 June 1982):

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is an integral part (annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States, confirmed that, provided matters of security and status are not affected and provided that the extension is specified in each case international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of the Three Powers, which is similarly an integral part (annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed *inter alia* to afford the authorities of the Three Powers the opportunity to ensure that international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany which are to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status are not affected.

When authorizing the extension of the above-mentioned Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers took such steps as were necessary to ensure that the application of the Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin remained subject to Allied rights and responsibilities in the field of privileges and immunities of international organisations. Accordingly, the validity of the Berlin declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with established procedures is unaffected and the application of the Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect, subject to Allied rights and responsibilities.

With reference to the said communication for the Government of the German Democratic Republic we wish to state that States which are not party to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions. The three Governments do not consider it necessary, nor do they intend to respond to any further communications from States which are not party to the Quadripartite Agreement. We wish to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change in their position on this matter.

Federal Republic of Germany (16 August 1982):

"By their note of 28 May 1982, . . . the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under established procedures continues in full force and effect, subject to Allied rights and responsibilities.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (29 December 1982):

The Soviet side once again confirms, as was already stated in the Mission's note of 9 November 1981, that the declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension to West Berlin of the application of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations of 13 February 1946 is a

violation of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and therefore has no legal force.

The Quadripartite Agreement, as is well known, clearly determined that by no means all international treaties of the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to West Berlin, but only those which do not affect matters of status and security. The above-mentioned Convention, by reason of its content, directly affects such matters.

The declarations by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America that in the extension of the Convention to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany the established procedures are being observed do not alter the substance of the problem. Those procedures may be applied only in relation to international treaties which the Federal Republic of Germany is entitled to extend to West Berlin. The Convention of 13 February 1946 is not such a treaty.

At the same time the Soviet side wishes to point out that the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 contains provisions relating to West Berlin which have universal force of international law. The extension of the Convention of 13 February 1946 to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany notwithstanding those provisions naturally affects the interests of other parties to the Convention, which have the right to express their opinions in the matter. That right cannot be disputed by anyone.

Accordingly, the Soviet side rejects as unfounded the assertions made by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America concerning the declaration by the German Democratic Republic [. . .]. The view set forth in that declaration by the German Democratic Republic as a party to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations is fully consistent with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971.

United States of America, France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (7 July 1983):

"The three Missions wish to recall the position set forth in their communication to the Secretary-General's Note [. . .] dated 20 July 1982. They wish further to recall that the Quadripartite Agreement is an international agreement concluded between the four contracting parties and not open to participation by any other State. In concluding this agreement, the Four Powers acted on the basis of their quadripartite rights and responsibilities, and the corresponding wartime and post-war agreements and decisions of the Four Powers which are not affected. The Quadripartite Agreement is part of conventional, not customary international law. States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions. The absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of their position in this matter."
See also note 3 above.

[5] In a communication received on 25 November 1960, the Government of New Zealand gave notice of the withdrawal of the reservation made upon deposit of its instrument of accession. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 11, p. 406.

[6] On 16 March 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations 1946 does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

[7] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[8] The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General, on the dates indicated, that it was unable to accept certain reservations made by the States listed below because in its view they were not of the kind which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Date of the receipt of the objection, or date on which it was circulated by the Secretary-General			*With respect to reservation by:*
4 August	1954*	.....	Belarus
4 August	1954*	.....	Ukraine
4 August	1954*	.....	Russian Federation
1 December	1955*	.....	Czechoslovakia**
6 September	1956*	.....	Romania
4 September	1956*	.....	Hungary
3 October	1957*	.....	Albania
20 June	1967*	.....	Algeria
20 June	1967*	.....	Bulgaria
20 June	1967*	.....	Mongolia
20 June	1967*	.....	Nepal
21 September	1972	.....	Indonesia
29 November	1979	.....	German Democratic Republic***
8 November	1979	.....	China
30 January	1990	.....	Viet Nam

* Date the objection was circulated.
**See also note 2 above.
***See also note 3 above.

[9] In a communication received on 7 August 1989, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw, with effect on that same date, the reservation in respect to Section 30 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 376, p. 402.

[10] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to Section 30 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 248, p. 358.

[11] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation it had made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 429, p. 246.

[12] By a communication received on 5 January 1955, the Government of Lebanon notified the Secretary-General that it objected to this reservation.

[13] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 20 June 1957, the Government of Turkey withdrew the second, third and fourth reservations contained in its instrument of accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 70, p. 266.

2. Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies

Approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 November 1947[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: For each State and in respect of each specialized agency indicated in its instrument of accession or in a subsequent notification, as from the date of deposit of the instrument of accession or receipt of the notification.

REGISTRATION: 16 August 1949, No. 521.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 33, p. 261. For the final texts of annexes I to VIII and X, which had been transmitted to the Secretary-General as at the date of registration of the Convention, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 33, p. 290. For the texts of final or revised texts of annexes transmitted to the Secretary-General subsequent to the date of registration of the Convention, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, as follows: vol. 71, p. 318, (revised text of annex VII); vol. 79, p. 326 (annex IX); vol. 117, p. 386 (annex XI); vol. 275, p. 298 (second revised text of annex VII); vol. 314, p. 308 (third revised text of annex VII); vol. 323, p. 364 (annex XII); vol. 327, p. 326 (annex XIII); vol. 371, p. 266 (revised text of annex II); vol. 423, p. 284 (annex XIV); vol. 559, p. 348 (second revised text of annex II); vol. 645, p. 340 (revised text of annex XII); vol. 1057, p. 320 (annex XV); vol. 1060, p. 337 (annex XVI) and depositary notification C.N.224.1987.TREATIES-1 of 16 October 1987 (annex XVII).

STATUS: Parties: 102.

Final texts or revised texts of annexes transmitted to the Secretary-General by the specialized agencies concerned and dates of their receipt by the Secretary-General

1.	Annex I—International Labour Organisation (ILO)	14 Sep 1948
2.	Annex II—Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	13 Dec 1948
	Revised text of annex II	26 May 1960
	Second revised text of annex II	28 Dec 1965
3.	Annex III—International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)	11 Aug 1948
4.	Annex IV—United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	7 Feb 1949
5.	Annex V—International Monetary Fund (IMF)	9 May 1949
6.	Annex VI—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	29 Apr 1949
7.	Annex VII—World Health Organization (WHO)	2 Aug 1948
	Revised text of annex VII	1 Jun 1950
	Second revised text of annex VII	1 Jul 1957
	Third revised text of annex VII	25 Jul 1958
8.	Annex VIII—Universal Postal Union (UPU)	11 Jul 1949
9.	Annex IX—International Telecommunication Union (ITU)	16 Jan 1951
10.	Annex X—International Refugee Organization (IRO)[2]	4 Apr 1949
11.	Annex XI—World Meteorological Organization (WMO)	29 Dec 1951
12.	Annex XII—International Maritime Organization (IMO)	12 Feb 1959
	Revised text of annex XII	9 Jul 1968
13.	Annex XIII—International Finance Corporation (IFC)	22 Apr 1959
14.	Annex XIV—International Development Association (IDA)	15 Feb 1962
15.	Annex XV—World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)	19 Oct 1977
16.	Annex XVI—International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	16 Dec 1977
17.	Annex XVII—United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	15 Sep 1987

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes		*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Algeria	25 Mar 1964 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
Antigua and Barbuda	13 Dec 1988 *d*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO
Argentina	10 Oct 1963 *a*	ILO, FAO (revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC
Australia	9 May 1986 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD
Austria	21 Jul 1950 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, IRO

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Austria (cont'd)	28	Mar	1951	ITU
	21	Jan	1955	WHO (revised text of annex VII), WMO
	1	Nov	1957	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	28	Oct	1958	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	10	Nov	1959	IFC
	14	Feb	1962	FAO (revised text of annex II)
	8	Nov	1962	IDA
	22	Jul	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	2	Jul	1991	WIPO
Bahamas	17	Mar	1977 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Bahrain	17	Sep	1992 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Barbados	19	Nov	1971 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
Belarus	18	Mar	1966 *a*	ILO, UNESCO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	27	Aug	1992	IMF
	13	Oct	1992	WHO
Belgium	14	Mar	1962 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	Sep	1993 *d*	FAO, IBRD, IDA, IFAD, IFC, ILO, IMF, ITU, UNESCO, UPU WHO, WIPO, WMO
Botswana	5	Apr	1983 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU
Brazil	22	Mar	1963 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
	24	Apr	1963	IBRD
	15	Jul	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	11	Feb	1969	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Bulgaria	13	Jun	1968 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
	2	Dec	1968	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Burkina Faso	6	Apr	1962 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC
Cambodia	15	Oct	1953 *a*	UPU
	26	Sep	1955	FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, ITU, WMO
Cameroon	30	Apr	1992 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD, UNIDO
Central African Republic	15	Oct	1962 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, WMO
Chile	21	Sep	1951 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU
	7	Jun	1961	UNESCO
China	11	Sep	1979 *a*	FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	30	Jun	1981	IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA.
	9	Nov	1984	ILO
Côte d'Ivoire	8	Sep	1961 *a*	WHO
	28	Dec	1961	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, UPU, ITU,
	4	Jun	1962	IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA
	26	Sep	1962	WMO

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Croatia	12	Oct	1992 *d*	ILO, FAO (revised and second revised text of annex II), UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (second and third revised texts of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD
Cuba	13	Sep	1972 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
	21	Jul	1981	IFAD
Cyprus	6	May	1963 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
Czech Republic[3]	22	Feb	1993 *d*	ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, UNIDO, IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA
Denmark	25	Jan	1950 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU
	5	Apr	1950	IRO
	22	May	1951	WHO (revised text of annex VII)
	19	Jul	1951	ITU
	10	Mar	1953	WMO
	14	Oct	1957	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	8	Jan	1959	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	20	May	1960	IMO
	26	Dec	1960	FAO (revised text of annex II)
	19	Jul	1961	IFC
	3	Aug	1962	IDA
	20	Mar	1969	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	15	Dec	1983	WIPO
Dominica	24	Jun	1988 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), UNESCO, IMF, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFAD, UNIDO
Ecuador	8	Jun	1951 *a*	ILO
	7	Jul	1953	FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, ITU
	14	Jul	1954	WMO
	12	Dec	1958	UPU
	2	Aug	1960	FAO (revised text of annex II)
	26	Jul	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
Egypt	28	Sep	1954 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU
	1	Jun	1955	WMO
	3	Feb	1958	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	24	May	1976	IFC
Fiji	21	Jun	1971 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (second revised text), IMO, IFC, IDA, WIPO
Finland	31	Jul	1958 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	2	Dec	1958	WHO (third revised text of Annex VII)
	8	Jun	1959	IMO
	27	Jul	1959	IFC
	8	Sep	1960	FAO (revised text of Annex II)
	16	Nov	1962	IDA
	24	Nov	1969	IMO (revised text of Annex XII)
Gabon	29	Jun	1961 *a*	ITU
	30	Nov	1982	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA, WIPO
Gambia	1	Aug	1966 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
	1	Aug	1966	IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Germany[4,5,6]	10	Oct	1957 *a*	ILO, FAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, ITU, WMO
	10	Oct	1957	ICAO
	19	May	1958	UPU
	5	Sep	1958	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	11	Feb	1959	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	12	Jan	1962	IMO
	12	Apr	1962	IFC
	23	May	1963	FAO (revised text of annex II)
	20	Aug	1979	WIPO, IFAD
	11	Jun	1985	FAO (second revised text of annex II), IDA, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	3	Mar	1989	UNIDO
Ghana	9	Sep	1958 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO
	27	Oct	1958	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	16	Sep	1960	FAO (revised text of annex II)
Greece	21	Jun	1977 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII) IFC, IDA
Guatemala	30	Jun	1951 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, IRO
	4	Oct	1954	WMO
	18	May	1962	IDA
Guinea	1	Jul	1959 *a*	WMO
	29	Mar	1968	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, IMO, IFC, IDA
Guyana	13	Sep	1973 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
Haiti	16	Apr	1952 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU
	16	Apr	1952	WMO
	5	Aug	1959	IMO
Hungary[7]	2	Aug	1967 *a*	ILO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	9	Aug	1973	FAO, ICAO, IMO
	19	Aug	1982	IMF, IBRD
	12	Nov	1991	IFC, IDA
India	10	Feb	1949 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO
	19	Oct	1949	IMF, IBRD, UPU
	9	Mar	1955	WMO
	3	Jun	1955	WHO (revised text of annex VII), ITU
	3	Jul	1958	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	3	Aug	1961	IFC
	12	Apr	1963	FAO (revised text of annex II)
Indonesia	8	Mar	1972 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16	May	1974 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA
Iraq	9	Jul	1954 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
Ireland	10	May	1967 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
	27	Dec	1968	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Italy[8]	30	Aug	1985 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD, UNIDO
Jamaica	4	Nov	1963 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
Japan	18	Apr	1963 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
Jordan	12	Dec	1950 *a*	FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU
	24	Mar	1951	ITU
	10	Dec	1957	WMO
	11	Aug	1960	FAO (revised text of annex II)
Kenya	1	Jul	1965 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
	3	Mar	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
Kuwait	13	Nov	1961 *a*	ITU
	7	Feb	1963	ILO, FAO (revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
	29	Aug	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	9	Jul	1969	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9	Aug	1960 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC
Lesotho	26	Nov	1969 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IFC, IDA
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30	Apr	1958 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), ITU, WMO
Luxembourg	20	Sep	1950 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, IRO
	27	Mar	1951	ITU
	22	Aug	1952	WMO
Madagascar	3	Jan	1966 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC
	22	Nov	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	19	Nov	1968	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Malawi	2	Aug	1965 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
	16	Sep	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
Malaysia	29	Mar	1962 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO
	23	Nov	1962	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
Maldives	26	May	1969 *a*	WHO, UPU, ITU, IMO
Mali	24	Jun	1968 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
Malta	27	Jun	1968 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IBRD, IDA
	21	Oct	1968	FAO (second revised text of annex II), WHO (third revised text of annex VII), IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	13	Feb	1969	IMF, IFC
Mauritius[9]	18	Jul	1969 *d*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Mongolia	3	Mar	1970 *a*	ILO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	20	Sep	1974	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
Morocco	28	Apr	1958 *a*	ICAO, WMO
	10	Jun	1958	ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ITU
	13	Aug	1958	UPU
	30	Nov	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	3	Nov	1976	IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA
Nepal[10]	23	Feb	1954 *a*	WHO
	28	Sep	1965	FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, UPU, ITU
Netherlands	2	Dec	1948 *a*	ICAO, WHO
	2	Dec	1948	ILO
	21	Jul	1949	FAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, IRO
	15	Feb	1951	WHO (revised text of annex VII)
	15	Jun	1951	ITU
	14	May	1952	UPU
	5	Jan	1954	WMO
	18	Mar	1965	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	28	Jun	1965	FAO (revised text of annex II), IMO, IFC, IDA
	9	Dec	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	29	Oct	1969	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
New Zealand	25	Nov	1960 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	17	Oct	1963	IMO
	23	May	1967	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	6	Jun	1969	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Nicaragua	6	Apr	1959 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
Niger	15	May	1968 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IDA
Nigeria	26	Jun	1961 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
Norway	25	Jan	1950 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, IRO
	14	Sep	1950	WHO (revised text of annex VII)
	20	Sep	1951	ITU
	22	Nov	1955	WMO
	11	Sep	1957	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	10	Nov	1960	FAO (revised text of annex II), IFC
	30	Jan	1961	IMO
	2	Aug	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	1	Oct	1968	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Pakistan	23	Jul	1951 *a*	IBRD
	7	Nov	1951	IMF
	15	Sep	1961	ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	13	Mar	1962	FAO, IMO
	17	Jul	1962	IFC, IDA
Philippines	20	Mar	1950 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO
	21	May	1958	WMO
	12	Mar	1959	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	13	Jan	1961	IFC

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Poland	19	Jun	1969 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	11	Jun	1990	IMF, IBRD
	1	Nov	1990	IFC
Republic of Korea	13	May	1977 *a*	FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO
Romania	15	Sep	1970 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	23	Aug	1974	IMF, IBRD
Russian Federation	10	Jan	1966 *a*	ILO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
	16	Nov	1972	ICAO
	29	Jun	1994	IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA
Rwanda	15	Apr	1964 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	23	Jun	1964	IMF, IBRD, IDA
Saint Lucia	2	Sep	1986 *a*	FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IDA, WIPO
Senegal	2	Mar	1966 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA
Seychelles	24	Jul	1985 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD
Sierra Leone	13	Mar	1962 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
Singapore	18	Mar	1966 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
Slovakia[3]	28	May	1993 *d*	ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, UNIDO, IMF, IBRD, IFC, IDA
Slovenia	6	Jul	1992 *d*	FAO , IBRD, IDA, IFAD, IFC, ILO, IMF, ITU, UNESCO, UPU, WHO, WIPO, WMO
Spain	26	Sep	1974 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA
Sweden	12	Sep	1951 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU
	31	Jul	1953	WMO
	22	Aug	1957	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	1	Feb	1960	IMO
	3	Sep	1960	IFC
	28	Sep	1960	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	11	Apr	1962	IDA
	13	Sep	1968	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	1	Mar	1979	WIPO, IFAD
Thailand	30	Mar	1956 *a*	FAO, ICAO
	19	Jun	1961	ILO, FAO (revised text of annex II), UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), ITU, WMO, IFC
	28	Apr	1965	UPU
	21	Mar	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
Togo	15	Jul	1960 *a*	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	16	Sep	1975	UPU

Accessions (a), successions (d), notifications of undertaking to apply the Convention to further specialized agencies, notifications of acceptance of revised texts of annexes				*Specialized agencies in respect of which, on accession, on succession or in subsequent notifications, States have undertaken to apply the Convention, and revised texts of annexes in respect of which States have notified their acceptance*
Tonga	17	Mar	1976 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Trinidad and Tobago	19	Oct	1965 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO
	15	Jul	1966	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
Tunisia	3	Dec	1957 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	19	May	1958	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
Uganda	11	Aug	1983 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO, IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD
Ukraine	13	Apr	1966 *a*	ILO, UNESCO, UPU, ITU, WMO
	25	Feb	1993	FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD, UNIDO
United Kingdom[11]	16	Aug	1949 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, [UNESCO], WHO, IRO
	17	Dec	1954	UPU, ITU, WMO
	22	Sep	1955	WHO (revised text of annex VII)
	30	Sep	1957	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	4	Nov	1959	IMO
	28	Nov	1968	IMO (revised text of annex XII)
	6	Aug	1985	FAO (second revised text of annex II), WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	3	Sep	1986	WIPO
United Republic of Tanzania	29	Oct	1962 *a*	ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO
	26	Mar	1963	WMO
	10	Apr	1963	ICAO, IMF, IBRD, ITU, IFC
Uruguay	29	Dec	1977 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU
	24	Jun	1981	WMO
Yugoslavia	23	Nov	1951 *a*	ILO, FAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU
	5	Mar	1952	WMO
	16	Mar	1959	WHO (second revised text of annex VII)
	14	Apr	1960	WHO (third revised text of annex VII)
	8	Apr	1964	FAO (revised text of annex II), IMO, IFC, IDA
	27	Feb	1969	FAO (second revised text of annex II)
	26	Jan	1979	IFAD
	8	Feb	1979	WIPO
Zaire	8	Dec	1964 *a*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IFC, IDA
Zambia	16	Jun	1975 *d*	ILO, FAO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO (second revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII)
Zimbabwe	5	Mar	1991 *a*	ILO, FAO (second revised text of annex II), ICAO, UNESCO, IMF, IBRD, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII), IFC, IDA, WIPO, IFAD, UNIDO

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BAHRAIN

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind herewith."

BELARUS[12]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Concerning the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will maintain the same position as hitherto, namely, that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all Parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation similarly applies to the provision contained in section 32, stipulating that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

BULGARIA[12, 13]

CHINA[12]

The Government of the People's Republic of China has reservations on the provisions of section 32, article IX, of the said Convention.

COTE D'IVOIRE

28 December 1961

It is not possible for any Government fully to comply with the requirements of section 11 of that Convention in so far as it requires the specialized agency to enjoy in the territory of a State party to the Convention treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of that State to any other Government in the matter of priorities and rates on telecommunications, unless and until all other Governments collaborate in according this treatment to the agency in question. It is understood that this matter is being discussed in the International Telecommunication Union.

CUBA[12]

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, under which the International Court of Justice has compulsory jurisdiction in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. Concerning the competence of the International Court of Justice in such disputes, Cuba takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation also applies to the provision of section 32 requiring the parties concerned to accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as decisive.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3, 12]

GABON

It is not possible for any Government fully to comply with the requirements of section 11 of that Convention in so far as it requires the specialized agency to enjoy in the territory of a State party to the Convention treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of that State to any other Government in the matter of priorities and rates on telecommunications, unless and until all other Governments collaborate in according this treatment to the agency in question. It is understood that this matter is being discussed in the International Telecommunication Union.

GERMANY[5,6]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany takes the liberty of calling attention to the fact that the provisions of section 11 of article IV of the Convention, to the effect that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to this Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and other taxes, cannot be fully complied with by any Government. Reference is made to the provisions of article 37 and of annex 3 of the International Telecommunication Convention concluded at Buenos Aires in 1952, as well as to the resolutions Nos. 27 and 28 appended to that Convention."

HUNGARY[12, 14]

INDONESIA[12, 15]

"(1) Article II (b) section 3: The capacity of the specialized agencies to acquire and dispose of immovable property shall be exercised with due regard to national laws and regulations.

"(2) Article IX section 32: With regard to the competence of the International Court of Justice in disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of Indonesia reserves the right to maintain that in every individual case the agreement of the parties to the dispute is required before the Court for a ruling."

ITALY

Declaration:

In the event that some of the specialized agencies which are mentioned in the instrument of accession and to which Italy undertakes to apply the Convention should decide to establish their headquarters or their regional offices in Italian territory, the Italian Government will be able to avail itself of the option of concluding with such agencies, in accordance with Section 39 of the Convention supplemental agreements specifying, in particular, the limits within which immunity from jurisdiction may be granted to a given agency or immunity from jurisdiction and exemption from taxation granted to officials of that agency.

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Government will not be able to comply fully with the provisions of article IV, section 11, of the Convention, which states that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Govern-

ment, in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, until such time as all Governments decide to co–operate by according such treatment to the agencies in question.

MONGOLIA[12,16]

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand, in common with other Governments, cannot give full effect to article IV, section 11, of the Convention, which requires that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than the treatment accorded by the Government of such a State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, as long as all Governments have not decided to co–operate in granting this treatment to the agencies in question.

"It is noted that this matter has been receiving the consideration of the United Nations and of the International Telecommunication Union. It is also noted that the final text of the annex of the Convention approved by the International Telecommunication Union, and transmitted by the Union to the Secretary– General of the United Nations in accordance with section 36 of the Convention, contains a statement that the Union would not claim for itself the enjoyment of privileged treatment with regard to the facilities in respect of communications provided in section 11 of the Convention."

NORWAY

20 September 1951

"The Norwegian Government is of the opinion that it is impossible for any government to comply fully with Section 11 of the said Convention, which requires that the Specialized Agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each state party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment no less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications as long as all governments have not agreed to grant to the agency in question, the treatment specified in this Section."

PAKISTAN

Declaration contained in the notification received on 15 September 1961 and also, with the second paragraph omitted, in the notifications received on 13 March 1962 and 17 July 1962:

"The enjoyment by Specialized Agencies of the communication privileges provided for in Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention cannot, in practice, be determined by unilateral action of individual Governments and has in fact been determined by the International Telecommunication Convention, Atlantic City, 1947 and Telegraph and Telephone Regulations annexed thereto, Pakistan would, therefore, not be able to comply with the provisions of Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention in view of Resolution No. 28 (annexure I) passed at the Plenipotentiary Conference of the International Telecommunication Union, held in Buenos Aires in 1952.

"The International Telecommunication Union shall not claim for itself the communication privileges provided in Article IV, Section 11 of the Convention."

POLAND[12]

Subject to the reservation, in respect of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, that disputes arising out of the interpretation and application of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of all parties to the dispute and that the Polish People's Republic reserves the right not to accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice as decisive.

ROMANIA[12]

The Socialist Republic of Romania states that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32, whereby the question whether an abuse of a privilege or immunity has occurred, and differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention and disputes between specialized agencies and Member States, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice. The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that such questions, differences or disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of the parties in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[12]

Declaration made upon accession and also contained in the notification received on 16 November 1972:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Concerning the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the USSR will maintain the same position as hitherto, namely, that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all Parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation similarly applies to the provision contained in section 32, stipulating that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

SLOVAKIA[3, 12]

UKRAINE[12]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of sections 24 and 32 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Concerning the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will maintain the same position as hitherto, namely, that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement, the agreement of all Parties involved in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case. This reservation similarly applies to the provision contained in section 32, stipulating that the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice shall be accepted as decisive.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"It is not possible for any Government fully to comply with the requirements of Section 11 of that Convention in so far as it requires the Specialized Agency to enjoy in the territory of a state party to the Convention treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of that state to any other Government in the matter of priorities and rates on telecommunications, unless and until all other Governments collaborate in according this treatment to the Agency in question. It is understood that this matter is being discussed in the International Telecommunication Union."

17 December 1954

"With regard to the Universal Postal Union and the World Meteorological Organization, . . . no Government can fully comply with Section 11 of this Convention which requires that the specialized agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable that that accorded by the Government of such a State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications so long as all the other Governments have not decided to co-operate in granting this treatment to the agencies in question. This matter is under consideration by the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union.

"The final text of the annex to the Convention approved by the International Telecommunication Union and transmitted by the Union to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in accordance with Section 36 of the Convention contains a statement that the Union would not claim for itself the enjoyment of privileged treatment with regard to the facilities in respect of communications provided in Section 11 of the Convention."

4 November 1959

"Her Majesty's Government observe [in connection with its notification of application to the International Maritime Organisation] that it would be impracticable for any Government fully to comply with Section 11 of the Convention which requires that the Specialized Agencies shall enjoy, in the territory of each State party to the Convention, for their official communications, treatment not less favourable than that accorded by the Government of such State to any other Government in the matter of priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, until such time as all the other Governments have decided to co-operate in granting this treatment to the agencies in question. This matter is under consideration by the United Nations and the International Telecommunication Union."

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon accession.)

NETHERLANDS[17]

11 January 1980

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has noted the reservation made on the accession of China to the Convention on the privileges and immunities of the specialized agencies, and is of the opinion that the reservation mentioned, and similar reservations other States have made in the past or may make in the future, are incompatible with the objectives and purposes of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does, however, not wish to raise a formal objection to these reservations made by States parties to the Convention."

Notes:

[1] Resolution 179 (II); *Official Records of the Second Session of the General Assembly, Resolutions* (A/519), p. 112.

[2] Resolution No. 108, adopted by the General Council of the International Refugee Organization at its 101st meeting on 15 February 1952, provided for the liquidation of the Organization.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 December 1966 in respect of the following agencies: ILO, ICAO, UNESCO, WHO, UPU, ITU, WMO and IMO. Subsequently, on 6 September 1988 and 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General that it applied the Convention in respect of FAO (second revised text of annex II), WIPO, and UNIDO, and IMF, IBRD, IFC and IDA, respectively. The instrument of accession also contained a reservation, subsequently withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 586, p. 247. See also note 12 in this chapter and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 October 1957, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention will also apply to the Saar Territory except that Section 7 (b) of the Convention shall not take effect with regard to the Saar Territory until the expiration of the interim period defined in article 3 of the Treaty of 27 October 1956 between France and the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 12 below and note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 4 October 1974 in respect of the following specialized agencies: ILO, UNESCO, WHO (third revised text of annex VII), UPU, ITU, WMO, IMO (revised text of annex XII). For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 950, p. 357. See also note 12 below and note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention would also apply to *Land Berlin*.

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bulgaria, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Mongolia, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 4 of chapter III.3.

Subsequently, upon accession to the Convention, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made on the same subject the following declaration:

> As regards the application of the Convention to Berlin (West), the German Democratic Republic notes, in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic of 3 September 1971, that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and cannot be governed by it. Consequently, the declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that the said Convention is valid also for "*Land Berlin*" is in contradiction with the Quadripartite Agreement, which provides that agreements affecting matters of the status of Berlin (West) may not be extended to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany.

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration the Secretary-General received on 8 July 1975 from the Governments of the United States of America, France and the United Kingdom, the following declaration:

> ["The communication mentioned in the Note listed refers] to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. This Agreement was concluded in Berlin between the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. [The Government sending this communication is not a party to the Quadripartite Agreement and is] therefore not competent to make authoritative comments on its provisions.
>
> "The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to bring the following to the attention of the States Parties to the [Convention]. When authorising the extension of [this instrument] to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers, acting in the exercise of their supreme author-

ity, ensured in accordance with established procedures that [this instrument is] applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin in such a way as not to affect matters of security and status.

"Accordingly, the application of [this instrument] to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications of a similar nature by States which are not signatories to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter."

Subsequently, on 19 September 1975, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany made on the same subject the following declaration:

"By their Notes of 8 July 1975, . . . The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the [communication] referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the Note of the Three Powers wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned [instrument] extended by it under the established procedures [continues] in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

See also note 5 above.

[7] The notifications of 9 August 1973 and 19 August 1982 were made with the same reservations as those made upon accession.

The notification of application of 12 November 1991 contains the following declaration:

"The Convention is being applied on behalf of Hungary as from 29 April 1985 with respect to the [said] specialized agencies."

[8] The Government of Italy in its instrument of accession has (subject to the declaration made upon accession) undertaken to apply the Convention to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). However, the Convention became applicable to UNIDO on 15 September 1987, upon the completion by UNIDO of the procedures provided for by article 37 of the Convention. Until that time, the provision of article 21 (2) (b) of the Constitution of UNIDO, to which Italy is a party, will continue to apply.

[9] Between 12 March 1968, the date of accession to independence, and 18 July 1969, the date of the notification of succession, Mauritius applied Annex II unrevised.

[10] The instrument of accession by the Government of Nepal was deposited with the Director-General of the World Health Organization, in accordance with section 42 of the Convention.

[11] On 13 December 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a notification to the effect that, the United Kingdom having withdrawn from UNESCO, it would withhold from UNESCO the benefits of the said Convention with effect from 13 March 1986.

[12] The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General, on the dates indicated, that it is unable to accept certain reservations made by the States listed below because in its view they are not of the kind which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make:

Date of receipt of the objection:	*With respect to reservation by:*
20 Jun 1967	Belarus
20 Jun 1967	Czechoslovakia*
20 Jun 1967	Ukraine
20 Jun 1967	Russian Federation
11 Jan 1968	Hungary
12 Aug 1968	Bulgaria
2 Dec 1969	Poland
17 Aug 1970	Mongolia
30 Nov 1970	Romania
21 Sep 1972	Indonesia
1 Nov 1972	Cuba
20 Nov 1974	Germany**
6 Nov 1979	China
21 Apr 1983	Hungary

* See also note 3 above.

**See also note 5 above.

[13] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 638, p. 266.

[14] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservations in respect to sections 24 and 32 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 602, p. 300.

[15] In a communication received on 10 January 1973, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General, in reference to the reservation [concerning the capacity to acquire and dispose of immovable property] that it would grant to the Specialized Agencies the same privileges and immunities which it had granted to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

[16] The reservation was repeated in essence in the notification of application to FAO received from Mongolia on 20 September 1974.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 719, p. 274.

[17] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 28 January 1980, the Government of the Netherlands indicated that the statement concerning their wish not to raise a formal objection to these reservations ". . . is intended to mean that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not oppose the entry into force of the Convention between itself and the reserving states."

3. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations

Done at Vienna on 18 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1964, in accordance with article 51.
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1964, No. 7310.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 95.
STATUS: Signatories: 61. Parties: 174.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 14 April 1961 by the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 2 March to 14 April 1961. The Conference also adopted the Optional Protocol concerning the Acquisition of Nationality, the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, the Final Act and four resolutions annexed to that Act. The Convention and two Protocols were deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Final Act, by unanimous decision of the Conference, was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. The text of the Final Act and of the annexed resolutions is published in the United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 212. For the proceedings of the Conference, see *United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, Official Records*, vols. I and II (United Nations publication, Sales Nos: 61.X.2 and 62.X.1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		6 Oct 1965 *a*
Albania	18 Apr 1961	18 Feb 1988
Algeria		14 Apr 1964 *a*
Angola		9 Aug 1990 *a*
Argentina	8 Apr 1961	10 Oct 1963
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Australia	30 Mar 1962	26 Jan 1968
Austria	18 Apr 1961	28 Apr 1966
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 *a*
Bahamas		17 Mar 1977 *d*
Bahrain		2 Nov 1971 *a*
Bangladesh		13 Jan 1978 *d*
Barbados		6 May 1968 *d*
Belarus	18 Apr 1961	14 May 1964
Belgium	23 Oct 1961	2 May 1968
Benin		27 Mar 1967 *a*
Bhutan		7 Dec 1972 *a*
Bolivia		28 Dec 1977 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		11 Apr 1969 *a*
Brazil	18 Apr 1961	25 Mar 1965
Bulgaria	18 Apr 1961	17 Jan 1968
Burkina Faso		4 May 1987 *a*
Burundi		1 May 1968 *a*
Cambodia		31 Aug 1965 *a*
Cameroon		4 Mar 1977 *a*
Canada	5 Feb 1962	26 May 1966
Cape Verde		30 Jul 1979 *a*
Central African Republic	28 Mar 1962	19 Mar 1973
Chad		3 Nov 1977 *a*
Chile	18 Apr 1961	9 Jan 1968
China[1]		25 Nov 1975 *a*
Colombia	18 Apr 1961	5 Apr 1973
Congo		11 Mar 1963 *a*
Costa Rica	14 Feb 1962	9 Nov 1964
Côte d'Ivoire		1 Oct 1962 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	16 Jan 1962	26 Sep 1963
Cyprus		10 Sep 1968 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		29 Oct 1980 *a*
Denmark	18 Apr 1961	2 Oct 1968
Djibouti		2 Nov 1978 *a*
Dominica		24 Nov 1987 *d*
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 1962	14 Jan 1964
Ecuador	18 Apr 1961	21 Sep 1964
Egypt		9 Jun 1964 *a*
El Salvador		9 Dec 1965 *a*
Equatorial Guinea		30 Aug 1976 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		22 Mar 1979 *a*
Fiji		21 Jun 1971 *d*
Finland	20 Oct 1961	9 Dec 1969
France	30 Mar 1962	31 Dec 1970
Gabon		2 Apr 1964 *a*
Georgia		12 Jul 1993 *a*
Germany[3,4]	18 Apr 1961	11 Nov 1964
Ghana	18 Apr 1961	28 Jun 1962
Greece	29 Mar 1962	16 Jul 1970
Grenada		2 Sep 1992 *a*
Guatemala	18 Apr 1961	1 Oct 1963
Guinea		10 Jan 1968 *a*
Guinea-Bissau		11 Aug 1993 *a*
Guyana		28 Dec 1972 *a*
Haiti		2 Feb 1978 *a*
Holy See	18 Apr 1961	17 Apr 1964
Honduras		13 Feb 1968 *a*
Hungary	18 Apr 1961	24 Sep 1965
Iceland		18 May 1971 *a*
India		15 Oct 1965 *a*
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1961	3 Feb 1965
Iraq	20 Feb 1962	15 Oct 1963
Ireland	18 Apr 1961	10 May 1967
Israel	18 Apr 1961	11 Aug 1970
Italy	13 Mar 1962	25 Jun 1969
Jamaica		5 Jun 1963 *a*
Japan	26 Mar 1962	8 Jun 1964
Jordan		29 Jul 1971 *a*
Kazakstan		5 Jan 1994 *a*
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 *a*
Kiribati		2 Apr 1982 *d*
Kuwait		23 Jul 1969 *a*
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Dec 1962 *a*
Latvia		13 Feb 1992 *a*
Lebanon	18 Apr 1961	16 Mar 1971

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Lesotho		26 Nov 1969 *a*
Liberia	18 Apr 1961	15 May 1962
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		7 Jun 1977 *a*
Liechtenstein	18 Apr 1961	8 May 1964
Lithuania		15 Jan 1992 *a*
Luxembourg	2 Feb 1962	17 Aug 1966
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 *a*
Malawi		19 May 1965 *a*
Malaysia		9 Nov 1965 *a*
Mali		28 Mar 1968 *a*
Malta[5]		7 Mar 1967 *d*
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 *a*
Mauritania		16 Jul 1962 *a*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	18 Apr 1961	16 Jun 1965
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 *a*
Mongolia		5 Jan 1967 *a*
Morocco		19 Jun 1968 *a*
Mozambique		18 Nov 1981 *a*
Myanmar		7 Mar 1980 *a*
Namibia		14 Sep 1992 *a*
Nauru		5 May 1978 *d*
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 *a*
Netherlands[6]		7 Sep 1984 *a*
New Zealand	28 Mar 1962	23 Sep 1970
Nicaragua		31 Oct 1975 *a*
Niger		5 Dec 1962 *a*
Nigeria	31 Mar 1962	19 Jun 1967
Norway	18 Apr 1961	24 Oct 1967
Oman		31 May 1974 *a*
Pakistan	29 Mar 1962	29 Mar 1962
Panama	18 Apr 1961	4 Dec 1963
Papua New Guinea		4 Dec 1975 *d*
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 *a*
Peru		18 Dec 1968 *a*
Philippines	20 Oct 1961	15 Nov 1965
Poland	18 Apr 1961	19 Apr 1965
Portugal		11 Sep 1968 *a*
Qatar		6 Jun 1986 *a*
Republic of Korea[7]	28 Mar 1962	28 Dec 1970
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania	18 Apr 1961	15 Nov 1968
Russian Federation	18 Apr 1961	25 Mar 1964
Rwanda		15 Apr 1964 *a*
Saint Lucia		27 Aug 1986 *d*
Samoa		26 Oct 1987 *a*
San Marino	25 Oct 1961	8 Sep 1965
Sao Tome and Principe		3 May 1983 *a*
Saudi Arabia		10 Feb 1981 *a*
Senegal	18 Apr 1961	12 Oct 1972
Seychelles		29 May 1979 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Aug 1962 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Somalia		29 Mar 1968 *a*
South Africa	28 Mar 1962	21 Aug 1989
Spain		21 Nov 1967 *a*
Sri Lanka	18 Apr 1961	2 Jun 1978
Sudan		13 Apr 1981 *a*
Suriname		28 Oct 1992 *a*
Swaziland		25 Apr 1969 *a*
Sweden	18 Apr 1961	21 Mar 1967
Switzerland	18 Apr 1961	30 Oct 1963
Syrian Arab Republic		4 Aug 1978 *a*
Thailand	30 Oct 1961	23 Jan 1985
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Aug 1993 *d*
Togo		27 Nov 1970 *a*
Tonga		31 Jan 1973 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		19 Oct 1965 *a*
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 *a*
Turkey		6 Mar 1985 *a*
Tuvalu[8]		15 Sep 1982 *d*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
Ukraine	18 Apr 1961	12 Jun 1964
United Arab Emirates		24 Feb 1977 *a*
United Kingdom	11 Dec 1961	1 Sep 1964
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Feb 1962	5 Nov 1962
United States of America	29 Jun 1961	13 Nov 1972
Uruguay	18 Apr 1961	10 Mar 1970
Uzbekistan		2 Mar 1992 *a*
Venezuela	18 Apr 1961	16 Mar 1965
Viet Nam[9]		26 Aug 1980 *a*
Yemen[10]		24 Nov 1976 *a*
Yugoslavia	18 Apr 1961	1 Apr 1963
Zaire	18 Apr 1961	19 Jul 1965
Zambia[11]		16 Jun 1975 *d*
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

BAHRAIN[12]

"1. With respect to paragraph 3 of article 27, relating to the 'Diplomatic Bag', the Government of the State of Bahrain reserves its right to open the diplomatic bag if there are serious grounds for presuming that it contains articles the import or export of which is prohibited by law.

"2. The approval of this Convention does not constitute a recognition of Israel, or amount to entering with it into any transaction required by the aforesaid Convention."

BELARUS

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of States, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and should therefore be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a Convention of this nature.

BOTSWANA

"Subject to the reservation that article 37 of the Convention should be applicable on the basis of reciprocity only."

BULGARIA

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The provisions of these articles are inconsistent with the very nature of the Convention, which is universal in character and should be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of equality, no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a convention of this kind.

CAMBODIA

The diplomatic immunities and privileges provided for in article 37, paragraph 2, of the afore-mentioned Convention, recognized and admitted in customary law and in the practice of States in favour of heads of missions and members of diplomatic staff of the mission, cannot be granted by the Royal Government of Cambodia for the benefit of other categories of mission staff, including administrative and technical staff.

CHINA[13]

The Government of the People's Republic of China holds reservations on the provisions about nuncios and the representative of the Holy See in articles 14 and 16 and on the provisions of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37.

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba makes an explicit reservation in respect of the provisions of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, because it considers that, in view of the nature of the contents of the Convention and the subject it concerns, all free and sovereign States have the right to participate in it: for that reason, the Revolutionary Government of Cuba favours facilitating the admission of all countries of the International Community, without any distinction based on the extent of a State's territory, the number of its inhabitants or its social, economic or political system.

ECUADOR[14]

EGYPT[12, 15]

"1. Paragraph 2 of article 37 shall not apply."

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic considers that article 38, paragraph 1, is to be interpreted as granting to a diplomatic agent who is a national of or permanently resident in the receiving State only immunity from jurisdiction, and inviolability, both being confined to official acts performed by the said diplomatic agent in the exercise of his functions.

The Government of the French Republic declares that the provisions of the bilateral agreements in force between France and foreign States are not affected by the provisions of the Convention.

GREECE[16]

HUNGARY

"The Hungarian People's Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States were precluded from signing and are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and therefore, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, no State should be barred from participation in a Convention of this nature."

IRAQ

"With reservation that paragraph 2 of article 37 shall be applied on the basis of reciprocity."

JAPAN

Declaration with regard to article 34 (a) of the said Convention:

"It is understood that the taxes referred to in article 34 (*a*) include those collected by special collectors under the laws and regulations of Japan provided that they are normally incorporated in the price of goods or services. For example, in the case of the travelling tax, railway, shipping and airline companies are made special collectors of the tax by the Travelling Tax Law. Passengers of railroad trains, vessels and airplanes who are legally liable to pay the tax for their travels within Japan are required to purchase travel tickets normally at a price incorporating the tax without being specifically informed of its amount. Accordingly, taxes collected by special collectors such as the travelling tax have to be considered as the indirect taxes normally incorporated in the price of goods or services referred to in article 34 (*a*)."

KUWAIT[12]

If the State of Kuwait has reason to believe that the diplomatic pouch contains something which may not be sent by pouch under paragraph 4 of article 27 of the Convention, it considers that it has the right to request that the pouch be opened in the presence of the representative of the diplomatic mission [concerned]. If this request is refused by the authorities of the sending State, the diplomatic pouch shall be returned to its place of origin.

The Government of Kuwait declares that its accession to the Convention does not imply recognition of "Israel" or entering with it into relations governed by the Convention thereto acceded.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[12]

(1) The accession of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to said Convention cannot be interpreted as signifying

in any form whatsoever any recognition of Israel nor does accession to said Convention imply the entertaining of any relations or obligations with Israel.

(2) The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya will not be bound by paragraph 3 of article 37 of the Convention except on the basis of reciprocity.

(3) In the event that the authorities of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya entertain strong doubts that the contents of a diplomatic pouch include items which may not be sent by diplomatic pouch in accordance with paragraph 4 of article 27 of said Convention, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya reserves its right to request the opening of such pouch in the presence of an official representative of the diplomatic mission concerned. If such request is denied by the authorities of the sending state, the diplomatic pouch shall be returned to its place of origin.

MALTA

"The Government of Malta wishes to declare that paragraph 2 of article 37 shall be applied on the basis of reciprocity."

MONGOLIA[17]

Referring to articles 48 and 50, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic deems it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Vienna Convention and declares that, as the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, it should be open for accession by all States.

MOROCCO

The Kingdom of Morocco accedes to the Convention subject to the reservation that paragraph 2 of article 37 is not applicable.

MOZAMBIQUE

"The People's Republic of Mozambique takes this opportunity to draw the attention to the discriminatory nature of the articles 48 and 50 of the present Convention which preclude a number of States from acceding to it. In view of its broad scope which affects the interest of all States in the world the present Convention should therefore be open for participation of all States."

"The People's Republic of Mozambique considers that the joint participation of States in a convention does not represent their official recognition."

NEPAL

"Subject to the reservation with regard to article 8, paragraph 3, of the Convention, that the prior consent to His Majesty's Government of Nepal shall be required for the appointment to the diplomatic staff of any mission in Nepal of any national of a third State who is not also a national of the sending State."

OMAN

"The accession of this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Sultanate of Oman and Israel."

PORTUGAL[18]

QATAR[12]

I. *On article 27, para. 3:*

The Government of the State of Qatar reserves its right to open a diplomatic bag in the following two situations:

1. The abuse, observed in *flagrante delicto*, of the diplomatic bag for unlawful purposes incompatible with the aims of the relevant rule of immunity, by putting therein items other that the diplomatic documents and articles for official use mentioned in para.4 of the said article, in violation of the obligations prescribed by the Government and by international law and custom.

In such a case both the foreign Ministry and the Mission concerned will be notified. The bag will not be opened except with the approval by the Foreign Ministry.

The contraband articles will be seized in the presence of a representative of the Ministry and the Mission.

2. The existence of strong indications or suspicions that the said violations have been perpetrated.

In such a case the bag will not be opened except with the approval of the Foreign Ministry and in the presence of a member of the Mission concerned. If permission to open the bag is denied it will be returned to its place of origin.

II. *On article 37, para. 2:*

The State of Qatar shall not be bound by para. 2 of article 37.

III. Accession to this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel and does not entail entering with it into any transactions regulated by this Convention.

ROMANIA

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of articles 48 and 50 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, are at variance with the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and should therefore be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a Convention of this nature.

SAUDI ARABIA[12]

Reservations:

1. If the authorities of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia suspect that the diplomatic pouch or any parcel therein contains matters which may not be sent through the diplomatic pouch, such authorities may request the opening of the parcel in their presence and in the presence of a representative appointed by the diplomatic mission concerned. If such request is rejected, the pouch or parcel shall be returned back.

2. Accession to this Convention shall not constitute a recognition of Israel or lead to any kind of intercourse with it or the establishment of any relations with Israel under the Convention.

SUDAN[12]

Reservations:

"The diplomatic immunities and privileges provided for in article 37 paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic

Relations of 1961, recognized and admitted in customary law and in the practice of States in favour of heads of missions and members of diplomatic staff of the mission, cannot be granted by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan for other categories of mission staff except on the basis of reciprocity.

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan reserves the right to interpret article 38 as not granting to a diplomatic agent who is a national of or permanent resident in the Sudan any immunity from jurisdiction, and inviolability, even though the acts complained of are official acts performed by the said diplomatic agent in the exercise of his functions."

Understanding:

"The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan understands that its ratification of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 does not imply whatsoever recognition of Israel or entering with it into relations governed by the said Convention."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[12, 19]

15 March 1979

1. The Syrian Arab Republic does not recognize Israel and will not enter into dealings with it.

2. The Optional Protocol Concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes does not enter into force for the Syrian Arab Republic.

3. The exemption provided for in article 36, paragraph 1, shall not apply to the administrative and technical staff of the mission except during the first six months following their arrival in the receiving State.

UKRAINE

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In accordance with the principle of the equality of rights of States, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that any difference of opinion regarding the size of a diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration concerning articles 48 and 50:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and should therefore be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, no State has the right to bar other States from accession to a Convention of this nature.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

"The accession of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relation with Israel."

VENEZUELA[20]

Under the Constitution of Venezuela, all Venezuelan nationals are equal before the law and none may enjoy special privileges; for that reason [the Government of Venezuela] make[s] a formal reservation to article 38 of the Convention.

VIET NAM

1. The degrees of privileges and immunities accorded the administrative and technical staff and the members of their families as stipulated in paragraph 2, article 37 of the Convention should be agreed upon in detail by the concerned States;

2. The provisions of articles 48 and 50 of the Convention are of a discriminatory character, which is not in accordance with the principle of equality of the sovereignty among States and limits the universality of the Convention. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, therefore, holds the view that all States have the right to adhere to the said Convention.

YEMEN[10, 12]

Reservation concerning article 11, paragraph 1:

In conformity with the principle of equality among States, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen holds that any difference of opinion regarding the size of the diplomatic mission should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Declaration:

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen states that its acceptance of the provisions of the Convention does not, in any way whatsoever, imply recognition of, or entering into contractual relations with, Israel.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

14 March 1968

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia does not regard the statements concerning paragraph (1) of Article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Mongolian People's Republic as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservations to paragraph 2, Article 37, of the Convention made by the United Arab Republic and by Cambodia."

20 November 1970

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservations to article 37, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by Morocco and Portugal."

6 September 1973

"The Government of Australia does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the German Democratic Republic, in a letter accompanying the instrument of accession as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

25 January 1977

"The Government of Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of article 37 of that Convention."

21 June 1978

"The Government of Australia does not regard the reservation made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to paragraph (1) of article 11 as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph."

22 February 1983

"Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the State of Bahrain, the State of Kuwait and the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, in respect of treatment of the diplomatic bag under article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

10 February 1987

"Australia does not regard as valid the reservations made by the State of Qatar and the Yemen Arab Republic in respect of treatment of the diplomatic bag under Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961."

BAHAMAS[21]

BELARUS

2 November 1977

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Chinese People's Republic to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

16 October 1986

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 October 1986.]

11 November 1986

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 November 1986.]

BELGIUM

The Belgian Government considers the statement made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 to be incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Convention and does not regard it as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

The Belgian Government also considers the reservation made by the United Arab Republic and the Kingdom of Cambodia to paragraph 2 of article 37 to be incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Convention.

28 January 1975

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium objects to the reservations made with respect to article 27, paragraph 3, by Bahrain and with respect to article 37, paragraph 2, by the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), Cambodia (now the Khmer Republic) and Morocco. The Government nevertheless considers that the Convention remains in force as between it and the aforementioned States, respectively, except in respect of the provisions which in each case are the subject of the said reservations.

BULGARIA

22 September 1972

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria cannot regard the reservation made by the Bahraini Government with respect to article 27, paragraph 3, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations as valid.

18 August 1977

"The Bulgarian Government does not consider itself to be bound by the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning the application of article 27, paragraph 3, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

23 June 1981

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on its accession to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations regarding the immunity of the diplomatic bag and the right of the competent authorities of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to demand the opening of the diplomatic bag and, in case of refusal on the part of the diplomatic mission concerned, its return. It is the understanding of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria that the reservation thus made is in violation of article 27, para. 4 of the 1961 Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

CANADA

"The Government of Canada does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Convention made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights or obligations under this paragraph."

16 March 1978

"The Government of Canada does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China. Similarly the Government of Canada does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention which have been made by the Government of the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), the Government of Cambodia (now Kampuchea) and the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco.

"The Government of Canada does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic, the Government of Bulgaria, the Government of the German Democratic Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph.

"The Government of Canada also desires to place on record that it does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 3 of article 27 of the Convention made by the Government of Bahrain and the reservations to paragraph 4 of article 27 made by the State of Kuwait and the Government of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

CZECH REPUBLIC[2]

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph. Further, the Government of Denmark does not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 37 made by the United Arab Republic, Cambodia and Morocco. This statement shall not be regarded as precluding the entry into force of the Convention between Denmark and the above-mentioned countries."

5 August 1970

"The Government of Denmark does not regard the reservation to article 37, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by Portugal on 11th of September 1968 as valid.

"This statement shall not be regarded as precluding the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and Portugal."

29 March 1977

"The Government of Denmark does not regard as valid the reservations made by the People's Republic of China to article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961. This statement is not to be regarded as preventing the Convention's entry into force as between Denmark and the People's Republic of China.

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic does not regard the statements concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservation to article 27, paragraph 4, made by the State of Kuwait.

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations to article 37, paragraph 2, made by the Government of Cambodia, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco, the Government of Portugal and the Government of the United Arab Republic.

None of these declarations shall be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the French Republic and the States mentioned.

28 December 1976

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations made by the People's Republic of China to article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961. This declaration is not to be regarded as preventing the Convention's entry into force as between the French Republic and the People's Republic of China.

29 August 1986

1. The Government of the French Republic declares that it does not recognize as valid the reservation entered by the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic which would make it permissible to request the opening of the diplomatic bag and to return it to the sender. The Government of the French Republic considers that this or any similar reservation is inconsistent with the object and the purpose of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations done at Vienna on 18 April 1961.

2. This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the French Republic and the Yemen Arab Republic.

GERMANY[3]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers as incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Convention the reservations made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic concerning article 11 of the Convention."

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

i) 16 March 1967: In respect of the reservations by the United Arab Republic and the Kingdom of Cambodia concerning article 37, paragraph 2.

ii) 10 May 1967: In respect of the reservation made by the Mongolian People's Republic concerning article 11.

iii) 9 July 1968: In respect of the reservation made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria concerning article 11, paragraph 1.

iv) 23 December 1968: In respect of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Morocco and by Portugal concerning article 37, paragraph 2.

v) 25 September 1974: In respect of the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 11, para. 1.

vi) 4 February 1975: In respect of the reservation made by Bahrain concerning article 27, paragraph 3.

vii) 4 March 1977: In respect of the reservation made by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen concerning article 11, paragraph 1.

viii) 6 May 1977: In respect of the reservations made by the People's Republic of China concerning article 37.

ix) 19 September 1977: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning article 27.

x) 11 July 1979: In respect of the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic concerning article 36, paragraph 1.

xi) 11 December 1980: In respect of the declaration made by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam concerning article 37, paragraph 2.

xii) 15 May 1981: In respect of the reservation made by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia concerning article 27.

xiii) 30 September 1981: In respect of the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan concerning article 37, paragraph 2 and of article 38.

xiv) 3 March 1987: In respect of the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic and the State of Qatar in respect of articles 27 (3) and 37 (2).

In the case of objections under paragraphs viii), ix), x), xii) and xiii), the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany specified that the declaration is not to be interpreted as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the respective States.

GREECE

The Government of Greece cannot accept the reservation to paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Mongolia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention made by Cambodia, Morocco, Portugal and the United Arab Republic.

GUATEMALA

23 December 1963

The Government of Guatemala rejects formally the reservations to articles 48 and 50 of the Convention made by the Government of Cuba in its instrument of ratification.

HAITI

9 May 1972

The Haitian Government considers that the reservation expressed by the Government of Bahrain with regard to the inviolability of diplomatic correspondence may destroy the effectiveness of the Convention, one of the main aims of which is precisely to put an end to certain practices impeding the performance of the functions assigned to diplomatic agents.

HUNGARY

7 July 1975

"The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to article 27, paragraph 3, of the 1961 Vienna Convention on

Diplomatic Relations is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag which is generally recognized in the international practice, and is incompatible with the objectives of the Convention.

"Therefore, the Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize this reservation as valid."

6 September 1978

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Chinese People's Republic to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

IRELAND

17 January 1978

"The Government of Ireland object to the reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China concerning the provisions relating to Nuncios and the representative of the Holy See in articles 14 and 16 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Government of Ireland do not regard these reservations as modifying any rights or obligations under those articles.

"The Government of Ireland do not regard as valid the reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37.

"This statement is not to be regarded as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between Ireland and the People's Republic of China."

JAPAN

27 January 1987

"With respect to paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961, the Government of Japan believes that the protection of diplomatic correspondence by means of diplomatic bags constitutes an important element of the Convention, and any reservation intended to allow a receiving State to open diplomatic bags without the consent of the sending State is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of Japan does not regard as valid the reservations concerning article 27 of the Convention made by the Government of Bahrain and the Government of Qatar on 2 November 1971 and 6 June 1986, respectively. The Government of Japan also desires to record that the above-stated position is applicable to any reservations to the same effect to be made in the future by other countries."

LUXEMBOURG

18 January 1965

With reference to the reservation and declaration made by the Governments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Luxembourg regrets that it cannot accept that reservation or that declaration which tends to modify the effect of certain provisions of the Convention.

25 October 1965

With reference to the statement made by the Government of Hungary upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Luxembourg regrets that it cannot accept this declaration.

MALTA

"The Government of Malta does not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

MONGOLIA

18 January 1978

"Reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to paragraph 3, article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations is incompatible with the very object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the above-mentioned reservation.

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

NETHERLANDS

"1. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the declarations by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen concerning article 11, paragraph 1, of the Convention. The Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the said States in accordance with international customary law.

"2. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the declaration by the State of Bahrain concerning article 27, paragraph 3 of the Convention. It takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the State of Bahrain in accordance with international customary law. The Kingdom of the Netherlands is nevertheless prepared to agree to the following arrangement on a basis of reciprocity: If the authorities of the receiving state have serious grounds for supposing that the diplomatic bag contains something which pursuant to article 27, paragraph 4 of the Convention may not be sent in the diplomatic bag, they may demand that the bag be opened in the presence of the representative of the diplomat mission concerned. If the authorities of the sending state refuse to comply with such a request, the diplomatic bag shall be sent back to the place of origin.

"3. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the declarations by the Arab Republic of Egypt, the Khmer Republic, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, the Republic of Malta and the Kingdom of Morocco concerning article 37, paragraph 2 of the Convention. It takes the view that these provisions remain in force in relations between it and the said States in accordance with international customary law."

5 December 1986

The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept both reservations made by the State of Qatar concerning article 27, paragraph 3, of the Convention. It takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the State of Qatar in accordance with international customary law. The Kingdom of the Netherlands is nevertheless prepared to agree to the following arrangement on a basis of reciprocity: If the authorities of the receiving State have serious grounds for believing that the diplomatic bag contains something which, pursuant to article 27, paragraph 4, of the Convention, may not be sent in the diplomatic bag, they may demand that the bag be opened in the presence of the representative of the diplomatic mission concerned. If the authorities of the sending State refuse to comply with such a demand, the diplomatic bag shall be sent back to the place of origin.

Furthermore, the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the reservation made by the State of Qatar concerning article 37,

paragraph 2, of the Convention. It takes the view that this provision remains in force in relations between it and the State of Qatar in accordance with international customary law.

Moreover, the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Republic concerning article 37, paragraph 2, of the Convention. It takes the view that these provisions remain in force in relations between it and the Yemen Arab Republic in accordance with international customary law.

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand does not regard the statements concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph. Further, the Government of New Zealand does not accept the reservation to paragraph 2 of Article 37 of the Convention made by Cambodia, Morocco, Portugal and the United Arab Republic."

25 January 1977

"The Government of New Zealand does not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961 made by the Government of the People's Republic of China and considers that those paragraphs are in force between New Zealand and the People's Republic of China."

POLAND

3 November 1975

"The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to article 27, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, is not compatible with the object and purpose of this Convention. It is contrary to fundamental principles of diplomatic international law. Therefore, the Polish People's Republic does not recognize this reservation as valid."

7 March 1978

"The principles of inviolability of diplomatic pouch and freedom of communication are generally recognized in international law and cannot be changed by unilateral reservation.

"This objection does not prevent entry into force of the Convention as between the Polish People's Republic and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

6 June 1972

With respect to the reservation made by Bahrain to article 27 (3):

... This reservation is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag, which is recognized in international practice, and is therefore unacceptable.

11 October 1977

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the validity of the reservation expressed by the People's Republic of China concerning paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961.

7 November 1977

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the reservation made by the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya concerning article 27 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations."

16 February 1982

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the validity of the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on its accession to the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, since that reservation is contrary to one of the most important provisions of the Convention, namely, that the diplomatic bag shall not be opened or detained."

6 October 1986

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize as valid the reservations of the Government of Qatar with respect to article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2 of the 1961 Convention on Diplomatic Relations. The Government of the USSR considers that the reservations in question are illegal, since they conflict with the purposes of the Convention.

6 November 1986

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize as lawful the reservations of the Government of Yemen with respect to articles 27, 36 and 37 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, since those reservations conflict with the purposes of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA[2]

THAILAND

"1. The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not regard the statements concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not regard as valid the reservation made by the State of Bahrain in respect of paragraph 3 of article 27 of the Convention.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand does not regard as valid the reservations and declarations with respect to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention made by Democratic Kampuchea, the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Kingdom of Morocco.

The foregoing objections shall not, however, be regarded as preventing the entry into force of the Convention as between Thailand and the above-mentioned countries."

TONGA

In its notification of succession, the Government of Tonga has indicated that it adopts the objections made by the United Kingdom respecting the reservations and statements made by Egypt, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mongolia, Bulgaria, the Khmer Republic, Morocco and Portugal, when ratifying (or acceding to) the said Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

UKRAINE

28 July 1972

The reservation made by the Government of Bahrain to the above-mentioned Convention is contrary to the principle of the inviolability of the diplomatic bag, which is generally recognized in international practice, and is therefore unacceptable to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

24 October 1977

"The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize as valid the reservation to article 37,

paragraphs 2, 3 and 4, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China."

20 October 1986

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Russian Federation on 6 October 1986.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

1 September 1964

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the United Arab Republic. Further, the Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

7 June 1967

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

29 March 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention made by the Government of Bulgaria as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

19 June 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Cambodia."

23 August 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Kingdom of Morocco."

10 December 1968

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Portugal."

13 March 1973

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to put on record that they do not regard as valid the reservation to paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of Bahrain."

16 April 1973

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard the statement concerning paragraph 1 of Article 11 of the Convention made by the German Democratic Republic, in a letter accompanying the instrument of accession, as modifying any rights and obligations under that paragraph."

25 January 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservations to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the People's Republic of China".

4 February 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard the reservation concerning paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Convention, made by the Government of Democratic Yemen, as modifying any rights or obligations under that paragraph."

19 February 1987

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record that they do not regard as valid the reservations to paragraph 3 of article 27, and to paragraph 2 of article 37, of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made by the Government of the State of Qatar."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

22 June 1964

"The Government of the United Republic of Tanganyka and Zanzibar rejects formally the reservation to article 11, paragraph 1, of the Convention made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in its instrument of ratification."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 July 1974

"The Government of the United States of America . . . states its objection to reservations with respect to paragraph 3 of article 27 by Bahrain; with respect to paragraph 4 of article 27 by Kuwait; with respect to paragraph 2 of article 37 by the United Arab Republic (now the Arab Republic of Egypt), by Cambodia (now the Khmer Republic) and by Morocco, respectively. The Government of the United States, however, considers the Convention as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

4 September 1987

"The Government of the United States of America wishes to state its objections to the reservations regarding the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations made with respect to paragraph 4 of Article 27 by the Yemen Arab Republic and with respect to paragraph 3 of Article 27 and paragraph 2 of Article 37 by the State of Qatar, respectively.

. . .

The Government of the United States, however, considers the [Convention] as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

NOTES:

[1] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 April 1961 and 19 December 1969, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Representatives of the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Mongolia, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that their Governments considered the said signature and/or ratification as null and void, since the so-called "Government of China" had no right to speak or assume obligations on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the 1961 Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, contributed to the formula-

tion of the Convention concerned, signed the Convention and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof, and that "any statements and reservations relating to the above-mentioned Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under this Convention".

The instrument of accession deposited on behalf of the Government of China on 25 November 1975 contained the following declaration:

> The "signature" on and "ratification" of this Convention by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 April 1961 and 24 May 1963, respectively.

Subsequently, the Government of Czechoslovakia communicated objections to various reservations and declarations. For the text of the objections, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 808, p. 388; vol. 1057, p. 330 and vol. 1060, p. 347.

On 1 June 1987, the Government of Czechoslovakia communicated the following objections:

With regard to the reservations made by Yemen concerning articles 27, 36 and 37:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regards the reservations of the Yemen Arab Republic with respect to articles 27, 36 and 37 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of April 18, 1961 as incompatible with the objects and purposes of this Convention. Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

With regard to reservations made by Qatar concerning article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regards the reservations of the State of Qatar with respect to article 27, paragraph 3 and article 37, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of April 18, 1961 as incompatible with the objects and purposes of this Convention. Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 23 February 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 856, p. 231. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] The instrument of ratification contains the following statement:

"The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality and the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, shall also apply to Land Berlin as from the date on which the Convention and the Protocols will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

The Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have informed the Secretary-General, that they consider the above-mentioned statement as having no legal force ground that West Berlin is not, and never has been, a State territory of the Federal Republic of Germany and that, consequently, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is in no way competent to assume any obligations in respect of West Berlin or to extend to it the application of international agreements, including the Convention in question.

The Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America have informed the Secretary-General that, in the Declaration on Berlin of 5 May 1955, which accords with instruments that previously entered into force, the Allied Kommandatura as the supreme authority in Berlin had authorized the Berlin authorities to assure the representation abroad of the interests of Berlin and its inhabitants under suitable arrangements, and that the arrangements made in accordance with the said authorization permitted the Federal Republic of Germany to extend to Berlin the international agreements which the Federal Republic concludes, provided that the final decision in every case of such an extension was left to the Allied Kommandatura and that internal Berlin action was required to make any such agreement applicable as domestic law in Berlin. For these reason they consider the objections referred to in the preceding paragraph as unfounded.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

German Democratic Republic (27 December 1973):

"With regard to the application to Berlin (West) of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement concluded on September 3, 1971 between the governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the United States of America and of the French Republic, the German Democratic Republic declares that Berlin (West) is no constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and must not be governed by it. For this reason the statement of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany, according to which this convention also applies to the 'Land Berlin', is in contradiction to the Quadripartite Agreement and cannot produce any validity."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (17 June 1974—in relation to the declaration by the German Democratic Republic received on 27 December 1973):

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America wish to bring to the attention of the States Parties to the Convention that the extension of the Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin received the prior authorization, under established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on the basis of their supreme authority in those Sectors.

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of the 3rd of September 1971 the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States reaffirmed that, provided matters of security and status are not affected, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of the 3rd of September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

"Accordingly, the application of the Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect."

Federal Republic of Germany (15 July 1974):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shares the position set out in the Note of the Three Powers. The extension of the Convention to Berlin (West) continues in full force and effect."

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (12 September 1974):

The Soviet Union shares the view expressed in the communications from the German Democratic Republic concerning the action by the Federal Republic of Germany in extending to "*Land* Berlin" ... the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 18 April 1961 ... Berlin (West) has never been a "*Land* of the Federal Republic of Germany", does not form part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not governed by it. This fact was reaffirmed and given legal effect in the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. The declarations by the Federal Republic of Germany extending international agreements to "*Land* Berlin" are regarded and will continue to be regarded by the Soviet Union as having no legal effect.

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (19 September 1974):

The Ukrainian SSR shares the view set forth in the communication from the German Democratic Republic on the question of the extension by the Federal Republic of Germany of the application of ... the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, of 18 April 1961 to "*Land* Berlin". Berlin (West) has never been a *Land* of the Federal Republic of Germany, is not a part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not governed by it. This was reaffirmed and firmly established in the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. Statements by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of international agreements to "*Land* Berlin" are regarded

and will continue to be regarded by the Ukrainian SSR as having no legal force whatsoever.

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (8 July 1975—In relation to the declaration by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics received on 12 September 1974):

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States confirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected and provided that extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

"The Quadripartite Agreement does not impose any requirement regarding terminology to be used by the Federal Republic of Germany when extending to the Western Sectors of Berlin such international agreements or arrangements nor of course, does the Quadripartite Agreement affect terminology used in the past.

"In any case, the use by the Federal Republic of Germany of the terminology mentioned in the [Note] under reference can in no way affect quadripartite agreements or decisions relating to Berlin.

"Consequently, the validity of the Berlin Declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany is unaffected by the use of this terminology and the application to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the [instrument] mentioned in the above listed [document] continues in full force and effect."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (8 July 1975—in relation to the declaration by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic received on 19 September 1974):

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to point out that the [State whose communication is reported in the above-mentioned Note is not a party] to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, which was concluded in Berlin by the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and [is] not therefore competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions.

"The Quadripartite Agreement does not impose any requirement regarding terminology to be used by the Federal Republic of Germany when extending to the Western Sectors of Berlin treaties or agreements to which it has become a party nor, of course, does the Agreement affect terminology used in the past.

"In any case the use by the Federal Republic of Germany of the terminology mentioned in the [communication] under reference can in no way affect quadripartite agreements or decisions relating to Berlin.

"Consequently the validity of the Berlin Declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany is unaffected by the use of this terminology.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications of a similar nature by States which are not signatories to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (19 September 1975):

"By their Notes of 8 July 1975, [...] circulated on 13 August 1975, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the [communication] referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the Notes of the Three Powers wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned [instrument] extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter.

"Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (8 December 1975):

The Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations considers it necessary to confirm the position on the question set forth in the Permanent Mission's note No. 491 of 11 September 1974. The declarations by the Federal Republic of Germany extending the above-mentioned [Convention] to "*Land* Berlin" will continue to be regarded by the Soviet side as having no legal effect.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 3 above.

[5] In its notification of succession, the Government of Malta indicated that it considers itself bound by the Convention as from 1 October 1964 [the date of entry into force of the Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland].

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, the Permanent Mission of Bulgaria and the Permanent Representative of Romania to the United Nations stated that their Governments considered the said ratification as null and void for the South Korean authorities could not speak on behalf of Korea.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the above-mentioned communication from the Permanent Representative of Romania, the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations stated the following:

"The Republic of Korea took part in the United Nations Conference on Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities, and contributed to the formulation of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, signed the Convention on the same day and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 28 December 1970.

"As the resolution 195 (III) of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 12 December 1948 declares unmistakably, the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful government in Korea.

"Therefore, the rights and obligations of the Republic of Korea under the said Convention shall in no way be affected by any statement that has no basis in fact or unjustly distorts the legitimacy of the Government of the Republic of Korea."

[8] In a communication accompanying the notification of succession, the Government of Tuvalu declared that it had decided not to succeed to the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, and that pursuant to Tuvalu's declaration, dated 19 December 1978, regarding treaties applied before independence, the application of the Optional Protocol to Tuvalu should be regarded as terminated as at 1 September 1982.

[9] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 10 May 1973. See footnote 30 in chapter I.2.

[10] The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention on 10 April 1986 with the following reservations:

1. The accession of the Yemen Arab Republic to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, in no way implies recognition of Israel and shall not entail the entry of the Yemen Arab Republic with Israel into any of the relations governed by this Convention.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic has the right to inspect foodstuffs imported by diplomatic envoys and diplomatic missions in order to ascertain that they conform in quantity and in kind to the list

submitted by them to the customs authorities and to the Office of Protocol at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the purpose of obtaining approval for their importation exempt from customs duties in accordance with article 36 of the Convention.

3. Where there are serious and strong grounds for believing that the diplomatic bag contains articles or substances not mentioned in article 27, paragraph 4, of the Convention, the Yemen Arab Republic reserves its right to request that the bag be opened in the presence of a representative of the embassy concerned. If the embassy refuses to comply with this request, the bag shall be returned to its place of origin.

4. Reservation concerning the privileges and immunities provided for in article 37, paragraph 2, of the Convention in respect of members of the administrative and technical staff of the mission: the Yemen Arab Republic shall not be bound to implement this paragraph except on a basis of reciprocity.

See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[11] In a communication received on 16 October 1985, the Government of Zambia specified that upon succession, it had not wished to maintain the objections made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to articles 11 (1), 27 (3) and 37 (2).

[12] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 5 September 1969, the Government of Israel declared that it "has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Kuwait on acceding to the above Convention. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity".

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 15 October 1969 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Egypt (see also note 5 in chapter I.1 and note 15 below), on 6 January 1972 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Bahrain, on 12 January 1977 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Democratic Yemen, on 30 August 1977 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, on 29 October 1979 in respect of the declaration made on 15 March 1979 by the Syrian Arab Republic, on 1 April 1981 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Saudi Arabia, on 14 August 1981 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Sudan, on 15 October 1986 in respect of the reservation made upon accession by Qatar, and on 1 September 1987 in respect of the reservation made upon accession by Yemen.

[13] In a communication received on 15 September 1980, the Government of China notified the Secretary-General that it withdraws its reservations with regard to article 37, paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the Convention.

[14] Upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of Ecuador withdrew the reservation to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 37 of the Convention formulated at the time of its signature.

[15] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation relating to Israel, made upon accession. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 211.

[16] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of Greece notified the Secretary-General that it did not maintain the reservation made at the time of signature of the Convention, to the effect that the last sentence of paragraph 2 of article 37 would not apply. (See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 186).

[17] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 11, paragraph 1. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 587, p. 352.

[18] In a communication received on 1 June 1972, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to paragraph 2 of article 37 of the Convention, made upon accession. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 645, p. 372.

[19] These reservations were not included in the instrument of accession deposited on behalf of the Syrian Arab Republic on 4 August 1978. In accordance with the practice followed by the Secretary-General in similar circumstances, the text of the reservations was communicated to the States concerned on 2 April 1979, and, since no objections to this procedure were received within 90 days from that date, the Secretary-General received the said notification of reservation in definitive deposit on 1 July 1979. For the objection as to the substance formulated by the Federal Republic of Germany in respect of reservation No. 3, see under "*Objections*" in this chapter. It should be noted that, as at the date of receipt of the said declaration the Syrian Arab Republic had become neither a party nor a signatory to the Optional Protocol concerning the settlement of disputes.

[20] In the instrument of ratification, the Government of Venezuela confirmed the reservation set forth in paragraph 3 of its reservations made upon signature. On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations stated that the reservations set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 had not been maintained by the Government of Venezuela upon ratification and should be considered as withdrawn; for the text of those reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 202.

[21] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 June 1977, the Government of the Bahamas declared that it wishes to maintain the objections made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland prior to the independence of the Bahamas. (For the text of the objections made by the Government of the United Kingdom prior to 10 July 1973, the date when the Bahamas acceded to independence, see under "*Objections*" in this chapter.)

4. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality

Done at Vienna on 18 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1964, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1964, No. 7311.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 223.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 48.

Note: See "*Note:*" in chapter III.3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina	25 Oct 1961	10 Oct 1963
Belgium		2 May 1968 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Botswana		11 Apr 1969 *a*
Cambodia		31 Aug 1965 *a*
Central African Republic	28 Mar 1962	19 Mar 1973
China[1]		
Denmark	18 Apr 1961	2 Oct 1968
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 1962	14 Jan 1964
Egypt		9 Jun 1964 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Finland	20 Oct 1961	19 Dec 1969
Gabon		2 Apr 1964 *a*
Germany[2,3]	28 Mar 1962	11 Nov 1964
Ghana	18 Apr 1961	
Guinea		10 Jan 1968 *a*
Iceland		18 May 1971 *a*
India		15 Oct 1965 *a*
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1961	3 Feb 1965
Iraq	20 Feb 1962	15 Oct 1963
Italy	13 Mar 1962	25 Jun 1969
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Dec 1962 *a*
Lebanon	18 Apr 1961	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		7 Jun 1977 *a*
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 *a*
Malawi		29 Apr 1980 *a*
Malaysia		9 Nov 1965 *a*
Morocco		23 Feb 1977 *a*
Myanmar		7 Mar 1980 *a*
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 *a*
Netherlands[4]		7 Sep 1984 *a*
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 *a*
Niger		28 Mar 1966 *a*
Norway	18 Apr 1961	24 Oct 1967
Oman		31 May 1974 *a*
Panama		4 Dec 1963 *a*
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 *a*
Philippines	20 Oct 1961	15 Nov 1965
Republic of Korea	30 Mar 1962	7 Mar 1977
Senegal	18 Apr 1961	
Sri Lanka		31 Jul 1978 *a*
Suriname		28 Oct 1992 *a*
Sweden	18 Apr 1961	21 Mar 1967
Switzerland		12 Jun 1992 *a*
Thailand	30 Oct 1961	23 Jan 1985
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Aug 1993 *d*
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 *a*
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Feb 1962	5 Nov 1962
Yugoslavia	18 Apr 1961	1 Apr 1963
Zaire		15 Jul 1976 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands interprets the words "not, solely by the operation of the law of the receiving State" in article II of the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality as meaning that acquisition of nationality by descent is not regarded as acquisition of nationality solely by the operation of this law."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

THAILAND

[*See chapter III.3.*]

NOTES:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 April 1961. See notes concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1 and note 1 in chapter III.3).

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note 4 in chapter III.3 and note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

5. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes

Done at Vienna on 18 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1964, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1964, No. 7312.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, p. 241.
STATUS: Signatories: 30. Parties: 61.

Note: See "*Note:*" in chapter III.3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Australia		26 Jan 1968 *a*
Austria	18 Apr 1961	28 Apr 1966
Bahamas		17 Mar 1977 *a*
Belgium	23 Oct 1961	2 May 1968
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		11 Apr 1969 *a*
Bulgaria		6 Jun 1989 *a*
Cambodia		31 Aug 1965 *a*
Central African Republic	28 Mar 1962	19 Mar 1973
China[1]		
Colombia	18 Apr 1961	
Costa Rica		9 Nov 1964 *a*
Denmark	18 Apr 1961	2 Oct 1968
Dominican Republic	30 Mar 1962	13 Feb 1964
Ecuador	18 Apr 1961	21 Sep 1964
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Fiji		21 Jun 1971 *d*
Finland	20 Oct 1961	9 Dec 1969
France	30 Mar 1962	31 Dec 1970
Gabon		2 Apr 1964 *a*
Germany[2, 3, 4]	18 Apr 1961	11 Nov 1964
Ghana	18 Apr 1961	
Guinea		10 Jan 1968 *a*
Hungary		8 Dec 1989 *a*
Iceland		18 May 1971 *a*
India		15 Oct 1965 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1961	3 Feb 1965
Iraq	20 Feb 1962	15 Oct 1963
Ireland	18 Apr 1961	
Israel	18 Apr 1961	
Italy	13 Mar 1962	25 Jun 1969
Japan	26 Mar 1962	8 Jun 1964
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 *a*
Kuwait		21 Feb 1991 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Dec 1962 *a*
Lebanon	18 Apr 1961	
Liechtenstein	18 Apr 1961	8 May 1964
Luxembourg	2 Feb 1962	17 Aug 1966
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 *a*
Malawi		29 Apr 1980 *a*
Malaysia		9 Nov 1965 *a*
Malta[5]		7 Mar 1967 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 *a*
Netherlands[6]		7 Sep 1984 *a*
New Zealand	28 Mar 1962	23 Sep 1970
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 *a*
Niger		26 Apr 1966 *a*
Norway	18 Apr 1961	24 Oct 1967
Oman		31 May 1974 *a*
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 *a*
Panama		4 Dec 1963 *a*
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 *a*
Philippines	20 Oct 1961	15 Nov 1965
Republic of Korea	30 Mar 1962	25 Jan 1977
Seychelles		29 May 1979 *a*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Sri Lanka		31 Jul 1978 *a*
Suriname		28 Oct 1992 *a*
Sweden	18 Apr 1961	21 Mar 1967
Switzerland	18 Apr 1961	22 Nov 1963
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[7]		18 Aug 1993 *d*
United Kingdom	11 Dec 1961	1 Sep 1964
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Feb 1962	5 Nov 1962
United States of America	29 Jun 1961	13 Nov 1972
Yugoslavia	18 Apr 1961	1 Apr 1963
Zaire		19 Jul 1965 *a*

NOTES:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 April 1961. See notes concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1 and note 1 in chapter III.3).

[2] See note 4 in chapter III.3.

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication received on 22 March 1965, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"The Federal Republic of Germany is not a Party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. In order to meet her obligations under article I of the Optional Protocol on the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, and in accordance with Security Council resolution of 15 October 1946 on the conditions under which the International Court of Justice shall be open to States not Parties to that Statute [resolution 9 (1946) adopted by the Security Council at its 76th meeting], the Federal Republic has issued a declaration accepting the competence of the International Court of Justice for the disputes named in article I of the Optional Protocol on the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes. This declaration also applies to the disputes named in article IV of the Optional Protocol on the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes which arise from the interpretation or

application of the Optional Protocol on the Acquisition of Nationality."

The declaration referred to above was deposited by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on 29 January 1965 with the Registrar of the International Court of Justice who transmitted certified true copies thereof to all States parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with paragraph 3 of the Security Council resolution referred to above.

In the same communication, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has notified the Secretary–General, in accordance with article IV of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, that it will extend the provisions of the said Protocol to disputes arising out of the interpretation or application of the Optional Protocol concerning the Acquisition of Nationality, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961.

See also note 3 above.

[5] See note 5 in chapter III.3 which also applies to this Protocol.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] Upon depositing the notification of succession, the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia declared that "...the stipulation contained in this Protocol also apply to differences that arose from the interpretation or implementation of the Protocol with facultative signing relating to the acquisition of citizenship".

6. Vienna Convention on Consular Relations

Done at Vienna on 24 April 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 March 1967, in accordance with article 77.
REGISTRATION: 8 June 1967, No. 8638.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 261.
STATUS: Signatories: 49. Parties: 153.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 April 1963 by the United Nations Conference on Consular Relations held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 4 March to 22 April 1963. The Conference also adopted the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality, the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, the Final Act and three resolutions annexed to that Act. The Convention and the two Protocols were deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Final Act, by unanimous decision of the Conference, was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. For the proceedings of the Conference, see *United Nations Conference on Consular Relations, Official Records*, vols. I and II (United Nations publication, Sales Nos.: 63.X.2 and 64.X.1). The text of the Convention, two Protocols, Final Act and resolutions is published in vol. II.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Albania		4 Oct 1991 *a*
Algeria		14 Apr 1964 *a*
Angola		21 Nov 1990 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina	24 Apr 1963	7 Mar 1967
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Australia	31 Mar 1964	12 Feb 1973
Austria	24 Apr 1963	12 Jun 1969
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 *a*
Bahamas		17 Mar 1977 *d*
Bahrain		17 Sep 1992 *a*
Bangladesh		13 Jan 1978 *d*
Barbados		11 May 1992 *a*
Belarus		21 Mar 1989 *a*
Belgium	31 Mar 1964	9 Sep 1970
Benin	24 Apr 1963	27 Apr 1979
Bhutan		28 Jul 1981 *a*
Bolivia	6 Aug 1963	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	24 Apr 1963	11 May 1967
Bulgaria		11 Jul 1989 *a*
Burkina Faso	24 Apr 1963	11 Aug 1964
Cameroon	21 Aug 1963	22 May 1967
Canada		18 Jul 1974 *a*
Cape Verde		30 Jul 1979 *a*
Central African Republic	24 Apr 1963	
Chile	24 Apr 1963	9 Jan 1968
China[2]		2 Jul 1979 *a*
Colombia	24 Apr 1963	6 Sep 1972
Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Costa Rica	6 Jun 1963	29 Dec 1966
Côte d'Ivoire	24 Apr 1963	
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	24 Apr 1963	15 Oct 1965
Cyprus		14 Apr 1976 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Aug 1984 *a*
Denmark	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1972
Djibouti		2 Nov 1978 *a*
Dominica		24 Nov 1987 *d*
Dominican Republic	24 Apr 1963	4 Mar 1964
Ecuador	25 Mar 1964	11 Mar 1965
Egypt		21 Jun 1965 *a*
El Salvador		19 Jan 1973 *a*
Equatorial Guinea		30 Aug 1976 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Fiji		28 Apr 1972 *a*
Finland	28 Oct 1963	2 Jul 1980
France	24 Apr 1963	31 Dec 1970
Gabon	24 Apr 1963	23 Feb 1965
Georgia		12 Jul 1993 *a*
Germany[4, 5]	31 Oct 1963	7 Sep 1971
Ghana	24 Apr 1963	4 Oct 1963
Greece		14 Oct 1975 *a*
Grenada		2 Sep 1992 *a*
Guatemala		9 Feb 1973 *a*
Guinea		30 Jun 1988 *a*
Guyana		13 Sep 1973 *a*
Haiti		2 Feb 1978 *a*
Holy See	24 Apr 1963	8 Oct 1970
Honduras		13 Feb 1968 *a*
Hungary		19 Jun 1987 *a*
Iceland		1 Jun 1978 *a*
India		28 Nov 1977 *a*
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	24 Apr 1963	5 Jun 1975
Iraq		14 Jan 1970 *a*
Ireland	24 Apr 1963	10 May 1967
Israel	25 Feb 1964	
Italy	22 Nov 1963	25 Jun 1969
Jamaica		9 Feb 1976 *a*
Japan		3 Oct 1983 *a*
Jordan		7 Mar 1973 *a*
Kazakstan		5 Jan 1994 *a*
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 *a*
Kiribati		2 Apr 1982 *d*
Kuwait	10 Jan 1964	31 Jul 1975
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Aug 1973 *a*
Latvia		13 Feb 1992 *a*
Lebanon	24 Apr 1963	20 Mar 1975
Lesotho		26 Jul 1972 *a*
Liberia	24 Apr 1963	28 Aug 1984
Liechtenstein	24 Apr 1963	18 May 1966
Lithuania		15 Jan 1992 *a*
Luxembourg	24 Mar 1964	8 Mar 1972
Madagascar		17 Feb 1967 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Malawi		29 Apr 1980 *a*
Malaysia		1 Oct 1991 *a*
Maldives		21 Jan 1991 *a*
Mali		28 Mar 1968 *a*
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 *a*
Mauritius		13 May 1970 *a*
Mexico	7 Oct 1963	16 Jun 1965
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 *a*
Mongolia		14 Mar 1989 *a*
Morocco		23 Feb 1977 *a*
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 *a*
Namibia		14 Sep 1992 *a*
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 *a*
Netherlands[6]		17 Dec 1985 *a*
New Zealand		10 Sep 1974 *a*
Nicaragua		31 Oct 1975 *a*
Niger	24 Apr 1963	26 Apr 1966
Nigeria		22 Jan 1968 *a*
Norway	24 Apr 1963	13 Feb 1980
Oman		31 May 1974 *a*
Pakistan		14 Apr 1969 *a*
Panama	4 Dec 1963	28 Aug 1967
Papua New Guinea		4 Dec 1975 *d*
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 *a*
Peru	24 Apr 1963	17 Feb 1978
Philippines	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1965
Poland	20 Mar 1964	13 Oct 1981
Portugal		13 Sep 1972 *a*
Republic of Korea		7 Mar 1977 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania		24 Feb 1972 *a*
Russian Federation		15 Mar 1989 *a*
Rwanda		31 May 1974 *a*
Saint Lucia		27 Aug 1986 *d*
Samoa		26 Oct 1987 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe		3 May 1983 *a*
Saudi Arabia		29 Jun 1988 *a*
Senegal		29 Apr 1966 *a*
Seychelles		29 May 1979 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Somalia		29 Mar 1968 *a*
South Africa		21 Aug 1989 *a*
Spain		3 Feb 1970 *a*
Sudan		23 Mar 1995 *a*
Suriname		11 Sep 1980 *a*
Sweden	8 Oct 1963	19 Mar 1974
Switzerland	23 Oct 1963	3 May 1965
Syrian Arab Republic		13 Oct 1978 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[7]		18 Aug 1993 *d*
Togo		26 Sep 1983 *a*
Tonga		7 Jan 1972 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		19 Oct 1965 *a*
Tunisia		8 Jul 1964 *a*
Turkey		19 Feb 1976 *a*
Tuvalu[8]		15 Sep 1982 *d*
Ukraine		27 Apr 1989 *a*
United Arab Emirates		24 Feb 1977 *a*
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[9]	27 Mar 1964	9 May 1972
United Republic of Tanzania		18 Apr 1977 *a*
United States of America	24 Apr 1963	24 Nov 1969
Uruguay	24 Apr 1963	10 Mar 1970
Uzbekistan		2 Mar 1992 *a*
Vanuatu		18 Aug 1987 *a*
Venezuela[10]	24 Apr 1963	27 Oct 1965
Viet Nam		8 Sep 1992 *a*
Yemen[11]		10 Apr 1986 *a*
Yugoslavia	24 Apr 1963	8 Feb 1965
Zaire	24 Apr 1963	15 Jul 1976
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BARBADOS

Declaration:

"The Government of Barbados hereby declares that it will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to Acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the juridical or administrative authorities of the receiving state in accordance with the provisions of article 43 of the Convention."

BULGARIA

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that referring to the provisions of article 31, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations the authorities of the receiving State may enter the consular premises in the event of fire or other disaster in the presence of a representative of the sending State or after all appropriate steps have been taken to obtain the consent of the head of the consular post.

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba makes an express reservation to the provisions of articles 74 and 76 of the Convention because it considers that, in view of the nature of the content and rules of the Convention, all free and sovereign States have the right to participate in it, and the Revolutionary Government is therefore in favour of facilitating accession by all countries in the international community, without distinction as to the terri-

torial size of States, the number of their inhabitants or their social, economic or political systems.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

DENMARK

In respect of article 5 (j), consular posts established in Denmark by foreign States may not, except by virtue of a special agreement, execute letters rogatory or commissions to take evidence for the courts of the sending State, and may transmit judicial and extra-judicial documents only in civil or commercial matters.

(1) "With reference to Article 22, the Government of Denmark expresses the wish that it may be possible to maintain the practice existing between Denmark and a number of other countries to appoint honorary consular officers from among persons having the nationality of the receiving State or of a third State; the Government of Denmark further expresses the hope that States with which Denmark establishes consular relations will give their consent, pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 22, to the appointment of honorary consuls having the nationality of the receiving State or a third State.

(2) "With reference to Article 68, the Government of Denmark expresses its desire, in accordance with Danish practice, to continue appointing honorary consular officers and, on condition of reciprocity, its willingness to continue receiving honorary consular officers in Denmark."

EGYPT[12, 13]

" "

"2—Paragraph 1 of article 46 concerning exemption from registration of aliens and residence permits shall not apply to consular employees.

"3—Article 49 concerning exemption from taxation shall apply only to consular officers, their spouses and minor children. This exemption cannot be extended to consular employees and to members of the service staff.

"4—Article 62 concerning exemption from custom duties and taxes on articles for the official use of a consular post headed by an honorary officer, shall not apply.

"5—Article 65 is not accepted. Honorary consular officers cannot be exempted from registration of aliens and residence permits.

"6—It is the understanding of the United Arab Republic that the privileges and immunities specified in this Convention are granted only to consular officers, their spouses and minor children and cannot be extended to other members of their families."

FIJI

"Fiji will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of Article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving State in accordance with the provisions of article 43 of the Convention."

FINLAND

Reservation:

"With regard to article 35, paragraph 1, and article 58, paragraph 1, Finland does not accord to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic or consular couriers and diplomatic or consular bags, or to governments, diplomatic missions and other consular posts the right to employ these means in communicating with consular posts headed by honorary consular officers, except to the extent that Finland may have consented thereto in particular cases."

Declarations:

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Finnish Government expressed the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Finnish honorary consuls, this practice will continue to be allowed as before. The Finnish Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Finland establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22."

"With reference to article 49, paragraph 1 b, the Finnish Government wishes to add that, according to established practice, exemption cannot be granted in respect of dues or taxes levied on certain private movable property, such as shares or stock or other form of partnership in condominium or housing corporation entitling the holder of such movable property to possess and control immovable property situated in the territory of Finland and owned or otherwise legally possessed by the said condominium or housing corporation."

GERMANY[4, 5]

8 April 1974

Declaration:

"The Federal Republic of Germany interprets the provisions of Chapter II of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done on 24 April 1963, as applying to all career consular personnel (consular officers, consular employees and members of the service staff), including those assigned to a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer, and that it will apply the said provisions accordingly."

ICELAND

With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Icelandic Government expresses the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Icelandic honorary consuls, this will continue to be allowed as before. The Icelandic Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Iceland establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22.

IRAQ[12]

The accession of the Republic of Iraq to this Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of the Member of the United Nations called Israel or imply any obligation toward or relation with the said Member.

ITALY

With reference to the provision contained in article 36, paragraph 1 (c), of the Convention on Consular Relations, the Italian Government considers that the right of a consular official to visit nationals of his State who are for any reason held in custody and to act on their behalf may not be waived, inasmuch as it is embodied in general law. The Italian Government will therefore act on the basis of reciprocity.

KUWAIT

It is understood that the ratification of this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government

of the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

LESOTHO

"The Kingdom of Lesotho will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions or to produce official correspondence and documents relating thereto as not extending to matters, correspondence or documents connected with the administration of the estate of a deceased person in respect of which a grant of representation has been made to a member of a consular post.".

MEXICO

Mexico does not accept that part of article 31, paragraph 4 of the Convention which refers to expropriation of consular premises. The main reason for this reservation is that that paragraph, by contemplating the possibility of expropriation of consular premises by the receiving State, presupposes that the sending State is the owner of the premises. That situation is precluded in the Mexican Republic by article 27 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, according to which foreign States cannot acquire private title to immovable property unless it is situated at the permanent seat of Federal Power and necessary for the direct use of their embassies or legations.

MOROCCO[14]

Morocco's accession to the Convention on Consular Relations shall not in any way imply tacit recognition of "Israel"; nor shall any conventional relations be established between the Kingdom of Morocco and "Israel".

Article 62, concerning the exemption from customs duties on articles for the use of a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer, shall not apply.

Article 65 shall not apply, since honorary consular officers cannot be exempted from obligations in regard to the registration of aliens and residence permits.

MOZAMBIQUE

Declaration:

"As regards articles 74 and 76, the People's Republic of Mozambique considers that these provisions are incompatible with the principle that multilateral international instruments whose purpose and subject matters are of interest to the International Community as a whole should be open for universal participation.

It also considers that the said articles are contrary to the principle of sovereign equality of states and deprive sovereign states from their legitimate right to participate in it."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands interprets chapter II of the Convention as applying to all career consular officers and employees, including those assigned to a consular post headed by a honorary consular officer."

NORWAY

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention,the Norwegian Government expresses the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Norwegian honorary consuls, this practice will continue to be allowed as before. The Norwegian Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Norway establishes new consular relations will follow a similar practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22."

OMAN

"The accession of this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Sultanate of Oman and 'Israel'.

ROMANIA

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of articles 74 and 76 of the Convention are incompatible with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose subject-matter and purposes are of interest to the international community as a whole should be open for universal accession.

SAUDI ARABIA[12]

Reservations:

1. Approval of this Convention in no way signifies recognition of Israel and shall not lead to entry with Israel into the relations governed by this Convention.

2. The transmission of the judicial and extrajudicial documents shall be confined to civil and commercial questions and shall in all other cases be effected only by a special agreement.

3. The privileges and immunities provided for under the Convention are guaranteed only for consular staff and their spouses and minor children and shall not extend to other members of their families.

4. The privileges and immunities set forth in chapter III concerning honorary consular officers and consular posts headed by such officers shall be confined to a consular post where the honorary consul is a Saudi Arabian citizen. Consular posts headed by honorary consuls shall not be entitled to use the consular means of correspondence and consular bags referred to in article 35 of the Convention. Governments or other diplomatic missions or consular posts may not use such means of correspondence in their communications with honorary consular posts save within the limits agreed upon in particular cases.

SLOVAKIA[3]

SWEDEN

Reservation:

With regard to article 35, paragraph 1, and article 58, paragraph 1, Sweden does not accord to consular posts headed by honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic or consular couriers and diplomatic or consular bags, or to Governments, diplomatic missions and other consular posts the right to employ these means in communicating with consular posts headed by honorary consular officers, except to the extent that Sweden may have consented thereto in particular cases.

Declaration:

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Swedish Government expresses the wish that in countries where it has been an established practice to allow nationals of the receiving State or of a third State to be appointed as Swedish honorary consuls, this will continue to be allowed as before. The Swedish Government also expresses the hope that countries with which Sweden establishes new consular relations will follow a similar

practice and will give their consent to such appointments pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[12]

(*a*) Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the said Convention and ratification thereof by its Government does not, in any way, imply recognition of Israel, nor shall they lead to any such dealings with the latter as are governed by the provisions of the Convention;

(*b*) The Syrian Arab Republic shall be under no obligation to apply article 49 of the Convention to local personnel employed by consulates or to exempt them from dues and taxes.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[12]

"The accession of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relation with Israel."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom will interpret the exemption accorded to members of a consular post by paragraph 3 of article 44 from liability to give evidence concerning matters connected with the exercise of their functions as relating only to acts in respect of which consular officers and consular employees enjoy immunity from the jurisdiction of the judicial or administrative authorities of the receiving State in accordance with the provisions of article 43 of the Convention."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The United Kingdom hereby confirms its declaration in respect of paragraph 3 of article 44 of the Convention made at the time of signature, and further declares that it will interpret Chapter II of the Convention as applying to all career consular employees, including those employed at a consular post headed by an honorary consular officer."

VIET NAM

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shall not accord to the consular posts headed by the honorary consular officers the right to employ diplomatic, consular couriers, diplomatic and consular bags or messages in code or cipher; or to other governments, their diplomatic missions or consular posts headed by the honorary consular officers, unless the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam may give express consent thereto in a particular case.

YEMEN[11, 12]

1. The accession of the Yemen Arab Republic to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna on 24 April 1963, in no way implies recognition of Israel and shall not entail the entry of the Yemen Arab Republic with Israel into any of the relations governed by this Convention.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic understands the words "members of their families forming part of their households" in article 46, paragraph 1, and article 49 as being restricted to members of the consular posts and their wives and minor children for the purpose of the privileges and immunities enjoyed by them.

3. Where there are serious and strong grounds for believing that the consular bag contains articles or substances not mentioned in article 35, paragraph 4, of the Convention, the Yemen Arab Republic reserves its right to request that the bag be opened in the presence of a representative of the consular mission concerned. If the consulate refuses to comply with this request, the bag shall be returned to its place of origin.

4. The Yemen Arab Republic shall have the right to inspect foodstuffs imported by consular representatives in order to ascertain that they conform in quantity and in kind to the list submitted by them to the customs authorities and the Office of Protocol at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the purpose of obtaining approval for their importation exempt from customs duties.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark objects to the reservations made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to paragraph 1 of article 46 and to articles 49, 62 and 65 of the Convention and to the reservation made by Italy to paragraph 1(c) of article 36 of the Convention."

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic does not regard as valid the reservations to articles 46, 49, 62 and 65 of the Convention made by the Government of the United Arab Republic. This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the French Republic and the United Arab Republic.

GERMANY[2]

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany does not regard as valid the reservations to articles 46, 49, 62 and 65 of the Convention made by the Government of the United Arab Republic.

This declaration shall not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United Arab Republic."

25 July 1977

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the reservations made by the Kingdom of Morocco in respect of articles 62 and 65 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 as incompatible with the purpose and objective of the Convention.

This declaration shall, however, not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Morocco.

LUXEMBOURG

The Government of Luxembourg is not in a position to accept the reservations formulated by the Government of Cuba regarding articles 74 and 76 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, done on 24 April 1963.

NETHERLANDS[15]

1. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard as valid the reservations to the articles 46, 49 and 62 of the Convention made by the United Arab Republic. This declaration should

not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Arab Republic.

2. The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard as valid the reservation to article 62 of the Convention made by the Kingdom of Morocco. This declaration should not be regarded as an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Morocco.

5 December 1986

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Republic concerning the articles 46, paragraph 1, and 49 of the Convention only in so far as it does not purport to exclude the husbands of female members of the consular posts from enjoying the same privileges and immunities under the present Convention.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

4 September 1987

"The Government of the United States wishes to state its objection to the reservation regarding the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations made with respect to paragraph 3 of article 35 by the Yemen Arab Republic.

The Government of the United States notes that the reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of Article 46 and Article 49 of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations by the Yemen Arab Republic states that the Yemen Arab Republic understands the term "members of their families forming part of their households" in paragraph 1 of Article 46 and Article 49 as being restricted to members of the consular posts and, *inter alia*, their wives for the purpose of the privileges and immunities enjoyed by them. The United States understands this term to include members of the consular posts and their spouses, regardless of whether the spouse is a husband or wife. Accordingly, the Government of the United States wishes to state its objection if the Yemen Arab Republic does not include all spouses of the members of the consular posts as being within the meaning of the term "members of their families forming part of their households" in paragraph 1 of Article 46 and Article 49.

The Government of the United States, however, considers the [Convention] as continuing in force between it and the respective above-mentioned States except for the provisions to which the reservations are addressed in each case."

NOTES:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 10 May 1973 (see note 30 in chapter I.2). At the time of preparing this publication no indication had been received from the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam regarding its position with respect to succession to treaties.

[2] The Convention was signed on 24 April 1963 on behalf of the Republic of China. Upon accession, the Government of China made the following declaration:

"The Taiwan authorities' signature on this Convention in the name of China is illegal and null and void."

[See note in this respect concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).]

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 March 1964 and 13 March 1968, respectively, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration made upon signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 429. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 9 September 1987 with the following reservation:

1. While acceding to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 the German Democratic Republic reserves itself the right, in accordance with Article 73 of the Convention, to conclude agreements with other State-parties in order to supplement and complete the provisions as regards bilateral relations. This concerns, in particular, the status, privileges and immunities of independent consular missions and their members as well as the consular tasks.

2. The German Democratic Republic holds the opinion that the provisions of Articles 74 and 76 of the Convention are in contradiction to the principle according to which all states that are guided in their policy by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter have the right to accede to conventions affecting the interests of all states.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] With the following declaration:

"... The Convention and Optional Protocols shall also apply to Land Berlin with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany, subject to the existing rights and responsibilities of the Powers responsible for Berlin including the right to decide on the admission of heads of consular missions in their sectors and to determine the extent of consular privileges and immunities."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, a communication was received on 30 March 1972 from the Government of Czechoslovakia. The said communication is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding one referred to in the second paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3. See also note 4 above.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] On 16 March 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

[8] In a communication accompanying the notification of succession, the Government of Tuvalu declared that it had decided not to succeed to the Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, done at Vienna on 18 April 1961, and that pursuant to Tuvalu's declaration, dated 19 December 1978, regarding treaties applied before independence, the application of the Optional Protocol to Tuvalu should be regarded as terminated as at 1 September 1982.

[9] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent) and territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

[10] The instrument of ratification does not maintain the reservations made on behalf of the Government of Venezuela upon signature of the Convention. On depositing the said instrument, the Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the United Nations confirmed that those reservations should be considered as withdrawn. For the text of the reservations in question, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 452.

[11] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[12] In a communication received on 16 March 1966, the Government of Israel declared that it "has noted the political character of paragraph 1 of the declaration made by the Government of the United Arab Republic (see also note 5 in chapter I.1 and note 13 below). In the view of the Government of Israel, the Convention and Protocol are not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards

the Government of the United Arab Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, have been received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 16 March 1970 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Iraq; on 12 May 1977 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the United Arab Emirates; on 11 May 1979 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Syrian Arab Republic; on 1 September 1987 in respect of the reservation made upon accession by Yemen; and on 29 November 1989 in respect of the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

[13] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation under paragraph 1 which related to Israel. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 456.

[14] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 4 April 1977, the Government of Morocco declared that 'the reservation concerning Israel ... constituted a declaration of general policy which did not affect the legal effects of the provisions of the said Convention as far as their application in respect of the Kingdom of Morocco was concerned'.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 May 1977 the Government of Israel made the following declaration:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Morocco contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Morocco cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Morocco under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Morocco an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[15] In regard to the objection to the reservation made by the Yemen Arab Republic dated 5 December 1986, the Secretary-General received, on 28 May 1987, from the Government of Yemen the following communication:

[The Government of Yemen] should like to make clear in this connection that it was our country's intention in making that reservation that the expression "family of a member of the consular post" should, for the purposes of enjoyment of the privileges and immunities specified in the Convention, be understood to mean the member of the consular post, his spouse and minor children only.

[The Government of Yemen] should like to make it clear that this reservation is not intended to exclude the husbands of female members of the consular posts, as was suggested in the Netherlands interpretation, since it is natural that husbands should in such cases enjoy the same privileges and immunities.

7. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality

Done at Vienna on 24 April 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 March 1967, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 8 June 1967, No. 8639.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 469.
STATUS: Signatories: 18. Parties: 36.

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter III.6.

Participant[1]	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium		9 Sep 1970 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Jan 1994 *d*	
Brazil	24 Apr 1963	
Bulgaria		11 Jul 1989 *a*
Cameroon	21 Aug 1963	
China[2]		
Colombia	24 Apr 1963	
Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Denmark	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1972
Dominican Republic	24 Apr 1963	4 Mar 1964
Egypt		21 Jun 1965 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Finland	28 Oct 1963	2 Jul 1980
Gabon		23 Feb 1965 *a*
Germany[3,4]	31 Oct 1963	7 Sep 1971
Ghana	24 Apr 1963	4 Oct 1963
Iceland		1 Jun 1978 *a*
India		28 Nov 1977 *a*
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 *a*
Iraq[5]		14 Jan 1970 *a*
Italy	22 Nov 1963	25 Jun 1969
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 *a*
Kuwait	10 Jan 1964	
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Aug 1973 *a*
Liberia	24 Apr 1963	
Madagascar		17 Feb 1967 *a*
Malawi		23 Feb 1981 *a*
Morocco		23 Feb 1977 *a*
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 *a*
Netherlands[6]		17 Dec 1985 *a*
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 *a*
Niger		21 Jun 1978 *a*
Norway	24 Apr 1963	13 Feb 1980
Oman		31 May 1974 *a*
Panama	4 Dec 1963	28 Aug 1967
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 *a*
Philippines		15 Nov 1965 *a*
Republic of Korea		7 Mar 1977 *a*
Senegal		29 Apr 1966 *a*
Suriname		11 Sep 1980 *a*
Sweden	8 Oct 1963	19 Mar 1974
Switzerland		12 Jun 1992 *a*
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 *a*
Yugoslavia	24 Apr 1963	
Zaire	24 Apr 1963	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands interprets the words "not, solely by the operation of the law of the receiving State" in article II of the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality as meaning that acquisition of nationality by descent is not regarded as acquisition of nationality solely by the operation of this law.

Notes:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Protocol on 10 May 1973. See also note 1 in chapter III.6.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 24 April 1963. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note 5 in chapter III.6 and note 3 above.

[5] See chapter III.6 for the text of the reservation contained in the instrument of accession by the Government of Iraq to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and to this Protocol and note in the same chapter for the communication received in this regard by the Government of Israel.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

8. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes

Done at Vienna on 24 April 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 March 1967, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 8 June 1967, No. 8640.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 487.
STATUS: Signatories: 38. Parties: 44.

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter III.6.

Participant[1]	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Argentina	24 Apr 1963	
Australia		12 Feb 1973 *a*
Austria	24 Apr 1963	12 Jun 1969
Belgium	31 Mar 1964	9 Sep 1970
Benin	24 Apr 1963	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Jan 1994 *d*	
Bulgaria		11 Jul 1989 *a*
Burkina Faso	24 Apr 1963	11 Aug 1964
Cameroon	21 Aug 1963	
Central African Republic	24 Apr 1963	
Chile	24 Apr 1963	
China[2]		
Colombia	24 Apr 1963	
Congo	24 Apr 1963	
Côte d'Ivoire	24 Apr 1963	
Denmark	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1972
Dominican Republic	24 Apr 1963	4 Mar 1964
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Finland	28 Oct 1963	2 Jul 1980
France	24 Apr 1963	31 Dec 1970
Gabon	24 Apr 1963	23 Feb 1965
Germany[3,4]	31 Oct 1963	7 Sep 1971
Ghana	24 Apr 1963	
Hungary		8 Dec 1989 *a*
Iceland		1 Jun 1978 *a*
India		28 Nov 1977 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 *a*
Ireland	24 Apr 1963	
Italy	22 Nov 1963	25 Jun 1969
Japan		3 Oct 1983 *a*
Kenya		1 Jul 1965 *a*
Kuwait	10 Jan 1964	
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Aug 1973 *a*
Lebanon	24 Apr 1963	
Liberia	24 Apr 1963	
Liechtenstein	24 Apr 1963	18 May 1966
Luxembourg	24 Mar 1964	8 Mar 1972
Madagascar		17 Feb 1967 *a*
Malawi		23 Feb 1981 *a*
Mauritius		13 May 1970 *a*
Nepal		28 Sep 1965 *a*
Netherlands[5]		17 Dec 1985 *a*
New Zealand		10 Sep 1974 *a*
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1990 *a*
Niger	24 Apr 1963	21 Jun 1978
Norway	24 Apr 1963	13 Feb 1980
Oman		31 May 1974 *a*
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 *a*
Panama	4 Dec 1963	28 Aug 1967
Paraguay		23 Dec 1969 *a*
Peru	24 Apr 1963	
Philippines	24 Apr 1963	15 Nov 1965
Republic of Korea		7 Mar 1977 *a*
Senegal		29 Apr 1966 *a*
Seychelles		29 May 1979 *a*
Suriname		11 Sep 1980 *a*
Sweden	8 Oct 1963	19 Mar 1974
Switzerland	23 Oct 1963	3 May 1965
United Kingdom[6]	27 Mar 1964	9 May 1972
United States of America	24 Apr 1963	24 Nov 1969
Uruguay	24 Apr 1963	
Yugoslavia	24 Apr 1963	
Zaire	24 Apr 1963	

Notes:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Protocol on 10 May 1973. See also note 1 in chapter III.6.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 24 April 1963. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note 5 in chapter III.6. In a communication deposited on 24 January 1972 with the Registrar of the International Court of Justice, who transmitted it to the Secretary-General pursuant to operative paragraph 3 of Security Council resolution 9 (1946) of 15 October 1946, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated as follows:

"In respect of any dispute between the Federal Republic of Germany and any Party to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 24 April 1963 and to the Optional Protocol thereto concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes that may arise within the scope of that Protocol, the Federal Republic of Germany accepts the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. This declaration also applies to such disputes as may arise, within the scope of article IV of the Optional Protocol concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, in connexion with the Optional Protocol concerning Acquisition of Nationality.

"It is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the terms and subject to the conditions of the Statute and Rules of the International Court of Justice that the jurisdiction of the Court is hereby recognized.

"The Federal Republic of Germany undertakes to comply in good faith with the decisions of the Court and to accept all the obligations of a Member of the United Nations under Article 94 of the Charter."
See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[6] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Christopher–Nevis–Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent) and territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

9. Convention on Special Missions

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 8 December 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1985, in accordance with article 53 (1).
REGISTRATION: 21 June 1985, No. 23431.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1400, p. 231.
STATUS: Signatories: 13. Parties: 30.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 16 December 1969.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina	18 Dec 1969	13 Oct 1972
Austria		22 Aug 1978 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria		14 May 1987 *a*
Chile		19 Oct 1979 *a*
China[1]		
Cuba		9 Jun 1976 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus	18 Sep 1970	24 Jan 1972
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		22 May 1985 *a*
El Salvador	18 Dec 1970	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Fiji		18 Oct 1972 *a*
Finland	28 Dec 1970	
Guatemala		12 Feb 1988 *a*
Indonesia		4 Jun 1982 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 *a*
Israel	9 Nov 1970	
Jamaica	18 Dec 1969	
Liechtenstein	15 Dec 1970	3 Aug 1977
Mexico		31 Jan 1979 *a*
Nicaragua	18 Sep 1970	
Paraguay		19 Sep 1975 *a*
Philippines	16 Dec 1969	26 Nov 1976
Poland		22 Mar 1977 *a*
Rwanda		29 Nov 1977 *a*
Seychelles		28 Dec 1977 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Switzerland	31 Jul 1970	3 Nov 1977
Tonga		18 Jan 1977 *a*
Tunisia	19 Aug 1970	2 Nov 1971
Ukraine		27 Aug 1993 *a*
United Kingdom	17 Dec 1970	
Uruguay		17 Dec 1980 *a*
Yugoslavia	18 Dec 1969	5 Mar 1974

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BULGARIA

Reservation concerning article 8:

In accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that in case of difference on specifying the size of the special mission, this question should be settled by agreement between the sending State and the receiving State.

Reservation concerning article 25:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not accept the provision of article 25, paragraph 1 of the Convention, according to which the agents of the receiving State may enter the premises where the special mission is established in case of fire or other disaster without the express consent of the head of the special mission or, where appropriate, of the head of the permanent mission.

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to underline that article 50 of the Convention, which precludes a number of States from becoming parties to it, is of an unjustifiably restrictive character. This provision is incompatible with the very nature of the Convention, which is of a universal character and should be open for accession by all States.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba enters an express reservation with regard to the third sentence of paragraph 1 of article 25 of the Convention, and consequently does not accept the assumption of consent to enter the premises of the special mission for any of the reasons mentioned in that paragraph or for any other reasons.

Declaration:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba considers the provisions of articles 50 and 52 of the Convention to be discriminatory in nature because, whereas the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, the said provisions deny a number of States the right to sign and accede to the Convention, a situation which is contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

SLOVAKIA[2]

Notes:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 28 December 1970. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 1 October 1976 with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1400, p. 338. See also note 11 in chaper I.2.

10. Optional Protocol to the Convention on Special Missions concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 8 December 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1985, in accordance with article VII (1).
REGISTRATION: 21 June 1985, No. 23431.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1400, p. 339.
STATUS: Signatories: 9. Parties: 13.

Note: The Protocol was opened for signature at New York on 16 December 1969.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria		22 Aug 1978 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
China[1]		
Cyprus	31 Dec 1970	24 Jan 1972
El Salvador	18 Dec 1970	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Finland	28 Dec 1970	
Guatemala		12 Feb 1988 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jun 1975 *a*
Jamaica	1 Jul 1970	
Liechtenstein	15 Dec 1970	3 Aug 1977
Paraguay		19 Sep 1975 *a*
Philippines	16 Dec 1969	26 Nov 1976
Seychelles		28 Dec 1977 *a*
Switzerland	31 Jul 1970	3 Nov 1977
United Kingdom	17 Dec 1970	
Uruguay		17 Dec 1980 *a*
Yugoslavia	18 Dec 1969	5 Mar 1974

Notes:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 28 December 1970. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

11. Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character

Concluded at Vienna on 14 March 1975

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 89(1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.67/16.
STATUS: Signatories: 21. Parties: 30.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 13 March 1975 by the United Nations Conference on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations held at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, Austria, from 4 February to 14 March 1975. The Convention was opened for signature at Vienna on 14 March 1975 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria. After 30 September 1975, it remained open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 30 March 1976, the closing date for signature.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina	7 Apr 1975	6 Mar 1981
Barbados	29 Mar 1976	26 Nov 1979
Belarus	13 Oct 1975	24 Aug 1978
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	14 Mar 1975	
Bulgaria	26 Nov 1975	23 Feb 1976
Cameroon		23 Mar 1984 *a*
Chile	28 Nov 1975	22 Jul 1976
Cuba	30 Mar 1976	30 Apr 1981
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus		14 Mar 1978 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		14 Dec 1982 *a*
Ecuador	25 Aug 1975	6 Jan 1976
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Guatemala		14 Sep 1981 *a*
Holy See	14 Mar 1975	
Hungary	12 Feb 1976	28 Jul 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		30 Dec 1988 *a*
Jamaica		16 Nov 1990 *a*
Mongolia	30 Oct 1975	14 Dec 1976
Nigeria	17 Dec 1975	
Panama	12 Mar 1976	16 Mar 1977
Peru	14 Mar 1975	
Poland	10 Nov 1975	1 Nov 1979
Russian Federation	10 Oct 1975	8 Aug 1978
Rwanda		29 Nov 1977 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Tunisia		13 Oct 1977 *a*
Turkey	30 Mar 1976	
Ukraine	17 Oct 1975	25 Aug 1978
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Mar 1976	
Viet Nam		26 Aug 1980 *a*
Yemen[3]	30 Mar 1976	
Yugoslavia	14 Mar 1975	20 Sep 1977

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

In ratifying the 1975 Vienna Convention on the representation of States in their relations with international organizations of a universal character, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to state that the principle of the full inviolability of the official premises of delegations to international conferences is a norm of customary international law which should be observed by all States.

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

The Republic of Guatemala, upon acceding to the Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character, makes an express reservation with respect to articles 84 and 85, which it does not accept as applying to article 77, paragraph 4, when, in its capacity as the host State, it disapproves of the conduct of one or more persons enjoying privileges and immunity under the Convention, in which case it shall retain the right to take unilaterally, as a necessary measure for its own protection, the action of notifying the sending State at any time and without having to explain its decision that such person or persons are *persona non grata* in the country. The reservation concerning the non-applicability of articles 84 and 85 also refers to the right of the Republic of Guatemala to declare any person who, by virtue of the Convention, would enjoy privileges and immunity unacceptable before his arrival in its territory, without stating any reason.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

In ratifying the 1975 Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their Relations with International Organizations of a Universal Character, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it necessary to state that the principle of the absolute inviolability of the offices of delegations to international conferences is a rule of customary international law which must be observed by all States.

UKRAINE

In ratifying the Vienna Convention on the Representation of States in their relations with international organizations of a universal character of 1975, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is constrained to declare that the principle of total inviolability of working premises of delegations at international conferences is

a rule of customary international law to which all States must adhere.

VIET NAM

Adhering to this Convention, the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam deems it necessary to stress that the absolute inviolability privilege accorded the offices and residences of the representations of member States at International Organizations has been established as a principle in the practice of international law and therefore must be strictly observed by all States.

NOTES:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 15 March 1976 and 28 June 1988, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 24 February 1976 and 30 August 1976, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

12. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in Respect of State Property, Archives and Debts

Concluded at Vienna on 8 April 1983

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 50 of the Convention).
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.117/14.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 4.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 7 April 1983 and opened for signature on 8 April 1983 by the United Nations Conference on Succession of States in respect of State Property, Archives and Debts. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 36/113[1] of 10 December 1981 and 37/11[2] of 15 November 1982. The Conference met at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna from 1 March to 8 April 1983. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria. For the text of the Final Act, see Conference document A/CONF./117/15 of 7 April 1983.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Algeria	16 May 1983		Georgia		12 Jul 1993 *a*
Argentina	30 Dec 1983		Niger	23 May 1984	
Croatia		11 Apr 1994 *a*	Peru	10 Nov 1983	
Egypt	30 Jun 1984		Ukraine		8 Jan 1993 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*	Yugoslavia	24 Oct 1983	

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 51* (A/36/51), p. 243.

[2] *Ibid., Thirty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 51* (A/37/51), p. 263.

CHAPTER IV. HUMAN RIGHTS[1]

1. CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948[2]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 January 1951, in accordance with article XIII.
REGISTRATION: 12 January 1951, No. 1021.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 78, p. 277.
STATUS: Signatories: 42. Parties: 120.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		22 Mar 1956 *a*
Albania		12 May 1955 *a*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina		5 Jun 1956 *a*
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Australia	11 Dec 1948	8 Jul 1949
Austria		19 Mar 1958 *a*
Bahamas		5 Aug 1975 *d*
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 *a*
Barbados		14 Jan 1980 *a*
Belarus	16 Dec 1949	11 Aug 1954
Belgium	12 Dec 1949	5 Sep 1951
Bolivia	11 Dec 1948	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		29 Dec 1992 *d*
Brazil	11 Dec 1948	15 Apr 1952
Bulgaria		21 Jul 1950 *a*
Burkina Faso		14 Sep 1965 *a*
Cambodia		14 Oct 1950 *a*
Canada	28 Nov 1949	3 Sep 1952
Chile	11 Dec 1948	3 Jun 1953
China[4]	20 Jul 1949	18 Apr 1983
Colombia	12 Aug 1949	27 Oct 1959
Costa Rica		14 Oct 1950 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	28 Dec 1949	4 Mar 1953
Cyprus		29 Mar 1982 *a*
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		31 Jan 1989 *a*
Denmark	28 Sep 1949	15 Jun 1951
Dominican Republic	11 Dec 1948	
Ecuador	11 Dec 1948	21 Dec 1949
Egypt	12 Dec 1948	8 Feb 1952
El Salvador	27 Apr 1949	28 Sep 1950
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia	11 Dec 1948	1 Jul 1949
Fiji		11 Jan 1973 *d*
Finland		18 Dec 1959 *a*
France	11 Dec 1948	14 Oct 1950
Gabon		21 Jan 1983 *a*
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 *a*
Georgia		11 Oct 1993 *a*
Germany[6,7]		24 Nov 1954 *a*
Ghana		24 Dec 1958 *a*
Greece	29 Dec 1949	8 Dec 1954
Guatemala	22 Jun 1949	13 Jan 1950
Haiti	11 Dec 1948	14 Oct 1950
Honduras	22 Apr 1949	5 Mar 1952
Hungary		7 Jan 1952 *a*
Iceland	14 May 1949	29 Aug 1949
India	29 Nov 1949	27 Aug 1959
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Dec 1949	14 Aug 1956
Iraq		20 Jan 1959 *a*
Ireland		22 Jun 1976 *a*
Israel	17 Aug 1949	9 Mar 1950
Italy		4 Jun 1952 *a*
Jamaica		23 Sep 1968 *a*
Jordan		3 Apr 1950 *a*
Kuwait		7 Mar 1995 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		8 Dec 1950 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon	30 Dec 1949	17 Dec 1953
Lesotho		29 Nov 1974 *a*
Liberia	11 Dec 1948	9 Jun 1950
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Liechtenstein		24 Mar 1994 *a*
Luxembourg		7 Oct 1981 *a*
Malaysia		20 Dec 1994 *a*
Maldives		24 Apr 1984 *a*
Mali		16 Jul 1974 *a*
Mexico	14 Dec 1948	22 Jul 1952
Monaco		30 Mar 1950 *a*
Mongolia		5 Jan 1967 *a*
Morocco		24 Jan 1958 *a*
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 *a*
Myanmar	30 Dec 1949	14 Mar 1956
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Nepal		17 Jan 1969 *a*
Netherlands		20 Jun 1966 *a*
New Zealand	25 Nov 1949	28 Dec 1978
Nicaragua		29 Jan 1952 *a*
Norway	11 Dec 1948	22 Jul 1949
Pakistan	11 Dec 1948	12 Oct 1957
Panama	11 Dec 1948	11 Jan 1950
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 *a*
Paraguay	11 Dec 1948	
Peru	11 Dec 1948	24 Feb 1960
Philippines	11 Dec 1948	7 Jul 1950
Poland		14 Nov 1950 *a*
Republic of Korea		14 Oct 1950 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania		2 Nov 1950 *a*
Russian Federation	16 Dec 1949	3 May 1954
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
Saudi Arabia		13 Jul 1950 *a*
Senegal		4 Aug 1983 *a*
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Singapore		18 Aug 1995 *a*
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		13 Sep 1968 *a*
Sri Lanka		2 Oct 1950 *a*
Sweden	30 Dec 1949	27 May 1952
Syrian Arab Republic		25 Jun 1955 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		24 May 1984 *a*
Tonga		16 Feb 1972 *a*
Tunisia		29 Nov 1956 *a*
Turkey		31 Jul 1950 *a*
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 *a*
Ukraine	16 Dec 1949	15 Nov 1954
United Kingdom		30 Jan 1970 *a*
United Republic of Tanzania		5 Apr 1984 *a*
United States of America	11 Dec 1948	25 Nov 1988
Uruguay	11 Dec 1948	11 Jul 1967
Venezuela		12 Jul 1960 *a*
Viet Nam[8, 9]		9 Jun 1981 *a*
Yemen[10]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	11 Dec 1948	29 Aug 1950
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA

As regards article IX: The People's Republic of Albania does not consider as binding upon itself the provisions of article IX which provides that disputes between the Contracting Parties with regard to the interpretation, application and implementation of the Convention shall be referred for examination to the International Court at the request of any party to the dispute. The People's Republic of Albania declares that, as regards the International Court's jurisdiction in respect of disputes concerning the interpretation, application and implementation of the Convention, the People's Republic of Albania will, as hitherto, maintain the position that in each particular case the agreement of all parties to the dispute is essential for the submission of any particular dispute to the International Court for decision.

As regards article XII: The People's Republic of Albania declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article IX of the Convention, which confers on the International Court of Justice jurisdiction in all disputes relating to the said Convention.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria declares that no provision of article VI of the said Convention shall be interpreted as depriving its tribunals of jurisdiction in cases of genocide or other acts enumerated in article III which have been committed in its territory or as conferring such jurisdiction on foreign tribunals.

International tribunals may, as an exceptional measure, be recognized as having jurisdiction, in cases in which the Algerian Government has given its express approval.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria declares that it does not accept the terms of article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the said Convention should apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

ARGENTINA

Ad article IX: The Argentine Government reserves the right not to submit to the procedure laid down in this article any dispute relating directly or indirectly to the territories referred to in its reservation to article XII.

Ad article XII: If any other Contracting Party extends the application of the Convention to territories under the sovereignty of the Argentine Republic, this extension shall in no way affect the rights of the Republic.

BAHRAIN[11]

Reservations:

"With reference to article IX of the Convention the Government of the State of Bahrain declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the express consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

"Moreover, the accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause of for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BELARUS[12]

The Byelorussian SSR declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to non-self-governing territories, including trust territories.

BULGARIA[13]

As regards article XII: The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

CHINA

Declaration:

1. The ratification to the said Convention by the Taiwan local authorities on 19 July 1951 in the name of China is illegal and therefore null and void.

Reservation:

2. The People's Republic of China does not consider itself bound by article IX of the said Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC [5]

FINLAND

"Subject to the provisions of article 47, paragraph 2, of the Constitution Act, 1919, concerning the impeachment of the President of the Republic of Finland."

HUNGARY[14]

The Hungarian People's Republic reserves its rights with regard to the provisions of article XII which do not define the obligations of countries having colonies with regard to questions of colonial exploitation and to acts which might be described as genocide.

INDIA

"With reference to article IX of the Convention, the Government of India declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

MALAYSIA

Reservation:

"That with reference to article IX of the Convention, before any dispute to which Malaysia is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of Malaysia is required in each case."

Understanding:

"That the pledge to grant extradition in accordance with a state's laws and treaties in force found in article VII extends only to acts which are criminal under the law of both the requesting and the requested state."

MONGOLIA[15]

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic declares that it is not in a position to agree with article XII of the Convention and considers that the provisions of the said article should be extended to non-self-governing territories, including trust territories.

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article XI of the Convention, under the terms of which a number of States are precluded from acceding to the Convention and declares that the Convention deals with matters which affect the interests of all States and it should, therefore, be open for accession by all States.

MOROCCO

With reference to article VI, the Government of His Majesty the King considers that Moroccan courts and tribunals alone have jurisdiction with respect to acts of genocide committed within the territory of the Kingdom of Morocco.

The competence of international courts may be admitted exceptionally in cases with respect to which the Moroccan Government has given its specific agreement.

With reference to article IX, the Moroccan Government states that no dispute relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the present Convention can be brought before the International Court of Justice, without the prior agreement of the parties to the dispute.

MYANMAR

"(1) With reference to article VI, the Union of Burma makes the reservation that nothing contained in the said Article shall be construed as depriving the Courts and Tribunals of the Union of jurisdiction or as giving foreign Courts and tribunals jurisdiction over any cases of genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article III committed within the Union territory.

"(2) With reference to article VIII, the Union of Burma makes the reservation that the said article shall not apply to the Union."

PHILIPPINES

"1. With reference to article IV of the Convention, the Philippine Government cannot sanction any situation which would subject its Head of State, who is not a ruler, to conditions, less favorable than those accorded other Heads of State, whether constitutionally responsible rules or not. The Philippine Government does not consider said article, therefore, as overriding the existing immunities from judicial processes guaranteed certain public officials by the Constitution of the Philippines.

"2. With reference to article VII of the Convention, the Philippine Government does not undertake to give effect to said article until the Congress of the Philippines has enacted the necessary legislation defining and punishing the crime of genocide, which legislation, under the Constitution of the Philippines, cannot have any retroactive effect.

"3. With reference to articles VI and IX of the Convention, the Philippine Government takes the position that nothing contained in said articles shall be construed as depriving Philippine courts of jurisdiction over all cases of genocide committed within Philippine territory save only in those cases where the Philippine Government consents to have the decision of the Philippine courts reviewed by either of the international tribunals referred to in said articles. With further reference to article IX of the Convention, the Philippine Government does not consider said article to extend the concept of State responsibility beyond that recognized by the generally accepted principles of international law."

POLAND

As regards article IX: Poland does not regard itself as bound by the provisions of this article since the agreement of all the parties to a dispute is a necessary condition in each specific case for submission to the International Court of Justice.

As regards article XII: Poland does not accept the provisions of this article, considering that the Convention should apply to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

ROMANIA

As regards article IX: The People's Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article IX, which provides that disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, and declares that as regards the jurisdiction of the Court in disputes relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention, the People's Republic of Romania will adhere to the view which it has held up to the present, that in each particular case, the agreement of all the parties to a dispute is required before it can be referred to the International Court of Justice for settlement.

As regards article XII: The People's Republic of Romania declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention, and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should apply to the Non-Self-Governing Territories, including the Trust Territories.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[12]

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

RWANDA

The Rwandese Republic does not consider itself as bound by article IX of the Convention.

SINGAPORE

Reservation:

"That with reference to article IX of the Convention, before any dispute to which the Republic of Singapore is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the Republic of Singapore is required in each case."

SLOVAKIA[5]

SPAIN

With a reservation in respect of the whole of article IX (jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice).

UKRAINE[12]

The Ukrainian SSR declares that it is not in agreement with article XII of the Convention and considers that all the provisions of the Convention should extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[16]

Reservations:

"(1) That with reference to article IX of the Convention, before any dispute to which the United States is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the United States is required in each case.

(2) That nothing in the Convention requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States."

Understandings:

"(1) That the term 'intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such' appearing in article II means the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in substantial part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such by the acts specified in article II.

(2) That the term 'mental harm' in article II (b) means permanent impairment of mental faculties through drugs, torture or similar techniques.

(3) That the pledge to grant extradition in accordance with a state's laws and treaties in force found in article VII extends only to acts which are criminal under the laws of both the requesting and the requested state and nothing in article VI affects the right of any state to bring to trial before its own tribunals any of its nationals for acts committed outside a state.

(4) That acts in the course of armed conflicts committed without the specific intent required by article II are not sufficient to constitute genocide as defined by this Convention.

(5) That with regard to the reference to an international penal tribunal in article VI of the Convention, the United States declares that it reserves the right to effect its participation in any such tribunal only by a treaty entered into specifically for that purpose with the advice and consent of the Senate."

VENEZUELA

With reference to article VI, notice is given that any proceedings to which Venezuela may be a party before an international penal tribunal would be invalid without Venezuela's prior express acceptance of the jurisdiction of such international tribunal.

With reference to article VII, notice is given that the laws in force in Venezuela do not permit the extradition of Venezuelan nationals.

With reference to article IX, the reservation is made that the submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice shall be regarded as valid only when it takes place with Venezuela's approval, signified by the express conclusion of a prior agreement in each case.

VIET NAM

1. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not consider itself bound by article IX of the Convention which provides the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in solving disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention at the request of any of the parties to disputes. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is of the view that, regarding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in solving disputes referred to in article IX of the Convention, the consent of the parties to the disputes except the criminals is diametrically necessary for the submission of a given dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

2. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not accept article XII of the Convention and considers that all provisions of the Convention should also extend to Non-Self-Governing Territories, including Trust Territories.

3. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam considers that article XI is of a discriminatory nature, depriving a number of States of the opportunity to become parties to the Convention, and holds that the Convention should be open for accession by all States.

YEMEN[10]

In acceding to this Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by article IX of the Convention, which provides that disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

"The Australian Government does not accept any of the reservations contained in the instrument of accession of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, or in the instrument of ratification of the Republic of the Philippines."

15 November 1950

"The Australian Government does not accept any of the reservations made at the time of signature of the Convention by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

19 January 1951

"The Australian Government does not accept the reservations contained in the instruments of accession of the Governments of Poland and Romania."

BELGIUM

The Government of Belgium does not accept the reservations made by Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

BRAZIL[17, 18]

The Government of Brazil objects to the reservations made to the Convention by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Brazilian Government considers the said reservations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The position taken by the Government of Brazil is founded on the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951 and on the resolution adopted by the sixth session of the General Assembly on 12 January 1952, on reservations to multilateral conventions.

The Brazilian Government reserves the right to draw any such legal consequences as it may deem fit from its formal objection to the above-mentioned reservations.

CHINA[17]

15 November 1954

"The Government of China . . . objects to all the identical reservations made at the time of signature or ratification or accession to the Convention by Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Chinese Government considers the above-mentioned reservations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and, therefore, by virtue of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951, would not regard the above-mentioned States as being Parties to the Convention."

13 September 1955

[Same communication, *mutatis mutandis*, in respect of the reservations made by Albania.]

25 July 1956

[Same communication, *mutatis mutandis*, in respect of the reservations made by Myanmar.]

CUBA[19]

DENMARK

27 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"In the view of the Government of Denmark this reservation is subject to general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

ECUADOR

31 March 1950

The Government of Ecuador is not in agreement with the reservations made to article IX and XII of the Convention by the Governments of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia,the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and, therefore, they do not apply to Ecuador which accepted without any modifications the integral text of the Convention.

21 August 1950

[Same communication, *mutatis mutandis*, in respect of the reservations made by Bulgaria.]

9 January 1951

The Government of Ecuador does not accept the reservations made by the Governments of Poland and Romania to articles IX and XII of the Convention.

ESTONIA

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"The Estonian Government objects to this reservation on the grounds that it creates uncertainty, as to the extent of the obligations the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention. According to article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, no party may invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

FINLAND

22 December 1989

With respect to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"In the view of the Government of Finland this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

GREECE

We further declare that we have not accepted and do not accept any reservation which has already been made or which may hereafter be made by the countries signatory to this instrument or by countries which have acceded or may hereafter accede thereto.

26 January 1990

The Government of the Hellenic Republic cannot accept the first reservation entered by the United States of America upon ratifying the Agreement on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, for it considers such a reservation to be incompatible with the Convention.

In respect of the second reservation formulated by the United States of America:

[Same objection *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Denmark.]

IRELAND

22 December 1989

"The Government of Ireland is unable to accept the second reservation made by the United States of America on the occasion of its ratification of the [said] Convention on the grounds that as a generally accepted rule of international law a party to an international agreement may not, by invoking the terms of its internal law, purport to override the provisions of the Agreement."

ITALY

29 December 1989

The Government of the Republic of Italy objects to the second reservation entered by the United States of America. It creates uncertainty as to the extent of the obligations which the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention."

MEXICO

4 June 1990

The Government of Mexico believes that the reservation made by the United States Government to article IX of the aforesaid Convention should be considered invalid because it is not in keeping with the object and purpose of the Convention, nor with the principle governing the interpretation of treaties whereby no State can invoke provisions of its domestic law as a reason for not complying with a treaty.

If the aforementioned reservation were applied, it would give rise to a situation of uncertainty as to the scope of the obligations which the United States Government would assume with respect to the Convention.

Mexico's objection to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as preventing the entry into force of the 1948 Convention between the [Mexican] Government and the United States Government.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it considers the reservations made by Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Morocco, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in respect of article IX of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, opened for signature at Paris on 9 December 1948, to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore does not deem any State which has made or which will make such reservation a party to the Convention."

27 December 1989

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

"As concerns the first reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls its declaration, made on 20 June 1966 on the occasion of the accession of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Convention [...] stating that in its opinion the reservations in respect of article IX of the Convention, made at that time by a number of states, were incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands did not consider states making such reservations parties to the Convention. Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not consider the United States of America a party to the Convention. Similarly, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not consider parties to the Convention other states which have made such reservations, i.e., in addition to the states mentioned in the aforementioned declaration, the People's Republic of China, Democratic Yemen, the German Democratic Republic, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Philippines, Rwanda, Spain, Venezuela, and Viet Nam, on the other hand, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does consider parties to the Convention those states that have since withdrawn their reservations, i.e. the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

As the Convention may come into force between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States of America as a result of the latter withdrawing its reservation in respect of article IX, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands deems it useful to express the following position on the second reservation of the United States of America:

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to this reservation on the ground that it creates uncertainty as to the extent of the obligations the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention. Moreover, any failure by the United States of America to act upon the obligations contained in the Convention on the ground that such action would be prohibited by the constitution of the United States would be contrary to the generally accepted rule of international law, as laid down in article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties (Vienna, 23 May 1969)".

NORWAY

10 April 1952

"The Norwegian Government does not accept the reservations made to the Convention by the Government of the Philippines at the time of ratification."

22 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"In the view of the Government of Norway this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

SPAIN

29 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

Spain interprets the reservation entered by the United States of America to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948 [...] to mean that legislation or other action by the United States of America will continue to be in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

SRI LANKA

6 February 1951

"The Government of Ceylon does not accept the reservations made by Romania to the Convention."

SWEDEN

22 December 1989

With regard to reservation (2) made by the United States of America:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that a State party to the Convention may not invoke the provisions of its national legislation, including the Constitution, to justify that it does not fulfil its obligations under the Convention and therefore objects to the reservation.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the United States of America."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservations to articles IV, VII, VIII, IX or XII of the Convention

made by Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Burma, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Mongolia, Morocco, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or Venezuela."

21 November 1975

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations in respect of article IX of the said Convention; in their view this is not the kind of reservation which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservation entered by the Republic of Rwanda against article IX of the Convention. They also wish to place on record that they take the same view of the similar reservation made by the German Democratic Republic as notified by the circular letter [. . .] of 25 April 1973."

26 August 1983

With regard to statements made by Viet Nam concerning articles IX and XII and reservation made by China concerning article IX:

"The Government of the United Kingdom have [...] consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations to [article IX]. Likewise, in conformity with the attitude adopted by them in previous cases, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the reservation entered by Viet Nam relating to article XII."

30 December 1987

With regard to a reservation made by Democratic Yemen concerning article IX:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations in respect of article IX of the said Convention; in their view this is not the kind of reservation which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Accordingly the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not accept the reservation entered by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen against article IX of the Convention."

22 December 1989

"The Government of the United Kingdom have consistently stated that they are unable to accept reservations to article IX. Accordingly, in conformity with the attitude adopted by them in previous cases, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept the first reservation entered by the United States of America.

The Government of the United Kingdom object to the second reservation entered by the United States of America. It creates uncertainty as to the extent of the obligations which the Government of the United States of America is prepared to assume with regard to the Convention."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	8 Jul 1949	All territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations Australia is responsible
Belgium	13 Mar 1952	Belgian Congo, Trust Territory of Rwanda–Urundi
United Kingdom[20]	30 Jan 1970	Channel Islands, Isle of Man, Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Bahamas, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Fiji, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Pitcairn, St. Helena and Dependencies, Seychelles, Turks and Caicos Islands
	2 Jun 1970	Kingdom of Tonga

NOTES:

[1] For other multilateral treaties concluded in the field of human rights, see chapters V, VII, XVI, XVII and XVIII.

[2] Resolution 260 (III), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session*, Part I (A/810), p. 174.

[3] On 15 June 1993, the Secretary–General received form the Government of Yugoslavia the following communication:

"Considering the fact that the replacement of sovereignty on the part of the territory of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia previously comprising the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out contrary to the rules of international law, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia herewith states that it does not consider the so–called Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina a party to the [said Convention], but does consider that the so–called Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is bound by the obligation to respect the norms on preventing and punishing the crime of genocide in accordance with general international law irrespective of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide."

[4] Ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 19 July 1951. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 28 December 1949 and 21 December 1950, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article IX made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 78, p. 303. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with reservation and declaration on 27 March 1973. For the text of the reservation and the declarations see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 861, p. 200. See also note 13 under chapter I.2.

[7] In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention would also apply to *Land Berlin*.

With reference to the above–mentioned declaration, a communication from the German Democratic Republic was received by the Secretary–General on 27 December 1973. The text of the communication is identical, *mutatis mutandis*, to that published in note 4 of chapter III.3, paragraph 4.

In this connection, the Secretary–General received from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (17 June 1974 and 8 July

1975), the Federal Republic of Germany (15 July 1974 and 19 September 1975), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (12 September 1974 and 8 December 1975), and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (19 September 1974), communications identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 4 chapter III.3. See also note 4 above.

[8] Accession on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 11 August 1950. (For the text of objections to some of the reservations made upon the said accession, see publication, *Multilateral Treaties for which the Secretary-General acts as Depositary* (ST/LEG/SER.D/13, p.91); also see note 30 in chapter I.2.

[9] The Secretary-General received on 9 November 1981 from the Government of the Democratic Republic of Kampuchea the following objection with regard to the accession by Viet Nam:

> The Government of Democratic Kampuchea, as a party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, considers that the signing of that Convention by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has no legal force, because it is no more than a cynical, macabre charade intended to camouflage the foul crimes of genocide committed by the 250,000 soldiers of the Vietnamese invasion army in Kampuchea. It is an odious insult to the memory of the more than 2,500,000 Kampucheans who have been massacred by these same Vietnamese armed forces using conventional weapons, chemical weapons and the weapon of famine, created deliberately by them for the purpose of eliminating all national resistance at its source.
>
> It is also a gross insult to hundreds of thousands of Laotians who have been massacred or compelled to take refuge abroad since the occupation of Laos by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to the Hmong national minority in Laos, exterminated by Vietnamese conventional and chemical weapons and, finally, to over a million Vietnamese "boat people" who died at sea or sought refuge abroad in their flight to escape the repression carried out in Viet Nam by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.
>
> This shameless accession by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam violates and discredits the noble principles and ideals of the United Nations and jeopardizes the prestige and moral authority of our world Organization. It represents an arrogant challenge to the international community, which is well aware of these crimes of genocide committed by the Vietnamese army in Kampuchea, has constantly denounced and condemned them since 25 December 1978, the date on which the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea began, and demands that these Vietnamese crimes of genocide be brought to an end by the total withdrawal of the Vietnamese forces from Kampuchea and the restoration of the inalienable right of the people of Kampuchea to decide its own destiny without any foreign interference, as provided in United Nations resolutions 34/22, 35/6 and 36/5.

[10] The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention on 6 April 1989. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[11] On on 25 June 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following objection:

> "The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession of Bahrain to the [said] Convention contains a declaration in respect of Israel.
>
> In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purpose and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain under general International Law or under particular Conventions.
>
> The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity".

[12] In communications received on 8 March, 19 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX. For the texts of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 190, p. 381, vol.196, p. 345 and vol. 201, p. 368, respectively.

[13] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article IX of the Convention, made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 78, p. 318.

[14] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 118, p. 306.

[15] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 587, p. 326.

[16] On 11 January 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany the following declaration:

> "The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has taken note of the declarations made under the heading "Reservations" by the Government of the United States of America upon ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1948. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany interprets paragraph (2) of the said declarations as a reference to article V of the Convention and therefore as not in any way affecting the obligations of the United States of America as a State Party to the Convention."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[17] For the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 28 May 1951, see *I.C.J., Report 1951*, p. 15.

[18] For the resolution adopted on 12 January 1952 by the sixth session of the General Assembly concerning reservations to multilateral conventions, see Resolution 598 (VI); *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 20* (A/2119), p. 84.

[19] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 29 January 1982, the Government of Cuba withdrew the declaration made on its behalf upon ratification of the said Convention with respect to the reservations to articles IX and XII by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[20] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

> [The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands". The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

> "The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.
>
> For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

2. International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

Opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 January 1969, in accordance with article 19.[1]
REGISTRATION: 12 March 1969, No. 9464.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 660, p. 195.
STATUS: Signatories: 76. Parties: 146.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2106 (XX)[2] of 21 December 1965.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		6 Jul 1983 *a*
Albania		11 May 1994 *a*
Algeria	9 Dec 1966	14 Feb 1972
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina	13 Jul 1967	2 Oct 1968
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Australia	13 Oct 1966	30 Sep 1975
Austria	22 Jul 1969	9 May 1972
Bahamas		5 Aug 1975 *d*
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 *a*
Bangladesh		11 Jun 1979 *a*
Barbados		8 Nov 1972 *a*
Belarus	7 Mar 1966	8 Apr 1969
Belgium	17 Aug 1967	7 Aug 1975
Benin	2 Feb 1967	
Bhutan	26 Mar 1973	
Bolivia	7 Jun 1966	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993 *d*
Botswana		20 Feb 1974 *a*
Brazil	7 Mar 1966	27 Mar 1968
Bulgaria	1 Jun 1966	8 Aug 1966
Burkina Faso		18 Jul 1974 *a*
Burundi	1 Feb 1967	27 Oct 1977
Cambodia	12 Apr 1966	28 Nov 1983
Cameroon	12 Dec 1966	24 Jun 1971
Canada	24 Aug 1966	14 Oct 1970
Cape Verde		3 Oct 1979 *a*
Central African Republic	7 Mar 1966	16 Mar 1971
Chad		17 Aug 1977 *a*
Chile	3 Oct 1966	20 Oct 1971
China[3]		29 Dec 1981 *a*
Colombia	23 Mar 1967	2 Sep 1981
Congo		11 Jul 1988 *a*
Costa Rica	14 Mar 1966	16 Jan 1967
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Jan 1973 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	7 Jun 1966	15 Feb 1972
Cyprus	12 Dec 1966	21 Apr 1967
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	21 Jun 1966	9 Dec 1971
Dominican Republic		25 May 1983 *a*
Ecuador		22 Sep 1966 *a*
Egypt	28 Sep 1966	1 May 1967
El Salvador		30 Nov 1979 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		23 Jun 1976 *a*
Fiji		11 Jan 1973 *d*
Finland	6 Oct 1966	14 Jul 1970
France		28 Jul 1971 *a*
Gabon	20 Sep 1966	29 Feb 1980
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 *a*
Germany[5, 6]	10 Feb 1967	16 May 1969
Ghana	8 Sep 1966	8 Sep 1966
Greece	7 Mar 1966	18 Jun 1970
Grenada	17 Dec 1981	
Guatemala	8 Sep 1967	18 Jan 1983
Guinea	24 Mar 1966	14 Mar 1977
Guyana	11 Dec 1968	15 Feb 1977
Haiti	30 Oct 1972	19 Dec 1972
Holy See	21 Nov 1966	1 May 1969
Hungary	15 Sep 1966	4 May 1967
Iceland	14 Nov 1966	13 Mar 1967
India	2 Mar 1967	3 Dec 1968
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Mar 1967	29 Aug 1968
Iraq	18 Feb 1969	14 Jan 1970
Ireland	21 Mar 1968	
Israel	7 Mar 1966	3 Jan 1979
Italy	13 Mar 1968	5 Jan 1976
Jamaica	14 Aug 1966	4 Jun 1971
Japan		15 Dec 1995 *a*
Jordan		30 May 1974 *a*
Kuwait		15 Oct 1968 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Feb 1974 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon		12 Nov 1971 *a*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1971 *a*
Liberia		5 Nov 1976 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		3 Jul 1968 *a*
Luxembourg	12 Dec 1967	1 May 1978
Madagascar	18 Dec 1967	7 Feb 1969
Maldives		24 Apr 1984 *a*
Mali		16 Jul 1974 *a*
Malta	5 Sep 1968	27 May 1971
Mauritania	21 Dec 1966	13 Dec 1988
Mauritius		30 May 1972 *a*
Mexico	1 Nov 1966	20 Feb 1975
Monaco		27 Sep 1995 *a*
Mongolia	3 May 1966	6 Aug 1969
Morocco	18 Sep 1967	18 Dec 1970
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 *a*
Namibia		11 Nov 1982 *a*
Nepal		30 Jan 1971 *a*
Netherlands	24 Oct 1966	10 Dec 1971
New Zealand	25 Oct 1966	22 Nov 1972
Nicaragua		15 Feb 1978 *a*
Niger	14 Mar 1966	27 Apr 1967
Nigeria		16 Oct 1967 *a*
Norway	21 Nov 1966	6 Aug 1970
Pakistan	19 Sep 1966	21 Sep 1966

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Panama	8 Dec 1966	16 Aug 1967
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 *a*
Peru	22 Jul 1966	29 Sep 1971
Philippines	7 Mar 1966	15 Sep 1967
Poland	7 Mar 1966	5 Dec 1968
Portugal		24 Aug 1982 *a*
Qatar		22 Jul 1976 *a*
Republic of Korea	8 Aug 1978	5 Dec 1978
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania		15 Sep 1970 *a*
Russian Federation	7 Mar 1966	4 Feb 1969
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 *a*
Saint Lucia		14 Feb 1990 *d*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
Senegal	22 Jul 1968	19 Apr 1972
Seychelles		7 Mar 1978 *a*
Sierra Leone	17 Nov 1966	2 Aug 1967
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		17 Mar 1982 *d*
Somalia	26 Jan 1967	26 Aug 1975
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	
Spain		13 Sep 1968 *a*
Sri Lanka		18 Feb 1982 *a*
Sudan		21 Mar 1977 *a*
Suriname		15 Mar 1984 *d*
Swaziland		7 Apr 1969 *a*
Sweden	5 May 1966	6 Dec 1971
Switzerland		29 Nov 1994 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 *a*
Tajikistan		11 Jan 1995 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 janv 1994 *d*
Togo		1 Sep 1972 *a*
Tonga		16 Feb 1972 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	9 Jun 1967	4 Oct 1973
Tunisia	12 Apr 1966	13 Jan 1967
Turkey	13 Oct 1972	
Turkmenistan		29 Sep 1994 *a*
Uganda		21 Nov 1980 *a*
Ukraine	7 Mar 1966	7 Mar 1969
United Arab Emirates		20 Jun 1974 *a*
United Kingdom[7]	11 Oct 1966	7 Mar 1969
United Republic of Tanzania		27 Oct 1972 *a*
United States of America	28 Sep 1966	21 Oct 1994
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	30 Aug 1968
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Venezuela	21 Apr 1967	10 Oct 1967
Viet Nam		9 Jun 1982 *a*
Yemen[8]		18 Oct 1972 *a*
Yugoslavia	15 Apr 1966	2 Oct 1967
Zaire		21 Apr 1976 *a*
Zambia	11 Oct 1968	4 Feb 1972
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

While acceding to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention since according to this article, in the event of disagreement between two or several States Parties to the Convention on the interpretation and implementation of provisions of the Convention, the matters could be referred to the International Court of Justice upon the request of only one side.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, therefore, states that should any disagreement emerge on the interpretation and implementation of the Convention, the matter will be referred to the International Court of Justice only if all concerned parties agree with that procedure.

Declaration:

Furthermore, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan states that the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination have a discriminatory nature against some states and therefore are not in conformity with the principle of universality of international treaties.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Declaration:

"The Constitution of Antigua and Barbuda entrenches and guarantees to every person in Antigua and Barbuda the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights, whether by the state or by a private individual. Acceptance of the Convention by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial processes beyond those provided in the Constitution.

The Government of Antigua and Barbuda interprets article 4 of the Convention as requiring a Party to enact measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation."

AUSTRALIA

"The Government of Australia . . . declares that Australia is not at present in a position specifically to treat as offences all the matters covered by article 4 (a) of the Convention. Acts of the kind there mentioned are punishable only to the extent provided by the existing criminal law dealing with such matters as the maintenance of public order, public mischief, assault, riot, criminal libel, conspiracy and attempts. It is the intention of the Australian Government, at the first suitable moment, to seek from Parliament legislation specifically implementing the terms of article 4 (a)."

AUSTRIA

"Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provides that the measures

specifically described in sub–paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) shall be undertaken with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. The Republic of Austria therefore considers that through such measures the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association may not be jeopardized. These rights are laid down in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and are referred to in article 5 (d) (viii) and (ix) of the present Convention."

BAHAMAS

"Firstly the Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas wishes to state its understanding of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration set out in article 5 of the Convention (in particular to freedom of opinion and expression and the right of freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to, or variation of existing law and practice in these fields is necessary for the attainment of the ends specified in article 4. Lastly, the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas entrenches and guarantees to every person in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial process to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Acceptance of this Convention by the Commonwealth of the Bahamas does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial process beyond these prescribed under the Constitution."

BAHRAIN[9]

Reservations:

"With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Bahrain declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the express consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case."

"Moreover, the accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BARBADOS

"The Constitution of Barbados entrenches and guarantees to every person in Barbados the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Accession to the Convention does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial processes beyond those provided in the Constitution.

The Government of Barbados interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to enact measures in the fields covered by sub–paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation."

BELARUS[10]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

BELGIUM

In order to meet the requirements of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Kingdom of Belgium will take care to adapt its legislation to the obligations it has assumed in becoming a party to the said Convention.

The Kingdom of Belgium nevertheless wishes to emphasize the importance which it attaches to the fact that article 4 of the Convention provides that the measures laid down in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) should be adopted with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. The Kingdom of Belgium therefore considers that the obligations imposed by article 4 must be reconciled with the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. Those rights are proclaimed in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and have been reaffirmed in articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. They have also been stated in article 5, subparagraph (d) (viii) and (ix) of the said Convention.

The Kingdom of Belgium also wishes to emphasize the importance which it attaches to respect for the rights set forth in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, especially in articles 10 and 11 dealing respectively with freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

BULGARIA[11]

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and article 18, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the effect of which is to prevent sovereign States from becoming Parties to the Convention, are of a discriminatory nature. The Convention, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, should be open for accession by all States without any discrimination whatsoever.

CHINA[12]

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China has reservations on the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and will not be bound by it. *(The reservation was circulated by the Secretary–General on 13 January 1982.)*

Declaration:

The signing and ratification of the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China are illegal and null and void.

CUBA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba will make such reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when the Convention is ratified.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not accept the provision in article 22 of the Convention to the effect that disputes between two or more States Parties shall be referred to the International Court of Justice, since it considers that such disputes should be settled exclusively by the procedures expressly provided for in the Convention or by negotiation through the diplomatic channel between the disputants.

Statement:

This Convention, intended to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination, should not, as it expressly does in articles 17 and 18, exclude States not Members of the United Nations, members of the specialized agencies or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice from making an effective contribution under the Convention, since these articles constitute in themselves a form of discrimination that is at variance with the principles set out in the Convention; the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba accordingly ratifies the Convention, but with the qualification just indicated.

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK[13]

EGYPT[14]

"The United Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

FIJI

The reservation and declarations formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom on behalf of Fiji are affirmed but have been redrafted in the following terms:

"To the extent, if any, that any law relating to elections in Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (c), that any law relating to land in Fiji which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (d) (v), or that the school system of Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in articles 2, 3, or 5 (e) (v), the Government of Fiji reserves the right not to implement the aforementioned provisions of the Convention.

"The Government of Fiji wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier par of Article 4.

Further, the Government of Fiji interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an and. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

"The Government of Fiji maintains the view that Article 15 is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories whilst making no comparable provision for States without such territories."

FRANCE[15]

With regard to article 4, France wishes to make it clear that it interprets the reference made therein to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the rights set forth in article 5 of the Convention as releasing the States Parties from the obligation to enact anti-discrimination legislation which is incompatible with the freedoms of opinion and expression and of peaceful assembly and association guaranteed by those texts.

With regard to article 6, France declares that the question of remedy through tribunals is, as far as France is concerned, governed by the rules of ordinary law.

With regard to article 15, France's accession to the Convention may not be interpreted as implying any change in its position regarding the resolution mentioned in that provision.

GUYANA

"The Government of the Republic of Guyana do not interpret the provisions of this Convention as imposing upon them any obligation going beyond the limits set by the Constitution of Guyana or imposing upon them any obligation requiring the introduction of judicial processes going beyond those provided under the same Constitution."

HUNGARY[16]

"The Hungarian People's Republic considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and of article 18, paragraph 1, of the Convention, barring accession to the Convention by all States, are of a discriminating nature and contrary to international law. The Hungarian People's Republic maintains its general position that multilateral treaties of a universal character should, in conformity with the principles of sovereign equality of States, be open for accession by all States without any discrimination whatever."

INDIA[17]

"The Government of India declare that for reference of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision in terms of Article 22 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary in each individual case."

IRAQ[9]

Upon signature:

"The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq hereby declares that signature for and on behalf of the Republic of Iraq of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 December 1965, as well

as approval by the Arab States of the said Convention and entry into it by their respective governments, shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or lead to entry by the Arab States into such dealings with Israel as may be regulated by the said Convention.

"Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Iraq does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article twenty-two of the Convention afore-mentioned and affirms its reservation that it does not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice provided for in the said article."

Upon ratification:

1. The acceptance and ratification of the Convention by Iraq shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by Iraq into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Convention;

2. Iraq does not accept the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The Republic of Iraq does not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and deems it necessary that in all cases the approval of all parties to the dispute be secured before the case is referred to the International Court of Justice.

ISRAEL

"The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the said Convention."

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

(a) The positive measures, provided for in article 4 of the Convention and specifically described in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of that article, designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, discrimination, are to be interpreted, as that article provides, "with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5" of the Convention. Consequently, the obligations deriving from the aforementioned article 4 are not to jeopardize the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association which are laid down in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and are referred to in articles 5 (d) (viii) and (ix) of the Convention. In fact, the Italian Government, in conformity with the obligations resulting from Articles 55 (c) and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations, remains faithful to the principle laid down in article 29 (2) of the Universal Declaration, which provides that "in the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society."

(b) Effective remedies against acts of racial discrimination which violate his individual rights and fundamental freedoms will be assured to everyone, in conformity with article 6 of the Convention, by the ordinary courts within the framework of their respective jurisdiction. Claims for reparation for any damage suffered as a result of acts of racial discrimination must be brought against the persons responsible for the malicious or criminal acts which caused such damage.

JAMAICA

"The Constitution of Jamaica entrenches and guarantees to every person in Jamaica the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Ratification of the Convention by Jamaica does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce judicial processes beyond those prescribed under the Constitution."

JAPAN

Reservation:

"In applying the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of article 4 of the [said Convention] Japan fulfills the obligations under those provisions to the extent that fulfillement of the obligations is compatible with the guarantee of the rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression and other rights under the Constitution of Japan, noting the phrase 'with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of this Convention' referred to in article 4."

KUWAIT[9]

"In acceding to the said Convention, the Government of the State of Kuwait takes the view that its accession does not in any way imply recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige it to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said country.

"The Government of the State of Kuwait does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any party to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

LEBANON

The Republic of Lebanon does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any party to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all States parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[9]

"*(a)* The Kingdom of Libya does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

"*(b)* It is understood that the accession to this Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the Kingdom of Libya. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Kingdom of Libya and Israel."

MADAGASCAR

The Government of the Malagasy Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referral of the dispute to the International Court.

MALTA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification :

"The Government of Malta wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention.

"It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article should it consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights set forth in article 5 of the Convention, that the need arises to enact 'ad hoc' legislation, in addition to or variation of existing law and practice to bring to an end any act of racial discrimination.

"Further, the Government of Malta interprets the requirements in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end."

MONACO

Reservation regarding article 2, paragraph 1:

Monaco reserves the right to apply its own legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the labour market of the Principality.

Reservation regarding article 4:

Monaco interprets the reference in that article to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to the rights enumerated in article 5 of the Convention as releasing States Parties from the obligation to promulgate repressive laws which are incompatible with freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association, which are guaranteed by those instruments.

MONGOLIA[18]

The Mongolian People's Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and it holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

MOROCCO

The Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Kingdom of Morocco states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

MOZAMBIQUE

Reservation:

"The People's Republic of Mozambique does not consider to be bound by the provision of article 22 and wishes to restate that for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision in terms of the said article, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary in each individual case."

NEPAL

"The Constitution of Nepal contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, including the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to form unions and associations not motivated by party politics and the right to freedom of professing his/her own religion; and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by Nepal incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of Nepal.

"His Majesty's Government interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only insofar as His Majesty's Government may consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. His Majesty's Government interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available; and further interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end.

"His Majesty's Government does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 22 of the Convention under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA[12]

Reservation:

"The Government of Papua New Guinea interprets article 4 of the Convention as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the areas covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles contained in the Universal Declaration set out in Article 5 of the Convention that some legislative addition to, or variation of existing law and practice, is necessary to give effect to the provisions of Article 4. In addition, the Constitution of Papua New Guinea guarantees certain fundamental rights and freedoms to all persons irrespective of their race or place of origin. The Constitution also provides for judicial protection of these rights and freedoms. Acceptance of this Convention does not therefore indicate the acceptance of obligations by the Government of Papua New Guinea which go beyond those provided by the Constitution, nor does it indicate the acceptance of any obligation to introduce judicial process beyond that provided by the Constitution". (*The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 22 February 1982.*)

POLAND

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention.

The Polish People's Republic considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and article 18, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial

Discrimination, which make it impossible for many States to become parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and are incompatible with the object and purpose of that Convention.

The Polish People's Republic considers that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the said Convention should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or restrictions whatsoever.

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, whereby any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation or by the procedures expressly provided for in the Convention shall, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination are not in accordance with the principle that multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the world community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[10]

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

RWANDA

The Rwandese Republic does not consider itself as bound by article 22 of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SPAIN

With a reservation in respect of the whole of article 22 (jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice).

SWITZERLAND

Reservation concerning article 4:

Switzerland reserves the right to take the legislative measures necessary for the implementation of article 4, taking due account of freedom of opinion and freedom of association, provided for *inter alia* in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Reservation concerning article 2, paragraph 1 (a):

Switzerland reserves the right to apply its legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the Swiss market.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[9]

1. The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said Convention.

2. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the Parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Syrian Arab Republic states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

TONGA[19]

Reservation:

"To the extent, [. . .], that any law relating to land in Tonga which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (d) (v), [. . .], the Kingdom of Tonga reserves the right not to apply the Convention to Tonga.

Declaration:

"Secondly, the Kingdom of Tonga wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. Further, the Kingdom of Tonga interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

"Lastly, the Kingdom of Tonga maintains its position in regard to article 15. In its view this article is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories while making no comparable provision for States without such territories. Moreover, the article purports to establish a procedure applicable to the dependent territories of States whether or not those State shave become parties to the Convention. His Majesty's Government have decided that the Kingdom of Tonga should accede to the Convention, these objections notwithstanding because of the importance they attach to the Convention as a whole."

UKRAINE[10]

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the

Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[9]

"The accession of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relations with Israel."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

Subject to the following reservation and interpretative statements:

"First, in the present circumstances deriving from the usurpation of power in Rhodesia by the illegal régime, the United Kingdom must sign subject to a reservation of the right not to apply the Convention to Rhodesia unless and until the United Kingdom informs the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it is in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented.

"Secondly, the United Kingdom wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. Further, the United Kingdom interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

"Lastly, the United Kingdom maintains its position in regard to article 15. In its view this article is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories while making no comparable provision for States without such territories. Moreover, the article purports to establish a procedure applicable to the dependent territories of States whether or not those States have become parties to the Convention. Her Majesty's Government have decided that the United Kingdom should sign the Convention, these objections notwithstanding, because of the importance they attach to the Convention as a whole."

Upon ratification:

"First, the reservation and interpretative statements made by the United Kingdom at the time of signature of the Convention are maintained.

"Secondly, the United Kingdom does not regard the Commonwealth Immigrants Acts, 1962 and 1968, or their application, as involving any racial discrimination within the meaning of paragraph 1 of article 1, or any other provision of the Convention, and fully reserves its right to continue to apply those Acts.

"Lastly, to the extent if any, that any law relating to election in Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (c), that any law relating to land in Fiji which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5 (d) (v), or that the school system of Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in articles 2, 3 or 5 (e) (v), the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply the Convention to Fiji."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

"The Constitution of the United States contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, such as the right of free speech, and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by the United States of America incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America."

Upon ratification:

"I. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservations:

(1) That the Constitution and laws of the United States contain extensive protections of individual freedom of speech, expression and association. Accordingly, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention, in particular under articles 4 and 7, to restrict those rights, through the adoption of legislation or any other measures, to the extent that they are protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(2) That the Constitution and laws of the United States establish extensive protections against discrimination, reaching significant areas of non-governmental activity. Individual privacy and freedom from governmental interference in private conduct, however, are also recognized as among the fundamental values which shape our free and democratic society. The United States understands that the identification of the rights protected under the Convention by reference in article 1 to fields of 'public life' reflects a similar distinction between spheres of public conduct that are customarily the subject of governmental regulation, and shperes of private conduct that are not. To the extent, however, that the Convention calls for a broader regulation of private conduct, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention to enact legislation or take other measures under paragraph (1) of article 2, subparagraphs (1) (c) and (d) of article 2, article 3 and article 5 with respect to private conduct except as mandated by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(3) That with reference to article 22 of the Convention, before any dispute to which the United States is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the United States is required in each case.

II. the Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understanding, which shall apply to the obligations of the United States under this Convention:

That the United States understands that this Convention shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the state and local governments. to the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall, as necessary, take appropriate measures to ensure the fulfilment of this Convention.

III. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration:

That the United States declares that the provisions of the Convention are not self-executing."

VIET NAM[12]

Declaration:

(1) The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam declares that the provisions of article 17 (1) and of article 18 (1) of the Convention whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity of becoming Parties to the said Convention are of a

discriminatory nature and it considers that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

Reservation:

(2) The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and holds that, for any dispute with regard to the interpretation or application of the Convention to be brought before the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary. (*The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 10 August 1982.*)

YEMEN[8,9]

"The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said Convention.

"The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referral of the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

"The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen states that the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 1, and Article 18, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be opened to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

8 August 1989

"In accordance with article 20 (2), Australia objects to [the reservations made by Yemen] which it considers impermissible as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention."

BELARUS

29 December 1983

The ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by the so-called "Government of Democratic Kampuchea" – the Pol Pot–Ieng Sary clique of hangmen overthrown by the Kampuchean people – is completely unlawful and has no legal force. There is only one State of Kampuchea in the world – The People's Republic of Kampuchea, recognized by a large number of countries. All power in this State is entirely in the hands of its only lawful Government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has the exclusive right to act in the name of Kampuchea in the international arena, including the right to ratify international agreements prepared within the United Nations.

The farce involving the ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by a clique representing no one mocks the norms of law and morality and blasphemes the memory of millions of Kampuchean victims of the genocide committed by the Pol Pot–Ieng Sary régime.

BELGIUM

8 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and consequently are not permitted pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

CANADA

10 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The effect of these reservations would be to allow racial discrimination in respect of certain of the rights enumerated in Article 5. Since the objective of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as stated in its Preamble, is to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations, the Government of Canada believes that the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic are incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention. Moreover, the Government of Canada believes that the principle of non-discrimination is generally accepted and recognized in international law and therefore is binding on all states."

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK

10 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention, to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in the article.

The reservations made by the Government of Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and the reservations are consequently impermissible according to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention. In accordance with article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention the Government of Denmark therefore formally objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Denmark and Yemen, and the reservations cannot alter or modify in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

ETHIOPIA

25 January 1984

"The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia should like to reiterate that the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is the sole legitimate representative of the People of Kampuchea and as such it alone has the authority to act on behalf of Kampuchea.

The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia, therefore, considers the ratification of the so-called 'Government of Democratic Kampuchea' to be null and void."

FINLAND

7 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The Government of Finland formally, and in accordance with article 20 (2) of the Convention, objects to the reservations made by Yemen to the above-provisions.

In the first place, the reservations concerns matters which are of fundamental importance in the Convention. The first paragraph of article 5 clearly brings this out. According to it, the Parties have undertaken to guarantee the rights listed in that article "In compliance with fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention". Clearly, provisions prohibiting racial discrimination in the granting of such fundamental political rights and civil liberties as the right to participate in public life, to marry and choose a spouse, to inherit and to enjoy freedom of thought, conscience and religion are central in a convention against racial discrimination. Therefore, the reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as specified in paragraph 20 (2) thereof and in article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Finland that it would be unthinkable that merely by making a reservation to the said provisions, a State could achieve the liberty to start discriminatory practices on the grounds of race, colour, or national or ethnic origin in regard to such fundamental political rights and civil liberties as the right to participate in the conduct of public affairs, the right of marriage and choice of spouse, the right of inheritance and the freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Any racial discrimination in respect of those general principles of human rights law as reflected in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the practice of States and international organizations. By making a reservation a State cannot contract out from universally binding human rights standards.

For the above-reasons, the Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by Yemen are devoid of legal effect. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this fact is an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention in respect of Yemen."

FRANCE

15 May 1984

The Government of the French Republic, which does not recognize the coalition government of the Democratic Cambodia, declares that the instrument of ratification by the coalition government of Democratic Cambodia of the [International] Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, is without effect.

20 September 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

France considers that the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination are not valid as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between France and the Yemen Arab Republic.

GERMANY

8 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"These reservations relate to the basic obligations of States Parties to the Convention to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone to equality before the law and include the enjoyment of such fundamental political and civil rights as the right to take part in the conduct of public life, the right to marriage and choice of spouse, the right to inherit and the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. As a result, the reservations made by Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention within the meaning of article 20, paragraph 2 thereof."

ITALY

7 August 1989

"The Government of the Republic of Italy raises an objection to the reservations entered by the Government of the Arab Republic of Yemen to article 5 [(c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii)] of the above-mentioned Convention."

MEXICO

11 August 1989

With regard to reservation made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The Government of the United Mexican States has concluded that, in view of article 20 of the Convention, the reservation must be deemed invalid, as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Said reservation, if implemented would result in discrimination to the detriment of a certain sector of the population and, at the same time, would violate the rights established in articles 2, 16 and 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The objection of the United Mexican States to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the Convention of 1966 between the United States of Mexico and the Government of Yemen.

MONGOLIA

7 June 1984

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination by the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a regime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void."

NETHERLANDS

25 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned reservations, as they are incompatible with object and purpose of the Convention.

These objections are not an obstacle for the entry into force of this Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Yemen."

NEW ZEALAND

4 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The New Zealand Government is of the view that those provisions contain undertakings which are themselves fundamental to the Convention. Accordingly it considers that the reservations purportedly made by Yemen relating to political and civil rights are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Treaty within the terms of the article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of New Zealand advises therefore under article 20 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination that it does not accept the reservations made by Yemen."

NORWAY

28 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"The Government of Norway hereby enters its formal objection to the reservations made by Yemen."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

28 December 1983

The ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by the so-called "Government of Democratic Kampuchea" – the Pol Pot clique of hangmen overthrown by the Kampuchean people – is completely unlawful and has no legal force. Only the representatives authorized by the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea can act in the name of Kampuchea. There is only one State of Kampuchea in the world – the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has been recognized by a large number of countries. All power in this State is entirely in the hands of its only lawful Government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has the exclusive right to act in the name of Kampuchea in the international arena, including the right to ratify international agreements prepared within the United Nations.

Nor should one fail to observe that the farce involving the ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by a clique representing no one mocks the norms of law and morality and is a direct insult to the memory of millions of Kampuchean victims of the genocide committed against the Kampuchean people by the Pol Pot Sary régime. The entire international community is familiar with the bloody crimes of that puppet clique.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SWEDEN

5 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

"Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention, to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in the article.

The Government of Sweden has come to the conclusion that the reservations made by Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Sweden and Yemen, and the reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

UKRAINE

17 January 1984

The ratification of the above-mentioned international Convention by the Pol Pot–Ieng Sary clique, which is guilty of the annihilation of millions of Kampucheans and which was overthrown in 1979 by the Kampuchean people, is thoroughly illegal and has no juridical force. There is only one Kampuchean State in the World, namely, the People's Republic of Kampuchea. All authority in this State is vested wholly in its sole legitimate government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. This Government alone has the exclusive right to speak on behalf of Kampuchea at the international level, while the supreme organ of State power, the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea has the exclusive right to ratify international agreements drawn up within the framework of the United Nations.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

4 August 1989

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not accept the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic to article 5 (c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination."

VIET NAM

29 February 1984

"The Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam considers that only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which is the sole genuine and legitimate representative of the Kampuchean People, is empowered to act in their behalf to sign, ratify or accede to international conventions.

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam rejects as null and void the ratification of the above-mentioned international Convention by the so-called "Democratic Kampuchea" – a genocidal regime overthrown by the Kampuchean people since January 7, 1979.

Furthermore, the ratification of the Convention by a genocidal regime, which massacred more than 3 million Kampuchean people in gross violation of fundamental standards of morality and international laws on human rights, simply plays down the significance of the Convention and jeopardises the prestige of the United Nations."

Declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in accordance with article 14 of the Convention[20]

ALGERIA

12 September 1989

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by it of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be

victims of a violation by Australia of any of the rights set forth in the aforesaid Convention."

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Bulgaria of any of the rights set forth in this Convention."

CHILE

18 May 1994

In accordance with article 14 (1) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of Chile declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Government of Chile of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

COSTA RICA

8 January 1974

Costa Rica recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 8 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in accordance with article 14 of the Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the State of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

CYPRUS

"The Republic of Cyprus recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 14 (1) of [the Convention] to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Cyprus of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

DENMARK

11 October 1985

Denmark recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Danish jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Denmark of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communications unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been, and is not being, examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ECUADOR

18 March 1977

The State of Ecuador, by virtue of Article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention.

FINLAND

16 November 1994

"Finland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Finland claiming to be victims of a violation by Finland of any of the rights set forth in the said Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

FRANCE

16 August 1982

[The Government of the French Republic declares], in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination opened for signature on 7 March 1966, [that it] recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to received and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within French jurisdiction that either by reason of acts or omissions, events or deeds occurring after 15 August 1982, or by reason of a decision concerning the acts or omissions, events or deeds after the said date, would complain of being victims of a violation, by the French Republic, of one of the rights mentioned in the Convention.

HUNGARY

13 September 1989

"The Hungarian People's Republic hereby recognizes the competence of the Committee established by the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provided for in paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention."

ICELAND

10 August 1981

[The Government of Iceland declares] "in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination which was opened for signature in New York on 7 March 1966, that Iceland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Iceland claiming to be victims of a violation by Iceland of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

ITALY

5 May 1978

With reference to article 14, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, the Government of the Italian Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by the afore-mentioned Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Italian jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Italy of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

The Government of the Italian Republic recognizes that competence on the understanding that the Committee on the Elimin-

ation of Racial Discrimination shall not consider any communication without ascertaining that the same matter is not being considered or has not already been considered by another international body of investigation or settlement.

NETHERLANDS

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination concluded at New York on 7 March 1966, the Kingdom of the Netherlands recognizes, for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the competence of the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation, by the Kingdom of the Netherlands, of any of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention.

NORWAY

23 January 1976

"The Norwegian Government recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Norway claiming to be victims of a violation by Norway of any of the rights set forth in the International Convention of 21 December 1965 on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination according to article 14 of the said Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

PERU

27 November 1984

[The Government of the Republic of Peru declares] that, in accordance with its policy of full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms,without distinctions as to race, sex, language or religion, and with the aim of strengthening the international instruments on the subject, Peru recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction, who claim to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in conformity with the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications, in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of the USSR claiming to be victims of a violation by the USSR of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SENEGAL

3 December 1982

In accordance with [article 14], the Government of Senegal declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee (on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination) to receive and consider communications from individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Senegal of any of the rights set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

SLOVAKIA

17 March 1995

The Slovak Republic, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SWEDEN

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Sweden claiming to be victims of a violation by Sweden of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

UKRAINE

28 July 1992

In accordance with the article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination, Ukraine declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals [within its jurisdiction] claiming to be victims of a violation by [it] of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

URUGUAY

11 September 1972

The Government of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, under article 14 of the Convention.

NOTES:

[1] Article 19 of the Convention provides that the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification or instrument of accession. On 5 December 1968, the Government of Poland deposited the twenty-seventh instrument. However, among those instruments there were some which contained a reservation and therefore were subject to the provisions of article 20 of the Convention allowing States to notify objections within ninety days from the date of circulation by the Secretary-General of the reservations. In respect of two such instruments, namely those of Kuwait and Spain, the ninety-day period had not yet expired on the date of deposit of the twenty-seventh instrument. The reservation contained in one further instrument, that of India, had not yet been circulated on that date, and the twenty-seventh instrument itself, that of Poland, contained a reservation; in respect of these two instruments the ninety-day period would only begin to run on the date of the Secretary-General's notification of their deposit. Therefore, in that notification, which was dated 13 December 1968, the Secretary-General called the attention of the interested States to the situation and stated the following:

"It appears from the provisions of article 20 of the Convention that it would not be possible to determine the legal effect of the four

instruments in question pending the expiry of the respective periods of time mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Having regard to the above-mentioned consideration, the Secretary-General is not at the present time in a position to ascertain the date of entry into force of the Convention."

Subsequently, in a notification dated 17 March 1969, the Secretary-General informed the interested States: (*a*) that within the period of ninety days from the date of his previous notification he had received an objection from one State to the reservation contained in the instrument of ratification by the Government of India; and (*b*) that the Convention, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 19, had entered into force on 4 January 1969, i.e., on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Government of Poland, which was the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification or instrument of accession deposited with the Secretary-General.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 14* (A/6014),p. 47.

[3] The Convention had previously been signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 31 March 1966 and 10 December 1970, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, communications have been received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of Bulgaria (12 March 1971), Mongolia (11 January 1971), the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (9 June 1971), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (21 April 1971) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (18 January 1971) stating that they considered the said signature and/or ratification as null and void, since the so-called "Government of China" had no right to speak or assume obligations on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twentieth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned, signed the Convention and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof, and that "any statements and reservations relating to the above-mentioned Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under this Convention".

Finally, upon depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of the People's Republic of China made the following declaration: The signing and ratification of the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1966 and 29 December 1966, respectively, with reservations. Subsequently, on 12 March 1984, the Government of Czechoslovakia made an objection to the ratification by Democratic Kampuchea. Further, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservations and the objection see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 660, p. 276 and vol. 1350, p. 386, respectively. See also note 8 below and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 23 March 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 883, p. 190.

Moreover, on 26 April 1984, the Government of the German Democratic Republic had made an objection with regard to the ratification made by the Government of the Democratic Kampuchea. For the text of the objection, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1355, p. 327. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention "shall also apply to Land Berlin with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, the Secretary-General received communications from the Governments of Bulgaria (16 September 1969), Czechoslovakia (3 November 1969. See note 4 in this chapter), Mongolia (7 January 1970), Poland (20 June 1969), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (10 November 1969) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (4 August 1969). The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred in the second paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3.

On 27 December 1973, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made in respect of the above-mentioned declaration a declaration which is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one reproduced in the fourth paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany (15 July 1974 and 19 September 1975), France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (17 June 1974 and 8 July 1975), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (19 September 1974) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (12 September 1974 and 8 December 1975), declarations identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

See also note 5 above.

[7] With respect to the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Christopher Nevis Anguilla and Saint Lucia) and Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the State of Brunei, the Kingdom of Tonga and the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

[8] The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention on 6 April 1989 with the following reservation:

Reservations in respect of article 5 (c) and article 5 (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii).

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 30 April 1990, from the Government of Czechoslovakia the following objection:

"The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations of the Government of Yemen with respect to article 5 (c) and articles 5 (d) (iv), (vi), and (vii) of [the Convention], as incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention."

See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[9] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 July 1969, the Government of Israel declared:

"[The Government of Israel] has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Iraq on signing the above Convention.

In the view of the Government of Israel, the Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity. Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Israel that no legal relevance can be attached to those Iraqi statements which purport to represent the views of the other States".

Except for the omission of the last sentence, identical communications in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel as follows: on 29 December 1966 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of the United Arab Republic upon signature (see also note 14 below); on 16 August 1968 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Libya upon accession; on 12 December 1968 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Kuwait upon accession; on 9 July 1969 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Syria upon accession; on 21 April 1970 made in respect of the declaration made by Government of Iraq upon ratification with the following statement "With regard to the political declaration in the guise of a reservation made on the occasion of the ratification of the above Treaty, the Government of Israel wishes to refer to its objection circulated by the Secretary-General in his letter [. . .] and to maintain that objection."; on 12 February 1973 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen upon accession; on 25 September 1974 in respect of the declaration made by the United

Arab Emirates upon accession and on 25 June 1990 in respect of the reservation made by Bahrain upon accession.

[10] In communications received on 8 March, 19 and 20 April 1989, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Sovie Socialist Republic, respectively, notified the Secretary–General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations relating to article 22. For the texts of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 676, p. 397, vol. 681, p. 392 and vol. 677, p. 435.

[11] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 660, p. 270.

[12] None of the States concerned having objected to the reservation by the end of a period of ninety days after the date when it was circulated by the Secretary–General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 20 (1).

[13] In a communication received on 4 October 1972, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary–General that it withdrew the reservation made with regard to the implementation on the Faroe Islands of the Convention. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 820, p. 457.

The legislation by which the Convention has been implemented on the Faroe Islands entered into force by 1 November 1972, from which date the withdrawal of the above reservation became effective.

[14] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration it had made in respect of Israel. For the text of the declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 660, p. 318. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

[15] In a communication received subsequently, the Government of France indicated that the first paragraph of the declaration did not purport to limit the obligations under the Convention in respect of the French Government, but only to record the latter's interpretation of article 4 of the Convention.

[16] In a communication received on 13 September 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 22 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 660, p. 310.

[17] In a communication received on 24 February 1969, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary–General that it "has decided not to accept the reservation made by the Government of India in her instrument of ratification".

[18] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw the reservation concerning article 22 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 660, p. 289.

[19] By a notification received on 28 October 1977, the Government of Tonga informed the Secretary–General that it has decided to withdraw only those reservations made upon accession relating to article 5 (c) in so far as it relates to elections, and reservations relating to articles 2, 3 and 5 (e) (v), in so far as these articles relate to education and training. For the text of the original reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 829, p. 371.

[20] The first ten declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination took effect on 3 December 1982, date of the deposit of the tenth declaration, according to article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

(a) Amendment to article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination

Adopted at the Fourteenth Meeting of the States Parties on 15 January 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see paragraph 4 of the Decision of the States Parties).
TEXT: Doc. CERD/sp/45.
STATUS: Acceptances: 17.

Note: The amendment proposed by the Government of Australia and circulated by the Secretary-General under cover of depositary notification C.N.285.1991.TREATIES-4 of 20 December 1991, was adopted by the States Parties to the Convention at their Fourteenth Meeting and submitted to the General Assembly in accordance with article 23 of the Convention. The General Assembly endorsed the said amendment at its Forty-seventh session by resolution 47/111 of 16 December 1992.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*
Australia	15 Oct 1993	New Zealand	8 Oct 1993
Bahamas	31 Mar 1994	Norway	6 Oct 1993
Bulgaria	2 Mar 1995	Republic of Korea	30 Nov 1993
Burkina Faso	9 Aug 1993	Seychelles	23 Jul 1993
Canada	8 Feb 1995	Sweden	14 May 1993
Denmark	3 Sep 1993	Trinidad and Tobago	23 Aug 1993
Finland	9 Feb 1994	Ukraine	17 Jun 1994
France	1 Sep 1994	United Kingdom	7 Feb 1994
Netherlands[1]	24 Jan 1995		

NOTES:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

3. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27.[1]
REGISTRATION: 3 January 1976, No. 14531.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 59. Parties: 133.

Note: The Covenant was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		24 Jan 1983 *a*
Albania		4 Oct 1991 *a*
Algeria	10 Dec 1968	12 Sep 1989
Angola		10 Jan 1992 *a*
Argentina	19 Feb 1968	8 Aug 1986
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia	18 Dec 1972	10 Dec 1975
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Sep 1978
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 *a*
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 *a*
Belarus	19 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
Belgium	10 Dec 1968	21 Apr 1983
Benin		12 Mar 1992 *a*
Bolivia		12 Aug 1982 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil		24 Jan 1992 *a*
Bulgaria	8 Oct 1968	21 Sep 1970
Burundi		9 May 1990 *a*
Cambodia[2,3]	17 Oct 1980	26 May 1992 *a*
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 *a*
Canada		19 May 1976 *a*
Cape Verde		6 Aug 1993 *a*
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile	16 Sep 1969	10 Feb 1972
China[4]		
Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Congo		5 Oct 1983 *a*
Costa Rica	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Côte d'Ivoire		26 Mar 1992 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus	9 Jan 1967	2 Apr 1969
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		14 Sep 1981 *a*
Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Dominica		17 Jun 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 *a*
Ecuador	29 Sep 1967	6 Mar 1969
Egypt	4 Aug 1967	14 Jan 1982
El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	30 Nov 1979
Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		11 Jun 1993 *a*
Finland	11 Oct 1967	19 Aug 1975
France		4 Nov 1980 *a*
Gabon		21 Jan 1983 *a*
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 *a*
Georgia		3 May 1994 *a*
Germany[6,7]	9 Oct 1968	17 Dec 1973
Greece		16 May 1985 *a*
Grenada		6 Sep 1991 *a*
Guatemala		19 May 1988 *a*
Guinea	28 Feb 1967	24 Jan 1978
Guinea-Bissau		2 Jul 1992 *a*
Guyana	22 Aug 1968	15 Feb 1977
Honduras	19 Dec 1966	17 Feb 1981
Hungary	25 Mar 1969	17 Jan 1974
Iceland	30 Dec 1968	22 Aug 1979
India		10 Apr 1979 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Apr 1968	24 Jun 1975
Iraq	18 Feb 1969	25 Jan 1971
Ireland	1 Oct 1973	8 Dec 1989
Israel	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1991
Italy	18 Jan 1967	15 Sep 1978
Jamaica	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1975
Japan	30 May 1978	21 Jun 1979
Jordan	30 Jun 1972	28 May 1975
Kenya		1 May 1972 *a*
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon		3 Nov 1972 *a*
Lesotho		9 Sep 1992 *a*
Liberia	18 Apr 1967	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 May 1970 *a*
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 *a*
Luxembourg	26 Nov 1974	18 Aug 1983
Madagascar	14 Apr 1970	22 Sep 1971
Malawi		22 Dec 1993 *a*
Mali		16 Jul 1974 *a*
Malta	22 Oct 1968	13 Sep 1990
Mauritius		12 Dec 1973 *a*
Mexico		23 Mar 1981 *a*
Mongolia	5 Jun 1968	18 Nov 1974
Morocco	19 Jan 1977	3 May 1979
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Nepal		14 May 1991 *a*
Netherlands	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
New Zealand	12 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Nicaragua		12 Mar 1980 *a*
Niger		7 Mar 1986 *a*
Nigeria		29 Jul 1993 *a*
Norway	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Panama	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Paraguay		10 Jun 1992 *a*
Peru	11 Aug 1977	28 Apr 1978
Philippines	19 Dec 1966	7 Jun 1974
Poland	2 Mar 1967	18 Mar 1977
Portugal	7 Oct 1976	31 Jul 1978
Republic of Korea		10 Apr 1990 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania	27 Jun 1968	9 Dec 1974

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1968	16 Oct 1973
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
San Marino		18 Oct 1985 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe	31 Oct 1995	
Senegal	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands[8]		17 Mar 1982 *d*
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 *a*
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	
Spain	28 Sep 1976	27 Apr 1977
Sri Lanka		11 Jun 1980 *a*
Sudan		18 Mar 1986 *a*
Suriname		28 Dec 1976 *a*
Sweden	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971
Switzerland		18 Jun 1992 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		24 May 1984 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		8 Dec 1978 *a*
Tunisia	30 Apr 1968	18 Mar 1969
Uganda		21 Jan 1987 *a*
Ukraine	20 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
United Kingdom	16 Sep 1968	20 May 1976
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Jun 1976 *a*
United States of America	5 Oct 1977	
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Venezuela	24 Jun 1969	10 May 1978
Viet Nam		24 Sep 1982 *a*
Yemen[9]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	8 Aug 1967	2 Jun 1971
Zaire		1 Nov 1976 *a*
Zambia		10 Apr 1984 *a*
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Declaration:

The presiding body of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares that the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and provisions of paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, according to which some countries cannot join the aforesaid Covenants, contradicts the International character of the aforesaid Treaties. Therefore, according to the equal rights to all States to sovereignty, both Covenants should be left open for the purpose of the participation of all States.

ALGERIA[10]

Interpretative declarations:

1. The Algerian Government interprets article 1, which is common to the two Covenants, as in no case impairing the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and to control over their natural wealth and resources.

It further considers that the maintenance of the State of dependence of certain territories referred to in article 1, paragraph 3, of the two Covenants and in article 14 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, to the Charter of the Organization and to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)].

2. The Algerian Government interprets the provisions of article 8 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 22 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as making the law the framework for action by the State with respect to the organization and exercise of the right to organize.

3. The Algerian Government considers that the provisions of article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights can in no case impair its right freely to organize its educational system.

4. The Algerian Government interprets the provisions of article 23, paragraph 4, of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights regarding the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution as in no way impairing the essential foundations of the Algerian legal system.

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados states that it reserves the right to postpone–

"(*a*) The application of sub-paragraph (a) (1) of article 7 of the Covenant in so far as it concerns the provision of equal pay to men and women for equal work;

"(*b*) The application of article 10 (2) in so far as it relates to the special protection to be accorded mothers during a reasonable period during and after childbirth; and

"(*c*) The application of article 13 (2) (a) of the Covenant, in so far as it relates to primary education; since, while the Barbados Government fully accepts the principles embodied in the same articles and undertakes to take the necessary steps to apply them in their entirety, the problems of implementation are such that full application of the principles in question cannot be guaranteed at this stage."

BELARUS[11]

BELGIUM

Interpretative declarations:

1. With respect to article 2, paragraph 2, the Belgian Government interprets non-discrimination as to national origin as not necessarily implying an obligation on States automatically to guarantee to foreigners the same rights as to their nationals. The term should be understood to refer to the elimination of any arbitrary behaviour but not of differences in treatment based on objec-

tive and reasonable considerations, in conformity with the principles prevailing in democratic societies.

2. With respect to article 2, paragraph 3, the Belgian Government understands that this provision cannot infringe the principle of fair compensation in the event of expropriation or nationalization.

BULGARIA

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria deems it necessary to underline that the provisions of article 48, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become parties to the Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature. These provisions are inconsistent with the very nature of the Covenants, which are universal in character and should be open for accession by all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, no State has the right to bar other States from becoming parties to a covenant of this kind."

CONGO

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of the Congo declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 . . .

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights embody the principle of freedom of education by allowing parents the liberty to choose for their children schools other than those established by the public authorities. Those provisions also authorize individuals to establish and direct educational institutions.

In our country, such provisions are inconsistent with the principle of nationalization of education and with the monopoly granted to the State in that area.

CZECH REPUBLIC [5]

DENMARK[12]

"The Government of Denmark cannot, for the time being, undertake to comply entirely with the provisions of article 7 (d) on remuneration for public holidays."

EGYPT

Declaration:

... Taking into consideration the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and the fact that they do not conflict with the text annexed to the instrument, we accept, support and ratifiy it ... .

FRANCE

Declarations:

(1) The Government of the Republic considers that, in accordance with Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of conflict between its obligations under the Covenant and its obligations under the Charter (especially Articles 1 and 2 thereof), its obligations under the Charter will prevail.

(2) The Government of the Republic declares that articles 6, 9, 11 and 13 are not to be interpreted as derogating from provisions governing the access of aliens to employment or as establishing residence requirements for the allocation of certain social benefits.

(3) The Government of the Republic declares that it will implement the provisions of article 8 in respect of the right to strike in conformity with article 6, paragraph 4, of the European Social Charter according to the interpretation thereof given in the annex to that Charter.

GUINEA

In accordance with the principle whereby all States whose policies are guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations are entitled to become parties to covenants affecting the interests of the international community, the Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the provisions of article 26, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are contrary to the principle of the universality of international treaties and the democratization of international relations.

The Government of the Republic of Guinea likewise considers that article 1, paragraph 3, and the provisions of article 14 of that instrument are contrary to the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, in general, and United Nations resolutions on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, in particular.

The above provisions are contrary to the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States contained in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV), pursuant to which every State has the duty to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to put an end to colonialism.

HUNGARY

Upon signature:

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights according to which certain States may not become signatories to the said Covenants are of a discriminatory nature and are contrary to the basic principle of international law that all States are entitled to become signatories to general multilateral treaties. These discriminatory provisions are incompatible with the objectives and purposes of the Covenants."

Upon ratification:

"The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 48, paragraphs 1 and 3, of [...] the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are inconsistent with the universal character of the Covenants. It follows from the principle of sovereign equality of States that the Covenants should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or limitation."

INDIA

Declarations:

"I. With reference to article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of India declares that the words 'the right of self-determination' appearing in [this article] apply only to the peoples under foreign domination and that these words do not apply to sovereign independent States or to a section of a people or nation—which is the essence of national integrity.

"II. With reference to article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of India takes the position that the provisions of the article shall be so applied as to be in consonance with the provisions of clauses (3) to (7) of article 22 of the Constitution of India. Further under the Indian Legal System, there is no enforceable right to

compensation for persons claiming to be victims of unlawful arrest or detention against the State.

"III. With respect to article 13 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of the Republic of India reserves its right to apply its law relating to foreigners.

"IV. With reference to articles 4 and 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of the Republic of India declares that the provisions of the said [article] shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of article 19 of the Constitution of India.

"V. With reference to article 7 (c) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of the Republic of India declares that the provisions of the said article shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of article 16(4) of the Constitution of India."

IRAQ[13]

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The entry of the Republic of Iraq as a party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall in no way signify recognition of Israel nor shall it entail any obligation towards Israel under the said two Covenants."

"The entry of the Republic of Iraq as a party to the above two Covenants shall not constitute entry by it as a party to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights."

Upon ratification:

"Ratification by Iraq . . . shall in no way signify recognition of Israel nor shall it be conducive to entry with her into such dealings as are regulated by the said [Covenant]."

IRELAND

Reservations:

"Article 2, paragraph 2

In the context of Government policy to foster, promote and encourage the use of the Irish language by all appropriate means, Ireland reserves the right to require, or give favourable consideration to, a knowledge of the Irish language for certain occupations.

Article 13, paragraph 2 (a)

Ireland recognises the inalienable right and duty of parents to provide for the education of children, and, while recognising the State's obligations to provide for free primary education and requiring that children receive a certain minimum education, nevertheless reserves the right to allow parents to provide for the education of their children in their homes provided that these minimum standards are observed."

JAPAN

Reservations and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"1. In applying the provisions of paragraph (d) of article 7 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Japan reserves the right not be be bound by 'remuneration for public holidays' referred to in the said provisions.

"2. Japan reserves the right not to be bound by the provisions of sub–paragraph (d) of paragraph 1 of article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, except in relation to the sectors in which the right referred to in the said provisions is accorded in accordance with the laws and regulations of Japan at the time of ratification of the Covenant by the Government of Japan.

"3. In applying the provisions of sub–paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 of article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Japan reserves the right not to be bound by 'in particular by the progressive introduction of free education' referred to in the said provisions.

"4. Recalling the position taken by the Government of Japan, when ratifying the Convention (No. 87) concerning Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise, that 'the police' referred to in article 9 of the said Convention be interpreted to include the fire service of Japan, the Government of Japan declares that 'members of the police' referred to in paragraph 2 of article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as well as in paragraph 2 of article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights be interpreted to include fire service personnel of Japan."

KENYA

"While the Kenya Government recognizes and endorses the principles laid down in paragraph 2 of article 10 of the Covenant, the present circumstances obtaining in Kenya do not render necessary or expedient the imposition of those principles by legislation."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[13]

"The acceptance and the accession to this Covenant by the Libyan Arab Republic shall in no way signify a recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by the Libyan Arab Republic into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Covenant."

MADAGASCAR

The Government of Madagascar states that it reserves the right to postpone the application of article 13, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, more particularly in so far as relates to primary education, since, while the Malagasy Government fully accepts the principles embodied in the said paragraph and undertakes to take the necessary steps to apply them in their entirety at the earliest possible date, the problems of implementation, and particularly the financial implications, are such that full application of the principles in question cannot be guaranteed at this stage.

MALTA[14]

"Article 13 – The Government of Malta declares that it is in favour of upholding the principle affirmed in the words" and to ensure the religious and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions". However, having regard to the fact that the population of Malta is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, it is difficult also in view of limited financial and human resources, to provide such education in accordance with a particular religious or moral belief in cases of small groups, which cases are very exceptional in Malta."

MEXICO

Interpretative statement:

The Government of Mexico accedes to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights with the understanding that article 8 of the Covenant shall be applied in the Mexican Republic under the conditions and in conformity with the procedure established in the applicable provisions of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and the relevant implementing legislation.

MONGOLIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of

article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

NETHERLANDS

Reservation with respect to Article 8, paragraph 1 (d)

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept this provision in the case of the Netherlands Antilles with regard to the latter's central and local government bodies." [The Kingdom of the Netherlands] clarify that although it is not certain whether the reservation [...] is necessary, [it] has preferred the form of a reservation to that of a declaration. In this way the Kingdom of the Netherlands wishes to ensure that the relevant obligation under the Covenant does not apply to the Kingdom as far as the Netherlands Antilles is concerned."

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not apply article 8 to the extent that existing legislative measures, enacted to ensure effective trade union representation and encourage orderly industrial relations, may not be fully compatible with that article.

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right to postpone, in the economic circumstances foreseeable at the present time, the implementation of article 10 (2) as it relates to paid maternity leave or leave with adequate social security benefits."

NORWAY

Subject to reservations to article 8, paragraph 1 (d) "to the effect that the current Norwegian practice of referring labour conflicts to the State Wages Board (a permanent tripartite arbitral commission in matters of wages) by Act of Parliament for the particular conflict, shall not be considered incompatible with the right to strike, this right being fully recognised in Norway."

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of article 26, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are at variance with the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest.

Upon ratification:

(*a*) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 26 (1) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights are inconsistent with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose purposes concern the international community as a whole must be open to universal participation.

(*b*) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance in a state of dependence of certain territories referred to in articles 1 (3) and 14 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the instruments adopted by the Organization on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote the realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

RWANDA

The Rwandese Republic [is] bound, however, in respect of education, only by the provisions of its Constitution.

SLOVAKIA[5]

SWEDEN

Sweden enters a reservation in connexion with article 7 (d) of the Covenant in the matter of the right to remuneration for public holidays.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[13]

1. The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to these two Covenants shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said two Covenants.

2. The Syrian Arab Republic considers that paragraph 1 of article 26 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and paragraph 1 of article 48 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the said Covenants, inasmuch as they do not allow all States, without distinction or discrimination, the opportunity to become parties to the said Covenants.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

In respect to article 8 (1) (d) and 8 (2):

"The Government of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right to impose lawful and or reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the aforementioned rights by personnel engaged in essential services under the Industrial Relations Act or under any Statute replacing same which has been passed in accordance with the provisions of the Trinidad and Tobago Constitution.

UKRAINE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"First, the Government of the United Kingdom declare their understanding that, by virtue of article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of any conflict between their obligations under article 1 of the Covenant and their obligations under the Charter (in particular, under articles 1, 2 and 73 thereof) their obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

"Secondly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they must reserve the right to postpone the application of sub-paragraph (a) (i) of article 7 of the Covenant in so far as it concerns the provision of equal pay to men and women for equal work, since, while they fully accept this principle and are pledged to work towards its complete application at the earliest possible time, the problems of implementation are such that complete application cannot be guaranteed at present.

"Thirdly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that, in relation to article 8 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 1 in Hong Kong, in so far as it may involve the right of trade unions not engaged in the same trade or industry to establish federations or confederations.

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

Upon ratification:

"Firstly, the Government of the United Kingdom maintain their declaration in respect of article 1 made at the time of signature of the Covenant.

"The Government of the United Kingdom declare that for the purposes of article 2 (3) the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Gilbert Islands, the Pitcaim Islands Group, St. Helena and Dependencies, the Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu are developing countries.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to interpret article 6 as not precluding the imposition of restrictions, based on place of birth or residence qualifications, on the taking of employment in any particular region or territory for the purpose of safeguarding the employment opportunities of workers in that region or territory.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of sub-paragraph (i) of paragraph (*a*) of article 7, in so far as it concerns the provision of equal pay to men and women for equal work in the private sector in Jersey, Guernsey, the Isle of Man, Bermuda, Hong Kong and the Solomon Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply sub-paragraph 1(*b*) of article 8 in Hong Kong.

"The Government of the United Kingdom while recognising the right of everyone to social security in accordance with article 9 reserve the right to postpone implementation of the right in the Cayman Islands and the Falkland Islands because of shortage of resources in these territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of paragraph 1 of article 10 in regard to a small number of customary marriages in the Solomon Islands and the application of paragraph 2 of article 10 in so far as it concerns paid maternity leave in Bermuda and the Falkland Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom maintain the right to postpone the application of sub-paragraph (*a*) of paragraph 2 of article 13, and article 14, in so far as they require compulsory primary education, in the Gilbert Islands, the Solomon Islands and Tuvalu.

"Lastly the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

VIET NAM

Declaration:

That the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and article 26, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become parties to the Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature. The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or limitation.

YEMEN[9]

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to this Covenant shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or serve as grounds for the establishment of relations of any sort with Israel.

ZAMBIA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Zambia states that it reserves the right to postpone the application of article 13 (2) (a) of the Covenant, in so far as it relates to primary education; since, while the Government of the Republic of Zambia fully accepts the principles embodied in the same article and undertakes to take the necessary steps to apply them in their entirety, the problems of implementation, and particularly the financial implications, are such that full application of the principles in question cannot be guaranteed at this stage.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

FRANCE

The Government of the Republic takes objection to the reservation entered by the Government of India to article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as this reservation attaches conditions not provided for by the Charter of the United Nations to the exercise of the right of self-determination. The present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the French Republic and the Republic of India.

GERMANY[6]

15 August 1980

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany strongly objects, . . . to the declaration made by the Republic of India in respect of article 1 of the International Covenant on

Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

"The right of self-determination as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and as embodied in the Covenants applies to all peoples and not only to those under foreign domination. All peoples, therefore, have the inalienable right freely to determine their political status and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The Federal Government cannot consider as valid any interpretation of the right of self-determination which is contrary to the clear language of the provisions in question. It moreover considers that any limitation of their applicability to all nations is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenants."

NETHERLANDS

12 January 1981

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of +India in relation to article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, since the right of self determination as embodied in the Covenants is conferred upon all peoples. This follows not only from the very language of article 1 common to the two Covenants but as well from the most authoritative statement of the law concerned, i.e. the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Any attempt to limit the scope of this right or to attach conditions not provided for in the relevant instruments would undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character."

18 March 1991

With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Algeria concerning article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4:

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the interpretative declaration concerning article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights must be regarded as a reservation to the Covenant. From the text and history of the Covenant it follows that the reservation with respect to article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 made by the Government of Algeria is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it.

[This objection is] not an obstacle to the entry into force of [the Covenant] between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Algeria."

PORTUGAL

26 October 1990

"The Government of Portugal hereby presents its formal objection to the interpretative declarations made by the Government of Algeria upon ratification of the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Government of Portugal having examined the contents of the said declarations reached the conclusion that they can be regarded as reservations and therefore should be considered invalid as well as incompatible with the purposes and object of the Covenants.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenants between Portugal and Algeria."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[15]	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles
Portugal[16]	27 Apr 1993	Macau
United Kingdom[17]	20 May 1976	Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Belize, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, the Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, the Pitcairn Group, St. Helena and Dependencies, the Solomon Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu

Notes:

[1] The thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession was deposited with the Secretary-General on 3 October 1975. The Contracting States did not object to having those instruments accompanied with reservations taken into account under article 27 (1) for the purpose of determining the date of general entry into force of the Covenant.

[2] The signature was effected by Democratic Kampuchea. In this regard the Secretary-General received, on 5 November 1980, the following communication from the Government of Mongolia:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the signature of the Human Rights Covenants by the representative of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a régime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void.

"The signing of the Human Rights Covenants by an individual, whose régime during its short period of reign in Kampuchea had exterminated about 3 million people and had thus grossly violated the elementary norms of human rights, each and every provision of the Human Rights Covenants is a regrettable precedence, which discredits the noble aims and lofty principles of the United Nations Charter, the very spirit of the above-mentioned Covenants, gravely impairs the prestige of the United Nations."

Thereafter, similar communications were received from the Government of the following States on the dates indicated and their texts were circulated as depositary notifications or, at the request, of the States concerned, as official documents of the General Assembly (A/33/781 and A/35/784):

State	*Date of receipt*
German Democratic Republic*	11 Dec 1980
Poland	12 Dec 1980
Ukraine	16 Dec 1980
Hungary	19 Jan 1981
Bulgaria	29 Jan 1981

Belarus	18	Feb	1981
Russian Federation	18	Feb	1981
Czechoslovakia**	10	Mar	1981

*See note 6 below.

**See note 5 below.

[3] Although Democratic Kampuchea had signed both [the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Political rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights] on 17 October 1980 (see note 2 above), the Government of Cambodia deposited an instrument of accession to the said Covenants.

[4] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 5 October 1967. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 3 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Representatives of Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia, stating that their Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Covenants and the Optional Protocol concerned, and that "any statements or reservations relating to the above-mentioned Covenants and Optional Protocol that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under these Covenants and Optional Protocol".

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Covenant on 7 October 1968 and 23 December 1975, respectively, with declarations. For the text of the declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, pp.78 and 85. See also note 2 above and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention with reservations on 27 March 1973 and 8 November 1973, respectively. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993. p. 83. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[7] With the following declaration: "... The said Covenant shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany except as far as Allied rights and responsibilities are affected."

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 5 July 1974, a communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which states in part as follows:

> By reason of their material content, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 19 December 1966 directly affect matters of security and status. With this in mind the Soviet Union considers the statement made by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the operation of these Covenants to Berlin (West) to be illegal and to have no force in law, since, under the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the treaty obligations of the Federal Republic of Germany affecting matters of security and status may not be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin.

Communications identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were received from the Governments of the German Democratic Republic (12 August 1974) and of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (16 August 1974).

In this regard, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, in a communication received on 5 November 1974, made the following declaration:

> "The Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America wish to bring to the attention of the States Parties to the Covenants that the extension of the Covenants to the Western Sectors of Berlin received the prior authorization, under established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on the basis of their supreme authority in those Sectors.
>
> "The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to point out that the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the primary purpose of both of which is the protection of the rights of the individual, are not treaties which 'by reason of their material content, directly affect matters of security and status'.
>
> "As for the references to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 which are contained in the communication made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics referred to in the Legal Counsel's Note, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to point out that, in a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement, they reaffirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin. For its part the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.
>
> "In authorizing the extension of the Covenants to the Western Sectors of Berlin, as mentioned above, the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States took all necessary measures to ensure that the Covenants cannot be applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin in such a way as to affect matters of security and status. Accordingly, the application of the Covenants to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect."

In a communication received on 6 December 1974, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated in part:

> "By their note of 4 November 1974, circulated to all States Parties to either of the Covenants on 19 November 1974, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shares the position set out in the note of the Three Powers. The extension of the Covenants to Berlin (West) continues in full force and effect."

On the same subject, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (13 February1975):

> The Soviet Union deems it essential to reassert its view that the extension by the Federal Republic of Germany of the operation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 19 December 1966 to Berlin (West) is illegal as stated in the note dated 4 July 1974 addressed to the Secretary-General (circulated on 5 August 1974).

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (8 July 1975—in relation to the declarations by the German Democratic Republic and by the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic received on 12 and 16 August 1974, respectively):

> "The communications mentioned in the notes listed above refer to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. This Agreement was concluded in Berlin between the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. The Governments sending these communications are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement and are therefore not competent to make authoritative comments on its provisions.
>
> The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to bring the following to the attention of the

States Parties to the instruments referred to in the above-mentioned communications. When authorising the extension of these instruments to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers, acting in the exercise of their supreme authority, ensured in accordance with established procedures that those instruments are applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin in such a way as not to affect matters of security and status.

Accordingly, the application of these instruments to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect.

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications of a similar nature by States which are not signatories to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (19 September 1975—in relation to the declarations by the German Democratic Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic received on 12 and 16 August 1974, respectively):

"By their note of 8 July 1975, disseminated on 13 August 1975, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communications referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the Note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned instruments extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

See also note 6 above.

[8] In a communication received on 10 May 1982, the Government of Solomon Islands declared that Solomon Islands maintains the reservations entered by the United Kingdom save in so far as the same cannot apply to Solomon Islands.

[9] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 31 in chapter I.2.

[10] With respect to the interpretative declarations made by Algeria the Secretary-General received, on 25 October 1990, from the Government of Germany the following declaration:

[The Federal Republic of Germany] interprets the declaration under paragraph 2 to mean that the latter is not intended to eliminate the obligation of Algeria to ensure that the rights guaranteed in article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and in article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights may be restricted only for the reasons mentioned in the said articles and that such restrictions shall be prescribed by law.

It interprets the declaration under paragraph 4 to mean that Algeria, by referring to its domestic legal system, does not intend to restrict its obligation to ensure through appropriate steps equality of rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

[11] On 30 September 1992, the Government of Belarus notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, 993, p. 78.

[12] In a communication received on 14 January 1976, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General that it withdraws its reservation made prior with regard to article 7 (*a*) (*i*) on equal pay for equal work.

[13] In two communications received by the Secretary-General on 10 July 1969 and 23 March 1971 respectively, the Government of Israel declared that it "has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Iraq on signing and ratifying the above Covenants. In the view of the Government of Israel, these two Covenants are not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity.

Identical communications, *mutatis mutandis*, were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 9 July 1969 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Government of Syria, and on 29 June 1970 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by the Government of Libya. In the latter communication, the Government of Israel moreover stated that the declaration concerned "cannot in any way affect the obligations of the Libyan Arab Republic already existing under general international law".

[14] Upon ratification, the Government of Malta indicated that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon signature to paragraph 2, article 10. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 80.

[15] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[16] In its notification of territorial application to Macau, the Government of Portugal stated the following:

... The Covenants are confirmed and proclaimed binding and valid, and they shall have effect and be implemented and observed without exception, bearing in mind that:

Article 1. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, ratified, respectively, by Act No. 29/78 of 12 June, and By Act No. 45/78 of 11 July, shall be applicable in the territory of Macau.

Article 2. 1. The applicability in Macau of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and in particular of article 1 in both Covenants, shall in no way effect the status of Macau as defined in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic and in the Organic Statute of Macau.

2. The applicability of the Covenants in Macau shall in no way affect the provisions of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau, signed on 13 April 1987, especially with respect to the provision specifying that Macau forms part of Chinese territory and that the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999, and that Portugal will be responsible for the administration until 19 December 1999.

Article 3. Article 25 (b) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall not apply to Macau with respect to the composition of elected bodies and the method of choosing and electing their officials as defined in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, the Organic Statute of Macau and provisions of the Joint Declaration on the Question of Macau.

Article 4. Article 12 (4) and article 13 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall not apply to Macau with respect to the entry and exit of individuals and the expulsion of foreigners from the territory. These matters shall continue to be regulated by the Organic Statute of Macau and other applicable legislation, and also by the Joint Declaration on the Question of Macau.

Article 5. 1. The provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights that are applicable to Macau shall be implemented in Macau, in particular through specific legal documents issued by the organs of government of the territory.

2. The restrictions of the fundamental rights in Macau shall be confined to those cases prescribed by law and shall not exceed the limits permitted by the applicable provisions of the aforementioned Covenants.

[17] On 3 October 1983 the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that

country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[For the text of the declaration see note 20 in chapter IV.1.]

Upon ratification, the Government of Argentina made the following declaration with regard to the above-mentioned declaration made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

The Argentine Republic rejects the extension, notified to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 May 1976 by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the application of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966, to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, and reaffirms its sovereign rights to those archipelagos, which form an integral part of its national territory.

The General Assembly of the United Nations had adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6 and 40/21 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute regarding the question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to pursue negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute, through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall inform the General Assembly of the progress made."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Government of Argentina, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1988, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects the statements made by the Argentine Republic, regarding the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, when ratifying [the said Covenants and acceding to the said Protocol].

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has no doubt as to British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequent right to extend treaties to those territories."

4. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 March 1976, in accordance with article 49, for all provisions except those of article 41; 28 March 1979 for the provisions of article 41 (Human Rights Committee), in accordance with paragraph of the said article 41.

REGISTRATION: 23 March 1976, No. 14668.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, p. 171 and vol. 1057, p. 407 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Spanish text).

STATUS: Signatories: 58. Parties: 132.

Note: The Covenant was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		24 Jan 1983 *a*
Albania		4 Oct 1991 *a*
Algeria	10 Dec 1968	12 Sep 1989
Angola		10 Jan 1992 *a*
Argentina	19 Feb 1968	8 Aug 1986
Armenia		23 June 1993 *a*
Australia	18 Dec 1972	13 Aug 1980
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Sep 1978
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 *a*
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 *a*
Belarus	19 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
Belgium	10 Dec 1968	21 Apr 1983
Benin		12 Mar 1992 *a*
Bolivia		12 Aug 1982 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil		24 Jan 1992 *a*
Bulgaria	8 Oct 1968	21 Sep 1970
Burundi		9 May 1990 *a*
Cambodia[1, 2]	17 Oct 1980	26 May 1992 *a*
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 *a*
Canada		19 May 1976 *a*
Cape Verde		6 Aug 1993 *a*
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile	16 Sep 1969	10 Feb 1972
China[3]		
Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Congo		5 Oct 1983 *a*
Costa Rica	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Côte d'Ivoire		26 Mar 1992 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus	19 Dec 1966	2 Apr 1969
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		14 Sep 1981 *a*
Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Dominica		17 Jun 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 *a*
Ecuador	4 Apr 1968	6 Mar 1969
Egypt	4 Aug 1967	14 Jan 1982
El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	30 Nov 1979
Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		11 Jun 1993 *a*
Finland	11 Oct 1967	19 Aug 1975
France		4 Nov 1980 *a*
Gabon		21 Jan 1983 *a*
Gambia		22 Mar 1979 *a*
Georgia		3 May 1994 *a*
Germany[5, 6]	9 Oct 1968	17 Dec 1973
Grenada		6 Sep 1991 *a*
Guatemala		5 May 1992 *a*
Guinea	28 Feb 1967	24 Jan 1978
Guyana	22 Aug 1968	15 Feb 1977
Haiti		6 Feb 1991 *a*
Honduras	19 Dec 1966	
Hungary	25 Mar 1969	17 Jan 1974
Iceland	30 Dec 1968	22 Aug 1979
India		10 Apr 1979 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Apr 1968	24 Jun 1975
Iraq	18 Feb 1969	25 Jan 1971
Ireland	1 Oct 1973	8 Dec 1989
Israel	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1991
Italy	18 Jan 1967	15 Sep 1978
Jamaica	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1975
Japan	30 May 1978	21 Jun 1979
Jordan	30 Jun 1972	28 May 1975
Kenya		1 May 1972 *a*
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon		3 Nov 1972 *a*
Lesotho		9 Sep 1992 *a*
Liberia	18 Apr 1967	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 May 1970 *a*
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 *a*
Luxembourg	26 Nov 1974	18 Aug 1983
Madagascar	17 Sep 1969	21 Jun 1971
Malawi		22 Dec 1993 *a*
Mali		16 Jul 1974 *a*
Malta		13 Sep 1990 *a*
Mauritius		12 Dec 1973 *a*
Mexico		23 Mar 1981 *a*
Mongolia	5 Jun 1968	18 Nov 1974
Morocco	19 Jan 1977	3 May 1979
Mozambique		21 Jul 1993 *a*
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Nepal		14 May 1991 *a*
Netherlands	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
New Zealand	12 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Nicaragua		12 Mar 1980 *a*
Niger		7 Mar 1986 *a*
Nigeria		29 Jul 1993 *a*
Norway	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Panama	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Paraguay		10 Jun 1992 *a*
Peru	11 Aug 1977	28 Apr 1978
Philippines	19 Dec 1966	23 Oct 1986

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Poland	2 Mar 1967	18 Mar 1977
Portugal	7 Oct 1976	15 Jun 1978
Republic of Korea		10 Apr 1990 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania	27 Jun 1968	9 Dec 1974
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1968	16 Oct 1973
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
San Marino		18 Oct 1985 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe	31 Oct 1995	
Senegal	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 *a*
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	
Spain	28 Sep 1976	27 Apr 1977
Sri Lanka		11 Jun 1980 *a*
Sudan		18 Mar 1986 *a*
Suriname		28 Dec 1976 *a*
Sweden	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971
Switzerland		18 Jun 1992 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 *a*
Togo		24 May 1984 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		21 Dec 1978 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Tunisia	30 Apr 1968	18 Mar 1969
Uganda		21 Jun 1995 *a*
Ukraine	20 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
United Kingdom	16 Sep 1968	20 May 1976
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Jun 1976 *a*
United States of America	5 Oct 1977	8 Jun 1992
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Venezuela	24 Jun 1969	10 May 1978
Viet Nam		24 Sep 1982 *a*
Yemen[7]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	8 Aug 1967	2 Jun 1971
Zaire		1 Nov 1976 *a*
Zambia		10 Apr 1984 *a*
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

[See chapter IV.3.]

ALGERIA[8]

[See chapter IV.3.]

ARGENTINA

Understanding:

The Argentine Government states that the application of the second part of article 15 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights shall be subject to the principle laid down in article 18 of the Argentine National Constitution.

AUSTRALIA[9]

Reservations:

Article 10

"In relation to paragraph 2 (a) the principle of segregation is accepted as an objective to be achieved progressively. In relation to paragraph 2 (b) and 3 (second sentence) the obligation to segregate is accepted only to the extent that such segregation is considered by the responsible authorities to be beneficial to the juveniles or adults concerned".

Article 14

"Australia makes the reservation that the provision of compensation for miscarriage of justice in the circumstances contemplated in paragraph 6 of article 14 may be by administrative procedures rather than pursuant to specific legal provision."

Article 20

"Australia interprets the rights provided for by article 19, 21 and 22 as consistent with article 20; accordingly, the Commonwealth and the constituent States, having legislated with respect to the subject matter of the article in matters of practical concern in the interest of public order (ordre public), the right is reserved not to introduce any further legislative provision on these matters."

Declaration:

"Australia has a federal constitutional system in which legislative, executive and judicial powers are shared or distributed between the Commonwealth and the constituent States. The implementation of the treaty throughout Australia will be effected by the Commonwealth, State and Territory authorities having regard to their respective constitutional powers and arrangements concerning their exercise."

AUSTRIA

1. Article 12, paragraph 4, of the Covenant will be applied provided that it will not affect the Act of April 3, 1919, State Law Gazette No. 209, concerning the Expulsion and the Transfer of Property of the House of Habsburg–Lorraine as amended by the Act of October 30, 1919, State Law Gazette No. 501, the Federal Constitutional Act of July 30, 1925, Federal Law Gazette No. 292, and the Federal Constitutional Act of January 26, 1928, Federal Law Gazette No. 30, read in conjunction with the Federal Constitutional Act of July 4, 1963, Federal Law Gazette No. 172.

2. Article 9 and article 14 of the Covenant will be applied provided that legal regulations governing the proceedings and measures of deprivation of liberty as provided for in the Administrative Procedure Acts and in the Financial Penal Act remain permissible within the framework of the judicial review by the Federal Administrative Court or the Federal Constitutional Court as provided by the Austrian Federal Constitution.

3. Article 10, paragraph 3, of the Covenant will be applied provided that legal regulations allowing for juvenile prisoners to be detained together with adults under 25 years of age who give no reason for concern as to their possible detrimental influence on the juvenile prisoner remain permissible.

4. Article 14 of the Covenant will be applied provided that the principles governing the publicity of trials as set forth in article 90 of the Federal Constitutional Law as amended in 1929 are in no way prejudiced and that

(a) paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (d) is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that an accused person who disturbs the orderly conduct of the trial or whose presence would impede the questioning of another accused person, of a witness or of an expert can be excluded from participation in the trial;

(b) paragraph 5 is not in conflict with legal regulations which stipulate that after an acquittal or a lighter sentence passed by a court of the first instance, a higher tribunal may pronounce conviction or a heavier sentence for the same offence, while they exclude the convicted person's right to have such conviction or heavier sentence reviewed by a still higher tribunal;

(c) paragraph 7 is not in conflict with legal regulations which allow proceedings that led up to a person's final conviction or acquittal to be reopened.

5. Articles 19, 21 and 22 in connection with article 2 (1) of the Covenant will be applied provided that they are not in conflict with legal restrictions as provided for in article 16 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

6. Article 26 is understood to mean that it does not exclude different treatment of Austrian nationals and aliens, as is also permissible under article 1, paragraph 2, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados states that it reserves the right not to apply in full, the guarantee of free legal assistance in accordance with paragraph 3 (d) of Article 14 of the Covenant, since, while accepting the principles contained in the same paragraph, the problems of implementation are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at present."

BELARUS[10]

BELGIUM

Reservations:

1. With respect to articles 2, 3 and 25, the Belgian Government makes a reservation, in that under the Belgian Constitution the royal powers may be exercised only by males. With respect to the exercise of the functions of the regency, the said articles shall not preclude the application of the constitutional rules as interpreted by the Belgian State.

2. The Belgian Government considers that the provision of article 10, paragraph 2 (a), under which accused persons shall, save in exceptional circumstances, be segregated from convicted persons is to be interpreted in conformity with the principle, already embodied in the standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners [resolution (73) 5 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe of 19 January 1973], that untried prisoners shall not be put in contact with convicted prisoners against their will [rules 7 (b) and 85 (1)]. If they so request, accused persons may be allowed to take part with convicted persons in certain communal activities.

3. The Belgian Government considers that the provisions of article 10, paragraph 3, under which juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and be accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status refers exclusively to the judicial measures provided for under the régime for the protection of minors established by the Belgian Act relating to the protection of young persons. As regards other juvenile ordinary-law offenders, the Belgian Government intends to reserve the option to adopt measures that may be more flexible and be designed precisely in the interest of the persons concerned.

4. With respect to article 14, the Belgian Government considers that the last part of paragraph 1 of the article appears to give States the option of providing or not providing for certain derogations from the principle that judgements shall be made public. Accordingly, the Belgian constitutional principle that there shall be no exceptions to the public pronouncements of judgements is in conformity with that provision. Paragraph 5 of the article shall not apply to persons who, under Belgian law, are convicted and sentenced at second instance following an appeal against their acquittal of first instance or who, under Belgian law, are brought directly before a higher tribunal such as the Court of Cassation, the Appeals Court or the Assize Court.

5. Articles 19, 21 and 22 shall be applied by the Belgian Government in the context of the provisions and restrictions set forth or authorized in articles 10 and 11 of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, by the said Convention.

Declarations:

6. The Belgian Government declares that it does not consider itself obligated to enact legislation in the field covered by article 20, paragraph 1, and that article 20 as whole shall be applied taking into account the rights to freedom of thought and religion, freedom of opinion and freedom of assembly and association proclaimed in articles 18, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in articles 18, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

7. The Belgian Government declares that it interprets article 23, paragraph 2, as meaning that the right of persons of marriageable age to marry and to found a family presupposes not only that national law shall prescribe the marriageable age but that it may also regulate the exercise of that right.

BULGARIA

[See chapter IV.3.]

CONGO

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of Congo declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11 [. . .]

Article 11 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is quite incompatible with articles 386 *et seq.* of the Congolese Code of Civil, Commercial, Administrative and Financial Procedure, derived from Act 51/83 of 21 April 1983. Under those provisions, in matters of private law, decisions or orders emanating from conciliation proceedings may be enforced through imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed, when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

DENMARK

"1. The Government of Denmark makes a reservation in respect of Article 10, paragraph 3, second sentence. In Danish practice, considerable efforts are made to ensure appropriate age distribution of convicts serving sentences of imprisonment, but it is considered valuable to maintain possibilities of flexible arrangements.

"2. (a). Article 14, paragraph 1, shall not be binding on Denmark in respect of public hearings. In Danish law, the right to exclude the press and the public from trials may go beyond

what is permissible under this Covenant, and the Government of Denmark finds that this right should not be restricted.

(b). Article 14, paragraphs 5 and 7, shall not be binding on Denmark.

The *Danish Administration of Justice Act* contains detailed provisions regulating the matters dealt with in these two paragraphs. In some cases, Danish legislation is less restrictive than the Covenant (e.g. a verdict returned by a jury on the question of guilt cannot be reviewed by a higher tribunal, cf. paragraph 5); in other cases, Danish legislation is more restrictive than the Covenant (e.g. with respect to resumption of a criminal case in which the accused party was acquitted, cf. paragraph 7).

"3. Reservation is further made to Article 20, paragraph 1. This reservation is in accordance with the vote cast by Denmark in the XVI General Assembly of the United Nations in 1961 when the Danish Delegation, referring to the preceding article concerning freedom of expression, voted against the prohibition against propaganda for war."

EGYPT

[See chapter IV.3.]

FINLAND[11]

Reservations:

"With respect to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and 3, of the Covenant, Finland declares that although juvenile offenders are, as a rule, segregated from adults, it does not deem appropriate to adopt an absolute prohibition not allowing for more flexible arrangements;

With respect to article 14, paragraph 7, of the Covenant, Finland declares that it is going to pursue its present practice, according to which a sentence can be changed to the detriment of the convicted person, if it is established that a member or an official of the court, the prosecutor or the legal counsel have through criminal or fraudulent activities obtained the acquittal of the defendant or a substantially more lenient penalty, or if false evidence has been presented with the same effect, and according to which an aggravated criminal case may be taken up for reconsideration if within a year until then unknown evidence is presented, which would have led to conviction or a substantially more severe penalty;

With respect to article 20, paragraph 1, of the Covenant, Finland declares that it will not apply the provisions of this paragraph, this being compatible with the standpoint Finland already expressed at the 16th United Nations General Assembly by voting against the prohibition of propaganda for war, on the grounds that this might endanger the freedom of expression referred in article 19 of the Covenant."

FRANCE[12, 13]

Declarations and reservations:

(1) The Government of the Republic considers that, in accordance with Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in case of conflict between its obligations under the Covenant and its obligations under the Charter (especially Articles 1 and 2 thereof), its obligations under the Charter will prevail.

(2) The Government of the Republic enters the following reservation concerning article 4, paragraph 1: firstly, the circumstances enumerated in article 16 of the Constitution in respect of its implementation, in article 1 of the Act of 3 April 1978 and in the Act of 9 August 1849 in respect of the declaration of a state of siege, in article 1 of Act No. 55-385 of 3 April 1955 in respect of the declaration of a state of emergency and which enable these instruments to be implemented, are to be understood as meeting the purpose of article 4 of the Covenant; and, secondly, for the purpose of interpreting and implementing article 16 of the Constitution of the French Republic, the terms "to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation" cannot limit the power of the President of the Republic to take "the measures required by circumstances".

(3) The Government of the Republic enters a reservation concerning articles 9 and 14 to the effect that these articles cannot impede enforcement of the rules pertaining to the disciplinary régime in the armies.

(4) The Government of the Republic declares that article 13 cannot derogate from chapter IV of Order No. 45-2658 of 2 November 1945 concerning the entry into, and sojourn in, France of aliens, nor from the other instruments concerning the expulsion of aliens in force in those parts of the territory of the Republic in which the Order of 2 November 1945 does not apply.

(5) The Government of the Republic interprets article 14, paragraph 5, as stating a general principle to which the law may make limited exceptions, for example, in the case of certain offences subject to the initial and final adjudication of a police court and of criminal offences. However, an appeal against a final decision may be made to the Court of Cassation which rules on the legality of the decision concerned.

(6) The Government of the Republic declares that articles 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant will be implemented in accordance with articles 10, 11 and16 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

(7) The Government of the Republic declares that the term "war", appearing in article 20, paragraph1, is to be understood to mean war in contravention of international law and considers, in any case, that French legislation in this matter is adequate.

(8) In the light of article 2 of the Constitution of the French Republic, the French Government declares that article 27 is not applicable so far as the Republic is concerned.

GAMBIA

"For financial reasons free legal assistance for accused persons is limited in our constitution to persons charged with capital offences only. The Government of the Gambia therefore wishes to enter a reservation in respect of article 14 (3) (d) of the Covenant in question."

GERMANY[5]

"1. Articles 19, 21 and 22 in conjunction with Article 2 (1) of the Covenant shall be applied within the scope of Article 16 of the Convention of 4 November 1950 for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

"2. Article 14 (3) (d) of the Covenant shall be applied in such manner that it is for the court to decide whether an accused person held in custody has to appear in person at the hearing before the court of review (*Revisionsgericht*).

"3. Article 14 (5) of the Covenant shall be applied in such manner that:

(*a*) A further appeal does not have to be instituted in all cases solely on the grounds the accused person—having been acquitted by the lower court—was convicted for the first time in the proceedings concerned by the appellate court.

(*b*) In the case of criminal offences of minor gravity the review by a higher tribunal of a decision not imposing imprisonment does not have to be admitted in all cases.

"4. Article 15 (1) of the Covenant shall be applied in such manner that when provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty the hitherto applicable law may for certain exceptional categories of cases remain applicable to criminal offences committed before the law was amended."

GUINEA

In accordance with the principle whereby all States whose policies are guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations are entitled to become parties to covenants affecting the interests of the international community, the Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are contrary to the principle of the universality of international treaties and the democratization of international relations.

GUYANA

In respect of sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 3 of article 14

"While the Government of the Republic of Guyana accept the principle of Legal Aid in all appropriate criminal proceedings, is working towards that end and at present apply it in certain defined cases, the problems of implementation of a comprehensive Legal Aid Scheme are such that full application cannot be guaranteed at this time."

In respect of paragraph 6 of article 14

"While the Government of the Republic of Guyana accept the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle."

HUNGARY

[See chapter IV.3.]

ICELAND[14]

The ratification is accompanied by reservations with respect to the following provisions:

1. ...

2. Article 10, paragraph 2 (b), and paragraph 3, second sentence, with respect to the separation of juvenile prisoners from adults. Icelandic law in principle provides for such separation but it is not considered appropriate to accept an obligation in the absolute form called for in the provisions of the Covenant.

3. Article 13, to the extent that it is inconsistent with the Icelandic legal provisions in force relating to the right of aliens to object to a decision on their expulsion.

4. Article 14, paragraph 7, with respect to the resumption of cases which have already been tried. The Icelandic law of procedure has detailed provisions on this matter which it is not considered appropriate to revise.

5. Article 20, paragraph 1, with reference to the fact that a prohibition against propaganda for war could limit the freedom of expression. This reservation is consistent with the position of Iceland at the General Assembly at its 16th session.

Other provisions of the Covenant shall be inviolably observed.

INDIA

[See chapter IV.3.]

IRAQ

[See chapter IV.3.]

IRELAND[15]

Article 10, paragraph 2

Ireland accepts the principles referred to in paragraph 2 of article 10 and implements them as far as practically possible. It reserves the right to regard full implementation of these principles as objectives to be achieved progressively.

Article 14

Ireland reserves the right to have minor offenses against military law dealt with summarily in accordance with current procedures, which may not, in all respects, conform to the requirements of article 14 of the Covenant.

Ireland makes the reservation that the provision of compensation for the miscarriage of justice in the circumstances contemplated in paragraph 6 of article 14 may be by administrative procedures rather than pursuant to specific legal provisions.

Article 19, paragraph 2

Ireland reserves the right to confer a monopoly on or require the licensing of broadcasting enterprises.

Article 20, paragraph 1

Ireland accepts the principle in paragraph 1 of article 20 and implements it as far as it is practicable. Having regard to the difficulties in formulating a specific offence capable of adjudication and national level in such a form as to reflect the general principles of law recognised by the community of nations as well as the right to freedom of expression, Ireland reserves the right to postpone consideration of the possibility of introducing some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law until such time as it may consider that such is necessary for the attainment of the objective of paragraph 1 of article 20.

Article 23, paragraph 4

Ireland accepts the obligations of paragraph 4 of article 23 on the understanding that the provision does not imply any right to obtain a dissolution of marriage."

ISRAEL

Reservation:

"With reference to Article 23 of the Covenant, and any other provision thereof to which the present reservation may be relevant, matters of personal status are governed in Israel by the religious law of the parties concerned.

"To the extent that such law is inconsistent with its obligations under the Covenant, Israel reserves the right to apply that law."

ITALY

Article 9, paragraph 5

The Italian Republic, considering that the expression "unlawful arrest or detention" contained in article 9, paragraph 5, could give rise to differences of interpretation, declares that it interprets the aforementioned expression as referring exclusively to cases of arrest or detention contrary to the provisions of article 9, paragraph 1.

Article 12, paragraph 4

Article 12, paragraph 4, shall be without prejudice to the application of transitional provision XIII of the Italian Constitution, respecting prohibition of the entry into and sojourn in the national territory of certain members of the House of Savoy.

Article 14, paragraph 3

The provisions of article 14, paragraph 3 (*d*), are deemed to be compatible with existing Italian provisions governing trial of the accused in his presence and determining the cases in which the accused may present his own defence and those in which legal assistance is required.

Article 14, paragraph 5

Article 14, paragraph 5, shall be without prejudice to the application of existing Italian provisions which, in accordance with the Constitution of the Italian Republic, govern the conduct, at one level only, of proceedings instituted before the Constitutional Court in respect of charges brought against the President of the Republic and its Ministers.

Article 15, paragraph 1

With reference to article 15, paragraph 1, last sentence: "If, subsequent to the commission of the offence, provisions is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby", the Italian Republic deems this provision to apply exclusively to cases in progress.

Consequently, a person who has already been convicted by a final decision shall not benefit from any provision made by law, subsequent to that decision, for the imposition of a lighter penalty.

Article 19, paragraph 3

The provisions of article 19, paragraph 3, are interpreted as being compatible with the existing licensing system for national radio and television and with the restrictions laid down by law for local radio and television companies and for stations relaying foreign programmes.

JAPAN

[See chapter IV.3.]

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

[See chapter IV.3.]

LUXEMBOURG

"(a) The Government of Luxembourg considers that article 10, paragraph 3, which provides that juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status, refers solely to the legal measures incorporated in the system for the protection of minors, which is the subject of the Luxembourg youth welfare act. With regard to other juvenile offenders falling within the sphere of ordinary law, the Government of Luxembourg wishes to retain the option of adopting measures that might be more flexible and be designed to serve the interests of the persons concerned."

"(b) The Government of Luxembourg declares that it is implementing article 14, *paragraph 5*, since that paragraph does not conflict with the relevant Luxembourg legal statutes, which provide that, following an acquittal or a conviction by a court of first instance, a higher tribunal may deliver a sentence, confirm the sentence passed or impose a harsher penalty for the same crime. However, the tribunal's decision does not give the person declared guilty on appeal the right to appeal that conviction to a higher appellate jurisdiction."

The Government of Luxembourg further declares that article 14, paragraph 3, shall not apply to persons who, under Luxembourg law, are remanded directly to a higher court or brought before the Assize Court."

"(c) The Government of Luxembourg accepts the provision in *article 19, paragraph 2*, provided that it does not preclude it from requiring broadcasting, television and film companies to be licensed."

"(d) The Government of Luxembourg declares that it does not consider itself obligated to adopt legislation in the field covered by *article 20, paragraph 1*, and that article 20 as a whole will be implemented taking into account the rights to freedom of thought, religion, opinion, assembly and association laid down in articles 18, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in articles 18, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant."

MALTA

Reservations:

"1. Article 13 – The Government of Malta endorses the principles laid down in article 13. However, in the present circumstances it cannot comply entirely with the provisions of this article;

2. Article 14 (2) – The Government of Malta declares that it interprets paragraph 2 of article 14 of the Covenant in the sense that it does not preclude any particular law from imposing upon any person charged under such law the burden of proving particular facts;

3. Article 14 (6) – While the Government of Malta accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to implement such a principle in accordance with article 14, paragraph 6, of the Covenant;

4. Article 19 – The Government of Malta desiring to avoid any uncertainty as regards the application of article 19 of the Covenant declares that the Constitution of Malta allow such restrictions to be imposed upon public officers in regard to their freedom of expression as are reasonably justifiable in a democratic society. The code of Conduct of public officers in Malta precludes them from taking an active part in political discussions or other political activity during working hours or on the premises.

"The Government of Malta also reserves the right not to apply article 19 to the extent that this may be fully compatible with Act 1 of 1987 entitled "An act to regulate the limitations on the political activities of aliens", and this in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention of Rome (1950) for the protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms or with Section 41 (2) (a) (ii) of the Constitution of Malta;

"5. Article 20 – The Government of Malta interprets article 20 consistently with the rights conferred by Articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant but reserves the right not to introduce any legislation for the purposes of article 20;

"6. Article 22 – the Government of Malta reserves the right not to apply article 22 to the extent that existing legislative measures may not be fully compatible with this article.

MEXICO

Interpretative statements:

Article 9, paragraph 5

Under the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and the relevant implementing legislation, every individual enjoys the guarantees relating to penal matters embodied therein, and consequently no person may be unlawfully arrested or detained. However, if by reason of false accusation or complaint any individual suffers an infringement of this basic right, he has, *inter alia*, under the provisions of the appropriate laws, an enforceable right to just compensation.

Article 18

Under the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States, every person is free to profess his preferred religious belief and to practice its ceremonies, rites and religious acts, with the limitation, with regard to public religious acts, that they must be performed in places of worship and, with regard to education, that studies carried out in establishments designed for the professional education of ministers of religion are not officially recognized. The Government of Mexico believes that these limitations are included among those established in paragraph 3 of this article.

Reservations:

Article 13

The Government of Mexico makes a reservation to this article, in view of the present text of article 33 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States.

Article 25, subparagraph (b)

The Government of Mexico also makes a reservation to this provision, since article 130 of the Political Constitution of the

United Mexican States provides that ministers of religion shall have neither an active nor a passive vote, nor the right to form associations for political purposes.

MONGOLIA

[See chapter IV.3.]

NETHERLANDS[16]

Reservations:

"Article 10

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands subscribes to the principle set out in paragraph 1 of this article, but it takes the view that ideas about the treatment of prisoners are so liable to change that it does not wish to be bound by the obligations set out in paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 (second sentence) of this article.

"Article 12, paragraph 1

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate territories of a State for the purpose of this provision.

"Article 12, paragraphs 2 and 4

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate countries for the purpose of these provisions.

"Article 14, paragraph 3 (d)

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory option of removing a person charged with a criminal offence from the courtroom in the interests of the proper conduct of the proceedings.

"Article 14, paragraph 5

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory power of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands to have sole jurisdiction to try certain categories of persons charged with serious offences committed in the discharge of a public office.

"Article 14, paragraph 7

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts this provision only insofar as no obligations arise from it further to those set out in article 68 of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands and article 70 of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands Antilles as they now apply. They read:

"1. Except in cases where court decisions are eligible for review, no person may be prosecuted again for an offence in respect of which a court in the Netherlands or the Netherlands Antilles has delivered an irrevocable judgement.

"2. If the judgement has been delivered by some other court, the same person may not be prosecuted for the same offence in the case of (I) acquittal or withdrawal of proceedings or (II) conviction followed by complete execution, remission or lapse of the sentence.

"Article 19, paragraph 2

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provision with the proviso that it shall not prevent the Kingdom from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.

"Article 20, paragraph 1

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the obligation set out in this provision in the case of the Netherlands."

"[The Kingdom of the Netherlands] clarify that although the reservations [...] are partly of an interpretational nature, [it] has preferred reservations to interpretational declarations in all cases, since if the latter form were used doubt might arise concerning whether the text of the Covenant allows for the interpretation put upon it. By using the reservation form the Kingdom of the Netherlands wishes to ensure in all cases that the relevant obligations arising out of the Covenant will not apply to the Kingdom, or will apply only in the way indicated.

NEW ZEALAND

Reservations:

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) or article 10 (3) in circumstances where the shortage of suitable facilities makes the mixing of juveniles and adults unavoidable; and further reserves the right not to apply article 10 (3) where the interests of other juveniles in an establishment require the removal of a particular juvenile offender or where mixing is considered to be of benefit to the persons concerned.

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 14 (6) to the extent that it is not satisfied by the existing system for *ex gratia* payments to persons who suffer as a result of a miscarriage of justice.

"The Government of New Zealand having legislated in the areas of the advocacy of national and racial hatred and the exciting of hostility or ill will against any group of persons, and having regard to the right of freedom of speech, reserves the right not to introduce further legislation with regard to article 20.

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 22 as it relates to trade unions to the extent that existing legislative measures, enacted to ensure effective trade union representation and encourage orderly industrial relations, may not be fully compatible with that article."

NORWAY[17]

Subject to reservations to article 10, paragraph 2 (b) and paragraph 3 "with regard to the obligation to keep accused juvenile persons and juvenile offenders segregated from adults" and to article 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and to article 20, paragraph 1.

19 September 1995

[The Government of Norway declares that] the entry into force of an amendment to the Criminal Procedure Act, which introduces the right to have a conviction reviewed by a higher court in all cases, the reservation made by the Kingdom of Norway with respect to article 14, paragraph 5 of the Covenant shall continue to apply only in the following exceptional circumstances:

1. "Riksrett" (Court of Impeachment)

According to article 86 of the Norwegian Constitution, a special court shall be convened in criminal cases against members of the Government, the Storting (Parliament) or the Supreme Court, with no right of appeal.

2. Conviction by an appellate court

In cases where the defendant has been acquitted in the first instance, but convicted by an appellate court, the conviction may not be appealed on grounds of error in the assessment of evidence in relation to the issue of guilt. If the appellate court convicting the defendant is the Supreme Court, the conviction may not be appealed whatsoever.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA[18]

Reservations:

The Government of the Republic of Korea [declares] that the provisions of paragraph 5 [...] of article 14, article 22 [...] of the Covenant shall be so applied as to be in conformity with the provisions of the local laws including the Constitution of the Republic of Korea.

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of article 48, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are at variance with

the principle that all States have the right to become parties to multilateral treaties governing matters of general interest.

Upon ratification:

(*a*) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 48 (1) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights are inconsistent with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose purposes concern the international community as a whole must be open to universal participation.

(*b*) The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance in a state of dependence of certain territories referred to in article 1 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations and the instruments adopted by the Organization on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, adopted unanimously by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote the realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SWEDEN

Sweden reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 10, paragraph 3, with regard to the obligation to segregate juvenile offenders from adults, the provisions of article 14, paragraph 7, and the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1, of the Covenant.

SWITZERLAND[19]

Reservations:

(a) Reservation concerning article 10, paragraph 2 (b):

The separation of accused juvenile persons from adults is not unconditionally guaranteed.

(b) Reservation concerning article 12, paragraph 1:

The right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose one's residence is applicable, subject to the federal laws on aliens, which provide that residence and establishment permits shall be valid only for the canton which issues them.

(c) Reservations concerning article 14, paragraph 1:

The principle of a public hearing is not applicable to proceedings which involve a dispute relating to civil rights and obligations or to the merits of the prosecution's case in a criminal matter; these, in accordance with cantonal laws, are held before an administrative authority. The principle that any judgement rendered shall be made public is adhered to without prejudice to the cantonal laws on civil and criminal procedure, which provide that a judgement shall not be rendered at a public hearing, but shall be transmitted to the parties in writing.

The guarantee of a fair trial has as its sole purpose, where disputes relating to civil rights and obligations are concerned, to ensure final judicial review of the acts or decisions of public authorities which have a bearing on such rights or obligations. The Term "final judicial review" means a judicial examination which is limited to the application of the law, such as a review by a Court of Cassation.

(d) Reservation concerning article 14, paragraph 3, subparagraphs (d) and (f):

The guarantee of free legal assistance assigned by the court and of the free assistance of an interpreter does not definitively exempt the beneficiary from defraying the resulting costs.

(e) Reservation concerning article 14, paragraph 5:

The reservation applies to the federal laws on the organization of criminal justice, which provide for an exception to the right of anyone convicted of a crime to have his conviction and sentence reviewed by a higher tribunal, where the person concerned is tried in the first instance by the highest tribunal.

(f) Reservation concerning article 20:

Switzerland reserves the right not to adopt further measures to ban propaganda for war, which is prohibited by article 20, paragraph 1.

...

(g) Reservation concerning article 25, subparagraph (b):

The present provision shall be applied without prejudice to the cantonal and communal laws, which provide for or permit elections within assemblies to be held by a means other than secret ballot.

(h) Reservation concerning article 26:

The equality of all persons before the law and their entitlement without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law shall be guaranteed only in connection with other rights contained in the present Covenant.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

[See chapter IV.3.]

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO[20]

(i) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply in full the provision of paragraph 2 of article 4 of the Covenant since section 7 (3) of its Constitution enables Parliament to enact legislation even though it is inconsistent with sections (4) and (5) of the said Constitution;

(ii) Where at any time there is a lack of suitable prison facilities, the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply article 10 (2) (b) and 10 (3) so far as those provisions require juveniles who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults;

(iii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply paragraph 2 of article 12 in view of the statutory provisions requiring persons intending to travel abroad to furnish tax clearance certificates;

(iv) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply paragraph 5 of article 14 in view of the fact that section 43 of its Supreme Court of Judicature Act No. 12 of 1962 does not confer on a person convicted on indictment an unqualified right of appeal and that in particular cases, appeal to the Court of Appeal can only be done with the leave of the Court of Appeal itself or of the Privy Council;

(v) While the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago accepts the principle of compensation for wrongful imprisonment, it is not possible at this time to

implement such a principle in accordance with paragraph 6 of article 14 of the Covenant;

(vi) With reference to the last sentence of paragraph 1 of article 15—"If, subsequent to the commission of the offence, provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby", the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago deems this provision to apply exclusively to cases in progress. Consequently, a person who has already been convicted by a final decision shall not benefit from any provision made by law, subsequent to that decision, for the imposition of a lighter penalty.

(vii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right to impose lawful and or reasonable restrictions with respect to the right of assembly under article 21 of the Covenant;

(viii) The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago reserves the right not to apply the provision of article 26 of the Covenant in so far as it applies to the holding of property in Trinidad and Tobago, in view of the fact that licences may be granted to or withheld from aliens under the Aliens Landholding Act of Trinidad and Tobago.

UKRAINE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 26 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and of paragraph 1 of article 48 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, under which a number of States cannot become parties to these Covenants, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that the Covenants, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, should be open for participation by all States concerned without any discrimination or limitation.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[21]

Upon signature:

"First, the Government of the United Kingdom declare their understanding that, by virtue of Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, in the event of any conflict between their obligations under Article 1 of the Covenant and their obligations under the Charter (in particular, under Articles 1, 2 and 73 thereof) their obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

"Secondly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that:

"(a) In relation to Article 14 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply, or not to apply in full, the guarantee of free legal assistance contained in sub-paragraph (*d*) of paragraph 3 in so far as the shortage of legal practitioners and other considerations render the application of this guarantee in British Honduras, Fiji and St. Helena impossible;

"(b) In relation to Article 23 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply the first sentence of paragraph 4 in so far as it concerns any inequality which may arise from the operation of the law of domicile;

"(c) In relation to Article 25 of the Covenant, they must reserve the right not to apply:

"(i) Sub-paragraph (*b*) in so far as it may require the establishment of an elected legislature in Hong Kong and the introduction of equal suffrage, as between different electoral rolls, for elections in Fiji; and

"(ii) Sub-paragraph (*c*) in so far as it applies to jury service in the Isle of Man and to the employment of married women in the Civil Service of Northern Ireland, Fiji, and Hong Kong.

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

Upon ratification:

"Firstly the Government of the United Kingdom maintain their declaration in respect of article 1 made at the time of signature of the Covenant.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to apply to members of and persons serving with the armed forces of the Crown and to persons lawfully detained in penal establishments of whatever character such laws and procedures as they may from time to time deem to be necessary for the preservation of service and custodial discipline and their acceptance of the provisions of the Covenant is subject to such restrictions as may for these purposes from time to time be authorised by law.

"Where at any time there is a lack of suitable prison facilities or where the mixing of adults and juveniles is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 10 (2) (*b*) and 10 (3), so far as those provisions require juveniles who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults, and not to apply article 10 (2) (*a*) in Gibraltar, Montserrat and the Turks and Caicos Islands in so far as it requires segregation of accused and convicted persons.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 11 in Jersey.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to interpret the provisions of article 12 (1) relating to the territory of a State as applying separately to each of the territories comprising the United Kingdom and its dependencies.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in and departure from the United Kingdom as they may deem necessary from time to time and, accordingly, their acceptance of article 12 (4) and of the other provisions of the Covenant is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards persons not at the time having the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom also reserves a similar right in regard to each of its dependent territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply article 13 in Hong Kong in so far as it confers a right of review of a decision to deport an alien and a right to be represented for this purpose before the competent authority.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply or not to apply in full the guarantee of free legal assistance in sub-paragraph (*d*) of paragraph 3 of article 14 in so far as the shortage of legal practitioners renders the application of this guarantee impossible in the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands, the Gilbert Islands, the Pitcairn Islands Group, St. Helena and Dependencies and Tuvalu.

"The Government of the United Kingdom interpret article 20 consistently with the rights conferred by articles 19 and 21 of the Covenant and having legislated in matters of practical concern in the interests of public order (ordre public) reserve the right not to introduce any further legislation. The United Kingdom also reserve a similar right in regard to each of its dependent territories.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to postpone the application of paragraph 3 of article 23 in regard to a small number of customary marriages in the Solomon Islands.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right to enact such nationality legislation as they may deem necessary from time to time to reserve the acquisition and possession of citizenship under such legislation to those having sufficient connection with the United Kingdom or any of its dependent territories and accordingly their acceptance of article 24 (3) and of the other provisions of the Covenant is subject to the provisions of any such legislation.

"The Government of the United Kingdom reserve the right not to apply sub–paragraph (*b*) of article 25 in so far as it may require the establishment of an elected Executive or Legislative Council in Hong Kong [...].

"Lastly, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that the provisions of the Covenant shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until they inform the Secretary–General of the United Nations that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Covenant in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservations:

"(1) That article 20 does not authorize or require legislation or other action by the United States that would restrict the right of free speech and association protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

"(2) That the United States reserves the right, subject to its Constitutional constrains, to impose capital punishment on any person (other than a pregnant woman) duly convicted under existing or future laws permitting the imposition of capital punishment, including such punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age.

"(3) That the United States considers itself bound by article 7 to the extent that 'cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment' means the cruel and unusual treatment or punishment prohibited by the Fifth, Eighth, and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

"(4) That because U.S. law generally applies to an offender the penalty in force at the time the offense was committed, the United States does not adhere to the third clause of paragraph 1 of article 15.

"(5) That the policy and practice of the United States are generally in compliance with and supportive of the Covenant's provisions regarding treatment of juveniles in the criminal justice system. Nevertheless, the United States reserves the right, in exceptional circumstances, to treat juveniles as adults, notwithstanding paragraphs 2 (b) and 3 of article 10 and paragraph 4 of article 14. The United States further reserves to these provisions with respect to States with respect to individuals who volunteer for military service prior to age 18."

Understandings:

"(1) That the Constitution and laws of the United States guarantee all persons equal protection of the law and provide extensive protections against discrimination. The United States understands distinctions based upon race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or any other status — as those terms are used in article 2, paragraph 1 and article 26 — to be permitted when such distinctions are, at minimum, rationally related to a legitimate governmental objective. The United States further understands the prohibition in paragraph 1 of article 4 upon discrimination, in time of public emergency, based 'solely' on the status of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin, not to bar distinctions that may have a disproportionate effect upon persons of a particular status.

"(2) That the United States understands the right to compensation referred to in articles 9 (5) and 14 (6) to require the provision of effective and enforceable mechanisms by which a victim of an unlawful arrest or detention or a miscarriage of justice may seek and, where justified, obtain compensation from either the responsible individual or the appropriate governmental entity. Entitlement to compensation may be subject to the reasonable requirements of domestic law.

"(3) That the United States understands the reference to 'exceptional circumstances' in paragraph 2 (a) of article 10 to permit the imprisonment of an accused person with convicted persons where appropriate in light of an individual's overall dangerousness, and to permit accused persons to waive their right to segregation from convicted persons. The United States further understands that paragraph 3 of article 10 does not diminish the goals of punishment, deterrence, and incapacitation as additional legitimate purposes for a penitentiary system.

"(4) That the United States understands that subparagraphs 3 (b) and (d) of article 14 do not require the provision of a criminal defendant's counsel of choice when the defendant is provided with court–appointed counsel on grounds of indigence, when the defendant is financially able to retain alternative counsel, or when imprisonment is not imposed. The United States further understands that paragraph 3 (e) does not prohibit a requirement that the defendant make a showing that any witness whose attendance he seeks to compel is necessary for his defense. The United States understands the prohibition upon double jeopardy in paragraph 7 to apply only when the judgment of acquittal has been rendered by a court of the same governmental unit, whether the Federal Government or a constituent unit, as is seeking a new trial for the same cause.

"(5) That the United States understands that this Covenant shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the state and local governments; to the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall take measures appropriate to the Federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the state or local governments may take appropriate measures for the fulfillment of the Covenant."

Declarations:

"(1) That the United States declares that the provisions of articles 1 through 27 of the Covenant are not self–executing.

"(2) That it is the view of the United States that States Party to the Covenant should wherever possible refrain from imposing any restrictions or limitations on the exercise of the rights recognized and protected by the Covenant, even when such restrictions and limitations are permissible under the terms of the Covenant. For the United States, article 5, paragraph 2, which provides that that fundamental human rights existing in any State Party may not be diminished on the pretext that the Covenant recognizes them to a lesser extent, has particular relevance to article 19, paragraph 3 which would permit certain restrictions on the freedom of expression. The United States declares that it will continue to adhere to the requirements and constraints of its Constitution in respect to all such restrictions and limitations.

"(3) That the United States declares that the right referred to in article 47 may be exercised only in accordance with international law."

VENEZUELA

Article 60, paragraph 5, of the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela establishes that: "No person shall be convicted in a criminal trial unless he has first been personally notified of the

charges and heard in the manner prescribed by law. Persons accused of an offence against the *res publica* may be tried *in absentia*, with the guarantees and in the manner prescribed by law". Venezuela is making this reservation because article 14, paragraph 3 (d), of the Covenant makes no provision for persons accused of an offence against the *res publica* to be tried *in absentia*.

VIET NAM

[See chapter IV.3.]

YEMEN[7]

[See chapter IV.3.]

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

6 November 1984

[The Belgian Government] wishes to observe that the sphere of application of article 11 is particularly restricted. In fact, article 11 prohibits imprisonment only when there is no reason for resorting to it other than the fact that the debtor is unable to fulfil a contractual obligation. Imprisonment is not incompatible with article 11 when there are other reasons for imposing this penalty, for example when the debtor, by acting in bad faith or through fraudulent manoeuvres, has placed himself in the position of being unable to fulfil his obligations. This interpretation of article 11 can be confirmed by reference to the *travaux préparatoires* (see document A/2929 of1 July 1955).

After studying the explanations provided by the Congo concerning its reservation, [the Belgian Government] has provisionally concluded that this reservation is unnecessary. It is its understanding that the Congolese legislation authorizes imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith. The latter condition is sufficient to show that there is no contradiction between the Congolese legislation and the letter and the spirit of article 11 of the Covenant.

By virtue of article 4, paragraph 2, of the aforementioned Covenant, article 11 is excluded from the sphere of application of the rule which states that in the event of an exceptional public emergency, the States Parties to the Covenant may, in certain conditions, take measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant. Article 11 is one of the articles containing a provision from which no derogation is permitted in any circumstances. Any reservation concerning that article would destroy its effects and would therefore be in contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the Covenant.

Consequently, and without prejudice to its firm belief that Congolese law is in complete conformity with the provisions of article 11 of the Covenant, [the Belgian Government] fears that the reservation made by the Congo may, by reason of its very principle, constitute a precedent which might have considerable effects at the international level.

[The Belgian Government] therefore hopes that this reservation will be withdrawn and, as a precautionary measure, wishes to raise an objection to that reservation.

5 October 1993

The Government of Belgium wishes to raise an objection to the reservation made by the United States of America regarding article 6, paragraph 5, of the Covenant, which prohibits the imposition of the sentence of death for crimes committed by persons below 18 years of age.

The Government of Belgium considers the reservation to be incompatible with the provisions and intent of article 6 of the Covenant which, as is made clear by article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, establishes minimum measures to protect the right to life.

The expression of this objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Belgium and the United States of America.

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK

1 October 1993

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

"Having examined the contents of the reservations made by the United States of America, Denmark would like to recall article 4, para 2 of the Covenant according to which no derogation from a number of fundamental articles, *inter alia* 6 and 7, may be made by a State Party even in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation.

In the opinion of Denmark, reservation (2) of the United States with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age as well as reservation (3) with respect to article 7 constitute general derogations from articles 6 and 7, while according to article 4, para 2 of the Covenant such derogations are not permitted.

Therefore, and taking into account that articles 6 and 7 are protecting two of the most basic rights contained in the Covenant, the Government of Denmark regards the said reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and consequent Denmark objects to the reservations.

These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Denmark and the United States.

FINLAND

28 September 1993

With regard to the reservations, understandings and declarations made by the United States of America:

"... It is recalled that under international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Understanding (1) pertaining to articles 2, 4 and 26 of the Covenant is therefore considered to constitute in substance a reservation to the Covenant, directed at some of its most essential provisions, namely those concerning the prohibition of discrimination. In the view of the Government of Finland, a reservation of this kind is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant, as specified in article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

As regards reservation (2) concerning article 6 of the Covenant, it is recalled that according to article 4(2), no restrictions of articles 6 and 7 of the Covenant are allowed for. In the view of the Government of Finland, the right to life is of fundamental importance in the Covenant and the said reservation therefore is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

As regards reservation (3), it is in the view of the Government of Finland subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty.

For the above reasons the Government of Finland objects to reservations made by the United States to articles 2, 4 and 26[cf. Understanding (1)], to article 6 [cf. Reservation (2)] and to article 7[cf. Reservation (3)]. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry

into force of the Covenant between Finland and the United States of America.

FRANCE

The Government of the Republic takes objection to the reservation entered by the Government of the Republic of India to article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as this reservation attaches conditions not provided for by the Charter of the United Nations to the exercise of the right of self-determination. The present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the French Republic and the Republic of India.

4 October 1993

At the time of the ratification of [the said Covenant], the United States of America expressed a reservation relating to article 6, paragraph 5, of the Covenant, which prohibits the imposition of the death penalty for crimes committed by persons below 18 years of age.

France considers that this United States reservation is not valid, inasmuch a it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between France and the United States.

GERMANY[5]

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

21 April 1982

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the [reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago]. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant."

25 October 1990

With regard to interpretative declaration made by Algeria:

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

28 May 1991

[The Federal Republic of Germany] interprets the declaration to mean that the Republic of Korea does not intend to restrict its obligations under article 22 by referring to its domestic legal system.

29 September 1993

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the United States' reservation referring to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant, which prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age. The reservation referring to this provision is incompatible with the text as well as the object and purpose of article 6, which, as made clear by paragraph 2 of article 4, lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany interprets the United States' 'reservation' with regard to article 7 of the Covenant as a reference to article 2 of the Covenant, thus not in any way affecting the obligations of the United States of America as a state party to the Covenant."

ITALY

5 October 1993

"The Government of Italy, ..., objects to the reservation to art. 6 paragraph 5 which the United States of America included in its instrument of ratification.

In the opinion of Italy reservations to the provisions contained in art. 6 are not permitted, as specified in art.4 , para 2, of the Covenant.

Therefore this reservation is null and void since it is incompatible with the object and the purpose of art. 6 of the Covenant.

Furthermore in the interpretation of the Government of Italy, the reservation to art. 7 of the Covenant does not affect obligations assumed by States that are parties to the Covenant on the basis of article 2 of the same Covenant.

These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Italy and the United States."

NETHERLANDS

12 June 1980

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that [reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago] is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it."

12 January 1981

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

17 September 1981

"I. Reservation by Australia regarding articles 2 and 50

The reservation that article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 50 shall be given effect consistently with and subject to the provisions in article 2, paragraph 2, is acceptable to the Kingdom on the understanding that it will in no way impair Australia's basic obligation under international law, as laid down in article 2, paragraph 1, to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

II. Reservation by Australia regarding article 10

The Kingdom is not able to evaluate the implications of the first part of the reservation regarding article 10 on its merits, since Australia has given no further explanation on the laws and lawful arrangements, as referred to in the text of the reservation. In expectation of further clarification by Australia, the Kingdom for the present reserves the right to raise objection to the reservation at a later stage.

III. Reservation by Australia regarding 'Convicted Persons'

The Kingdom finds it difficult, for the same reasons as mentioned in its commentary on the reservation regarding article 10, to accept the declaration by Australia that it reserves the right not to seek amendment of laws now in force in Australia relating to the rights of persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences. The Kingdom expresses the hope it will be possible to gain a more detailed insight in the laws now in force in Australia, in order to facilitate a definitive opinion on the extent of this reservation."

6 November 1984

[Same objection as the one made by Belgium.]

18 March 1991

With regard to interpretative declaration made by Algeria:

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

10 June 1991

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the reservations with respect to articles 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and 22 of the

Covenant made by the Government of the Republic of Korea are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises objection to it. This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea."

28 September 1993

With regard to the reservations to articles 6 and 7 made by the United States of America:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation with respect to article 7 of the Covenant, since it follows from the text and the interpretation of this article that the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands this reservation has the same effect as a general derogation from this article, while according to article 4 of the Covenant, no derogations, not even in times of public emergency, are permitted.

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the understandings and declarations of the United States do not exclude or modify the legal effect of provisions of the Covenant in their application to the United States, and do not in any way limit the competence of the Human Rights Committee to interpret these provisions in their application to the United States.

Subject to the proviso of article 21, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties, these objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States."

NORWAY

4 October 1993

With regard to reservations to articles 6 and 7 made by the United States of America:

"1. In the view of the Government of Norway, the reservation (2) concerning capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age is according to the text and history of the Covenant, incompatible with the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, According to article 4 (2), no derogations from article 6 may be made, not even in times of public emergency. For these reasons the Government of Norway objects to this reservation.

2. In the view of the Government of Norway, the reservation (3) concerning article 7 of the Covenant is according to the text and interpretation of this article incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. According to article 4 (2), article 7 is a non-derogable provision, even in times of public emergency. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to this reservation.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Norway and the United States of America."

PORTUGAL

26 October 1990

[See under "Objections" in chapter IV.3.]

5 October 1993

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the reservation made by the United States of America referring to article 6, paragraph 5 of the Covenant which prohibits capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age is incompatible with article 6 which, as made clear by paragraph 2 of article 4, lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of Portugal also considers that the reservation with regard to article 7 in which a State limits its responsibilities under the Covenant by invoking general principles of National Law may create doubts on the commitments of the Reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of International Law.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservations made by the United States of America. These objections shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and the United States of America."

SLOVAKIA[4]

SPAIN

5 October 1993

With regard to the reservations made by the United States of America:

... After careful consideration of the reservations made by the United States of America, Spain wishes to point out that pursuant to article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, a State Party may not derogate from several basic articles, among them articles 6 and 7, including in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation.

The Government of Spain takes the view that reservation (2) of the United States having regard to capital punishment for crimes committed by individuals under 18 years of age, in addition to reservation (3) having regard to article 7, constitute general derogations from articles 6 and 7, whereas, according to article 4, paragraph 2, of the Covenant, such derogations are not to be permitted.

Therefore, and bearing in mind that articles 6 and 7 protect two of the most fundamental rights embodied in the Covenant, the Government of Spain considers that these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and, consequently, objects to them.

This position does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and the United States of America.

SWEDEN

18 June 1993

With regard to interpretative declarations made by the United States of America:

"... In this context the Government recalls that under international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government considers that some of the understandings made by the United States in substance constitute reservations to the Covenant.

A reservation by which a State modifies or excludes the application of the most fundamental provisions of the Covenant, or limits its responsibilities under that treaty by invoking general principles of national law, may cast doubts upon the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

the reservations made by the United States of America include both reservations to essential and non-derogable provisions, and general references to national legislation. Reservations of this nature contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. All States Parties share a common interest in the respect for the object and purpose of the treaty to which they have chosen to become parties.

Sweden therefore objects to the reservations made by the United States to:

- article 2; cf. Understanding (1);
- article 4; cf. Understanding (1);
- article 6; cf. Reservation (2);
- article 7; cf. Reservation (3);
- article 15; cf. Reservation (4);
- article 24; cf. Understanding (1).

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Sweden and the United States of America."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

24 May 1991

"The Government of the United Kingdom have noted the statement formulated by the Government of the Republic of Korea on accession, under the title "Reservations". They are not however able to take a position on these purported reservations in the absence of a sufficient indication of their intended effect, in accordance with the terms of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and the practice of the Parties to the Covenant. Pending receipt of such indication, the Government of the United Kingdom reserve their rights under the Covenant in their entirety."

Declarations recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41[22]
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

[The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Algeria] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ARGENTINA

The instrument contains a declaration under article 41 of the Covenant by which the Government of Argentina recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established by virtue of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

"The Government of Australia declares that it recognizes, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforesaid Convention."

AUSTRIA

10 September 1978

[The Government of the Republic of Austria] declares under article 41 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that Austria recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

BELARUS

30 September 1992

The Republic of Belarus declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on Human Rights in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

BELGIUM

5 March 1987

The Kingdom of Belgium declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

18 June 1987

The Kingdom of Belgium declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Belgium, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

"The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party which has made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

CANADA

29 October 1979

"The Government of Canada declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Canada, made a dec-

laration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

CHILE

7 September 1990

As from the date of this instrument, the Government of Chile recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with article 41 thereof, with regard to all actions which may have been initiated since 11 March 1990.

CONGO

6 July 1989

Pursuant to article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Congolese Government recognizes, with effect from today's date, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the above-mentioned Covenant.

CROATIA

12 October 1995

The Government of the Republic of Croatia declares under article 41 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the Republic of Croatia recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK[23]

19 April 1983

"[The Government of Denmark] recognizes, in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, opened for signature in New York on December 19, 1966, the competence of the Committee referred to in article 41 to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

ECUADOR

6 August 1984

The Government of Ecuador recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforementioned Covenant, as provided for in paragraph 1 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) of that article.

This recognition of competence is effective for an indefinite period and is subject to the provisions of article 41, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

FINLAND

"Finland declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Covenant."

GAMBIA

9 June 1988

"The Government of the Gambia hereby declares that the Gambia recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant."

GERMANY[5, 24, 25]

10 May 1991

The Federal Republic of Germany, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes for a further five years from the date of expiry of the declaration of 24 March 1986 the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from the State Party insofar as that State Party has recognized in regard to itself the competence of the Committee and as corresponding obligations have been assumed under the Covenant by the Federal Republic of Germany and by the State Party concerned.

GUYANA

10 May 1993

"The Government of the Co-operative Republic of Guyana hereby declares that it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforementioned Covenant."

HUNGARY

7 September 1988

The Hungarian People's Republic [. . .] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ICELAND

22 August 1979

"The Government of Iceland [. . .] recognizes in accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

IRELAND

"The Government of Ireland hereby declare that in accordance with article 41 they recognise the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the Covenant."

ITALY

15 September 1978

The Italian Republic recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee, elected in accordance with article 28 of the Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

LUXEMBOURG

18 August 1983

"The Government of Luxembourg recognizes, in accordance with article 41, the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to received and consider communications to the effect that a State party claims that another State party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

MALTA

"The Government of Malta declares that under article 41 of this Covenant it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted

by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Malta, made a declaration under article 41 recognising the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

NETHERLANDS

11 December 1978

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

NEW ZEALAND

28 December 1978

"The Government of New Zealand declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognises the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from another State Party which has similarly declared under article 41 its recognition of the Committee's competence in respect to itself except where the declaration by such a state party was made less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a complaint relating to New Zealand."

NORWAY

31 August 1972

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

PERU

9 April 1984

Peru recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to received and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant.

PHILIPPINES

"The Philippine Government, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee set up in the aforesaid Covenant, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

POLAND

25 September 1990

"The Republic of Poland recognizes, in accordance with article 41, paragraph 1, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

[The Government of the Republic of Korea] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under article 41 of the Covenant.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, pursuant to article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, provided that the State Party in question has, not less than 12 months prior to the submission by it of such a communication, recognized in regard to itself the competence of the Committee, established in article 41, in so far as obligations have been assumed under the Covenant by the USSR and by the State concerned.

SENEGAL

5 January 1981

The Government of Senegal declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the said Covenant to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Senegal, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SLOVENIA

"[The] Republic of Slovenia, in accordance with article 41 of the said Covenant, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

SPAIN[27]

21 December 1988

The Spanish Government declares, under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes, for a period of five years as from the date of the deposit of this declaration, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Covenant.

SRI LANKA

"The Government of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant, from another State Party which has similarly declared under article 41 its recognition of the Committee's competence in respect to itself."

SWEDEN

26 November 1971

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland declares, pursuant to article 41, that it shall recognize, for a period of five years, the competence of the Human

Rights Committee to receive and to consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the present Covenant.

TUNISIA

24 June 1993

The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established under article 28 of the [said Covenant] ..., to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Republic of Tunisia is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

The State Party submitting such communications to the Committee must have made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee under article 41 of the [said Covenant].

UKRAINE

28 July 1992

In accordance with article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Ukraine recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that any State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom declare under article 41 of this Covenant that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to the United Kingdom made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States declares that it accepts the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications under article 41 in which a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

ZIMBABWE

20 August 1991*

"The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe recognizes with effect from today's date, the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another state party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant [provided that such State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication relating to Zimbabwe, made a declaration under article 41 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications relating to itself]."(*_The text between brackets was received at the Secretariat on 27 January 1993._)"

Notifications under Article 4 (3) of the Covenant (Derogations)

(Taking into account the important number of these declarations, and in order not to increase excessively the number of pages of the present publication, the text of the notifications has in some cases, exceptionally, been abridged. Unless otherwise indicated, when the notification concerns an extension, the said extension affects those articles of the Covenant originally derogated from, and was decided for the same reasons. The date on the right hand, above the notification, is the date of receipt.)

ALGERIA

19 June 1991

In view of public disturbances and the threat of deterioration of the situation [...] a state of siege has been proclaimed, beginning at midnight in the night of 4/5 June 1991, for a period of four months throughout Algerian territory.

The Government of Algeria subsequently specified that these disturbances had been fomented with a view of preventing the general elections to be held on 27 June 1991 and to challenge the ongoing democratic process; and that in view of the insurrectional situation which threatened the stability of the institutions, the security of the people and their property, and the normal operation of the public services, it had been necessary to derogate from the provisions of articles 9 (3), 12 (1), 17, 19 (2) and 21 of the Covenant.

The said state of siege was terminated throughout Algeria on 29 September 1991.

14 February 1992

(Dated 13 February 1992)

In view of the serious threats to public order and the safety of individuals over the past few weeks, the growth of such threats during the month of February 1992 and the dangers of aggravation of the situation, the President of the High State Council, [...], has issued Presidential decree No. 92–44 of 9 February 1992, decreeing a state of emergency, throughout the national territory, with effect from 9 February 1992 at 2000 hours for a duration of twelve months, in accordance with articles 67, 74 and 76 of the Algerian Constitution. [*The Government of Algeria has specified that the articles of the Covenant which are derogated from are articles 9(3), 12, 17 and 21*].

The establishment of the state of emergency, which is aimed essentially at restoring public order, protecting the safety of individuals and public services, does not interfere with the democratic process inasmuch as the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms continues to be guarantied.

The state of emergency may, however, be lifted ahead of schedule, once the situation which prompted its establishment has been resolved and normal conditions of life in the nation have been restored.

ARGENTINA

7 June 1989

(Dated 7 June 1989)

Proclamation of the state of siege throughout the national territory for a period of 30 days in response to events [attacks and looting of retail shops, vandalism, use of firearms] whose seriousness jeopardizes the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by the entire community. (Derogation from articles 9 and 21.)

12 July 1989

(Dated 11 July 1989)

Termination of the state of siege as from 27 June 1989 throughout the national territory.

AZERBAIJAN

16 April 1993

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 6 a.m. on 3 April 1993 until 6 a.m. on 3 June 1993 in the territory of the Azerbaijani Republic. The Government of the Azerbaijani Republic declared that the measures were taken as result of the escalating aggression by the armed forces of Armenia threatening the very existence of the Azerbaijani State.

(Derogation from articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22.)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 2 August 1993.

27 September 1993

Lifting of the state of emergency proclaimed on 2 April 1993 as from 22 September 1993.

7 October 1994

(Dated 5 October 1994)

Proclamation of a 60 day state of emergency in Baku by Decree of the President of 4 October 1994 with effect from 20 hours on 4 October 1994 owing to the fact that in September 1994, terrorist groups wounded two prominent Azerbaijani politicians followed by a series of terrorist acts in densely populated districts of the city which caused loss of life. These acts, designed to destabilize the social and political situation in the country were preliminary to the subsequent direct attempt to overthrow by force of arms the constitutional order of the Azerbaijani Republic and the country's democratically elected leader.

The Government of Azerbaijan specifed that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were derogated from.

27 October 1994

(Dated 21 October 1994)

Declaration of a state of emergency in the city of Gyanja for a period of 60 days as from 11 October 1994 by Decree of the President of the Azerbaijani Republic dated 10 October 1994 following an attempted *coup d'état* in Gyanja since on 4 October 1994, control of the organs of State was seized by criminal groups and acts of violence were perpetrated against the civilian population. This action was the latest in a series of terrorist acts designed to destablize the situation in Baku. A number of the criminals involved in the insurrection are continuing their activities directed against the state system of Azerbaijan and are endeavouring to disrupt public order in the city of Gyanja.

It was specified that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were derogated from.

15 December 1994

(Dated 13 December 1994)

Extension of the state of emergency in Baku, as from 2000 hours on 4 December 1994 in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for its imposition.

20 December 1994

(Dated 17 December 1994)

Extension of the state of emergency in the town of Gyandzha for a period of 60 days as from 2400 hours on 11 December 1994 in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for its imposition.

23 February 1995

(Dated 23 February 1995)

First notification:

By Decree by the President of the Republic dated 2 February 1995, extension of the state of emergency in Baku, for a period of 60 days, as from 2300 hours on 2 February 1995.

Second notification:

By Decree by the President of the Republic dated 2 February 1995 on the extension of the state of emergency in the town of Gyandzha, for a period of 60 days, as from 2400 hours on 9 February 1995.

The extension of the state of emergency in Baku and Gyandzha has been declared, as indicated by the Govenrment of Azerbaijan, bearing in mind the need to maintain social order, to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens and to restore legality and law and order and in view of the incomplete elimination of the causes that served as the basis for the imposition in October 1994 of the state of emergency in the cities of Baku and Gyandzha.

It is recalled that the provisions from which it has been derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

17 April 1995

(Dated 8 April 1995)

Extension of the state of emergency in Baku for a period of 60 days, by Decree of the President of the Republic dated 2 April 1995 as from 2000 hours on 3 April 1995. The extension of the state of emergency in Baku has been declared, as indicated by the Government of Azerbaijan, due to an attempted *coup d'état* which took place on 13–17 March 1995 in the city of Baku and to the fact that notwithstanding the suppression of the rebellion, criminal elements in the city of Baku are continuing activities inconsistent with the will of the people and endeavouring to disrupt public order. The Government of Azerbaijan also confirmed that the extension was decided in order to protect the constitutional order of the country, to maintain public order in the city of Baku, to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens and to restore legality and law and order.

21 April 1995

(Dated 17 April 1995)

Termination, as from 11 April 1995, on the basis of a decision of the Milli Mejlis (Parliament) of the Azerbaijani Republic dated 11 April 1995, of the State of emergency in the city of Gyanja declared on 11 October 1994.

BOLIVIA

1 October 1985

By Supreme Decree No. 21069, the Government of Bolivia declared a temporary state of siege throughout the country, with effect from 18 September 1985.

The notification specifies that this measure was adopted to ensure the maintenance of the process of economic recovery initiated by the Government so as to save Bolivia from the scourge of hyper inflation and to counter the social unrest which sought to supplant the legitimate authorities by establishing itself as an authority which publicly proclaimed the repudiation of the law and called for subversion, and to counter the occupation of State facilities and the interruption of public services. The Government of Bolivia has specified that the provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated from concern articles 9, 12 and 21.

9 January 1986

(Dated 6 January 1986)

. . . The guarantees and rights of citizens had been fully restored throughout the national territory, with effect from 19 December 1985 and, accordingly, the provisions of the Covenant were again being implemented in accordance with the stipulations of its relevant articles.

29 August 1986

(Dated 28 August 1986)

The notification indicates that the state of emergency was proclaimed because of serious political and social disturbances, *inter alia*, a general strike in Potosi and Druro which paralyzed illegal-

ly those cities; the hyper inflationary crisis suffered by the country; the need for rehabilitation of the Bolivian mining structures; the subversive activities of the extreme left; the desperate reaction of the drug trafficking mafia in response to the government successful campaign of eradication; and in general plans aiming to overthrow the Constitutional Government.

28 November 1986

(Dated 28 November 1986)

Notification, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as that of 9 January 1986. With effect from 29 November 1986.

17 November 1989

(Dated 16 November 1989)

Proclamation of a state of siege throughout the Bolivian territory. The notification indicates that this measure was necessary to restore peace which had been seriously breached owing to demands of an economic nature, but with a subversive purpose that would have put an end to the process of economic stabilization. The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated from concern articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant.

22 March 1990

(Dated 18 March 1990)

Termination of the state of emergency as from 15 February 1990.

19 April 1995

(Dated 19 April 1995)

Declaration of a state of siege throughout the nation by Supreme Decree No. 23993 on 18 April 1995 for a period of 90 days.

The reasons for the declaration of this state of siege, as indicated by the Government of Bolivia, were due to the fact that leaders, particularly from the teaching profession and from political groups having close ties to trade union leaders have organized strikes, embargoes and violence against individuals and property, in an effort to bypass existing laws and disrupt the public order and peace in the country. Moreover, assemblies of people openly disregarding the Constitution of the Sate and the laws have arrogated to themselves the sovereignty of the people, seeking to create bodies outside the supreme law of the national and the other laws.

The articles which were being derogated from were articles 12(3), 21(2) and 22 (2).

26 July 1995

(Dated 26 July 1995)

Extension of the state of siege, declared on 19 April 1995, by Supreme Decree No. 24701 until 15 October 1995.

16 August 1995

(Dated 10 August 1995)

Termination as from 31 July 1995 of the provisional detention of all persons so detained or confined as a result of the proclamation of martial law in Bolivia.

25 October 1995

(Dated 23 October 1995)

Termination, as from 16 October 1995, of the state of siege which had been in force throughout the nation from 18 April 1995.

CHILE

7 September 1976

[Chile] has been under a state of siege for reasons of internal defence since 11 March 1976; the state of siege was legally proclaimed by Legislative Decree No. 1.369.

The proclamation was made in accordance with the constitutional provisions concerning state of siege, which have been in force since 1925, in view of the inescapable duty of the government authorities to preserve public order and the fact that there continue to exist in Chile extremist seditious groups whose aim is to overthrow the established Government.

As a consequence of the proclamation of the state of siege, the rights referred to in articles 9, 12, 13, 19 and 25 (*b*) of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights have been restricted in Chile.

23 September 1986

(Dated 16 September 1986)

By Decree No. 1.037, the Government of Chile declared a state of siege throughout the national territory from 8 September to 6 December 1986, for as long as circumstances warrant. The notification specifies that Chile has been subjected to a wave of terrorist aggression of alarming proportions, that an alarming number of attacks have taken the lives of a significant number of citizens and armed forces personnel, massive stockpiles of weapons were discovered in terrorists hands, and that for the first time in the history of the Republic, a terrorist attack was launched on H.E. the President of the Republic.

The notification specifies that the rights set forth in articles 9, 12, 13 and 19 of the Covenant would be derogated from.

29 October 1986

(Dated 28 October 1986)

Termination of State of siege by Decree No. 1074 of 26 September 1986 in the Eleventh Region and by Decree No. 1155 of 16 October 1986 in the 12th Region (with the exception of the Commune of Punta Areans), in the Province of Chiloé in the Tenth Region, and in the Province of Parinacota in the First Region.

20 November 1986

(Dated 20 November 1986)

Termination of the state of siege in the Provinces of Cardenal Caro in the 6th Region, Arauco in the 8th Region and Palena in the 10th Region.

29 January 1987

(Dated 20 January 1987)

Termination of the state of siege throughout Chile as at 6 January 1987.

31 August 1988

Termination of the state of emergency and of the state of danger of disturbance of the domestic peace in Chile as from 27 August 1988, [. . .] thereby bringing to an end all states of exception in the country, which is now in a situation of full legal normality.

COLOMBIA

18 July 1980

The Government, by Decree 2131 of 1976, declared that public order had been disturbed and that all of the national territory was in a state of siege, the requirements of the Constitution having been fulfilled, and that in the face of serious events that disturbed the public peace, it had become necessary to adopt extraordinary measures within the framework of the legal régime provided for in the National Constitution for such situations (art. 121 of the National Constitution). The events disturbing the public peace that led the President of the Republic to take that decision are a matter of public knowledge. Under the state of siege (art. 121 of the National Constitution) the Government is empowered to suspend, for the duration of the state of siege, those provisions that are incompatible with the maintenance and restoration of public order.

On many occasions the President of the Republic has informed the country of his desire to terminate the state of siege when the necessary circumstances prevail.

It should be observed that, during the state of siege in Colombia, the institutional order has remained unchanged, with the Congress and all public bodies functioning normally. Public freedoms were fully respected during the most recent elections, both the election of the President of the Republic and the election of members of elective bodies.

11 October 1982

By Decree No. 1674 of 9 June 1982, the state of siege was terminated on 20 June of 1982.

11 April 1984

(Dated 30 March 1984)

The Government of Colombia had declared a breach of the peace and a state of siege in the territory of the Departments of Caquetá, Huila, Meta and Cauca in response to the activities in those Departments of armed groups which were seeking to undermine the constitutional system by means of repeated public disturbances.

Further to Decree No. 615, Decree Nos. 666, 667, 668, 669 and 670 had been enacted on 21 March 1984 to restrict certain freedoms and to take other measures aimed at restoring public order. (For the provisions which were derogated from, see *in fine* notification of 8 June 1984 hereinafter.)

8 June 1984

(Dated 7 May 1984)

The Government of Colombia indicated that it had, through Decree No. 1038 of 1 May 1984, declared a state of siege in the territory of the Republic of Colombia owing to the assassination in April of the Minister of Justice and to recent disturbances of the public order that occurred in the cities of Bogotá, Cali, Barranquilla, Medellín, Acevedo (Department of Huila), Corinto (Department of Cauca), Sucre and Jordon Bajo (Department of Santander), Giraldo (Department of Antioquia) and Miraflores (*Comisaría* of Guaviare).

Pursuant to the above-mentioned Decree No. 1038,the Government had issued Decrees Nos. 1039 and 1040 of 1 May 1984 and Decree No. 1042 of 2 May 1984, restricting certain freedoms and enacting other measures to restore public order. The Government of Colombia, in a subsequent communication dated 23 November 1984, indicated that the decrees affected the rights referred to in articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant.)

12 December 1984

(Dated 11 December 1984)

Termination of derogation from article 21.

13 August 1991

(Dated 9 August 1991)

Termination as of 7 July 1991 of the state of siege and of the measures adopted on 1 and 2 May 1984, which were still in force through the national territory.

21 July 1992

(Dated 16 July 1992)

By Legislative Decree No. 1155 of 10 July 1992, which was to remain in force until 16 July 1992, the Government of Colombia declared a state of emergency throughout the national territory. ... The state of emergency was proclaimed in order to preserve public order by preventing the cartels responsible for the most serious assaults on public order from evading justice. The prospect of a torrent of releases on parole of persons, many of which "awaiting trial for a wide variety of terrorist activities, ... in addition to the acts perpetrated by the drug-trafficking cartels which might have taken place under the provisions of a newly promulgated Code of Penal Procedure", in disregard of the applicability of special legislation, was causing "serious disturbances of public order".

The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

20 November 1992

(Dated 10 November 1992)

By legislative Decree No. 1793 of 8 November 1992 which was to remain in force until 6 February 1993, the Government of Colombia declared a state of emergency throughout the national territory for a period of 90 days.... The state of emergency was due to the fact that "in recent weeks, the public order situation in the country ... has grown significantly worse because of terrorist activities by gorilla organizations and organized crime ... Those criminal groups have also managed to obstruct and evade judicial action because the criminal justice is unable to use military forces as a judicial police organ to gather the necessary evidence".

The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

29 March 1993

(Dated 5 March 1993)

In accordance with Legislative Decree No. 261, extension for a period of 90 days from 5 February 1993 until 7 May 1993 of the state of emergency in effect throughout the national territory. The extension was made necessary due to a continuation of the public order disturbances described above. The provisions of the Pact which were derogated from are articles 12, 17, 21 and 22.

27 May 1994

(Dated 6 May 1994))

By legislative Decree No. 874 of 1 May 1994 which is to remain in force until 10 May 1994, declaration of the state of emergency throughout the national territory for the following reasons:

> Since November 1993, there has been a significant increase in the number of investigations carried out by the Procurator-General's Office. It has become necessary to take steps to ensure that the efforts made by the Procurator-General's Office to conclude on-going investigations are not hampered through improper situations such as obstructing an agreement, requesting the postponement of formal proceedings, etc.
>
> The large number of cases in which prior circumstances have prevented characterisation within the stipulated time-limit constitutes an unforeseen situation which is generating social insecurity, public anxiety, a lack of trust in the administration of justice and strengthening of the criminal and guerilla warfare organizations committed to disrupting law and order and destabilizing the institutions of government.
>
> In view of the foregoing, measures must be adopted to ensure that the difficulties that have arisen do not affect institutional stability, national security and civil harmony, a judicial emergency must be declared and consequently, transition measures must be adopted in the area of administration and penal procedure.

8 June 1994

(Dated 27 May 1994)

Termination of the state of civil unrest and extension of the applicability of the provisions relating to the judicial emergency. Pursuant to the Decree No. 874 of 1 May 1994 and in exercise of the powers conferred on the Government under article 213 of the Political Constitution, the Government enacted Legislative Decree No. 875 of 1 May 1994, "by means of which a judicial

emergency has been declared and measures have been adopted with regard to penal procedure". Because of the declaration of judicial emergency, it was decided to suspend for two months, in respect of cases involving offences under the jurisdiction of regional and National Court judges, the time-limits established for obtaining release on bail.

By means of Decree No. 951 of 10 May 1994, measures were adopted to strengthen the functioning of the justice system.

The Government of Colombia has specified that the provision from which it has derogated is article 9 (3) of the Covenant.

ECUADOR

12 May 1983

The Government declared the extension of the state of emergency as from 20 to 25 October 1982 by Executive Decree No. 1252 of 20 October 1982 and derogation from article 12 (1) owing to serious disorders brought about by the suppression of subsidies, and termination of the state of emergency by Executive Decree No. 1274 of 27 October 1982

20 March 1984

Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (3); 17; 19 (2) and 21 in the provinces of Napo and Esmeraldas by Executive Decree No. 2511 of 16 March 1984 owing to destruction and sabotage in these areas.

29 March 1984

Termination of the state of emergency by Executive Decree No. 2537 of 27 March 1984.

17 March 1986

(Dated 14 March 1986)

Declaration of the State of emergency in the provinces of Pichincha and Manabi due to the acts of subversion and armed uprising by a high-ranking officer no longer on active service, backed by extremist groups; thereby derogations from articles 12, 21 and 22, it being understood that no Ecuadorian may be exiled or deported outside the capitals of the provinces or to a region other than the one in which he lives.

19 March 1986

(Dated 18 March 1986)

End of State of emergency as from 17 March 1986.

29 October 1987

(Dated 28 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as of 28 October 1987. [Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (2); 19 (2); and 21.]

The notification states that this measure was made necessary as a result of an illegal call for a national strike which would lead to acts of vandalism, offences against persons and property and would disrupt the peace of the State and the proper exercise of the civic rights of Ecuadorians.

30 October 1987

Termination of the state of emergency throughout the national territory as from 0 hour on 29 October 1987.

3 June 1988

(Dated 1 June 1988)

Declaration of a state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as of 9 p.m. on 31 May 1988. [Derogation from articles 9 (1) and (2); 12 (1) and (2); 19 (2); and 21.]

The notification states that this measure is the necessary legal response to the 24 hour strike called for by the United Workers Front, which would result in acts of vandalism, violation of the security of persons and attacks on public and private property.

(Dated 2 June 1988)

Termination of the state of emergency throughout the national territory as from 1 June 1988.

EL SALVADOR

14 November 1983

(Dated 3 November 1983)

The Government has declared an extension for a period of 30 days of the suspension of constitutional guarantees by Legislative Decree No. 329 dated 28 October 1983. The constitutional guarantees have been suspended in accordance with article 175 of the Political Constitution because of disruption of public order. In a complimentary notification dated 23 January 1984 and received on 24 January 1984, the Government of El Salvador specified the following:

1) The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated are articles 12 and 19 by Decree No. 329 of 28 August 1983, and article 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence);

2) The constitutional guarantees were first suspended by Decree No. 155 dated 6 March 1980, with further extensions of the suspension for a total of 24 months. Decree No. 155 was modified by Decree No. 999 dated 24 February 1982, which expired on 24 March 1982. By Decree No. 1089 dated 20 April 1982, the Revolutionary Government Junta again suspended the constitutional guarantees. By Legislative Decree No. 7 dated 20 May 1982, the Constituent Assembly extended the suspension for an additional period of 30 days. The said Legislative Decree No. 7 was itself extended several times until the adoption of the above-mentioned Decree No. 329 dated 28 October 1983, which took effect on that date.

3) The reasons for the adoption of the initial suspension decree (No. 155 of 6 March 1980) were the same as for the adoption of the subsequent decrees.

18 June 1984

(Dated 14 June 1984)

By Legislative Decree No. 28 of 27 January 1984, previous measures were amended to the effect that political parties would be permitted to conduct electoral campaigns, and were thus authorized to engage in partisan campaigning and electoral propaganda activities. The said Decree was extended for successive 30-day periods until the promulgation of Decree No. 97 of 17 May 1984, which rescinded the afore-mentioned change which had allowed political parties to conduct electoral campaigns.

The provisions of the Covenant from which it is derogated are articles 12, 19, 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence) and 21 and 22. As regards article 22, the suspension refers to the right of association in general, but does not affect the right to join professional associations (the right to form and join trade unions).

2 August 1985

(Dated 31 July 1985)

[. . .] the Government of El Salvador has for successive periods extended martial law by the following legislative decrees:

Decrees No. 127 of 21 June 1984, No. 146 of 19 July 1984, No. 175 of 24 August 1984, No. 210 of 18 September 1984, No. 234 of 21 October 1984, No. 261 of 20 November 1984, No. 277 of 14 December 1984, No. 322 of 18 January 1985, No. 335 of 21 February 1985, No. 351 of 14 March 1985, No. 386 of 18 April 1985, No. 10 of 21 May 1985, No. 38 of 13 June 1985, and the most recent, Decree No. 96 of 11 July 1985 which extended the martial law for an additional period of 30 days beyond that date.

The provisions of the Covenant that are thus suspended are those of articles 12, 17 (in respect of interference with correspondence) and 19 (2).

The notification specifies that the reasons for the suspension of constitutional guarantees continue to be those originally indicated, namely: the need to maintain a climate of peace and tranquility, which had been disturbed through the commission of acts designed to create a state of instability and social unrest which affected the economy and the public peace by persons seeking to obstruct the process of structural change, thus seriously disrupting public order.

19 December 1989

(Dated 13 November 1989)

Suspension for a period of 30 days as from 12 November 1990 of various constitutional guarantees. (Derogation from articles 12, 17, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.)

The notification indicates that this measure became necessary owing to the use of terror and violence by the Frente Farabundo Marti to obtain the political authority, in complete disregard of previous elections.

ISRAEL

3 October 1991

"Since its establishment, the State of Israel has been the victim of continuous threats and attacks on its very existence as well as on the life and property of its citizens.

"These have taken the form of threats of war, of actual armed attacks, and campaigns of terrorism resulting in the murder of and injury to human beings.

"In view of the above, the State of Emergency which was proclaimed in May 1948 has remained in force ever since. This situation constitutes a public emergency within the meaning of article 4 (1) of the Covenant.

"The Government of Israel has therefore found it necessary, in accordance with the said article 4, to take measures to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, for the defence of the State and for the protection of life and property, including the exercise of powers of arrest and detention.

"In so far as any of these measures are inconsistent with article 9 of the Covenant, Israel thereby derogates from its obligations under that provision."

NICARAGUA

4 June 1980

The Governing Junta for National Reconstruction of the Republic of Nicaragua, by Decree No. 383 of 29 April 1980, rescinded the National Emergency Act promulgated on 22 July 1979 and revoked the state of emergency extended by Decree No. 365 of 11 April 1980.

14 April 1982

Suspension of articles 1–5, 8 (3), 10, 12–14, 17, 19–22, 26 and 27 in accordance with Decree No. 996 of 15 March 1982 (national emergency) from 15 March to 14 April 1982. Extension of the suspension to 14 May 1982.

8 June 1982

Extension of the suspension to 14 June 1982.

26 August 1982

Suspension of the above-mentioned articles of the Covenant in accordance with Decree No. 1082 of 26 July 1982 from 26 July 1982 to 26 January 1983.

14 December 1982

Extension of the suspension to 30 May 1983.

8 June 1984

Extension of the state of emergency for fifty days beginning on 31 May 1984 and derogation from article 2, paragraph 3; articles 9, 12 and 14; article 19, paragraphs 2 and 3; and article 21 of the Covenant.

1 August 1984

(Dated 10 June 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency until 30 May 1984 by Decree 1255 of 26 May 1984 and derogations from articles 1 to 5, article 8, paragraph 3; articles 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19 to 22; and articles 26 and 27.

22 August 1984

(Dated 2 August 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency until 20 October 1984 and derogation from articles 2 (3), 9 and 14 of the Covenant by Legislative Decree No. 1477 of 19 July 1984.

(Dated 9 August 1984)

Derogation from the implementation of articles 2 (3), 9 and 14 of the Covenant from 6 August to 20 October 1984, in respect of persons committing or suspected of committing the offences referred to in articles 1 and 2 of the Act concerning the Maintenance of Order and Public Security.

13 November 1985

(Dated 11 November 1985)

. . . [The] Government [of Nicaragua] has been obliged, as a result of the foreign aggression to which it is being subjected, to suspend the application of certain of the provisions of the Covenant throughout the national territory, for a period of one year starting on 30 October 1985.

The reasons for this suspension are [the following]: the Government of the United States of America, against the express will of the majority of the world's governments and peoples and in violation of the norms of international law, has continued its unjust, unlawful and immoral aggression against the Nicaraguan people and their revolutionary government.

. . . The following provisions of the Covenant [are suspended] throughout the national territory for the period of one year, starting on 29 October 1985:

Article 8 (3); article 9; article 10, except paragraph 1; article 12 (2) and (4); article 14, except paragraphs 2 and 5 and subparagraphs (a), (b), (d) and (g) of paragraph 3; article 17; article 19; article 21 and article 22. Article 2 (2) remains in force for those rights that have not been suspended, and paragraph 3 of the same remains in force for all those offences which do not affect national security and public order.

30 January 1987

(Dated 29 January 1987)

Taking into account the continuation and the escalation of the military, political and economic aggressions by the United States of America, the State of National Emergency has been re-established as from 9 January 1987 by Decree No. 245. Accordingly and throughout the territory of Nicaragua and until 8 January 1988 the following provisions of the Covenant are suspended:

Article 2 (3) in respect of acts which undermine national security and public order and of the rights and guarantees set forth in those provisions of the Covenant which have been suspended;

Article 9, (solely for offences against national security and public order).

Article 12 and article 14 (3) (c); article 17, in so far as it relates to home and correspondence, with the other rights remaining in effect;

Articles 19, 21 and 22.

13 May 1987

(Dated 8 April 1987)

By Decree No. 250 dated 23 February 1987, confirming a previous Decree No. 245 of 9 January 1987, the Government of Nicaragua has reinstated the State of emergency for a year as of 28 February 1987, owing to the unjust, unlawful and cruel war of aggression waged against Nicaragua. Accordingly, the following articles of the Covenant are being derogated from:

Article 2, paragraph 3, in which we draw a distinction between administrative *amparo* which is suspended in respect of the rights and guarantees provided in the Covenant, which have been suspended, and the remedy of *habeas corpus*, which is not applicable to offences against national security and public order;

Article 9. It should be understood that the remedy referred to in paragraph 4 is suspended solely in respect of offences against national security and public order;

Article 12, regarding the right of residence, liberty of movement and freedom to enter and leave the country;

Article 14, paragraph (3), regarding the right to be tried without undue delay;

Article 17, in respect of the inviolability of the home and correspondence with the other rights remaining in effect;

Article 19, paragraphs (1) and (2), regarding the right to hold opinions and the freedom of expression.

8 February 1988

(Dated 4 February 1988)

Suspension of the state of emergency in force in the country, thus re-establishing the full enjoyment of all rights and guarantees of Nicaraguans laid down in the Constitution of Nicaragua.

20 May 1993

(Dated 19 May 1993)

Partial suspension for a period of 30 days by Decree 30-93 of 18 May 1993 as from that same date of the rights and guarantees provided for in articles 17(in respect of the inviolability of the home), 9(1)(2)(3) and (5) within the 14 Nicaraguan municipalities located in the departments of Matagalpa, Jinotega, Estelf, Nueva Segovia and Madriz for the purpose of restoring law and order and public safety in accordance with the needs expressed since criminal offences have been perpetrated continually in certain municipalities in the country threatening public order and personal security. Moreover, some members of armed groups have continued to engage in unlawful rebel activities.

13 August 1993

(Dated 11 August 1993)

Re-establishment of the rights and guarantees provided for in articles 17 and 9 of the Covenant as from 17 June 1993 in the affected municipalities and throughout Nicaragua.

PANAMA

21 June 1987

(Dated 11 June 1987)

Declaration of the State of emergency throughout the territory of the Republic of Panama. The notification specifies that the state of emergency was declared since, on 9 and 10 June 1987, there were outbreaks of violence, clashes between demonstrators and units of defence forces, and incitement to violence by individuals and political groups resulting in personal injury and considerable material damage. The measure was taken with a view to restoring law and order and safeguarding the life, the dignity and the property of Panamanian nationals and of foreigners living in Panama.

The articles of the Covenant being derogated from are articles 12, paragraph 1; 17, with regard to the inviolability of correspondence; 19 and 21.

1 July 1987

Termination of the State of emergency and reinstatement of all constitutional guarantees as at 30 June 1987.

PERU

22 March 1983

(Dated 18 March 1983)

First notification:

The Government has declared the extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Victor Fajardo y Huamanga, in the Department of Ayacucho, Andahuaylas in the Department of Apurímac, and Angaraes, Tayacaja and Acobamba in the Department of Huancavelica and for a period of 60 days from the date of the issue of the Supreme Decree No. 003-83-IN of 25 February 1983.

Suspension of the constitutional guarantees provided for in paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 20 (g) of article 2 of the Political Constitution of Peru, which relate to the inviolability of the home, liberty of movement in the national territory, the right of peaceful assembly and the right to liberty and security of person.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 4 April 1983, the Government of Peru specified that the state of emergency extended by Supreme Decree No. 003-83-IN of 25 February 1983 was originally proclaimed by Supreme Decree No. 026-81-IN of 12 October 1981. It further specified that the provisions of the Covenant from which it was derogated by reason of the proclamation of the state of emergency were articles 9, 12, 17 and 21.

Second notification:

Extension of a state of emergency in the Department of Lima by Supreme Decree No. 005-83-IN of 9 March [1983], and suspension for a period of five days of the constitutional guarantees provided for in paragraphs 9, 10 and 20 (g) of article 2 of the Political Constitution of Peru relating to liberty of movement in the national territory, the right of peaceful assembly and the right to liberty and security of persons. Suspension of the state of emergency as from 14 March 1983.

3 May 1983

(Dated 27 April 1983)

Extension of derogations for a further 60 days by Supreme Decree 014-83-IN of 22 April 1983.

2 June 1983

(Dated 28 May 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of three days in Lima and in the province of Callao by Supreme Decree No. 020-83 of 25 May 1983.

(Dated 31 May 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days throughout the Republic by Supreme Decree No. 022-83 of 30 May 1984.

9 August 1983

(Dated 8 August 1983)

Further extension of the state of emergency in its national territory for 60 days by Supreme Decree No. 036-83 of 2 August 1983.

29 September 1983

Termination as from 9 September 1983 of the state of emergency and of the derogations with the exceptions of the Departments of Huancavelica, Ayacucho and Apurímac.

9 November 1983

(Dated 3 November 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Víctor Fajardo y Huamanga (Department of Ayacucho), Andahuaylas (Department of Apurímac), Angaraes, Tayacaja and Acobamba (Department of Huancavelica) by Supreme Decree No. 054–83 of 22 October 1983.

20 December 1983

(Dated 19 December 1983)

Extension of the state of emergency in the provinces of Lucanas and Ayacucho (Department of Ayacucho) and the province of Huancavelica (Department of Huancavelica) by Supreme Decree No. 061–83–IN of 6 December 1983.

13 February 1984

(Dated 31 January 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency for 60 days in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Victor Fajardo and Huamanga (Department of Ayacucho), Andahuaylas (Department of Apurimac), Angaraes, Tayacaja and Acobamba (Department of Huancavelica), and in the districts of Querobamba and Cabana (Department of Ayacucho), and throughout the provinces of Lucanas (Department of Ayacucho) and Huancavelica (Department of Huancavelica) by Supreme Decree No. 061–83–IN of 6 December 1983.

28 March 1984

(Dated 26 March 1984)

Extension of state of emergency throughout Peru from 21 to 23 March 1984.

14 May 1984

(Dated 19 April 1984)

Continuation of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Victor Fajardo and Huamanga and Lucanas (Department of Ayacucho); Andahuaylas and Chinceros (Department of Apurimac); Angaraes, Tayacaja, Acobamba, Huancavelica and Castrovirreyna (Department of Huancavelica) by Decree No. 031–84–IN of 17 April 1984.

18 June 1984

(Dated 15 June 1984)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days, starting from 8 June 1984, in the whole of the territory of the Republic of Peru.

9 August 1984

(Dated 12 July 1984)

Extension of the state of emergency as at 8 July 1984, for a period of 30 days, throughout the territory of the Republic of Peru.

14 August 1984

Extension of the state of emergency throughout Peru for a period of 60 days, starting from7 August 1984.

25 October 1984

(Dated 22 October 1984)

By Supreme Decree No. 052–84–IN of 5 October 1984 termination of the state of emergency in the territory of the Republic excepting the following provinces and departments, where the state of emergency has been extended for 60 days as of 5 October 1984:

– the Department of Huánuco; the province of Mariscal Cáceres (Department of San Martín); the provinces of Huanta, La Mar, Cangallo, Víctor Fajardo, Huamanga and Lucanas (Department of Ayacucho); the provinces of Andahuaylas and Chincheros (Department of Apurímac); the provinces of Angaraes, Tayacaja, Acobamba, Huancavelica and Castrovirreyna (Department of Huancavelica).

21 December 1984

(Dated 19 December 1984)

By Supreme Decree No. 063–84–IN, the Government of Peru had extended the state of emergency as at 3 December 1984, for a period of 60 days, in the Departments of Huánuco and San Martín and the Province of Mariscal Cáceres. The said extension had been declared owing to the continued terrorist acts of violence and sabotage in those regions and, as a result, the Government of Peru continued to derogate from articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant.

(Dated 21 December 1984)

By Supreme Decree No. 065–84–IN, the Government of Peru had found it necessary to extend the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 7 December 1984, in the following provinces:

Ayacucho Department

– Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Lucanas, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán;

Huancavelica Department

– Ancobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja and Huaytará;

Apurímac Department

– Andahuaylas and Chincheros.

8 February 1985

(Dated 7 February 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 001/85–IN, extension of the state of emergency as of 3 February 1985 in the Departments of San Martín, including the province of Tocache and excluding the Province of Mariscal Cáceres, and Huánco, excluding the Provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea.

By Supreme Decree No. 001/85–IN, exclusion of the state of emergency as of 3 February 1985 in the Department of San Martín, including the Province of Tocache and excluding the Province of Mariscal Cáceres, and Huánco, excluding the Provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea.

12 April 1985

(Dated 9 April 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 012–85–IN, extension of the state of emergency as of 1 April 1985 in the Department of San Martín including the Province of Tocache, and in the Department of Huánco, except in the provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea.

18 June 1985

(14 June 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 020–85–IN, the state of emergency in the Province of Pasco (Department of Pasco) has been declared for a period of 60 days, starting from 10 May 1985.

By Supreme Decree No. 021–85–IN the state of emergency in the Department of San Martín, including the Province of Tocache and in the Department of Huánuco, except in the provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea, has been extended for a period of 60 days, starting from 1 June 1985.

By Supreme Decree No. 022–85–IN the state of emergency in the Province of Daniel Alcides Carrión (Department of Pasco)

has been extended for a period of 60 days, starting from 4 June 1985.

By Supreme Decree No. 023-85-IN, the state of emergency has been extended for a period of 60 days starting from 5 June 1985 in the following provinces:

Ayacucho Department

- Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Lucanas, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán;

Huancavelica Department

- Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytará and Churcampa;

Apurimac Department

- Andahuaylas and Chincheros

The above-mentioned notifications specify that the state of emergency had been declared or extended as indicated above owing to the continued terrorist acts of violence and sabotage.

As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being or still being derogated from in the regions in question for the said periods of time.

24 July 1985

(Dated 23 July 1985)

By supreme Decree No. 031-85, the state of emergency in the Province of Pasco (Department of Pasco) has been extended for a period of 60 days, starting from 10 July 1985.

6 August 1985

(Dated 31 July 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 033-85-IN, the state of emergency in the Province of Yauli (Department of Junín) has been declared for a period of 12 days, starting from 19 July 1985.

12 August 1985

(Dated 12 August 1985)

By Supreme Decree No. 042-85-IN, the State of emergency has been extended for a period of 60 days starting from 6 August 1985 in the following provinces and departments:

(i) the province of Tocache (Department of San Martín);
(ii) the Department of Huánco, except the provinces of Puerto Inca and Pachitea;
(iii) the province of Daniel Alcides Carrión (Department of Pasco);
(iv) the provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Lucanas, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán (Department of Ayacucho);
(v) the provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Andahuaylas and Chincheros (Department of Apurímac).

13 December 1985

(Dated 11 December 1985)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the following provinces, in accordance with Decree No. 052-85-IN as of 5 December 1985 (derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, and 21 of the Covenant), owing to continued terrorist actions in the said regions:

- Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos and Vilcashuamán (Department of Ayacucho);
- Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytará and Churcampe (Department of Huancavelica);
- Provinces of Huaycabamba, Huamalíes, Dos de Mayo and Ambo (Department of Huánuco);
- Province of Chincheros (Department of Apurímac).

21 February 1986

(Dated 14 February 1986)

First notification

Extension as of 5 February 1986 by Decree No. 001-86 of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the same provinces as declared by Decree No. 052-85 IN (see notification of 13 December 1985).

Second notification

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the city of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao for a period of 60 days starting from 7 February 1986, in accordance with Decree No. 002-86.

The notifications specify that the extension was decided owing to continued terrorist actions and that articles 9, 12, 17, and 21 of the Covenant continue to be derogated from).

24 April 1986

(Dated 14 April 1986)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the same provinces and city as declared by Decrees No. 001-86 and 002-86 (see notifications of 21 February 1986), in accordance with Decree No. 004-86 and 005-86-IN as of 3 April 1986.

5 June 1986

(Dated 4 June 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 012-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency in the city of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao for a period of 60 days, starting from 2 June 1986.

9 June 1986

(Dated 6 June 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 013-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 4 June 1986, in the provinces stated in the notification received on 21 February 1986.

23 June 1986

(Dated 20 June 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 015-86-IN, declaration of the state of emergency in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco) for a period of 60 days, starting from 18 June 1986.

The Government of Peru specified that the said extensions and declaration of a state of emergency had been declared owing to the continuation or occurrence of terrorist acts and sabotage. As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being or still being derogated from in the regions in question for the said periods of time.

6 August 1986

(Dated 5 August 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 019-86-IN, extension of the state of emergency in the Province of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao for a period of 30 days, starting from 2 August 1986.

8 August 1986

(Dated 7 August 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 020-86-IN, for a period of 60 days starting from 3 August 1986, extension of the state of emergency in the same provinces as under notification of 18 June 1985 and the Department of Huánuco (Province of Huaycabamba, Huamalíes, Dos de Mayo and Ambo).

25 August 1986

(Dated 19 August 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 023-86-IN, extension of the State of Siege in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco) for a period of 60 days, starting from 19 August 1986.

5 September 1986

(Dated 4 September 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 026–86–IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 1 September 1986 in the Province of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao.

The notification specifies that inasmuch as the municipal election process has begun, and in order to facilitate campaigning by political parties and independent candidates, without adversely affecting the security measures necessitated by the state of emergency, the prefectural authority, during the state of emergency, shall issue the appropriate regulations for governing the exercise of the right of assembly and the liberty of movement is partially re–established. In accordance with the said Decree, article 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant continue to be derogated from, within the limits indicated above.

8 October 1986

(Dated 3 October 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 029–86–IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting on 1 October 1986, in the same provinces as those indicated under the notification of 8 August 1986 (see above).

22 October 1986

(Dated 17 October 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 03–86–IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 16 October 1986, in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco). The notification further specifies that, during the state of emergency, the prefectoral authority shall issue the appropriate regulations for governing the exercise of the right of assembly.

5 November 1986

(Dated 3 November 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 03–86–IN, extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 16 October 1986, and starting from 29 October 1986, in the provinces of Lima and Callao (intervention of the prefectoral authority identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one indicated in the notification of 22 October 1986). The notification further specifies that, the armed forces shall continue to maintain responsibility for public order in the provinces concerned.

18 December 1986

(Dated 16 December 1986)

By Supreme Decree No. 036–86–IN, extension of the state of emergency in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco) for a period of 60 days, starting from 14 December 1986.

2 February 1987

(Dated 30 January 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 25 January 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

(Dated 2 February 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 29 January 1987 in the provinces stated in notification of 13 December 1985.

Both notifications specify that the said extensions for the state of emergency had been declared owing to the continued terrorist acts of violence and sabotage.

4 March 1987

(Dated 23 February 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 13 February 1987 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

3 April 1987

(Dated 2 April 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days in the Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuaman and Sucre; Department of Apurimac (Province of Chincheros); and Department of Huánuco (Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamaliés).

1 June 1987

(Dated 26 May 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days from 26 May 1987 in the provinces of Lima and Callao.

The notification specifies that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall maintain responsibility for domestic public order in those regions.

8 June 1987

(Dated 26 May 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days in the provinces stated in the notification of 3 April 1987 as well as in the Department of Huancavelica (Province of Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovierreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacajà, Huaytará and Churcampa).

18 June 1987

(Dated 8 June 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 8 June 1987 in the provinces stated in the notification of 4 March 1987 above.

24 June 1987

(Dated 24 June 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 June 1987 in the provinces of Lima and Callao (see also notification dated 23 July 1987 hereinafter).

23 July 1987

(20 July 1987)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 July 1987 in the provinces of Lima and Callao.

The notifications of 24 June and 23 July 1987 specify that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall maintain responsibility for domestic public order in those regions and that with respect to article 21 of the Covenant, the prefectural authority shall issue the appropriate regulations governing the exercise of the right of assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the said article 21 of the Covenant.

23 July 1987

(Dated 20 July 1987)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as from 14 July 1987 in the following areas:

Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Cholón Province of Marañon (Department of Huánuco) Provinces of Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín).

The notification specifies that the State of emergency had been declared owing to the continuing acts of terrorism and sabotage in those regions.

As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being derogated from for the said period of time and that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall continue to exercise political and military control of the areas in question.

4 August 1987

(Dated 25 July 1987)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 25 July 1987, in the Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuamán and Sucre (Department of Ayacucho); Provinces of

Acobamba, Angaraes, Castrovirreyna, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytara and Churcampa (Department of Huancavelica); Province of Chincheros (Department of Apurímac); and Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamalíes.

The notification specifies that the state of emergency had been declared owing to the continuing acts of terrorism and sabotage in those regions.

As a result, articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant are being derogated from for the said period of time; the notification further specifies that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall continue to exercise political and military control of the areas in question.

13 August 1987

(Dated 7 August 1987)

Declaration of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, staring from 7 August 1987, in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

The notification specifies that during the state of emergency, the Armed Forces shall maintain responsibility for domestic public order in the provinces in question and that with respect to article 21 of the Covenant, the prefectural authority shall issue the appropriate regulations governing the exercise of the right of assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the said article 21.

27 August 1987

(Dated 19 August 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days, starting from 19 August 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

23 September 1987

(Dated 13 September 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting 13 September 1987, in the Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Chólon of the Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco) and Provinces of Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín).

The armed forces will continue to exercise political and military control in the areas in question.

23 September 1987

(Dated 21 September 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days starring from 21 September 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

The notification specifies that with respect to article 21 of the Covenant, the prefectural authority shall issue the appropriate regulations governing the exercise of the right of assembly, in accordance with the provisions of the said article.

9 October 1987

First notification

(Dated 3 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 23 September 1987 in the Provinces of Abancay, Aymares, Antabamba, Andahuaylas and Grau (Department of Apurímac).

Second notification

(Dated 5 October 1987)

Declaration of a state of emergency for a period of 60 days as of 5 October 1987 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

The armed forces shall continue to exercise political and military control of the areas in question.

4 November 1987

(Dated 23 October 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 21 October 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

23 December 1987

(Dated 19 December 1987)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 17 December 1987 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

22 January 1988

(Dated 20 January 1988)

First notification:

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 16 January 1988 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

Second notification:

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as of 17 January 1988 in the following Provinces:

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Víctor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Department of Huancavelica (Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytará and Churcampa);

Department of Apurimac (Province of Chincheros);

Department of Huánuco (Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamaliés).

1 February 1988

(Dated 22 January 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 8 January 1988 in the following Provinces:

Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Cholón of the Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco);

Provinces of Moyobamba, Bellavista, Huallaga, Lamas, Picota, Rioja, San Martín, Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín).

8 February 1988

(Dated 4 February 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 2 February 1988 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrillo and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

11 March 1988

(Dated 10 March 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 9 March 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinces of Moyobamba, Bellavista, Huallaga, Lamas, Picota, Rioja, San Martín, Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín);

Province of Leoncio Prado and District of Cholón of the Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco).

29 March 1988

(Dated 21 March 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 17 March 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinces of Abancay, Aymares, Antabamba, Andahuaylas and Grau (Department of Apurímac).

8 April 1988

(Dated 4 April 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days, starting from 2 April 1988, in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrillo and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

19 April 1988

(Dated 21 March 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as of 15 April 1988, in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

2 May 1988

(Dated 28 April 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 20 days as of 27 April 1988 in the Province of Castrovirreyna (Department of Huancavelica).

23 May 1988

(Dated 19 May 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 60 days as of 15 May 1988 in the following Provinces:

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, Huanta, La Mar, Victor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Department of Huancavelica (Provinces of Acobamba, Angaraes, Huancavelica, Tayacaja, Huaytara, Churcampa and Castrovirreyna);

Department of Apurimac (Provinces of Chincheros, Abancay, Aymares, Antabamba, Andahuaylas and Grau);

Department of Huánuco (Province of Ambo and District of Monzón of the Province of Huamaliés).

27 June 1988

(Dated 7 June 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 43 days starting 1 June 1988 in the Provinces of Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco (Department of Pasco).

(Dated 16 June 1988)

First notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days starting 15 June 1988 in the Provinces of Cotabambas (Department of Apurímac).

Second notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 30 days starting 14 June 1988 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

Third notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 29 days starting 15 June 1988 in the following Provinces:

Provinces of Moyobamba, Bellavista, Huallaga, Lamas, Picota, Rioja, San Martín, Mariscal Cáceres and Tocache (Department of San Martín);

Province of Marañón (Department of Huánuco).

22 July 1988

(Dated 19 July 1988)

First notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 14 July 1988 in the Provinces of Lima and Callao.

Second notification:

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 14 July 1988 in the following Provinces:

Department of Apurímac;

Department of Huancavelica;

Department of San Martín;

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, La Mar, Victor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Huanta, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Department of Huánuco (Provinces of Ambo and Leoncio Prado; Districts of Monzón of the Province of Huamalíes and Cholón of the Province of Marañón).

15 September 1988

(Dated 13 September 1988)

Extension of the State of emergency for a period of 60 days starting 7 September 1988 in the following Provinces:

Department of Apurímac;

Department of Huancavelica;

Department of San Martín;

Department of Ayacucho (Provinces of Cangallo, Huamanga, La Mar, Victor Fajardo, Huancasancos, Huanta, Vilcashuamán and Sucre);

Pasco Department: Daniel Alcides Carrión and Pasco;

Department of Huànuco: Ambo and Leoncio Prado, District of Monzón (Province of Huamaliés) and District of Cholón (province of Marañon);

Department of Lima: Provinces of Lima and the constitutional province of Callao).

21 December 1988

(Dated 8 December 1988)

Extension of the state of emergency for sixty (60) days from [18 September 1988] in the provinces of Lucanas, Parinacochas and Páucar del Sara Sara in the Department of Ayacucho and the provinces of Pachitea, Huánuco, Dos de Mayo, Huamaliés and Marañon in the Department of Huánuco.

9 January 1989

(Dated 5 January 1989)

Extension of the state of emergency for sixty (60) days from 3 January 1989 in the Departments of Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho, Huánuco and Lima, the province of Lima and the constitutional province of Callao.

8 March 1989

(Dated 6 March 1989)

Extension of the state of emergency for sixty (60) days from 4 March 1989 in the following Departments and Provinces:

The Department of Apurímac (with the exception of the Province of Andahuaylas), the Departments of Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho, Huánuco and Lima, the province of Lima and the Constitutional Province of Callao.

4 August 1989

(Dated 2 August 1989)

Extension of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days from 31 July 1989 in the Department of Ucayali and the Province of Ucayali–Contamaná of the Department of Loreto.

15 August 1989

(Dated 14 August 1989)

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days from 9 August 1989 in the Province of Huarochirí of the Department of Lima.

7 June 1990

(Dated 7 June 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days, with effect from 31 May 1990, in the province of Lima, Department of Lima, and in the constitutional province of Callao.

Suspension of the individual rights provided for in articles 9 and 21 of the Covenant.

19 March 1992

Notification of declarations or extensions of the state of emergency which were made necessary by the continuing acts of violence caused by terrorist groups, leading to a climate of insecurity which endangered the normal performance of public and private activities. The articles of the Covenant which were dero-

gated from are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21. The said declarations and extensions of the state of emergency were as follows:

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 August 1990 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho, Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto.
- Declaration for a period of 30 days as from 5 September 1990 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 September 1990 in the District of Yurimaguas and in the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 5 October 1990 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for a period of 30 days as from 13 October 1990 in the Provinces of Melgar, Azángaro, Huancane and San Antonio de Putina of the Department of Puno.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 October 1990 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the District of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención in the Department of Cuzco.
- Extension for a period of 30 days as from 25 November 1990 in the District of Yurimaguas, Province of Alto Amazonas, Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 4 December 1990 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 24 December 1990 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the District of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención in the Department of Cuzco and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 2 February 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for a period of 60 days as from 18 February 1991 in the Provinces of Azángaro, Lampa, Melgar, San Antonio de Putina and Huancané of the Department of Puno and in the Provinces of Caravelí, La Unión and Caylloma in the Department of Arequipa.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 22 February 1991 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco, Ucayali and in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the District of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención in the Department of Cuzco and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 9 March 1991 in the Provinces of Chumbivilcas, Canas, Espinar and Canchis of the Region Inca.
- Declaration for 30 days as from 9 March 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 12 March 1991 in the ports, terminals and wharfs (maritime, fluvial and lacustrine) of the Republic.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 3 April 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Extension for a period of 30 days as from 8 April 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 19 April 1991 in the Provinces of Azángaro, Lampa, Melgar, San Antonio de Putina and Huancané of the Department of Puno and in the Provinces of Caravelí, La Unión and Caylloma in the Department of Arequipa.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 23 April 1991 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco and Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto, in the Districts of Quimbiri of the Province of Convención of the Department of Cuzco, Yurimaguas in the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 8 May 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 9 May 1991 in the Provinces of Chumbivilcas, Canas, Espinar and Canchis of the Region Inca.
- Declaration for a period of 60 days as from 21 May 1991 in the Provinces of Condesuyos and Castilla of the Region Arequipa.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 2 June 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 18 June 1991 in the Provinces of Sandia and Carabaya of the Department of Puno.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 18 June 1991 in the Provinces of Azángaro, Lampa, Melgar, San Antonio de Putina and Huancané of the Department of Puno and in the Provinces of Caravelí, La Unión and Caylloma in the Department of Arequipa.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 22 June 1991 in Apurímac, Huancavelica, San Martín, Junín, Pasco, Ayacucho (except the Province of Huamanga), Huánuco and Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto, in the Districts of Quimbiri in the Province of Convención of the Department of Cuzco, Yurimaguas in the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 4 July 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 30 July 1991 in the Province of Convención except the District of Quimbiri which already is under the state of emergency, and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 1 August 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 27 August 1991 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 27 August 1991 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 5 September 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 18 September 1991 in Apurimac.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 28 September in Ucayali, the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.
- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 30 September 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.
- Declaration for 60 days as from 28 September 1991 in the Province of Cajabamba of the Department of Cajamarca.

– Declaration for 30 days as from 26 September 1991 in the Provinces of Melgar, Azangare, Sandia and Carabaya of the Department of Puno.

– Declaration for 60 days as from 25 September 1991 in the Provinces of Chanchamayo, Satipo, in the Districts of Ulcumayo and Junín of the Province of Junín, in the District of Andamarca of the Province of Concepción, in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba and Pariahuanca of the Province of Huancayo, in the Districts of San Pedro de Cajas, Palca and Huasahuasi of the Province of Tarma and in the District of Monobamba of the Province of Jauja of the Department of Junín, in the Districts of Huachón and Paucartambo of the Province of Pasco, in the Districts of Chontabamba, Oxapampa and Villa Rica of the Province of Oxapampa of the Department of Pasco.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 October 1991 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 October 1991 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Mazanoas of the Department of Loreto.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 28 October 1991 in the Provinces of Chanchamayo, Satipo, in the Districts of Ulcumayo and Junín of the Province of Junín, in the Districts of Andamarca, Santa Rosa de Ocopa, Matahuasi, Mito, Nueve de Julio, Concepción and Orcotuna of the Province of Concepción, in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, Pariahuanca, Sapallanga, Chilca, Huancayo, Huamancaca Chico, Huayucachi, Tres de Diciembre, Pilcomayo, Huacan, Chupaca and Tambo of the Province of Huancayo, in the Districts of San Pedro de Cajas, Palca and Huasahuasi and Tarma of the Province of Tarma and in the District of Monobamba, Sausa, Jauja, Yauyos, Huetas and Pancas of the Province of Jauja and in the Districts of Oroya and Morococha of the Province of Yauli of the Department of Junín, in the Districts of Huachón, Paucartambo and Chaupimarca of the Province of Pasco, in the Districts of Chontabamba, Oxapampa and Villa Rica of the Province of Oxapampa of the Department of Pasco.

– Extension for a period of 30 days from 28 October 1991 in the Provinces of Melgar, Azángaro and Sandia of the Department of Puno.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 4 November 1991 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 17 November 1991 in Apurímac.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 27 November 1991 in the Department of Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and in the the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

– Extension for a period of 30 days as from 27 November 1991 in the Province of Azangaro of the Department of Puno.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 29 November 1991 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 December 1991 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Mazanoas of the Department of Loreto.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 December 1991 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

– Extension for a period of 30 days as from 27 December 1991 in the Province of Azangaro of the District of Puno.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 27 December 1991 in the Provinces of Chanchamayo, Satipo, in the Districts of Ulcumayo and Junín of the Province of Junín, in the Districts of Andamarca, Santa Rosa de Ocopa, Matahuasi, Mito, Nueve de Julio, Concepción and Orcotuna of the Province of Concepción, in the Districts of Santo Domingo de Acobamba, Partahuanca, Sapallanga, Chilca, Huancayo, Huamancaca Chico, Huayucachi, Tres de Diciembre, Pilcomayo, Huacan, Chupaca and Tambo of the Province of Huancayo, in the Districts of San Pedro de Cajas, Palca, Huasahuasi and Tarma of the Province of Tarma and in the District of Monobamba, Sausa, Jauja, Yauyos, Huertas and Pancas of the Province of Jauja and in the Districts of Oroya and Morococha of the Province of Yauli of the Department of Junín, in the Districts of Huachón, Paucartambo and Chanpimarca of the Province of Pasco, in the Districts of Chontabamba, Oxapampa and Villa Rica of the Province of Oxapampa of the Department of Pasco.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 3 January 1992 in the Provinces of Ica, Chincha, Nazca, Pisco and Palpa of the Region Los Libertadores–Wari.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 16 January 1992 in Apurímac.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 January 1992 in the Department of Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and in the the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 28 January 1992 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

– Declaration for 30 days as from 21 January 1992 in the Province of Danel Carrión, in the Districts of Huancabamba, Palcazu, Pozuzo and Puerto Bermudes of the Province of Oxapampa and in the Districts of Huariaca, Huayllay, Hinacaca, Pallanchacra, San Francisco de Assis, Simón Bolivar, Tillacayas, Tinyahuarco, Vicco and Yanacancha of the Province of Pasco of the Department of Pasco.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 23 February 1992 in Huánuco (except the Province of Puerto Inca and the District of Huacrachuco), San Martín and in the District of Yurimaguas of the Province of Alto Amazonas of the Department of Loreto.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 23 February 1992 in the Province of Convención (except the District of Quimbiri) and in the Districts of Yanatili and Lares of the Province of Calca of the Department of Cuzco.

– Declaration for 60 days as from 25 February 1992 in the provinces of Malgar and Azangaro of the Department of Puno.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 25 February 1992 in the Provinces of Pasco and Daniel Carrión of the Department of Pasco and in the Provinces of Huancayo, Concepción, Jauja, Satipo and Chanchamayo of the Department of Junín.

– Declaration for 60 days as from 25 February 1992 in the Provinces of Castrovirreyna, Huaytara and Huancavelica of the Department of Huancavelica and in the Provinces of Lucanas, Huamanga and Cangallo of the Department of Ayacucho.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 16 March 1992 in Apurímac.

– Extension for a period of 60 days as from 26 March 1992 in the Provinces of Coronel Portillo and Padre Abad of the Department of Ucayali, in the Province of Ucayali of the Department of Loreto and in the Province of Puerto Inca of the Department of Huánuco.

- Extension for a period of 60 days as from 28 March 1992 in Lima and in the constitutional province of Callao.

10 April 1992

A Framework Law relating to the Government of Emergency and National Reconstruction has been established by Decree Law No. 25418 of 6 April 1992. A Manisfesto to the Nation of 5 April 1992 by the President of the Republic is deemed to form part of the Decree.

This measure became necessary due to Parliament's inability to function together with the obvious obstructionist tactics and hidden conspirational methods of the partisan elites which are thwarting the efforts of the people and the Government. The Government indicated also other reasons such as terrorism and the fight against drug trafficking.

(The articles of the Convention which are being derogated from under the above-mentioned Decree have been requested from the Government of Peru.)

9 February, 22 May and 23 October 1995

The Government of Peru notified, under article 4 (3) of the Covenant, that it had declared, lifted or extended the state of emergency in a number of departments, provinces and districts of Peru indicating that the measures were prompted by the persistence of acts of violence caused by terrorist groups and drug traffickers, who are fomenting a climate of insecurity that threatens the normal conduct of public and private activities. The Government of Peru specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 17 and 21 of the Covenant. *[For reasons of economy and size, it will not be possible to include the texts of all the notifications concerning the states of siege as declared, lifted or extended. For a comprehensive list of these actions, see depositary notification C.N.460.1995. TREATIES-13 of 10 February 1996.]*

POLAND

1 February 1982

"In connection with the proclamation of martial law by the Council of State of the Polish People's Republic, as based on article 33, paragraph 2, of Poland's Constitution, there has been temporary derogation from or limitation of application of provisions of articles 9, 12 (paragraphs1 and 2), 14 (paragraph 5), 19 (paragraphs 2, 21 and 22) of the Covenant, to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation . . .

Temporary limitation of certain rights of citizens has been prompted by the supreme national interest. It was caused by the exigencies of averting a civil war, economic anarchy as well as de-stabilization of state and social structures . . .

The restrictive measures in question are of a temporary nature. They have already been considerably cut back and along with the stabilizing of the situation, will be successively terminated."

22 December 1982

Basing on the law by the Diet (Seym) of the Polish People's Republic of 18 December 1982 concerning special legal regulation in the time of suspension of marital law, derogation from Covenant's articles 9, 12 paragraphs 1 and 2, articles 21 and 22, has been terminated as of 31 December 1982.

By terms of the same law as well as a result of earlier successive measures, restrictions in the application of Covenant provisions which are still derogated from, namely article 14 paragraph 5 and article 19 paragraph 2, have also been considerable reduced.

For instance, with reference to Covenant's article 14 paragraph 5, emergency procedures have been lifted in relation to crimes and offences committed in social conflicts out of political motivations, they have only been retained with regard to crimes most dangerous to State's basic economic interests as well as to life, health and property of its citizens.

25 July 1983

Termination as from 22 July 1983 of derogations.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

18 October 1988

(Dated 13 October 1988)

[Owing to] nationalistic clashes in the Soviet Union in the Nagorno-Karabach Autonomous Region and the Agdam district of the Azerbaydzhan Soviet Socialist Republic [and to] contraventions of public order, accompanied in a number of cases by the use of weapons, [which] have unfortunately resulted in casualties and damage to the property of the State and of private individuals [and owing to the attack of] some State institutions . . . a state of emergency has been temporarily imposed, and a curfew is in effect, in the Nagorno-Karabach Autonomous Region and the Agdam district of the Azerbaydzhan SSR, as of 21 September 1988. The state of emergency has been imposed in order to restore public order, protect citizens' individual and property rights and enforce strict compliance with the law, in accordance with the powers conferred by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

While the state of emergency is in force, demonstrations, rallies, meetings and strikes are banned. The movements of civilians and vehicles are restricted between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. These restrictions represent a partial departure from the provisions of articles 12 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Steps to ensure the safety of civilians and maintain public order are being taken by units of the militia and the armed forces. The local and central organs of power and government are taking steps to normalize the situation; and elucidation effort is in progress, with the aim of preventing criminal acts and incitement to national hatred.

Further [information will be provided as concerns] the date on which the state of emergency is lifted after the normalization of the situation.

17 January 1990

(Dated 15 January 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency as from 11 p.m. local time on 15 January 1990, in territory of the Nagorno-Karabach autonomous region, the regions of the Azerbaijan SSR adjacent thereto, the Gorissa region of the Armenian SSR and the border zone along the state frontier between the USSR and the territory of the Azerbaijan SSR. The state of emergency was proclaimed owing to incitement by extremist groups which are organizing disorders, stirring up dissension and hostility between nationalities, and do not hesitate to mine roads, open fire in inhabited areas and take hostages. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

25 January 1990

(Dated 29 January 1990)

Proclamation of the state of emergency, as from 20 January in the city of Baku and application to that territory of the Decree adopted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on 15 January 1990, in the light of massive disorders organized by criminal extremist forces to overthrow the Government, and also with a view to ensure the protection and security of citizens. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant are accordingly suspended.

26 March 1990

(Dated 23 March 1990)

Establishment of the state of emergency as from 12 February 1990 in Dushanbe (Tadzhik SSR) because of widespread disorders, arson and other criminal acts which resulted in a threat to the citizens. Articles 9, 12 and 21 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

5 November 1992

(Dated 3 November 1992)

Establishment of the state of emergency from 2 p.m. on 2 November 1992 to 2 p.m. on 2 December 1992 in the territory of the North Ossetian SSR and the Ingush Republic as a result of the serious deterioration in the situation with mass disturbances and conflicts between minorities accompanied by violence involving the use of weapons and military equipment and leading to the loss of human lives, and also in view of the threat to the security and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. Articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant were accordingly suspended.

7 April 1993

(Dated 7 April 1993)

Establishment of the state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 March 1993 to 1400 hours on 31 May 1993 in the Prigorodny district and adjacent areas of the North Ossetian SSR and part of the Nazran district of the Ingush Republic due to "the continuing deterioration of the situation in parts of the North Ossetian Socialist Republic and the Ingush Republic, popular unrest and inter-ethnic conflicts, accompanied by violence involving the use of arms and military equipment".

The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

13 August 1993

(Dated 10 August 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency by Decree No. 1149 of 27 and 30 July 1993, as from 31 July 1993 at 1400 hours until 30 September 1993 at 1400 hours in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) and the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic due to the deterioration of the situation in certain parts of these territories.

The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12(1), 13, 17(1), 19(2), 21 and 22.

5 October 1993

(Dated 4 October 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency as from 3 October 1993 at 4 p.m. to 10 October 1993 at 4 p.m. in the city of Moscow "in connection with the attempts of extremist forces to provoke mass violence through organized attacks against the representatives of authority and the Police". The provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12(1), 13, 19(2) and 22.

22 October 1993

(Dated 21 October 1993)

Extension of the state of emergency in the city of Moscow pursuant Decree No. 1615 of 9 October 1993 until 18 October 1993 at 5 a.m. owing to "the need to ensure further normalization of the situation in Moscow, strengthen the rule of law and ensure the security of the inhabitants after the attempted armed *coup d'état* of 3–4 October 1993

27 October 1993

Termination of the state of emergency established in Moscow pursuant to Decree of 3 October 1993 and extended pursuant to Decree of 9 October 1993, as from 18 October 1993 at 5 a.m.

28 October 1993

(Dated 28 October 1993)

Proclamation of the state of emergency pursuant to Presidential Decree of 29 September 1993 as from 30 September 1993 at 1400 hours until 30 November 1993 at 1400 hours in the territories the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic. The Government of the Russian Federation specified that the reasons for the state of emergency were the deterioration of the situation in a number of districts of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ingush Republic as a result of the non-implementation of the agreements concluded earlier by the two sides and the decisions of the interim administration regarding the settlement of the conflict, and the increase in the number of acts of terrorism and violence. (Derogations from articles 12(1), 13, 19(2) and 22.)

29 December 1993

(Dated 23 December 1993)

Extension of the state of emergency until 31 January 1994 at 1400 hours by Presidential Decree to parts of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic ... necessitated by the worsening of the situation in a number of districts of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic.

18 February 1994

(Dated 22 June 1993)

In view of the deterioration of the situation and the increased frequency of terrorist acts and widespread disorder on national soil involving the use of firearms, the President of Russia issued a Decree on 29 May 1993 declaring a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 May 1993 to 1400 hours on 31 July 1993 in the Mozdok district, the Prigorodny district and adjacent localities of the North Ossetian SSR and in the Malgobek and Nazran districts of the Ingush Republic.

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 9, 12, 19, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

25 April 1994

(Dated 22 April 1994)

In view of the continuing state of tension in a number of districts of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, the unceasing acts of terrorism and violence, including violence against the civilian population, and the still unresolved problem of refugees, the President of the Russian Federation issued Decree No. 657 on 4 April 1994 declaring a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 March 1994 until 1400 hours on 31 May 1994 in territories of the Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Prigorodny district and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and of the Malgobek and Nazran districts (Ingush Republic).

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

23 May 1994

(Dated 20 May 1994)

Proclamation of the state of emergency by Decree No. 836 on 27 April 1994 from 2 p.m. on 27 April 1994 to 2 p.m. on 31 May 1994 in a portion of the territory of the Republic of North Ossetia. The said Decree extends the applicability of paragraphs 3 to 8 of presidential Decree No. 657 of 4 April 1994 to the territories of the Prigorodny district (the Oktyabrskoe, Kambileevskoe and Sunja populated areas) and Vladikavkaz (the Sputnik military

cantonment), in the Republic of North Ossetia. (*In this regard, reference is made to the notification received on 25 April 1994 and dated 22 April 1994).*

The Government of the Russian Federation has specified that the provisions from which it has derogated are articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

21 June 1994

(Dated 21 June 1994)

Lifting, as from 31 May 1994, by virtue of Decree No. 1112 of 30 May 1994, of the state of emergency in part of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, instituted by the President of the Russian Federation under Decrees Nos. 657 of 4 April 1994 and 836 of 27 April 1994. (*In this regard, reference is made to the notifications received on 25 April and 23 May 1994, and dated 22 April and 20 May 1994, respectively).*

Declaration of the state of emergency as from 31 May 1994 at 1400 hours until 31 July 1994 at 1400 hours in the following territories: Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Prigorodny district, the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia, the Malgobek, Nazran, Sunzha and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) by Decree 1112 of 30 May 1994, in view of the continuing state of tension in those districts and the need to ensure the return of refugees and forcibly displaced persons to their places of permanent residence and implement a set of meausres aimed at eliminating the consequences of the armed conflict.

Derogation from the provisions of article 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

12 August 1994

(Dated 12 August 1994)

Lifting as from 31 July 1994 of the state of emergency in part of the territories of the Republic of North Ossetia and the Ingush Republic, instituted on 30 May 1994 (*in this regard, reference is made to the notification received on 21 June 1994*), and proclamation of a state of emergency from 1400 hours on 31 July 1994 until 1400 hours on 30 September 1994 in the territories of the Mozdok, Pravoberezhny, and Prigorodny districts, the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia), and of Malgobek, Nazran, Sunja and Dzheirakh districts (Ingush Republic) in view of the continuing state of tension in those territories and the need for refugees and forcibly displaced persons to return to their places of permanent residence as well as for the elimination of the consequences of armed conflict.

Derogation from the provisions of article 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

(21 October 1994)

(Dated 21 October 1994)

Lifting of the state of emergency instituted by Decree No. 1541 of 25 July 1994 and proclamation of a state of emergency with effect from 1400 hours on 3 October 1994 until 1400 hours on 2 December 1994 in the territories of the Mozkok, Pravoberzhny and Prigorodny districts and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and the Malgobek, Nazran, Sunja and Djeirakh districts (Ingush Republic) in view of the continuing state of tension and the need to ensure the return of forcibly displaced persons to their places of permanent residence and the implementation of a set of measures to deal with the aftermath of the armed conflict in order to guarantee State and public security.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 12 (1) and (2), 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

5 January 1995

(Dated 4 January 1995)

Proclamation by Decree No. 2145 of 2 December 1994 of the state of emergency from 1400 hours on 3 December 1994 until 1400 hours on 31 January 1995 in the territories of the Mozdok district, the Pravoberezhny district, the Pigorodny district and the city of Vladikavkaz (Republic of North Ossetia) and of the Malgobek, Narzan, Sunzha and Dzheyrakh districts (Ingush Republic) for the same reasons as those given in notification of 21 October 1994.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 12, 19 (2), 21 and 22 (1) and (2) of the Covenant.

SRI LANKA

21 May 1984

Proclamation of state of emergency throughout Sri Lanka, and derogation as a consequence from articles 9 (3) and 14 (3) (b) of the Covenant as from 18 May 1983.

23 May 1984

The Government of Sri Lanka specified that the Emergency regulations and Special Laws were temporary measures necessitated by the existence of an extraordinary security situation and that it was not intended to continue with them longer that it was absolutely necessary.

16 January 1989

(Dated 13 January 1989)

Termination of the state of emergency as from 11 January 1989.

29 August 1989

(Dated 18 August 1989)

Establishment of the state of emergency for a period of 30 days as from 20 June 1989 and derogation from provisions of article 9 (2).

The notification specifies that the state of emergency was declared in view of the progressive escalation of violence, acts of sabotage and the disruption of essential services throughout the country as from the termination of the state of emergency on 11 January 1989 (*see previous notification of 16 January 1989*).

4 October 1994

(Dated 29 September 1994)

Lifting of the state of emergency established on 20 June 1989 and notified by notification of 18 August 1989, as from 4 September 1994, except with regard to the Northern and Eastern Provinces and certain areas which border the above two Provinces specifically designated in the Presidential Proclamation dated 1 September 1994.

SUDAN

14 February 1992

(Dated 21 August 1991)

"The state of emergency was declared all over the Sudan on June 30, 1989, when the Revolution for National Salvation took over the power, in order to ensure security and safety of the country. [*The articles of the Convention which are being derogated from are articles 2 and 22 (1) as subsequently indicated by the Government of the Sudan.*]

The reasons for declaring the State of Emergency were [that] the Revolution has in June 1989, inherited a very chaotic socio-economic and political situation with a civil war raging in the South (the Civil War started in 1983 and since then the state of emergency was declared), and lawlessness engulfing the North, and armed-robbery being practised, in a serious manner, in the

west (as a result of the present crisis in Tchad), and also in the east, in addition to possible threats of foreign interventions.

The emergency regulations were also issued to complement the provisions of the Constitutional Decree No. (2) (the State of Emergency) which contain more that 40 sections aimed at ensuring security and safety of the country. But no person has ever been convicted till now, or sentenced to death in accordance with these regulations since the declaration of the state of emergency. The army officers who were executed on July 1926, 1990, were charged in accordance with: –

I) The People's Armed Forces Act, (Section 47).
II) Rules of Procedure for the People's Armed Forces Act, 1983, (Section127).
III) The Penal Code, 1983 (Section 96).

Other three civilians were sentenced to death in accordance with the provisions of the Dealing in Currency Act, 1981.

It has to be mentioned that the President of the National Salvation Revolution Command Council had issued last April a general amnesty by which all the political detainees were released, and powers of detention entrusted to the Judiciary. Also a decree had been issued abrogating the Special courts which were established in accordance with he constitution of the Special Courts Act, 1989 and its Amendment of January 30, 1990, to have Jurisdiction over acts and charges arising from violation of the Constitutional Decrees and the Emergency Regulations.

Under those circumstances, it became necessary for the Revolution to proclaim the State of Emergency Regulations.

In conclusion, it was to be emphasised that the existence of the state of emergency in the Sudan came well before the eruption of the National Salvation Revolution in June 1989. As stated above, it initially came as a direct result of the political and military situation that existed, and still exists, in the Southern part of the country.

However, with the achievement of progress in the peace process and the establishment of the political system, which is currently underway, the State of Emergency will naturally be lifted."

SURINAME

18 March 1991

Termination, as from 1 September 1989, of the state of emergency declared on 1 December 1986 in the territory of the Districts of Marowijne, Commewijne, Para, Brokopondo and in part of the territory of the district of Sipaliwini (between the Marowijne river and 56° WLO. The articles of the Covenant being derogated from were articles 12, 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

6 November 1990

(Dated 15 August 1990)

Proclamation of state of emergency in the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago as from 28 July 1990 for a period of ninety days and derogation from articles 9, 12, 21 and 14 (3).

18 August 1995

(Dated 11 August 1995)

By a Proclamation issued on 3 August 1995, a state of emergency has been declared in the City of Port of Spain as of 3 August 1995 owing to the fact that, as indicated by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, action has been taken or is immediately threatened by persons or bodies of persons of such a nature and on so extensive a scale as to be likely to endanger the public safety or to deprive the community of supplies or services essential to life. The provisions of the Covenant from which the Government of Trinidiad and Tobago has derogated are articles 9, 12, 14 (3) and 21.

The said state of emergency was lifted on 7 August 1995 by a resolution of the House of Representatives.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

17 May 1976

"The Government of the United Kingdom notify other States Parties to the present Covenant, in accordance with article 4, of their intention to take and continue measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant.

"There have been in the United Kingdom in recent years campaigns of organised terrorism related to Northern Irish affairs which have manifested themselves in activities which have included murder, attempted murder, maiming, intimidation and violent civil disturbances and in bombing and fire–raising which have resulted in death, injury and widespread destruction of property. This situation constitutes a public emergency within the meaning of article 4 (1) of the Covenant. The emergency commenced prior to the ratification by United Kingdom of the Covenant and Legislation has, from time to time, been promulgated with regard to it.

"The Government of the United Kingdom have found it necessary (and in some cases continue to find it necessary) to take powers, to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, for the protection of life, for the protection of property and the prevention of outbreaks of public disorder, and including the exercise of powers of arrest and detention and exclusion. In so far as any of these measures is inconsistent with the provisions of articles 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 12 (1), 14, 17, 19 (2), 21 or 22 of the Covenant, the United Kingdom hereby derogates from its obligations under those provisions."

22 August 1984

Termination forthwith of derogations from articles 9, 10 (2), 10 (3), 12 (1), 14, 17, 19 (2), 21 and 22 of the Covenant.

23 December 1988

[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] have found it necessary to take or continue measures derogating in certain respects from their obligations under article 9 of the Covenant. (*For the reasons of that decision, see paragraph 2 of a previous notification of 17 May 1976, which continue to apply*).

Persons reasonably suspected of involvement in terrorism connected with the affairs of Northern Ireland, or of offences under the legislation and who have been detained for 48 hours may be, on the authority of the Secretary of State, further detained without charge for periods of up to five days.

Notwithstanding the judgement of 29 November 1988 by the European Court of Human Rights in the case of *Brogan and Others* the Government has found it necessary to continue to exercise the powers described above but to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation to enable necessary enquiries and investigations properly to be completed in order to decide whether criminal proceedings should be instituted. [This notice is given] in so far as these measures may be inconsistent with article 9 (3) of the Covenant.

31 March 1989

(Dated 23 March 1989)

Replacement as from 22 March 1989, of the measures indicated in the previous notification of 23 December 1988 by section 14 of and paragraph 6 of Schedule 5 to the Prevention of Terror-

ism (Temporary Provisions) Act 1989, which make comparable provisions.

18 December 1989

(Dated 12 December 1989)

"The Government of the United Kingdom have [previously] found it necessary to take and continue [various measures], derogating in certain respects from obligations under Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

On 14 November 1989 the Home Secretary announced that the Government had concluded that a satisfactory procedure for the review of detention of terrorist suspects involving the judiciary had not been identified and that the derogation notified under Article 4 of the Covenant would therefore remain in place for as long as circumstances require."

URUGUAY

30 July 1979

[The Government of Uruguay] has the honour to request that the requirement laid down in article 4 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights should be deemed to have been formally fulfilled with regard to the existence and maintenance in Uruguay of a public emergency as referred to in article 4 (1).

This emergency situation, the nature and consequences of which match the description given in article 4, namely that they threaten the life of the nation, is a matter of universal knowledge, and the present communication might thus appear superfluous in so far as the provision of substantive information is concerned.

This issue has been the subject of countless official statements at both the regional and the international level.

Nonetheless, [the Government of Uruguay] wishes both to comply formally with the above-mentioned requirement and to reiterate that the emergency measures which it has taken, and which complies strictly with the requirements of article 4 (2), are designed precisely to achieve genuine, effective and lasting protection of human rights, the observance and promotion of which are the essence of our existence as an independent and sovereign nation.

Notwithstanding what has been stated above, the information referred to in article 4 (3) concerning the nature and duration of the emergency measures will be provided in more detailed form when the report referred to in article 40 of the Covenant is submitted, so that the scope and evolution of these measures can be fully understood.

VENEZUELA

12 April 1989

(Dated 17 March 1989)

Establishment of emergency measures and derogation from articles 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21 throughout Venezuela. The notification stipulates that derogation was effected due to a series of serious breaches of the peace having taken place throughout Caracas and in other cities in the country and outbursts of violence, acts of vandalism and violations of the security of Venezuelan individuals and households, leading to loss of life and the destruction of much property, thus causing a further deterioration in the economic situation of the country.

(Dated 31 March 1989)

Re-establishment as from 22 March 1989 of the constitutional safeguards which had been suspended as stated in the previous notification of 17 March 1989.

5 February 1992

(Dated 4 February 1992)

Temporary suspension of of certain constitutional guarantees throughout the Venezuela with a view to facilitating the full restoration of public order throughout the national territory.

The Government of Venezuela specified that "the measures were made necessary after criminal attempt was made to assassinate the President of the Republic with the aim of upsetting the rule of law and undermining the constitutional order of the Republic thereby constituting an attempt against the achievements of the Venezuelan people over more than three decades of fully democratic government".

The constitutional guarantees suspended in Venezuela relate to the rights provided for in 9, 12, 17, 19 and 21. The right to strike was also temporarily suspended.

24 February 1992

(Dated 21 February 1992)

Restoration, as from 17 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for under articles 12 and 19 of the Covenant and also of the right to strike.

6 May 1992

(Dated 30 April 1992)

Restoration, as from 21 February 1991, of the guarantees provided for in articles 9, 17 and 21 of the Covenant, thereby fully ending the state of emergency declared on 4 February 1992.

2 December 1992

(Dated 30 November 1992)

On 27 November 1992, certain constitutional guarantees relating to the rights provided for in articles 9, 17, 19 and 21 of the Covenant have been suspended in Venezuela.

This measure was made necessary after a group of civil subversives in connivance with a small military squad took over Palo Negro air base in the city of Maracay, Aragua State, and Francisco de Miranda Base in the city of Caracas, which services as Headquarters of the Air Force Command, thereby threatening the democratic system.

On 28 November 1992, restoration, as from that date, of the rights provided for in article 21 of the Covenant, so as to allow public electioneering in contemplation of the elections to be held on 6 December 1992.

5 March 1993

Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2764 of 16 January 1993, of rights regarding personal liberty corresponding to articles 9(1) and 11 of the Covenant throughout the national territory . Rights regarding liberty and security of person as well as the inviolability of the home and the right to demonstrate had been restored as from 22 December 1992.

Restoration, pursuant to Decree No. 2672 of 1 December 1992 of certain rights which had been suspended by Decree 2668 of 27 November 1992.

Suspension, pursuant to Decree 2765 of 16 January 1993, of certain rights in the State of Sucre as a result of a breach of the peace in that State. These rights, corresponding to articles 12(1) and 21, were restored by Decree No. 2780 on 25 January 1993.

7 July 1994

(Dated 29 June 1994)

By Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994, suspension of certain constitutional guarantees in view of the fact that the economic and financial situation of he country has created circumstances liable to endanger public order.

Derogation from the provisions of articles 9, 12 and 17 of the Covenant.

1 September 1995

(Dated 18 July 1995)

By Decree No. 739 of 6 July 1995, restoration of the constitutional guarantees, suspended by Decree No. 241 of 27 June 1994 *[see notification received on 7 July 1994]*, throughout the national territory, except in the autonomous municipalities of Rosario de Perijá and Catatumbo, State of Zulia; García de Hevia, Pedro María Ureña, Bolivar, Panamericano and Fernández Feo, State of Táchira; Páez, Pedro Camejo and Rómulo Gallegos, State of Apure; and Atures, Atuana, Manapiare, Atabapo, Alto Orinoco and Guainía, State of Amazonas. The Government considers that the situation in these border municipalities, where the theatre of conflict and the theatre of operations No. 1 were decreed, requires that, in the interest of protecting its borders, the above guarantees remain suspended.

YUGOSLAVIA

17 April 1989

(Dated 14 April 1989)

Derogation from articles 12 and 21 of the Covenant in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo as from 28 March 1989. The measure became necessary because of disorders which led to the loss of human lives and which had threatened the established social system. This situation which represented a general danger was a threat to the rights, freedoms and security of all the citizens of the Province regardless of nationality.

30 May 1989

(Dated 29 May 1989)

Termination of the derogation from the provisions of article 12 of the Covenant in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo as from 21 May 1989. The right of public assembly [article 21] continues to be temporarily suspended but only as concerns demonstrations. This is aimed at protecting public order, peace and the rights of citizens, regardless of nationality.

20 March 1990

(Dated 19 March 1990)

As of 21 February 1990 and owing to the escalation of disorders which had led to the loss of human lives, the movement of persons in Kosovo was prohibited from 9 PM to 4 AM, thereby derogating from article 12; and that public assembly was prohibited for the purpose of demonstration, thereby derogating from article 21. The Government of Yugoslavia further indicated that the measure derogating from article 12 had been terminated as of 10 March 1990.

26 April 1990

(24 April 1990)

Termination of the state of emergency with effect from 18 April 1990.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[26]	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles
Portugal[28]	27 Apr 1993	Macau
United Kingdom[29]	20 May 1976	The Bailiwick of Guernesey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Belize, Bermuda, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, the Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, the Pitcairn Group, St. Helena and Dependencies, the Solomon Islands, the Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu

NOTES:

[1] See note 2 in chapter IV.3 for the texts of communications received by the Secretary-General in respect of the signature effected by Democratic Kampuchea.

[2] See note 3 in chapter IV.3.

[3] See note 4 in chapter IV.3.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1968 and 23 December 1975, respectively, with reservations and declarations. For the texts of the reservations and declarations made upon signature and ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, pp. 283 and 289.

Subsequently, on 12 March 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had declared the following:

[The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee established on the basis of article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

Further, on 7 June 1991, the Government of Czechoslovkia had made the following objection:

"The Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations entered by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the provisions of paragraphs 5 and 7 of article 14 and article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government these reservations are in contradiction to the generally recognized principle of international law according to which a state cannot invoke the provisions of its own internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

"Therefore, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid. Nevertheless the present declaration will not be deemed to be an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Korea."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2 .

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Covenant with reservations and declarations, on 23 March 1973 and 8 November 1973, respectively. For the text of the reservations and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, p. 294.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] With the following declaration: "The said Covenant shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany except as far as Allied rights and responsibilities are affected."

For communications on this subject addressed to the Secretary-General by various governments, see note 7 in chapter IV.3.

See also note 5 above.

[7] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[8] See note 10 in chapter IV.3.

[9] By a communication received on 6 November 1984, the Government of Australia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations and declarations made upon ratification with regard to articles 2 and 50, 10, 14, 17, 19, 20, 25. For the text of the reservations and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1197, p. 411.

[10] See note 11 in chapter IV.3. For the text of the declaration regarding article 48(1) so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, p. 282.

[11] In communications received on 29 March 1985 and 26 July 1990, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon ratification with respect to articles 13 and 14 (1) (the notification indicates that the withdrawal was effected because the relevant provisions of the Finnish legislation have been amended as to correspond fully to articles 13 and 14 (1) of the Covenant), and with respect to articles 9 (3) and 14 (3) (d), respectively. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, p. 291.

[12] In a communication received on 22 March 1988, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, its reservation with regard to article 19 made upon accession to the said Covenant. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1202, p. 395.

[13] In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 23 April 1982 from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the following declaration with regard to that declaration made by France concerning article 27 of the said Covenant:

> The Federal Government refers to the declaration on article 27 made by the French Government and stresses in this context the great importance attaching to the rights guaranteed by article 27. It interprets the French declaration as meaning that the Constitution of the French Republic already fully guarantees the individual rights protected by article 27.

[14] On 18 October 1993, the Government of Iceland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as of 18 October 1993, the reservation to paragraph 3(a) of article 8, made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1144, p. 386.

[15] On 12 April 1994, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration with respect to article 6, paragraph 2, made upon ratification which read as follows:

> "Pending the introduction of further legislation to give full effect to the provisions of paragraph 5 of article 6, should a case arise which is not covered by the provisions of existing law, the Government of Ireland will have regard to its obligations under the Covenant in the exercise of its power to advise commutation of the sentence of death."

[16] In a communication received on 20 December 1983, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that it was withdrawing its reservation with regard to article 25 (c). The text of the reservation read as follows:

> "The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept this provision in the case of the Netherlands Antilles."

[17] In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 12 December 1979, the Government of Norway withdrew the reservation formulated simultaneously in respect of article 6 (4).

[18] On 15 March 1991 and 19 January 1993, respectively, the Government of the Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made in respect of article 23 (4) (with effect from 15 March 1991) and of article 14 (7) (with effect from 21 January 1993) made upon accession.

[19] On 16 October 1995, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 20, paragraph 2 made upon accession, which read as follows:

> Switzerland reserves the right to adopt a criminal provision which will take into account the requirements of article 20, paragraph 2, on the occasion of its forthcoming accession to the 1966 International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

[20] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 31 January 1979, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago confirmed that paragraph (vi) constituted an interpretative declaration which did not aim to exclude nor modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Covenant.

[21] In a communication received on 2 February 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to sub-paragraph c) of article 25 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1007, p. 394.

[22] See "ENTRY INTO FORCE:" at the beginning of this chapter.

[23] A previous declaration received on 6 April 1978 expired on 23 March 1983.

[24] In a communication received on that same date, the Government of Germany indicated that it wishes to call attention to the reservations made by the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification of the Covenant with regard to articles 19, 21 and 22 in conjunction with articles 2 (1), 14 (3), 14 (5) and 15 (1). See also note 5 above.

[25] Previous declarations, received 22 April 1976, 28 March 1981 and 24 March 1986 expired on 28 March 1981, 28 March 1986 and 28 March 1991, respectively.

[26] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[27] A previous declaration received on 25 January 1985 expired on 25 January 1988.

[28] See note 16 in chapter IV.3.

[29] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration in respect of the territorial application of the Covenant to the Falkland Islands:

> [The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".
>
> The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received on 28 February 1985 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following declaration:

[For the text of the declaration see note 20 in chapter IV.1.]

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration made upon ratification:

[For the text of the declaration see note 17 in chapter IV.3.]

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration by the Government of Argentina, the Secretary-General received on 13 January 1988 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

[For the text of the declaration see note 17 in chapter IV.3.]

5. Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 March 1976, in accordance with article 9.
REGISTRATION: 23 March 1976, No. 14668.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 999, p. 171.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 87.

Note: The Protocol was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Algeria		12 Sep 1989 *a*
Angola		10 Jan 1992 *a*
Argentina		8 Aug 1986 *a*
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Australia		25 Sep 1991 *a*
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Dec 1987
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 *a*
Belarus		30 Sep 1992 *a*
Belgium		17 May 1994 *a*
Benin		12 Mar 1992 *a*
Bolivia		12 Aug 1982 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Mar 1995	1 Mar 1995
Bulgaria		26 Mar 1992 *a*
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 *a*
Canada		19 May 1976 *a*
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile		27 May 1992 *a*
China[1]		
Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Congo		5 Oct 1983 *a*
Costa Rica	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Croatia		12 Oct 1995 *a*
Cyprus	19 Dec 1966	15 Apr 1992
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 *a*
Ecuador	4 Apr 1968	6 Mar 1969
El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	6 Jun 1995
Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Finland	11 Dec 1967	19 Aug 1975
France		17 Feb 1984 *a*
Gambia		9 Jun 1988 *a*
Georgia		3 May 1994 *a*
Germany		25 Aug 1993 *a*
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	17 Jun 1993
Guyana		10 May 1993 *a*
Honduras	19 Dec 1966	
Hungary		7 Sep 1988 *a*
Iceland		22 Aug 1979 *a*
Ireland		8 Dec 1989 *a*
Italy	30 Apr 1976	15 Sep 1978
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Jamaica	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1975
Latvia		22 Jun 1994 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 *a*
Luxembourg		18 Aug 1983 *a*
Madagascar	17 Sep 1969	21 Jun 1971
Malta		13 Sep 1990 *a*
Mauritius		12 Dec 1973 *a*
Mongolia		16 Apr 1991 *a*
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Netherlands	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
Nepal		14 May 1991 *a*
New Zealand		26 May 1989 *a*
Nicaragua		12 Mar 1980 *a*
Niger		7 Mar 1986 *a*
Norway	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Panama	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Paraguay		10 Jan 1995 *a*
Peru	11 Aug 1977	3 Oct 1980
Philippines	19 Dec 1966	22 Aug 1989
Poland		7 Nov 1991 *a*
Portugal	1 Aug 1978	3 May 1983
Republic of Korea		10 Apr 1990 *a*
Romania		20 Jul 1993 *a*
Russian Federation		1 Oct 1991 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
San Marino		18 Oct 1985 *a*
Senegal	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		16 Jul 1993 *a*
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 *a*
Spain		25 Jan 1985 *a*
Suriname		28 Dec 1976 *a*
Sweden	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 Dec 1994 *d*	12 Dec 1994
Trinidad and Tobago		14 Nov 1980 *a*
Togo		30 Mar 1988 *a*
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 *a*
Ukraine		25 Jul 1991 *a*
Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Venezuela	15 Nov 1976	10 May 1978
Yugoslavia	14 Mar 1990	
Zaire		1 Nov 1976 *a*
Zambia		10 Apr 1984 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

"On the understanding that, further to the provisions of article 5 (2) of the Protocol, the Committee provided for in Article 28 of the Covenant shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has been ascertained that the same matter has not been examined by the European Commission on Human Rights established by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms."

CHILE

Declaration:

In recognizing the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals, it is the understanding of the Government of Chile that this competence applies in respect of acts occurring after the entry into force for that State of the Optional Protocol or, in any event, to acts which began after 11 March 1990.

CROATIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia interprets article 1 of this Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Croatia who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of any rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into the force for the Republic of Croatia."

"With regard to article 5, paragraph 2 (a) of the Protocol, the Republic of Croatia specifies that the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter is being examined or has already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

DENMARK

"With reference to article 5, paragraph 2 (a), the Government of Denmark makes a reservation with respect to the Competence of the Committee to consider a communication from an individual if the matter has already been considered under other procedures of international investigation."

EL SALVADOR

Reservation:

... That its provisions mean that the competence of the Human Rights Committee is recognized solely to receive and consider communications from individuals solely and exclusively in those situations, events, cases, omissions and legal occurrences or acts the execution of which began after the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, that is, those which took place three months after the date of the deposit, pursuant to article 9, paragraph 2, of the Protocol; the Committee being also without competence to examine communications and/or complaints which have been submitted to other procedures of international investigation or settlement.

FRANCE

Declaration:

France interprets article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the French Republic who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the Republic, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date.

With regard to article 7, France's accession to the Optional Protocol should not be interpreted as implying any change in its position concerning the resolution referred to in that article.

Reservation:

France makes a reservation to article 5, paragraph 2(a), specifying that the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter is being examined or has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

GERMANY

Reservation:

"The Federal Republic of Germany formulates a reservation concerning article 5 paragraph 2(a) to the effect that the competence of the Committee shall not apply to communications

a) which have already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement, or

b) by means of which a violation of rights is reprimanded having its origin in events occurring prior to the entry into force of the Optional Protocol for the Federal Republic of Germany

c) by means of which a violation of article 26 of the [said Covenant] is reprimanded, if and insofar as the reprimanded violation refers to rights other than those guaranteed under the aforementioned Covenant."

ICELAND

Iceland ... accedes to the said Protocol subject to a reservation, with reference to article 5, paragraph 2, with respect to the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider a communication from an individual if the matter is being examined or has been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement. Other provisions of the Covenant shall be inviolably observed.

IRELAND

Article 5, paragraph 2

Ireland does not accept the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider a communication from an individual if the matter has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ITALY

The Italian Republic ratifies the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it being understood that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol mean that the Committee provided for in article 28 of the Covenant shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being and has not

been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

"The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol mean that the Committee established by article 28 of the Covenant shall not consider any communications from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

MALTA

Declarations:

"1. Malta accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol mean that the Committee established by article 28 of the Covenant, shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

"2. The Government of Malta interprets Article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of Malta who claim to be victims of a violation by Malta of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts, omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol enters into force for Malta, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date."

NORWAY

Subject to the following reservation to article 5, paragraph 2:

"... The Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter has already been examined under other procedures of international investigation or settlement."

POLAND

Poland accedes to the Protocol while making a reservation that would exclude the procedure set out in article 5 (2) (a), in cases where the matter has already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ROMANIA

Declaration:

Romania considers that, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 2(a) of the Protocol, the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider communications from an individual if the matter is being or has already been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pursuant to article 1 of the Optional Protocol, recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in respect of situations or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the USSR. The Soviet Union also proceeds from the understanding that the Committee shall not consider any communications unless it has been ascertained that the same matter is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement and that the individual in question has exhausted all available domestic remedies.

SLOVENIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Slovenia interprets article 1 of the Protocol as giving the Committee the competence to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to the jurisdiction of the Republic of Slovenia who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant which results either from acts or omissions, developments or events occurring after the date on which the Protocol entered into force for the Republic of Slovenia, or from a decision relating to acts, omissions, developments or events after that date."

Reservation:

"With regard to article 5, paragraph 2(a) of the Optional Protocol, the Republic of Slovenia specifies that the Human Rights Committee shall not have competence to consider a communication from an individual if the same matter is being examined or has already been considered under another procedure of international investigation or settlement."

SPAIN

The Spanish Government accedes to the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of that Protocol mean that the Human Rights Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been or is not being examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

SWEDEN

On the understanding that the provisions of article 5, paragraph 2, of the Protocol signify that the Human Rights Committee provided for in article 28 of the said Covenant shall not consider any communication from an individual unless it has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

UGANDA

Reservation:

Article 5

"The Republic of Uganda does not accept the competence of the Human Rights Committee to consider a communication under the provisions of article 5 paragraph 2 from an individual if the matter in question has already been considered under another procedure on international investigation or settlement."

VENEZUELA

[Same reservation as the one made by Venezuela in respect of article 14(3)(d) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights: see chapter IV.4.]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles

NOTES:

1 See note 4 in chapter IV.3.

2 Czechoslovakia acceded to the Optional Protocol on 12 March 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

6. Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes Against Humanity

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 November 1968[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 November 1970, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 11 November 1970, No. 10823.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 754, p. 73.
STATUS: Signatories: 10. Parties: 41.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 16 December 1968.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		22 Jul 1983 *a*
Albania		19 May 1971 *a*
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Belarus	7 Jan 1969	8 May 1969
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	21 Jan 1969	21 May 1969
Cameroon		6 Oct 1972 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba		13 Sep 1972 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Nov 1984 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 *a*
Georgia		31 Mar 1995 *a*
Guinea		7 Jun 1971 *a*
Hungary	25 Mar 1969	24 Jun 1969
India		12 Jan 1971 *a*
Kenya		1 May 1972 *a*
Kuwait		7 Mar 1995 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		28 Dec 1984 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		26 May 1989 *a*
Mexico	3 Jul 1969	
Mongolia	31 Jan 1969	21 May 1969
Nicaragua		3 Sep 1986 *a*
Nigeria		1 Dec 1970 *a*
Philippines		15 May 1973 *a*
Poland	16 Dec 1968	14 Feb 1969
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania	17 Apr 1969	15 Sep 1969
Russian Federation	6 Jan 1969	22 Apr 1969
Rwanda		16 Apr 1975 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Tunisia		15 Jun 1972 *a*
Ukraine	14 Jan 1969	19 Jun 1969
Viet Nam		6 May 1983 *a*
Yemen[4]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	16 Dec 1968	9 Jun 1970

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Since the provisions of articles V and VII of the said Convention, according to which some States cannot become a party to the Convention, are not in conformity with the universal character of the Convention, the Presidium of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan states that, on the basis of the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should remain open to all States.

ALBANIA

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania states that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity are unacceptable because, in preventing a number of States from becoming parties to the Convention, they are discriminatory in nature and thus violate the principle of the sovereign equality of States and are incompatible with the spirit and purposes of the Convention.

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent certain States from signing the Convention or acceding to it are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

BULGARIA

The People's Republic of Bulgaria deems it necessary at the same time to declare that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent a number of States from signing the Convention or acceding to it, are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

CUBA

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it regards the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity as discriminatory and contrary to the principle of the equality of States.

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

GUINEA

The Government of the Republic of Guinea considers that the dispositions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-

Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, adopted by the General Assembly on 26 November 1968, make it impossible for a number of States to become parties to the Convention and are therefore of a discriminatory character which is contradictory to the object and aims of this Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Guinea is of the opinion that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to all States without any discrimination and limitation.

HUNGARY

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions contained in articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 26, 1968, which deny the possibility to certain States to become signatories to the Convention are of discriminatory nature, violate the principles of sovereign equality of States and are more particularly incompatible with the objectives and purposes of the said Convention."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Lao People's Democratic Republic accedes to the above-mentioned Convention and undertakes to implement faithfully all its clauses, except for the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 26 November 1968, which contravene the principle of the sovereign equality of States. The Convention should be open to universal participation in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

MONGOLIA

"The Mongolian People's Republic deems it necessary to state that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity have discriminatory nature and seek to preclude certain States from participation in the Convention and declares that as the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States it should be open to participation by all States without any discrimination or restriction."

POLAND

"The Polish People's Republic considers that the dispositions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, adopted by the General Assembly on the 26th of November 1968, make it impossible for a number of States to become parties to the Convention and are therefore of a discriminatory character which is contradictory to the object and aims of this Convention.

The Polish People's Republic is of the opinion that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to all States without any discrimination and limitation."

ROMANIA

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania states that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity are not compatible with the principle that multilateral international treaties, the subject and purpose of which concern the international community as a whole, should be open for universal participation.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent certain States from signing the Convention or acceding to it, are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

SLOVAKIA[3]

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of articles V and VII of the Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity, which prevent certain States from signing the Convention or acceding to it, are contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

VIET NAM

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam deems it necessary to state in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States that the Convention should be open to all States without any discrimination and limitation.

Notes:

[1] Resolution 2391 (XXIII), *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 18* (A/7218), p. 40.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 27 March 1973 with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 862, p. 410. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 May 1969 and 13 August 1970, respectively, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration made upon signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 754, p. 124. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

7. International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of *Apartheid*

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 30 November 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 July 1976, in accordance with article XV (1).
REGISTRATION: 18 July 1976, No. 14861.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1015, p. 243.
STATUS: Signatories: 32. Parties: 99.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 30 November 1973.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		6 Jul 1983 *a*
Algeria	23 Jan 1974	26 May 1982
Antigua and Barbuda		7 Oct 1982 *a*
Argentina	6 Jun 1975	7 Nov 1985
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Bahamas		31 Mar 1981 *a*
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 *a*
Bangladesh		5 Feb 1985 *a*
Barbados		7 Feb 1979 *a*
Belarus	4 Mar 1974	2 Dec 1975
Benin	7 Oct 1974	30 Dec 1974
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	27 Jun 1974	18 Jul 1974
Burkina Faso	3 Feb 1976	24 Oct 1978
Burundi		12 Jul 1978 *a*
Cambodia[2]		28 Jul 1981 *a*
Cameroon		1 Nov 1976 *a*
Cape Verde		12 Jun 1979 *a*
Central African Republic		8 May 1981 *a*
Chad	23 Oct 1974	23 Oct 1974
China		18 Apr 1983 *a*
Colombia		23 May 1988 *a*
Congo		5 Oct 1983 *a*
Costa Rica		15 Oct 1986 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba		13 Feb 1977 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Ecuador	12 Mar 1975	12 May 1975
Egypt		13 Jun 1977 *a*
El Salvador		30 Nov 1979 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		19 Sep 1978 *a*
Gabon		29 Feb 1980 *a*
Gambia		29 Dec 1978 *a*
Ghana		1 Aug 1978 *a*
Guinea	1 Mar 1974	3 Mar 1975
Guyana		30 Sep 1977 *a*
Haiti		19 Dec 1977 *a*
Hungary	26 Apr 1974	20 Jun 1974
India		22 Sep 1977 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		17 Apr 1985 *a*
Iraq	1 Jul 1975	9 Jul 1975
Jamaica	30 Mar 1976	18 Feb 1977
Jordan	5 Jun 1974	1 Jul 1992
Kenya	2 Oct 1974	
Kuwait		23 Feb 1977 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		5 Oct 1981 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1983 *a*
Liberia		5 Nov 1976 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		8 Jul 1976 *a*
Madagascar		26 May 1977 *a*
Maldives		24 Apr 1984 *a*
Mali		19 Aug 1977 *a*
Mauritania		13 Dec 1988 *a*
Mexico		4 Mar 1980 *a*
Mongolia	17 May 1974	8 Aug 1975
Mozambique		18 Apr 1983 *a*
Namibia		11 Nov 1982 *a*
Nepal		12 Jul 1977 *a*
Nicaragua		28 Mar 1980 *a*
Niger		28 Jun 1978 *a*
Nigeria	26 Jun 1974	31 Mar 1977
Oman	3 Apr 1974	22 Aug 1991
Pakistan		27 Feb 1986 *a*
Panama	7 May 1976	16 Mar 1977
Peru		1 Nov 1978 *a*
Philippines	2 May 1974	26 Jan 1978
Poland	7 Jun 1974	15 Mar 1976
Qatar	18 Mar 1975	19 Mar 1975
Romania	6 Sep 1974	15 Aug 1978
Russian Federation	12 Feb 1974	26 Nov 1975
Rwanda	15 Oct 1974	23 Jan 1981
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe		5 Oct 1979 *a*
Senegal		18 Feb 1977 *a*
Seychelles		13 Feb 1978 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Somalia	2 Aug 1974	28 Jan 1975
Sri Lanka		18 Feb 1982 *a*
Sudan	10 Oct 1974	21 Mar 1977
Suriname		3 Jun 1980 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic	17 Jan 1974	18 Jun 1976
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		24 May 1984 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	7 Apr 1975	26 Oct 1979
Tunisia		21 Jan 1977 *a*
Uganda	11 Mar 1975	10 Jun 1986
Ukraine	20 Feb 1974	10 Nov 1975
United Arab Emirates	9 Sep 1975	15 Oct 1975
United Republic of Tanzania		11 Jun 1976 *a*
Venezuela		28 Jan 1983 *a*
Viet Nam		9 Jun 1981 *a*
Yemen[4]		17 Aug 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1974	1 Jul 1975
Zaire		11 Jul 1978 *a*

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Zambia		14 Feb 1983 *a*	Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

It is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that article XII of the Convention should be interpreted to mean that its express consent shall be required in order for any dispute to which it is a party and which has not been settled by negotiation to be brought before the International Court of Justice.

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

EGYPT[5]

INDIA

"The Government of the Republic of India accede to the said Convention with effect from 17 August 1977."

IRAQ

Ratification by the Republic of Iraq of the above Convention shall in no way imply recognition of Israel, or be conducive to the establishment of such relations therewith as may be provided for in the Convention.

KUWAIT[6]

"It is understood that the Accession of the State of Kuwait [...] does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait."

MOZAMBIQUE

The People's Republic of Mozambique interprets article 12 of the Convention as to mean that the submission of any dispute concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention to the International Court of Justice shall be at the previous consent and request of all the parties to the dispute.

NEPAL

"The Constitution of Nepal contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, including the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to form unions and associations not motivated by party politics and the right to freedom of professing his/her own religion; and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by Nepal incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of Nepal.

"His Majesty's Government interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of that article only insofar as His Majesty's Government may consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4.

"His Majesty's Government does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 12 of the Convention under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

"The ratification of the United Arab Emirates to this Convention shall in no way amount to recognition of nor the establishment of any treaty relations with Israel."

VENEZUELA

With a reservation excluding the provisions of article XII of the Convention.

YEMEN[4,6]

The accession of the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or the establishment of such relations therewith as may be provided for in the Convention.

NOTES:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 2 May 1974 and 12 August 1974, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] The Secretary-General received, on 10 September 1981 from the Government of Viet Nam, the following objection with regard to the accession of Democratic Kampuchea:

"The accession to the above-mentioned international Convention on behalf of the so-called 'Government of Kampuchea' by the genocidal clique of Pol Pot-Ieng Sary-Khieu Samphan, which was overthrown on 7 January 1979 by the Kampuchean people, is completely illegal and has no legal value. Only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which is actually in power in Kampuchea, is empowered to represent the Kampuchea people and to sign and accede to international agreements and conventions.

As a party to that Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam is of the opinion that the accession of the so-called 'Government of Democratic Kampuchea' constitutes not only a gross violation of the standards of law and international morality, but also one of the most cynical affronts to the three million Kampucheans who are the victims of the most despicable crime of contemporary history, committed by the Pol Pot régime which is spurned by the whole of mankind."

Thereafter, similar communications objecting to the signature by Democratic Kampuchea were received by the Secretary-General on 14 September 1981 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic, on 12 November 1981 from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on 19 November 1981 from the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, on 3 December 1981 from the Government of Hungary, on 5 January 1982 from the Government of

Bulgaria, on 13 January 1982 from the Government of Mongolia, and on 17 May 1982 from the Government of Czechoslovakia.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 August 1975 and 25 March 1976, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] Democratic Yemen had signed the Convention on 31 July 1974. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[5] Upon accession, the Government of Egypt had formulated a declaration concerning Israel. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1045, p. 397. In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 30 August 1977, a declaration from the Government of Israel identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made with regard to the accession by Kuwait (see note 6).

Subsequently, in a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

[6] The Secretary-General received, on 12 May 1977 from the Government of Israel, the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Kuwait contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Kuwait cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

A communication identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, was received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel, on 15 December 1987, in respect of of the declaration made upon accession by Yemen.

8. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 18 December 1979[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 September 1981, in accordance with article 27 (1).
REGISTRATION: 3 September 1981, No. 20378.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, p. 13.
STATUS: Signatories: 97. Parties: 151.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters on 1 March 1980.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	14 Aug 1980	
Albania		11 May 1994 *a*
Angola		17 Sep 1986 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		1 Aug 1989 *a*
Argentina	17 Jul 1980	15 Jul 1985
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia	17 Jul 1980	28 Jul 1983
Austria	17 Jul 1980	31 Mar 1982
Azerbaijan		10 Jul 1995 *a*
Bahamas		6 Oct 1993 *a*
Bangladesh		6 Nov 1984 *a*
Barbados	24 Jul 1980	16 Oct 1980
Belarus	17 Jul 1980	4 Feb 1981
Belgium	17 Jul 1980	10 Jul 1985
Belize	7 Mar 1990	16 May 1990
Benin	11 Nov 1981	12 Mar 1992
Bhutan	17 Jul 1980	31 Aug 1981
Bolivia	30 May 1980	8 Jun 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	31 Mar 1981	1 Feb 1984
Bulgaria	17 Jul 1980	8 Feb 1982
Burkina Faso		14 Oct 1987 *a*
Burundi	17 Jul 1980	8 Jan 1992
Cambodia[2,3]	17 Oct 1980	15 Oct 1992 *a*
Cameroon	6 Jun 1983	23 Aug 1994
Canada	17 Jul 1980	10 Dec 1981
Cape Verde		5 Dec 1980 *a*
Central African Republic		21 Jun 1991 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile	17 Jul 1980	7 Dec 1989
China	17 Jul 1980	4 Nov 1980
Colombia	17 Jul 1980	19 Jan 1982
Congo	29 Jul 1980	26 Jul 1982
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 *a*
Costa Rica	17 Jul 1980	4 Apr 1986
Côte d'Ivoire	17 Jul 1980	18 Dec 1995
Croatia		9 Sep 1992 *d*
Cuba	6 Mar 1980	17 Jul 1980
Cyprus		23 Jul 1985 *a*
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	17 Jul 1980	21 Apr 1983
Dominica	15 Sep 1980	15 Sep 1980
Dominican Republic	17 Jul 1980	2 Sep 1982
Ecuador	17 Jul 1980	9 Nov 1981
Egypt	16 Jul 1980	18 Sep 1981
El Salvador	14 Nov 1980	19 Aug 1981
Equatorial Guinea		23 Oct 1984 *a*
Eritrea		5 Sep 1995 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia	8 Jul 1980	10 Sep 1981
Fiji		28 Aug 1995 *a*
Finland	17 Jul 1980	4 Sep 1986
France	17 Jul 1980	14 Dec 1983
Gabon	17 Jul 1980	21 Jan 1983
Gambia	29 Jul 1980	16 Apr 1993
Georgia		26 Oct 1994 *a*
Germany[5,6]	17 Jul 1980	10 Jul 1985
Ghana	17 Jul 1980	2 Jan 1986
Greece	2 Mar 1982	7 Jun 1983
Grenada	17 Jul 1980	30 Aug 1990
Guatemala	8 Jun 1981	12 Aug 1982
Guinea[7]	17 Jul 1980	9 Aug 1982
Guinea-Bissau	17 Jul 1980	23 Aug 1985
Guyana	17 Jul 1980	17 Jul 1980
Haiti	17 Jul 1980	20 Jul 1981
Honduras	11 Jun 1980	3 Mar 1983
Hungary	6 Jun 1980	22 Dec 1980
Iceland	24 Jul 1980	18 Jun 1985
India	30 Jul 1980	9 Jul 1993
Indonesia	29 Jul 1980	13 Sep 1984
Iraq		13 Aug 1986 *a*
Ireland		23 Dec 1985 *a*
Israel	17 Jul 1980	3 Oct 1991
Italy	17 Jul 1980	10 Jun 1985
Jamaica	17 Jul 1980	19 Oct 1984
Japan	17 Jul 1980	25 Jun 1985
Jordan	3 Dec 1980	1 Jul 1992
Kenya		9 Mar 1984 *a*
Kuwait		2 Sep 1994 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	17 Jul 1980	14 Aug 1981
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lesotho	17 Jul 1980	22 Aug 1995
Liechtenstein		22 Dec 1995 *a*
Liberia		17 Jul 1984 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Lithuania		18 Jan 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	17 Jul 1980	2 Feb 1989
Madagascar	17 Jul 1980	17 Mar 1989
Malawi		12 Mar 1987 *a*
Malaysia		5 Jul 1995 *a*
Maldives		1 Jul 1993 *a*
Mali	5 Feb 1985	10 Sep 1985
Malta		8 Mar 1991 *a*
Mauritius		9 Jul 1984 *a*
Mexico	17 Jul 1980	23 Mar 1981
Mongolia	17 Jul 1980	20 Jul 1981
Morocco		21 Jun 1993 *a*
Namibia		23 Nov 1992 *a*
Nepal	5 Feb 1991	22 Apr 1991
Netherlands[8]	17 Jul 1980	23 Jul 1991

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
New Zealand[9]	17 Jul 1980	10 Jan 1985
Nicaragua	17 Jul 1980	27 Oct 1981
Nigeria	23 Apr 1984	13 Jun 1985
Norway	17 Jul 1980	21 May 1981
Panama	26 Jun 1980	29 Oct 1981
Papua New Guinea		12 Jan 1995 *a*
Paraguay		6 Apr 1987 *a*
Peru	23 Jul 1981	13 Sep 1982
Philippines	15 Jul 1980	5 Aug 1981
Poland	29 May 1980	30 Jul 1980
Portugal	24 Apr 1980	30 Jul 1980
Republic of Korea	25 May 1983	27 Dec 1984
Republic of Moldova		1 Jul 1994 *a*
Romania	4 Sep 1980	7 Jan 1982
Russian Federation	17 Jul 1980	23 Jan 1981
Rwanda	1 May 1980	2 Mar 1981
Saint Kitts and Nevis		25 Apr 1985 *a*
Saint Lucia		8 Oct 1982 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		4 Aug 1981 *a*
Samoa		25 Sep 1992 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe	31 Oct 1995	
Senegal	29 Jul 1980	5 Feb 1985
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Sierra Leone	21 Sep 1988	11 Nov 1988
Singapore		5 Oct 1995 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	15 Dec 1995
Spain	17 Jul 1980	5 Jan 1984
Sri Lanka	17 Jul 1980	5 Oct 1981
Suriname		1 Mar 1993 *a*
Sweden	7 Mar 1980	2 Jul 1980
Switzerland	23 Jan 1987	
Tajikistan		26 Oct 1993 *a*
Thailand		9 Aug 1985 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		26 Sep 1983 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	27 Jun 1985	12 Jan 1990
Tunisia	24 Jul 1980	20 Sep 1985
Turkey		20 Dec 1985 *a*
Uganda	30 Jul 1980	22 Jul 1985
Ukraine	17 Jul 1980	12 Mar 1981
United Kingdom[10]	22 Jul 1981	7 Apr 1986
United Republic of Tanzania	17 Jul 1980	20 Aug 1985
United States of America	17 Jul 1980	
Uruguay	30 Mar 1981	9 Oct 1981
Uzbekistan		19 Jul 1995 *a*
Vanuatu		8 Sep 1995 *a*
Venezuela	17 Jul 1980	2 May 1983
Viet Nam	29 Jul 1980	17 Feb 1982
Yemen[11]		30 May 1984 *a*
Yugoslavia	17 Jul 1980	26 Feb 1982
Zaire	17 Jul 1980	17 Oct 1986
Zambia	17 Jul 1980	21 Jun 1985
Zimbabwe		13 May 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ARGENTINA

Reservation:

The Government of Argentina declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.

AUSTRALIA

Reservations:

"The Government of Australia states that maternity leave with pay is provided in respect of most women employed by the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria. Unpaid maternity leave is provided in respect of all other women employed in the State of New South Wales and elsewhere to women employed under Federal and some State industrial awards. Social Security benefits subject to income tests are available to women who are sole parents.

"The Government of Australia advises that it is not at present in a position to take the measures required by article 11 (2) to introduce maternity leave with pay or with comparable social benefits throughout Australia.

"The Government of Australia advises that it does not accept the application of the Convention in so far as it would require alteration of Defence Force policy which excludes women from combat and combat-related duties. The Government of Australia is reviewing this policy so as to more closely define 'combat' and 'combat-related duties'."

Declaration:

"Australia has a Federal Constitutional System in which Legislative, Executive and Judicial Powers are shared or distributed between the Commonwealth and the Constituent States. The implementation of the Treaty throughout Australia will be effected by the Commonwealth State and Territory Authorities having regard to their respective constitutional powers and arrangements concerning their exercise."

AUSTRIA

Reservation:

"Austria reserves its right to apply the provision of article 7 (b), as far as service in the armed forces is concerned, and the provision of article 11, as far as night work of women and special protection of working women is concerned, within the limits established by national legislation."

AZERBAIJAN

Reservations:

[Waiting for translation]

BAHAMAS

Reservations:

"The Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2(a), ... article 9, paragraph 2, ... article 16(h), ... [and] article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

BANGLADESH

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh does not consider as binding upon itself the provisions of articles 2, 13 (a) and 16 (1) (c) and (f) as they conflict with Sharia law based on Holy Quran and Sunna."

BELARUS[12]

BELGIUM

Reservations:

Article 7

The application of article 7 shall not affect the validity of the provisions of the Constitution as laid down in article 60, which reserves for men the exercise of royal powers, and in article 58, which reserves for the sons of the King or, where there are none, for Belgian princes of the branch of the royal family in line to the throne, the function of *ex officio* senators as from the age of 18 years, with entitlement to vote as from the age of 25 years.

Article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3

The application of article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, shall not affect the validity of the interim provisions enacted for couples married before the entry into force of the Act of 14 July 1976 concerning the reciprocal rights and duties of husbands and wifes and their marriage contracts, in cases where, in accordance with the option available to them under the Act, they have declared that they are maintaining *in toto* their prior marriage contracts.

BRAZIL[13]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"... Brazil does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the above-mentioned Convention."

BULGARIA[14]

CANADA[15]

CHILE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Government of Chile has signed this Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, mindful of the important step which this document represents, not only in terms of the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, but also in terms of their full and permanent integration into society in conditions of equality.

The Government is obliged to state, however, that some of the provisions of the Convention are not entirely compatible with current Chilean legislation.

At the same time, it reports the establishment of a Commission for the Study and Reform of the Civil Code, which now has before it various proposals to amend, *inter alia*, those provisions which are not fully consistent with the terms of the Convention.

CHINA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The People's Republic of China does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba makes a specific reservation concerning the provisions of article 29 of the Convention inasmuch as it holds that any disputes that may arise between States Parties should be resolved through direct negotiations through the diplomatic channel.

CYPRUS

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Cyprus wishes to enter a reservation concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, mentioned in article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention. This reservation is to be withdrawn upon amendment of the relevant law."

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

EGYPT

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

In respect of article 9

Reservation to the text of article 9, paragraph 2, concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, without prejudice to the acquisition by a child born of a marriage of the nationality of his father. This is in order to prevent a child's acquisition of two nationalities where his parents are of different nationalities, since this may be prejudicial to his future. It is clear that the child's acquisition of his father's nationality is the procedure most suitable for the child and that this does not infringe upon the principle of equality between men and women, since it is customary for a woman to agree, upon marrying an alien, that her children shall be of the father's nationality.

In respect of article 16

Reservation to the text of article 16 concerning the equality of men and women in all matters relating to marriage and family relations during the marriage and upon its dissolution, without prejudice to the Islamic Sharia's provisions whereby women are accorded rights equivalent to those of their spouses so as to ensure a just balance between them. This is out of respect for the sacrosanct nature of the firm religious beliefs which govern marital relations in Egypt and which may not be called in question and in view of the fact that one of the most important bases of these relations is an equivalency of rights and duties so as to ensure complementary which guarantees true equality between the spouses. The provisions of the Sharia lay down that the husband shall pay bridal money to the wife and maintain her fully and shall also make a payment to her upon divorce, whereas the wife retains full rights over her property and is not obliged to spend anything on her keep. The Sharia therefore restricts the wife's rights to divorce by making it contingent on a judge's ruling, whereas no such restriction is laid down in the case of the husband.

In respect of article 29:

The Egyptian delegation also maintains the reservation contained in article 29, paragraph 2, concerning the right of a State signatory to the Convention to declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article concerning the submission to an arbitral body of any dispute which may arise between States concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. This is in order to avoid being bound by the system of arbitration in this field.

Reservation made upon ratification:

General reservation on article 2

The Arab Republic of Egypt is willing to comply with the content of this article, provided that such compliance does not run counter to the Islamic Sharia.

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

. . . Upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of El Salvador will make the reservation provided for in article 29.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

With reservation as to the application of the provision of article 29, paragraph 1.

ETHIOPIA

Reservation:

Socialist Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention.

FIJI

Reservations:

"... With reservations on articles 5 (a) and 9 of the Convention."

FRANCE[16]

Upon signature:

The Government of the French Republic declares that article 9 of the Convention must not be interpreted as precluding the application of the second paragraph of article 96 of the code of French nationality.

[All other declarations and reservations were confirmed in substance upon ratification.]

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

The Government of the French Republic declares that the preamble to the Convention – in particular the eleventh preambular paragraph – contains debatable elements which are definitely out of place in this text.

The Government of the French Republic declares that the term "family education" in article 5 (b) of the Convention must be interpreted as meaning public education concerning the family and that, in any event, article 5 will be applied subject to respect for article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and article 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

The Government of the French Republic declares that no provision of the Convention must be interpreted as prevailing over provisions of French legislation which are more favourable to women that to men.

Reservations:

Article 5 (b) and 16, 1 (d)

1) The Government of the French Republic declares that article 5 (b) and article 16, paragraph 1 (d), must not be interpreted as implying joint exercise of parental authority in situations in which French legislation allows of such exercise by only one parent.

2) The Government of the French Republic declares that article 16, paragraph 1 (d), of the Convention must not preclude the application of article 383 of the Civil Code.

Article 14

1. The Government of the French Republic declares that article 14, paragraph 2 (c), should be interpreted as guaranteeing that women who fulfil the conditions relating to family or employment required by French legislation for personal participation shall acquire their own rights within the framework of social security.

2. The Government of the French Republic declares that article 14, paragraph 2 (h), of the Convention should not be interpreted as implying the actual provision, free of charge, of the services mentioned in that paragraph.

Article 16 1 (g)

The Government of the French Republic enters a reservation concerning the right to choose a family name mentioned in article 16, paragraph 1 (g), of the Convention.

Article 29

The Government of the French Republic declares, in pursuance of article 29, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it will not be bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1.

GERMANY[5]

Declaration:

The right of peoples to self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and in the International Covenants of 19 December 1966, applies to all peoples and not only to those living 'under alien and colonial domination and foreign occupation'. All peoples thus have the inalienable right freely to determine their political status and freely to pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The Federal Republic of Germany would be unable to recognize as legally valid an interpretation of the right to self-determination which contradicts the unequivocal wording of the Charter of the United Nations and of the two International Covenants of 19 December 1966 on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It will interpret the 11th paragraph of the Preamble accordingly.

Reservation:

Article 7 (b) will not be applied to the extent that it contradicts the second sentence of Article 12 a (4) of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany. Pursuant to this provision of the Constitution, women may on no account render service involving the use of arms.

HUNGARY[17]

INDIA

Declarations and reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Declarations:

"i) With regard to articles 5 (a) and 16 (1) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Government of the Republic of India declares that it shall abide by and ensure these provisions in conformity with its policy of non-interference in the personal affairs of any Community without its initiative and consent.

"ii) With regard to article 16 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Government of the Republic of India declares that though in principle it fully supports the principle of compulsory registration of marriages, it is not practical in a vast country like India with its variety of customs, religions and level of literacy."

Reservation:

"With regard to article 29 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Government of the Republic of India declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article."

INDONESIA

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1 of this Convention and takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute."

IRAQ[18]

Reservations:

1. Approval of and accession to this Convention shall not mean that the Republic of Iraq is bound by the provisions of article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), of article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2, nor of article 16 of the Convention. The reservation to this last-mentioned article shall be without prejudice to the provisions of the Islamic Shariah according women rights equivalent to the rights of their spouses so as to ensure a just balance between them. Iraq also enters a reservation to article 29, paragraph 1, of this Convention with regard to the principle of international arbitration in connection with the interpretation or application of this Convention.

2. This approval in no way implies recognition of or entry into any relations with Israel.

IRELAND[19]

Reservations:

Articles 13 (b) and (c)

The question of supplementing the guarantee of equality contained in the Irish Constitution which special legislation governing access to financial credit and other services and recreational activities, where these are provided by private persons, organisations or enterprises is under consideration. For the time being Ireland reserves the right to regard its existing law and measures in this area as appropriate for the attainment in Ireland of the objectives of the Convention.

Article 15

With regard to paragraph 3 of this article, Ireland reserves the right not to supplement the existing provisions in Irish law which accord women a legal capacity identical to that of men with further legislation governing the validity of any contract or other private instrument freely entered into by a woman.

Articles 16, 1 (d) and (f)

Ireland is of the view that the attainment in Ireland of the objectives of the Convention does not necessitate the extension to men of rights identical to those accorded by law to women in respect of the guardianship, adoption and custody of children born out of wedlock and reserves the right to implement the Convention subject to that understanding.

Articles 11 (1) and 13 (a)

Ireland reserves the right to regard the Anti-Discrimination (Pay) Act, 1974 and the Employment Equality Act 1977 and other measures taken in implementation of the European Economic Community standards concerning employment opportunities and pay as sufficient implementation of articles 11,1 (b), (c) and (d).

Ireland reserves the right for the time being to maintain provisions of Irish legislation in the area of social security which are more favourable to women than men.

ISRAEL

Reservations:

"1. The State of Israel hereby expresses its reservation with regard to article 7 (b) of the Convention concerning the appointment of women to serve as judges of religious courts where this is prohibited by the laws of any of the religious communities in Israel. Otherwise, the said article is fully implemented in Israel, in view of the fact that women take a prominent part in all aspect of public life.

"2. The State of Israel hereby expresses its reservation with regard to article 16 of the Convention, to the extent that the laws on personal status which are binding on the various religious communities in Israel do not conform with the provisions of that article."

Declaration:

"3. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 29 of the Convention, the State of Israel hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article."

ITALY

Upon signature:

Reservation:

Italy reserves the right to exercise, when depositing the instrument of ratification, the option provided for in article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969.

JAMAICA[20]

The Government of Jamaica declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

JORDAN

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Jordan does not consider itself bound by the following provisions:

1. Article 9, paragraph 2;
2. Article 15, paragraph 4 (a wife's residence is with her husband);
3. Article 16, paragraph (1) (c), relating to the rights arising upon the dissolution of marriage with regard to maintenance and compensation;
4. Article 16, paragraph (1) (d) and (g).

KUWAIT

Reservations:

1. Article 7 (a)

The Government of Kuwait enters a reservation regarding article 7 (a), inasmuch as the provision contained in that paragraph conflicts with the Kuwaiti Electoral Act, under which the right to be eligible for election and to vote is restricted to males.

2. Article 9, paragraph 2

The Government of Kuwait reserves its right not to implement the provision contained in article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention, inasmuch as it runs counter to the Kuwaiti Nationality Act, which stipulates that a child's nationality shall be determined by that of his father.

3. Article 16 (f)

The Government of the State of Kuwait declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provision contained in article 16 (f) inasmuch as it conflicts with the provisions of the Islamic *Shariah*, Islam being the official religion of the State.

4. The Government of Kuwait declares that it is not bound by the provision contained in article 29, paragraph 1.

LESOTHO

Reservation:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 2 to the extent that it conflicts with Lesotho's constitutional stipulations relative to succession to the throne of the Kingdom of Lesotho and law relating to succession to chieftainship. The Lesotho Government's ratification is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention especially in article 2 (e), shall be treated as extending to the affairs of religious denominations.

Furthermore, the Lesotho Government declares it shall not take any legislative measures under the Convention where those

measures would be incompatible with the Constitution of Lesotho."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA[21]

Reservation:

1. Article 2 of the Convention shall be implemented with due regard for the peremptory norms of the Islamic Shariah relating to determination of the inheritance portions of the estate of a deceased person, whether female or male.

2. The implementation of paragraph 16 (c) and (d) of the Convention shall be without prejudice to any of the rights guaranteed to women by the Islamic Shariah.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Reservation concerning article 1:

"In the light of the definition given in article 1 of the Convention, the Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply, with respect to all the obligations of the Convention, article 3 of the Liechtenstein Constitution."

Reservation concerning article 9(2):

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions."

LUXEMBOURG

Reservations:

(a) The application of article 7 shall not affect the validity of the article of our Constitution concerning the hereditary transmission of the crown of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in accordance with the family compact of the house of Nassau of 30 June 1783, maintained by article 71 of the Treaty of Vienna of 9 June 1815 and expressly maintained by article 1 of the Treaty of London of 11 May 1867.

(b) The application of paragraph 1 (g) of article 16 of the Convention shall not affect the right to choose the family name of children.

MALAWI[22]

MALAYSIA

Reservation:

The Government of Malaysia declares that Malaysia's accession is subject to the understanding that the provisions of the Convention do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia' law and the Federal Constitution of Malaysia. With regards thereto, further, the Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of articles 2 (f), 5 (a), 7 (b), 9 and 16 of the aforesaid Convention.

In relation to article 11, Malaysia interprets the provisions of this article as a reference to the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of equality between men and women only.

MALDIVES

Reservations:

"The Government of the Republic of Maldives will comply with the provisions of the Convention, except those which the Government may consider contradictory to the principles of the Islamic Sharia upon which the laws and traditions of the Maldives is founded.

Furthermore, the Republic of Maldives does not see itself bound by any provisions of the Convention which obliges to change its Constitution and laws in any manner."

MALTA

Reservations:

"A. *Article 11*

The Government of Malta interprets paragraph 1 of article II, in the light of provisions of paragraph 2 of article 4, as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions, or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or the work done by them, where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of Malta.

"B. *Article 13*

(i) The Government of Malta reserves the right, notwithstanding anything in the Convention, to continue to apply its tax legislation which deems, in certain circumstances, the income of a married woman to be the income of her husband and taxable as such.

(ii) The Government of Malta reserves the right to continue to apply its social security legislation which in certain circumstances makes certain benefits payable to the head of the household which is, by such legislation, presumed to be the husband.

"C. *Articles 13, 15, 16*

While the Government of Malta is committed to remove, in as far as possible, all aspects of family and property law which may be considered as discriminatory to females, it reserves the right to continue to apply present legislation in that regard until such time as the law is reformed and during such transitory period until those laws are completely superseded.

"D. *Article 16*

The Government of Malta does not consider itself bound by sub-paragraph (e) of paragraph (1) of article 16 in so far as the same may be interpreted as imposing an obligation on Malta to legalise abortion."

MAURITIUS

"The Government of Mauritius does not consider itself bound by sub-paragraph (b) and (d) of paragraph 1 of article 11 and sub-paragraph (g) of paragraph 1 of article 16.

"The Government of Mauritius does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 29 of the Convention, in pursuance of paragraph 2 of article 29."

MEXICO

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In signing *ad referendum* the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which the General Assembly opened for signature by States on 18 December 1979, the Government of the United Mexican States wishes to place on record that it is doing so on the understanding that the provisions of the said Convention, which agree in all essentials with the provisions of Mexican legislation, will be applied in Mexico in accordance with the modalities and procedures prescribed by Mexican legislation and that the granting of material benefits in pursuance of the Convention will be as generous as the resources available to the Mexican State permit.

MONGOLIA[23]

MOROCCO

Declarations:

1. *With regard to article 2:*

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco express its readiness to apply the provisions of this article provided that:

– They are without prejudice to the constitutional requirement that regulate the rules of succession to the throne of the Kingdom of Morocco;

– They do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah. It should be noted that certain of the provisions contained in the Moroccan Code of Personal Status according women rights that differ from the rights conferred on men may not be infringed upon or abrogated because they derive primarily from the Islamic Shariah, which strives, among its other objectives, to strike a balance between the spouses in order to preserve the coherence of family life.

2. *With regard to article 15, paragraph 4:*

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco declares that it can only be bound by the provisions of this paragraph, in particular those relating to the right of women to choose their residence and domicile, to the extent that they are not incompatible with articles 34 and 36 of the Moroccan Code of Personal Status.

Reservation:

1. *With regard to article 9, paragraph 2:*

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco makes a reservation with regard to this article in view of the fact that the Law of Moroccan Nationality permits a child to bear the nationality of its mother only in the cases where it is born to an unknown father, regardless of place of birth, or to a stateless father, when born in Morocco, and it does so in order to guarantee to each child its right to a nationality. Further, a child born in Morocco of a Moroccan mother and a foreign father may acquire the nationality of its mother by declaring, within two years of reaching the age of majority, its desire to acquire that nationality, provided that, on making such declaration, its customary and regular residence is in Morocco.

1. *With regard to article 16:*

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco makes a reservation with regard to the provisions of this article, particularly those relating to the equality of men and women, in respect of rights and responsibilities on entry into and at dissolution of marriage. Equality of this kind is considered incompatible with the Islamic Shariah, which guarantees to each of the spouses rights and responsibilities within a framework of equilibrium and complementary in order to preserve the sacred bond of matrimony.

The provisions of the Islamic Shariah oblige the husband to provide a nuptial gift upon marriage and to support his family, while the wife is not required by law to support the family.

Further, at dissolution of marriage, the husband is obliged to pay maintenance. In contrast, the wife enjoys complete freedom of disposition of her property during the marriage and upon its dissolution without supervision by the husband, the husband having no jurisdiction over his wife's property.

For these reasons, the Islamic Shariah confers the right of divorce on a woman only by decision of a Shariah judge.

1. *With regard to article 29:*

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by the first paragraph of this article, which provides that 'Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration.

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco is of the view that any dispute of this kind can only be referred to arbitration by agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"During the preparatory stages of the present Convention and in the course of debates on it in the General Assembly the position of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands was that it was not desirable to introduce political considerations such as those contained in paragraphs 10 and 11 of the preamble in a legal instrument of this nature. Moreover, the considerations are not directly related to the achievement of total equality between men and women. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that it must recall its objections to the said paragraphs in the preamble at this occasion."

NEW ZEALAND[24]

Reservations:

"The Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue reserve the right not to apply the provisions of article 11 (2) (b).

"The Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue reserve the right not to apply the provisions of the Convention in so far as they are inconsistent with policies relating to recruitment into or service in

(a) the Armed Forces which reflect either directly or indirectly the fact that members of such forces are required to serve on armed forces aircraft or vessels and in situations involving armed combat

or

(b) the law enforcement forces which reflect either directly or indirectly the fact that members of such forces are required to serve in situations involving violence or threat of violence.

...

"The Government of the Cook Islands reserves the right not to apply article 2 (f) and article 5 (a) to the extent that the customs governing the inheritance of certain Cook Islands chief titles may be inconsistent with those provisions."

POLAND

Reservation:

The People's Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA[25]

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"1. The Government of the Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 1979.

"2. Bearing in mind the fundamental principles as embodied in the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Korea has recently established the Korea Women's welfare and social activities. A committee under the chairmanship of the prime minister will shortly be set up to consider and coordinate overall policies on women.

"3. The Government of the Republic of Korea will make continued efforts to take further measures in line with the provisions stipulated in the Convention."

Upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Korea, having examined the said Convention, hereby ratifies the Convention considering itself not bound by the provisions of article 9 and sub-paragraph [. . .] (g) of paragraph 1 of article 16 of the Convention."

ROMANIA

Reservation made upon signature and upon ratification:

The Socialist Republic of Romania states that it does not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention, whereby any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration.

The Socialist Republic of Romania believes that such disputes shall be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all States parties to the dispute, for specific case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[12]

SINGAPORE

Reservations:

(1) In the context of Singapore's multi-racial and multi-religious society and the need to respect the freedom of minorities to practise their religious and personal laws, the Republic of Singapore reserves the right not to apply the provisions of articles 2 and 16 where compliance with these provisions would be contrary to their religious or personal laws.

(2) Singapore is geographically one of the smallest independent countries in the world and one of the most densely populated. The Republic of Singapore accordingly reserves the right to apply such laws and conditions governing the entry into, stay in, employment of and departure from its territory of those who do not have the right under the laws of Singapore to enter and remain indefinitely in Singapore and to the conferment, acquisitions and loss of citizenship of women who have acquired such citizenship by marriage and of children born outside Singapore.

(3) Singapore interprets article 11, paragraph 1 in the light of the provisions of article 4, paragraph 2 as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or on work done by them where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of Singapore and considers that legislation in respect of article 11 is unnecessary for the minority of women who do not fall within the ambit of Singapore's employment legislation.

(4) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it will not be bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SPAIN

Declaration:

The ratification of the Convention by Spain shall not affect the constitutional provisions concerning succession to the Spanish crown.

THAILAND[26]

Declaration:

The Royal Thai Government wishes to express its understanding that the purposes of the Convention are to eliminate discrimination against women and to accord to every person, men and women alike, equality before the law, and are in accordance with the principles prescribed by the Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand.

Reservations:

1. In all matters which concern national security, maintenance of public order and service or employment in the military or paramilitary forces, the Royal Thai Government reserves its right to apply the provisions of the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women, in particular articles 7 and 10, only within the limits established by national laws, regulations and practices.

. . .

3. The Royal Thai Government does not consider itself bound by the provisions of [. . .] article 16 and article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 29 (1) of the said Convention, relating to the settlement of disputes."

TUNISIA

1. *General declaration:*

The Tunisian Government declares that it shall not take any organizational or legislative decision in conformity with the requirements of this Convention where such a decision would conflict with the provisions of chapter I of the Tunisian Constitution.

2. *Reservation concerning article 9, paragraph 2:*

The Tunisian Government expresses its reservation with regard to the provisions in article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention, which must not conflict with the provisions of chapter VI of the Tunisian Nationality Code.

3. *Reservation concerning article 16, paragraphs (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h):*

The Tunisian Government considers itself not bound by article 16, paragraphs (c), (d) and (f) of the Convention and declares that paragraphs (g) and (h) of that article must not conflict with the provisions of the Personal Status Code concerning the granting of family names to children and the acquisition of property through inheritance.

4. *Reservation concerning article 29, paragraph 1:*

The Tunisian Government declares, in conformity with the requirements of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention, that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article which specify that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall be referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any one of those parties.

The Tunisian Government considers that such disputes should be submitted for arbitration or consideration by the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

5. *Declaration concerning article 15, paragraph 4:*

In accordance with the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, dated 23 May 1969, the Tunisian Government emphasizes that the requirements of article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination against Women, and particularly that part relating to the right of women to choose their residence and domicile, must not be interpreted in a manner which conflicts with the provisions of the

Personal Status Code on this subject, as set forth in chapters 23 and 61 of the Code.

TURKEY

Reservations:

"Reservations of the Government of the Republic of Turkey with regard to the articles of the Convention dealing with family relations which are not completely compatible with the provisions of the Turkish Civil Code, in particular, article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), as well as with respect to article 29, paragraph 1. In pursuance of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article."

Declaration:

"Article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention is not in conflict with the provisions of article 5, paragraph 1, and article 15 and 17 of the Turkish Law on Nationality, relating to the acquisition of citizenship, since the intent of those provisions regulating acquisition of citizenship through marriage is to prevent statelessness."

UKRAINE[12]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[27]

Upon signature:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that it is their intention to make certain reservations and declarations upon ratification of the Convention.

Upon ratification:

"A. *On behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:*

"(a) The United Kingdom understands the main purpose of the Convention, in the light of the definition contained in Article 1, to be the reduction, in accordance with its terms, of discrimination against women, and does not therefore regard the Convention as imposing any requirement to repeal or modify any existing laws, regulations, customs or practices which provide for women to be treated more favourably than men, whether temporarily or in the longer term; the United Kingdom's undertakings under Article 4, paragraph 1, and other provisions of the Convention are to be construed accordingly.

"(b) The United Kingdom reserves the right to regard the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, the Employment Protection (Consolidation) Act 1978, the Employment Act 1980, the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976, the Industrial Relations (No. 2) (Northern Ireland) Order 1976, the Industrial Relations (Northern Ireland) Order 1982, the Equal Pay Act 1970 (as amended) and the Equal Pay Act (Northern Ireland) 1970 (as amended), including the exceptions and exemptions contained in any of these Acts and Orders, as constituting appropriate measures for the practical realisation of the objectives of the Convention in the social and economic circumstances of the United Kingdom, and to continue to apply these provisions accordingly; this reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace the above Acts and Orders on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"(c) In the light of the definition contained in Article 1, the United Kingdom's ratification is subject to the understanding that none of its obligations under the Convention shall be treated as extending to the succession to, or possession and enjoyment of, the Throne, the peerage, titles of honour, social precedence or armorial bearings, or as extending to the affairs of religious denominations or orders or to the admission into or service in the Armed Forces of the Crown.

"(d) The United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply such immigration legislation governing entry into, stay in, and departure from, the United Kingdom as it may deem necessary from time to time and, accordingly, its acceptance of Article 15 (4) and of the other provisions of the Convention is subject to the provisions of any such legislation as regards persons not at the time having the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom.

"Article 1

With reference to the provisions of the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 and other applicable legislation, the United Kingdom's acceptance of Article 1 is subject to the reservation that the phrase "irrespective of their marital status" shall not be taken to render discriminatory any difference of treatment accorded to single persons as against married persons, so long as there is equality of treatment as between married men and married women and as between single men and single women.

"Article 2

In the light of the substantial progress already achieved in the United Kingdom in promoting the progressive elimination of discrimination against women, the United Kingdom reserves the right, without prejudice to the other reservations made by the United Kingdom, to give effect to paragraphs (f) and (g) by keeping under review such of its laws and regulations as may still embody significant differences in treatment between men and women with a view to making changes to those laws and regulations when to do so would be compatible with essential and overriding considerations of economic policy. In relation to forms of discrimination more precisely prohibited by other provisions of the Convention, the obligations under this Article must (in the case of the United Kingdom) be read in conjunction with the other reservations and declarations made in respect of those provisions including the declarations and reservations of the United Kingdom contained in paragraphs (a) – (d) above.

"With regard to paragraphs (f) and (g) of this Article the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply its law relating to sexual offences and prostitution; this reservation will apply equally to any future law which may modify or replace it.

"Article 9

The British Nationality Act 1981, which was brought into force with effect from January 1983, is based on principles which do not allow of any discrimination against women within the meaning of Article 1 as regards acquisition, change or retention of their nationality or as regards the nationality of their children. The United Kingdom's acceptance of Article 9 shall not, however, be taken to invalidate the continuation of certain temporary or transitional provisions which will continue in force beyond that date.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to take such steps as may be necessary to comply with its obligations under Article 2 of the First Protocol to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms signed at Paris on 20 March 1952 and its obligations under paragraph 3 of Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966, to the extent that the said provisions preserve the freedom of parental choice in respect of the education of children; and reserves also the right not to take any measures

which may conflict with its obligation under paragraph 4 of Article 13 of the said Covenant not to interfere with the liberty of individuals and bodies to establish and direct educational institutions, subject to the observation of certain principles and standards.

"Moreover, the United Kingdom can only accept the obligations under paragraph (c) of Article 10 within the limits of the statutory powers of central Government, in the light of the fact that the teaching curriculum, the provision of textbooks and teaching methods are reserved for local control and are not subject to central Government direction; moreover, the acceptance of the objective of encouraging coeducation is without prejudice to the right of the United Kingdom also to encourage other types of education.

"Article 11

The United Kingdom interprets the "right to work" referred to in paragraph 1 (a) as a reference to the "right to work" as defined in other human rights instruments to which the United Kingdom is a party, notably Article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 19 December 1966.

"The United Kingdom interprets paragraph 1 of Article 11, in the light of the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 4, as not precluding prohibitions, restrictions or conditions on the employment of women in certain areas, or on the work done by them, where this is considered necessary or desirable to protect the health and safety of women or the human foetus, including such prohibitions, restrictions or conditions imposed in consequence of other international obligations of the United Kingdom;

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply all United Kingdom legislation and the rules of pension schemes affecting retirement pensions, survivors' benefits and other benefits in relation to death or retirement (including retirement on grounds of redundancy), whether or not derived from a Social Security scheme.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace such legislation, or the rules of pension schemes, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply the following provisions of United Kingdom legislation concerning the benefits specified:

a) social security benefits for persons engaged in caring for a severely disabled person under section 37 of the Social Security Act 1975 and section 37 of the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Act 1975;

b) increases of benefits for adult dependants under section 44 to 47, 49 and 66 of the Social Security Act 1975 and under sections 44 to 47, 49 and 66 of the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Act 1975;

c) retirement pensions and survivors' benefits under the Social Security Acts 1975 to 1982 and the Social Security (Northern Ireland) Acts 1975 to 1982;

d) family income supplements under the Family Income Supplements Act 1970 and the Family Income Supplements Act (Northern Ireland) 1971.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace any of the provisions specified in sub–paragraphs (a) to (d) above, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply any non–discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment or insurance for the application of the provisions contained in Article 11 (2).

"Article 15

In relation to Article 15, paragraph 2, the United Kingdom understands the term "legal capacity" as referring merely to the existence of a separate and distinct legal personality.

"In relation to Article 15, paragraph 3, the United Kingdom understands the intention of this provision to be that only those terms or elements of a contract or other private instrument which are discriminatory in the sense described are to be deemed null and void, but not necessarily the contract or instrument as a whole.

"Article 16

As regards sub–paragraph 1 (f) of Article 16, the United Kingdom does not regard the reference to the paramountcy of the interests of the children as being directly relevant to the elimination of discrimination against women, and declares in this connection that the legislation of the United Kingdom regulating adoption, while giving a principal position to the promotion of the children's welfare, does not give to the child's interests the same paramount place as in issues concerning custody over children.

"The United Kingdom's acceptance of paragraph 1 of Article 16 shall not be treated as either limiting the freedom of a person to dispose of his property as he wishes or as giving a person a right to property the subject of such a limitation."

"B. *On behalf of the Isle of Man, the British Virgin Islands, the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the Turks and Caicos Islands:*

[Same reservations as the one made on behalf of the United Kingdom under paragraphs A (a), (c), and (d) except that in the of case d) it applies to the territories and their laws).]

Article 1

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom except with regard to the absence of a reference to United Kingdom legislation.]

Article 2

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom except that reference is made to the laws of the territories, and not the laws of the United Kingdom.]

Article 9

[Same reservation as the one made in respect of the United Kingdom.]

Article 11

[Same reservation as those made in respect of the United Kingdom except that a reference is made to the laws of the territories, and not to the laws of the United Kingdom.]

"Also, as far as the territories are concerned, the specific benefits listed and which may be applied under the provisions of these territories' legislation are as follows:

a) social security benefits for persons engaged in caring for a severely disabled person;

b) increases of benefit for adult dependants;

c) retirement pensions and survivors' benefits;

d) family income supplements.

"This reservation will apply equally to any future legislation which may modify or replace any of the provisions specified in sub–paragraphs (a) to (d) above, on the understanding that the terms of such legislation will be compatible with the United Kingdom's obligations under the Convention.

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply any non–discriminatory requirement for a qualifying period of employment or insurance for the application of the provisions contained in Article 11 (2)."

Article 13, 15 and 16

[Same reservations as those made on behalf the United Kingdom.]

VENEZUELA

Reservation made upon ratification confirming in substance the reservation made upon signature:

Venezuela makes a formal reservation with regard to article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention, since it does not accept arbitration or the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention.

VIET NAM

Reservation:

In implementing this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam will not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 article 29.

YEMEN[10]

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 1, of the said Convention, relating to the settlement of disputes which may arise concerning the application or interpretation of the Convention.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

26 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"The reservation made by the Maldives is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is therefore inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and shall not be permitted, in accordance with article 28 (2) of the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women. Austria therefore states that this reservation cannot alter or modify in any respect the obligations arising form the Convention for any State Party thereto."

CANADA

25 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"In the view of the Government of Canada, this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2). The Government of Canada therefore enters its formal objection to this reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Canada and the Republic of Maldives."

DENMARK

3 July 1990

"The Government of Denmark has taken note of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya when acceding [to the said Convention]. In the view of the Government of Denmark this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty."

FINLAND

8 June 1990

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Finland therefore enters its formal objection to this reservation.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya."

5 May 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

In the view of the Government of Finland, the unlimited and undefined character of the said reservations create serious doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. In their extensive formulation, they are clearly contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to such reservations.

The Government of Finland also recalls that the said reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as a justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland does not, however, consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Finland and Maldives."

GERMANY[5]

The Federal Republic of Germany considers that the reservations made by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16, by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), and (f), by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), and by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them. In relation to the Federal Republic of Germany, they may not be invoked in support of a legal practice which does not pay due regard to the legal status afforded to women and children in the Federal Republic of Germany in conformity with the above-mentioned articles of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Egypt, Bangladesh, Brazil, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Mauritius and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Objections of the same nature were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

i) 15 October 1986: In respect of reservations formulated by the Government of Thailand concerning article 9, paragraph 2, article 10, article 11, paragraph 1 (b),

article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16; (The Federal Republic of Germany also holds the view that the reservation made by Thailand regarding article 7 of the Convention is likewise incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention because for all matters which concern national security it reserves in a general and thus unspecific manner the right of the Royal Thai Government to apply the provisions only within the limits established by national laws, regulations and practices).

ii) 15 October 1986: In respect of reservations and some declarations formulated by the Government of Tunisia concerning article 9, paragraph 2 and article 16, as well as the declaration concerning article 15, paragraph 4.

iii) 3 March 1987: In respect of reservations made by the Government of Turkey to article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g); in respect of reservations made by the Government of Iraq with regard to article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9 and article 16.

iv) 7 April 1988: In respect of the first reservation made by Malawi.

v) 20 June 1990: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

vi) 24 October 1994: In respect of the reservations made by Maldives.

MEXICO[22]

11 January 1985

The Government of the United Mexican States has studied the content of the reservations made by Mauritius to article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), of the Convention and has concluded that they should be considered invalid in the light of article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, because they are incompatible with its object and purpose.

Indeed, these reservations, if implemented, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to all the articles of the Convention. The principles of equal rights of men and women and non-discrimination on the basis of sex, which are embodied in the second preambular paragraph and Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, to which Mauritius is a signatory, and in articles 2 and 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, were previously accepted by the Government of Mauritius when it acceded, on 12 December 1973, to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The above principles were stated in article 2, paragraph 1, and article 3 of the former Covenant and in article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 of the latter. Consequently, it is inconsistent with these contractual obligations previously assumed by Mauritius for its Government now to claim that it has reservations, on the same subject, about the 1979 Convention.

The objection of the Government of the United Mexican States to the reservations in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the 1979 Convention between the United Mexican States and Mauritius.

Objections, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, *were also formulated by the Government of Mexico in regard to reservations made by various States, as follows [for the States which were not Parties to the Covenants (marked below with an asterisk *), the participation in the Covenants was not invoked by Mexico in its objection with regard to reservations]:*

i) 21 February 1985: In respect of reservations by Bangladesh* concerning article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16 paragraph 1 (c) and (f).

ii) 21 February 1985: In respect of the reservation by Jamaica concerning article 9 (2).

iii) 22 May 1985: In respect of reservations by New Zealand (applicable to the Cook Islands) concerning article 2 (f) and article 5 (a).

iv) 6 June 1985: In respect of reservations by the Republic of Korea concerning article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g). In this case, the Government of Mexico stated that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex, which are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of its purposes in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in various multilateral instruments, have already become general principles of international law which apply to the international community, to which the Republic of Korea belongs.

v) 29 January 1986: In respect of the reservation made by Cyprus to article 9, paragraph 2.

vi) 7 May 1986: In respect of the reservations made by Turkey* to paragraphs 2 and 4 of article 15 and paragraphs 1 (c), 1 (d), 1 (f) and 1 (g) of article 16.

vii) 16 July 1986: In respect of reservations made by Egypt to articles 9 and 16.

viii) 16 October 1986: In respect of reservations by Thailand* concerning article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16.

ix) 4 December 1986: In respect of reservations by Iraq concerning article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 16.

x) 23 July 1990: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f), by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9 and article 16, by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g), and (h), by Iraq regarding article 2, sub-paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9 and article 16, by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3, and article 16, by Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h), by Turkey regarding article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession, and the first paragraph of the reservations made by Malawi upon accession, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

"These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Bangladesh, Egypt, Brazil, Iraq, Mauritius, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Tunisia,

Turkey, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

14 July1994

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declarations made by India regarding article 5 (a) and article 16, paragraphs 1. of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by India regarding article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, para. 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Morocco expressing the readiness of Morocco to apply the provisions of article 2 provided that they do not conflict with the provisions of the Islamic Shariah, is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Morocco regarding article 15, paragraph 4, of the Convention is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Morocco regarding article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16 of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Maldives, by which "The Government of the Republic of Maldives will comply with the provisions of the Convention, except those which the Government may consider contradictory to the principles of the Islamic Shariah upon which the laws and traditions of the Maldives is founded", and the Republic of Maldives declares that it "does not see itself bound by any provisions of the Convention which obliged to change its Constitution and Laws in any manner.". The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the said reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned declarations and reservations.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between India, Morocco, the Maldives and the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

NORWAY

16 July 1990

"The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, by which the accession 'is subject to the general reservation that such accession cannot conflict with the laws on personal status derived from the Islamic Shariah'. The Norwegian Government has come to the conclusion that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2). The Government of Norway objects to the reservation.

"The Norwegian Government will stress that by acceding to the Convention, a state commits itself to adopt the measures required for the elimination of discrimination, in all its forms and manifestations, against women. A reservation by which a State Party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking religious law (Shariah), which is subject to interpretation, modification, and selective application in different states adhering to Islamic principles, may create doubts about the commitments of the reserving state to the object and purpose of the Convention. It may also undermine the basis of international treaty law. All states have common interest in securing that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties."

25 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"In the view of the Government of Norway, a reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of internal law may create doubts about the commitments of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties. Furthermore, under well established international treaty law, a State is not permitted to invoke internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to Maldives reservations.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the above-stated Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Maldives."

2 May 1995

With regard to the reservations made by Kuwait upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Maldives.]

PORTUGAL

26 October 1994

With regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the reservations formulated by the Maldives are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and they are inadmissible under article19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the Government of Portugal considers that these reservations cannot alter or modify in any respect the obligations arising from the Convention for any State party thereto."

SWEDEN

17 March 1986

"The Government of Sweden considers that [the following reservations] are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them:

- Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16;
- Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h).
- Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f);
- Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4 and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h);

"Indeed the reservations in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to everything the Convention stands for. It should also be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of its purposes, in the Universal Declaration of Human

Rights of 1948 and in various multilateral instruments, to which Thailand, Tunisia and Bangladesh are parties.

"The Government of Sweden furthermore notes that, as a matter of principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations made by:

- Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16,
- Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g),
- Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2
- Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g)
- New Zealand in respect of the Cook Islands regarding article 2, paragraph (f) and article 5, paragraph (a).

"In this context the Government of Sweden wishes to take this opportunity to make the observation that the reason why reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not acceptable is precisely that otherwise they would render a basic international obligation of a contractual nature meaningless. Incompatible reservations, made in respect of the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, do not only cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving states to the objects and purpose of this Convention, but moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of international contractual law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by other parties."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Sweden, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

- 12 March 1987 with regard to the reservation made by Iraq in respect of article 2, paragraph (f) and (g), article 9, paragraph 1, and article 16;
- 15 April 1988 with regard to the first reservations made by Malawi;
- 25 May 1990 with regard to the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.
- 5 February 1993 with regard to the reservations made by Jordan in respect of article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, the wording of article 16 (c), and article 16 (d) and (g).
- 26 October 1994 with regard to the reservations made by Maldives upon accession. *The Government of Sweden also stated that:* "The Government of Sweden therefore objects to these reservations and considers that they constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Maldives."

NOTES:

[1] Resolution 34/180, *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46* (A/34/46), p. 193.

[2] The Secretary-General received several objections to the signature of the above Convention by Democratic Kampuchea. These objections are identical in matter, *mutatis mutandis*, as those reproduced in note 2 in chapter IV.3. Following is the list of States who have notified their objection with the date of receipt of the notifications:

Participant	*Date of receipt*
German Democratic Republic*	11 Dec 1980
Hungary	19 Jan 1981
Bulgaria	29 Jan 1981
Russian Federation	13 Feb 1981
Belarus	18 Feb 1981
Czechoslovakia**	10 Mar 1981

* See note 5 below.
** See note 4 below.

[3] See note 3 in chapter IV.3.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 July 1980 and 16 February 1982, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General if its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, p 123. See also note 2 above and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 25 June 1980 and 9 July 1980, respectively. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, p. 128. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 15 April 1986 from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the following objection:

The declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted on 18 December 1979, regarding the extension of the said Convention to West Berlin directly contradicts the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. This Agreement, as is known, clearly established that international agreements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to West Berlin only provided that such agreements do not affect matters of security and status. The said Convention, by virtue of its content, directly affects such matters.

In particular, it governs matters relating to the adoption of legislation, including amendments to national constitutions, by States parties, to their use of sanctions or other coercive measures, and to the provision by means of the competent national courts or other State institutions of effective legal protection for citizens.

The rights and duties referred to in the Convention are a manifestation of State sovereignty. Such rights and duties cannot be exercised by a State in a territory which does not fall within its jurisdiction.

In view of the foregoing, the Soviet Union considers the declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regarding the extension of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to West Berlin to be unlawful and not legally valid.

Accordingly, the declaration and reservation made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification are unlawful and not legally valid with respect to West Berlin.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received on 20 March 1987, from the Government of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America the following communication:

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is an integral part (annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States, without prejudice to the maintenance of their rights and responsibilities relating to the representation abroad of the interests of the western sectors of Berlin, confirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected and provided that the extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered

into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the western sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures.

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of the three powers which is similarly an integral part (annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement, affirmed that it would raise no objections to such extension.

The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement are designed *inter alia* to afford the authorities of the three powers the opportunity to ensure that international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany which are to be extended to the Western sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status are not affected.

When authorizing the extension of the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women to the Western sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the three powers took such steps as were necessary to ensure that matters of security and status were not affected. Accordingly, the Berlin declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with established procedures is valid and the Convention will apply to the Western sectors of Berlin, subject to allied rights and responsibilities."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received on 22 April 1987, from the Government of the German Democratic Republic the following objection:

With regard to the application to Berlin (West) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women the German Democratic Republic notes, in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not to be governed by it. The Federal Republic of Germany's declaration that the said Convention was to be extended to Berlin (West) is contradictory to the Quadripartite Agreement which provides that agreements concerning matters of the security and status of Berlin (West) must not be extended to the latter by the Federal Republic of Germany. Consequently, the Federal Republic of Germany's declaration can have no legal effect.

See also note 5 above.

[7] An instrument of accession had been deposited on 14 March 1980 with the Secretary-General. The signature was affixed on 17 July 1980 and was accompanied by the following declaration:

The People's Revolutionary Republic of Guinea wishes to sign the Convention... with the understanding that this procedure annuls the procedure of accession previously followed by Guinea with respect to the Convention.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[9] The instrument of ratification indicates that in accordance with the special relationships which exist between New Zealand and the Cook Islands and between New Zealand and Niue, there have been consultations regarding the Convention between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the Cook Islands and between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Niue; that the Government of the Cook Islands, which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in the Cook Islands, has requested that the Convention should extend to the Cook Islands; that the Government of Niue which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in Niue, has requested that the Convention should extend to Niue. The said instrument specifies that accordingly the Convention shall apply also to the Cook Islands and Niue. See also note 24 below.

[10] The instrument of ratification specifies that the said Convention is ratified in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Isle of Man, British Virgin Islands, Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this connection, on 4 April 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina an objection, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made in this regard, on 3 October 1983, published in note 17 of chapter IV.3, however also referring to General Assembly resolutions 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25.

Subsequently, on 27 November 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made in this regard in note 17 of chapter IV.3.

[11] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[12] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations made upon ratification relating to article 29 (1). The reservations were identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the reservation made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, pp. 117, 121 and 133.

[13] On 20 December 1994, the Government of Brazil notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil hereby expresses its reservations to article 15, paragraph 4 and to article 16, paragraphs 1 *(a)*, *(c)*, *(g)* and *(h)* of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

[14] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 29 (1) of the Convention, made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, p. 121.

[15] On 28 May 1992, the Government of Canada notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the declaration to article 11 (1) (d) of the Convention, made upon ratification. For the text of the said declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1257, p. 496.

[16] In a notification received on 26 March 1984, the Government of France informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 7 of the Convention made upon ratification. The notification specified that the withdrawal was effected because Organic Law No. 83-1096 of 20 December 1983 has abrogated article LO 128 of the electoral code relating to temporary disqualifications of persons who have obtained French nationality.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 21 July 1986, the Government of France informed the Secretary-General that it decided to withdraw its reservation relating to article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 16, paragraphs 1 (c), (d) and (h) of the Convention, made upon ratification. The notification specified that the withdrawal was effected because the existing discriminatory provisions, against women, in the rules governing property rights arising out of matrimonial relationship and in those concerning the legal administration of the property of children were abrogated by Act No. 85-1372 of 23 December 1985 concerning equality of spouses in respect of property rights arising out of a matrimonial relationship and equality of parents in respect of the property of minor children, which entered into force on 1 July 1986.

For the text of the reservations so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1343, p. 370.

[17] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 29 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, p. 129.

[18] On 12 December 1986, the Secretary General received from the Government of Israel the following objection:

... In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration which is explicitly of a political character is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq under general international law or under particular conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity.

19 On 19 December 1986, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary-General of its withdrawal of the following reservations made upon accession:

Article 9 (1)

Pending the proposed amendment to the law relating to citizenship, which is at an advanced stage, Ireland reserves the right to retain the provisions in its existing law concerning the acquisition of citizenship on marriage.

Article 15

With regard to paragraph 4 of this article, Ireland observes the equal rights of women relating to the movement of persons and the freedom to choose their residence; pending the proposed amendment of the law of domicile, which is at an advanced stage, it reserves the right to retain its existing law.

Article 11 (1) and 13 (a)

... and pending the coming into force of the Social Welfare (Amendment) (No. 2) Act, 1985, to apply special conditions to the entitlement of married women to certain social security schemes.

20 On 8 September 1995, the Government of Jamaica notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 9 (2) which it had made upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1374, p. 439.

21 On 5 July 1995, the Government of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Republic notified the Secretary-General of the "new formulation of its reservation to the Convention, which replaces the formulation contained in the instrument of accession" which read as follows:

[Accession] is subject to the general reservation that such accession cannot conflict with the laws on personal status derived from the Islamic Shariah.

22 On 24 October 1991, the Government of Malawi notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession:

"Owing to the deep-rooted nature of some traditional customs and practices of Malawians, the Government of the Republic of Malawi shall not, for the time being, consider itself bound by such of the provisions of the Convention as require immediate eradication of such traditional customs and practices.

"While the Government of the Republic of Malawi accepts the principles of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention this acceptance should nonetheless be read in conjunction with [its] declaration of 12th December 1966, concerning the recognition, by the Government of the Republic of Malawi, as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Justice under article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court."

In respect of the first reservation, the Secretary-General had received, on 5 August 1987, from the Government of Mexico the following communication:

The Government of the United Mexican States hopes that the process of eradication of traditional customs and practices referred to in the first reservation of the Republic of Malawi will not be so protracted as to impair fulfillment of the purpose and intent of the Convention.

23 In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation, made upon ratification with respect to article 29 (1). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1249, p. 131.

24 On 13 January 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of New Zealand, a communication notifying him that, after consultation with the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue, it denounced the Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (ILO Convention No. 45) on 23 June 1987 and that in accordance with article 28 (3) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, it withdraws the reservation made upon ratification which reads as follows:

"The Government of New Zealand, the Government of the Cook Islands and the Government of Niue reserve the right, to the extent the Convention is inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention concerning the Employment of Women on Underground Work in Mines of all Kinds (ILO Convention No. 45) which was ratified by the Government of New Zealand on 29 March 1938, to apply the provisions of the latter."

25 On 15 March 1991, the Government of the Republic of Korea notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon ratification to the extent that they apply to sub-paragraphs (c), (d) and (f) of paragraph 1 of article 16.

26 On 25 January 1991, the Government of Thailand notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations made upon accession to the extent that they apply to article 11, paragraph 1 (b), and article 15, paragraph 3.

Subsequently, on 26 October 1992, the Government of Thailand notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw one of the reservations made upon accession to the Convention, i.e. that relating to article 9 (2), which reservation reads as follows:

2. With regard to article 9, paragraph 2, [. . .] the Royal Thai Government considers that the application of the said provisions shall be subject to the limits and criteria established by national law, regulations and practices.

27 On 4 January 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following declaration and reservation made upon ratification:

Declaration:

"... the United Kingdom declares that, in the event of a conflict between obligations under the present Convention and its obligations under the Convention concerning the employment of women on underground work in mines of all kinds (ILO Convention No. 45), the provisions of the last mentioned Convention shall prevail."

Reservation:

"Article 13

The United Kingdom reserves the right, notwithstanding the obligations undertaken in Article 13, or any other relevant article of the Convention, to continue to apply the income tax and capital gains tax legislation which:

i) deems for income tax purposes the income of a married woman living with her husband in a year, or part of a year, of assessment to be her husband's income and not to be her income (subject to the right of the husband and the wife to elect jointly that the wife's earned income shall be charged to income tax as if she were a single woman with no other income); and

ii) requires tax in respect of such income and of chargeable gains accruing to such a married woman to be assessed on her husband (subject to the right of either of them to apply for separate assessment) and consequently (if no such application is made) restricts to her husband the right to appeal against any such assessment and to be heard or to be represented at the hearing of any such appeal; and

iii) entitles a man who has his wife living with him, or whose wife is wholly maintained by him, during the year of assessment to a deduction from his total income of an amount larger than that to which an individual in any other case is entitled and entitles an individual whose total income includes any earned income of his wife to have that deduction increased by the amount of that earned income or by an amount specified in the legislation whichever is the less.

a) Amendment to article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women

Adopted by the States Parties at their eighth meeting on 22 May 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see paragraph 3 of Resolution 50/202).
TEXT: A/C.3/50/L.63.
STATUS: Parties : .

Note: The amendment was proposed by the Governments of Denmark, Iceland, Finland, Norway and Sweden and communicated by the Secretary-General by depositary notification C.N.373.1994.TREATIES-8 of 23 January 1995 in accordance with article 26 (1) of the Convention. At their eighth meeting held on 22 May 1995, the States Parties to the above Convention decided to amend article 20 (1) of the Convention and adopted the amendment. By Resolution 50/202 adopted at its fiftieth session held on 22 December 1995, the General Assembly noted with approval the amendment.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*

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

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 June 1987, in accordance with article 27 (1).[1]
REGISTRATION: 26 June 1987, No. 24841.
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/39/46.[2]
STATUS: Signatories: 65. Parties: 93.

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by resolution 39/46 of 10 December 1984 at the thirty-ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention is open for signature by all States, in accordance with its article 25.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	4 Feb 1985	1 Apr 1987
Albania		11 May 1994 *a*
Algeria	26 Nov 1985	12 Sep 1989
Antigua and Barbuda		19 Jul 1993 a
Argentina	4 Feb 1985	24 Sep 1986
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia	10 Dec 1985	8 Aug 1989
Austria	14 Mar 1985	29 Jul 1987
Belarus	19 Dec 1985	13 Mar 1987
Belgium	4 Feb 1985	
Belize		17 Mar 1986 *a*
Benin		12 Mar 1992 *a*
Bolivia	4 Feb 1985	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	23 Sep 1985	28 Sep 1989
Bulgaria	10 Jun 1986	16 Dec 1986
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 *a*
Cameroon		19 Dec 1986 *a*
Cambodia		15 Oct 1992 *a*
Canada	23 Aug 1985	24 Jun 1987
Cape Verde		4 Jun 1992 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile	23 Sep 1987	30 Sep 1988
China	12 Dec 1986	4 Oct 1988
Colombia	10 Apr 1985	8 Dec 1987
Costa Rica	4 Feb 1985	11 Nov 1993
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	27 Jan 1986	17 May 1995
Cyprus	9 Oct 1985	18 Jul 1991
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	4 Feb 1985	27 May 1987
Dominican Republic	4 Feb 1985	
Ecuador	4 Feb 1985	30 Mar 1988
Egypt		25 Jun 1986 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		14 Mar 1994 *a*
Finland	4 Feb 1985	30 Aug 1989
France	4 Feb 1985	18 Feb 1986
Gabon	21 Jan 1986	
Gambia	23 Oct 1985	
Georgia		26 Oct 1994 *a*
Germany[4, 5]	13 Oct 1986	1 Oct 1990
Greece	4 Feb 1985	6 Oct 1988
Guatemala		5 Jan 1990 *a*
Guinea	30 May 1986	10 Oct 1989
Guyana	25 Jan 1988	19 May 1988
Hungary	28 Nov 1986	15 Apr 1987
Iceland	4 Feb 1985	
Indonesia	23 Oct 1985	
Ireland	28 Sep 1992	
Israel	22 Oct 1986	3 Oct 1991
Italy	4 Feb 1985	12 Jan 1989
Jordan		13 Nov 1991 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Liechtenstein	27 Jun 1985	2 Nov 1990
Luxembourg	22 Feb 1985	29 Sep 1987
Malta		13 Sep 1990 *a*
Mauritius		9 Dec 1992 *a*
Mexico	18 Mar 1985	23 Jan 1986
Monaco		6 Dec 1991 *a*
Morocco	8 Jan 1986	21 Jun 1993
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Nepal		14 May 1991 *a*
Netherlands[6]	4 Feb 1985	21 Dec 1988
New Zealand	14 Jan 1986	10 Dec 1989
Nicaragua	15 Apr 1985	
Nigeria	28 Jul 1988	
Norway	4 Feb 1985	9 Jul 1986
Panama	22 Feb 1985	24 Aug 1987
Paraguay	23 Oct 1989	12 Mar 1990
Peru	29 May 1985	7 Jul 1988
Philippines		18 Jun 1986 *a*
Poland	13 Jan 1986	26 Jul 1989
Portugal	4 Feb 1985	9 Feb 1989
Republic of Korea		9 Jan 1995 *a*
Republic of Moldova		28 Nov 1995 *a*
Romania		18 Dec 1990 *a*
Russian Federation	10 Dec 1985	3 Mar 1987
Senegal	4 Feb 1985	21 Aug 1986
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Sierra Leone	18 Mar 1985	
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		16 Jul 1993 *a*
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 *a*
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	
Spain	4 Feb 1985	21 Oct 1987
Sri Lanka		3 Jan 1994 *a*
Sudan	4 Jun 1986	
Sweden	4 Feb 1985	8 Jan 1986
Switzerland	4 Feb 1985	2 Dec 1986
Tajikistan		11 Jan 1995 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		12 Dec 1994 *d*
Togo	25 Mar 1987	18 Nov 1987
Tunisia	26 Aug 1987	23 Sep 1988
Turkey	25 Jan 1988	2 Aug 1988
Uganda		3 Nov 1986 *a*
Ukraine	27 Feb 1986	24 Feb 1987

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
United Kingdom[7]	15 Mar 1985	8 Dec 1988
United States of America[8]	18 Apr 1988	21 Oct 1994
Uruguay	4 Feb 1985	24 Oct 1986
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Venezuela	15 Feb 1985	29 Jul 1991
Yemen		5 Nov 1991 *a*
Yugoslavia	18 Apr 1989	10 Sep 1991

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

While ratifying the above-mentioned Convention, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, invoking paragraph 1 of the article 28, of the Convention, does not recognize the authority of the committee as foreseen in the article 20 of the Convention.

Also according to paragraph 2 of the article 30, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, will not be bound to honour the provisions of paragraph 1 of the same article since according to that paragraph 1 the compulsory submission of disputes in connection with interpretation or the implementation of the provisions of this Convention by one of the parties concerned to the International Court of Justice is deemed possible. Concerning to this matter, it declares that the settlement of disputes between the States Parties, such disputes may be referred to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the consent of all the Parties concerned and not by one of the Parties.

AUSTRIA

"1. Austria will establish its jurisdiction in accordance with article 5 of the Convention irrespective of the laws applying to the place where the offence occurred, but in respect of paragraph 1 (c) only if prosecution by a State having jurisdiction under paragraph 1 (a) or paragraph 1 (b) is not to be expected.

"2. Austria regards article 15 as the legal basis for the inadmissibility provided for therein of the use of statements which are established to have been made as a result of torture."

BELARUS[9]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention.

BULGARIA[10]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. Pursuant to article 28 of the Convention, the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture provided for in article 20 of the Convention, as it considers that the provisions of article 20 are not consistent with the principle of respect for sovereignty of the States parties to the Convention.

CHILE[11]

Upon signature:

1. The Government of Chile does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture provided for in article 20.

2. The Government of Chile does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

3. The Government of Chile reserve the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any declarations or reservations it may deem necessary in the light of its domestic law.

Upon ratification:

The Government of Chile declares that in its relations with American States that are Parties to the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, it will apply that Convention in cases where its provisions are incompatible with those of the present Convention.

The Government of Chile will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 30, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

CHINA

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"(1) The Chinese Government does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as provided for in article 20 of the Convention.

"(2) The Chinese Government does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention."

CUBA

Declarations:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba deplores the fact that even after the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) containing the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, a provision such as paragraph 1 of article 2 was included in the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

The Government of the Republic declares, in accordance with article 28 of the Convention, that the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of article 20 of the Convention will have to be invoked in strict compliance with the principle of the sovereignty of States and implemented with the prior consent of the States Parties.

In connection with the provisions of article 30 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba is of the view that any dispute between Parties should be settled by negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

ECUADOR

Reservation:

Ecuador declares that, in accordance with the provisions of article 42 of its Political Constitution, it will not permit extradition of its nationals.

FRANCE

Reservation:

The Government of France declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it shall not be bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of [article 30].

GERMANY[4]

Upon signature:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to communicate, upon ratification, such reservations or declarations of interpretation as are deemed necessary especially with respect to the applicability of article 3.

Upon ratification:

Article 3

This provision prohibits the transfer of a person directly to a State where this person is exposed to a concrete danger of being subjected to torture. In the opinion of the Federal Republic of Germany, article 3 as well as the other provisions of the Convention exclusively establish State obligations that are met by the Federal Republic of Germany in conformity with the provisions of its domestic law which is in accordance with the Convention.

GUATEMALA[12]

HUNGARY[13]

ISRAEL

Reservations:

"1. In accordance with article 28 of the Convention, the State of Israel hereby declares that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.

"2. In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 30, the State of Israel hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article."

LUXEMBOURG

Interpretative declaration:

Article l

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg hereby declares that the only "lawful sanctions" that it recognizes within the meaning of article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention are those which are accepted by both national law and international law.

MONACO

Reservation:

In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 30 of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article.

MOROCCO

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Declaration:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the same article.

NETHERLANDS

Interpretative declaration with respect to article 1:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the term "lawful sanctions" in article 1, paragraph 1, must be understood as referring to those sanctions which are lawful not only under national law but also under international law."

NEW ZEALAND

Reservation:

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right to award compensation to torture victims referred to in article 14 of the Convention Against Torture only at the discretion of the Attorney-General of New Zealand."

PANAMA

The Republic of Panama declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of the said article.

POLAND

Upon signature:

Under article 28, the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 20 of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[9]

SLOVAKIA[3]

TOGO

Upon signature:

The Government of the Togolese Republic reserves the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any reservations or declarations which it might consider necessary.

TUNISIA

Upon signature:

The Government of Tunisia reserves the right to make at some later stage any reservation or declaration which it deems necessary, in particular with regard to articles 20 and 21 of the said Convention.

Upon ratification:

[The Government of Tunisia] confirms that the reservations made at the time of signature of the Convention on Tunisia's behalf on 26 August 1987 have been completely withdrawn.

TURKEY

Reservation:

"The Government of Turkey declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article."

UKRAINE[9]

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservations, mutatis mutandis, *as those made by Belarus.]*

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any reservations or interpretative declarations which it might consider necessary."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature :

Declaration:

"The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to communicate, upon ratification, such reservations,

interpretive understandings, or declarations as are deemed necessary."

Upon ratification :

Reservations:

"I. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservations:

(1) That the United States considers itself bound by the obligation under article 16 to prevent 'cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment', only insofar as the term 'cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment' means the cruel, unusual and inhumane treatment or punishment prohibited by the Fifth, Eighth, and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

(2) That pursuant to article 30 (2) the United States declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 30 (1), but reserves the right specifically to agree to follow this or any other procedure for arbitration in a particular case.

II. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understandings, which shall apply to the obligations of the United States under this Convention:

(1) (a) That with reference to article 1, the United States understands that, in order to constitute torture, an act must be specifically intended to inflict severe physical or mental pain or suffering and that mental pain or suffering refers to prolonged mental harm caused by or resulting from (1) the intentional infliction or threatened infliction of severe physical pain or suffering; (2) the administration or application, or threatened administration or application, of mind altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or the personality; (3) the threat of imminent death; or (4) the threat that another person will imminently be subjected to death, severe physical pain or suffering, or the administration or application of mind altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality.

(b) That the United States understands that the definition of torture in article 1 is intended to apply only to acts directed against persons in the offender's custody or physical control.

(c) That with reference to article 1 of the Convention, the United States understands that 'sanctions' includes judicially–imposed sanctions and other enforcement actions authorized by United States law or by judicial interpretation of such law. Nonetheless, the United States understands that a State Party could not through its domestic sanctions defeat the object and purpose of the Convention to prohibit torture.

(d) That with reference to article 1 of the Convention, the United States understands that the term 'acquiescence' requires that the public official, prior to the activity constituting torture, have awareness of such activity and thereafter breach his legal responsibility to intervene to prevent such activity.

(e) That with reference to article 1 of the Convention, the Unites States understands that noncompliance with applicable legal procedural standards does not *per se* constitute torture.

(2) That the United States understands the phrase, 'where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture,' as used in article 3 of the Convention, to mean 'if it is more likely than not that he would be tortured.'

(3) That it is the understanding of the United States that article 14 requires a State Party to provide a private right of action for damages only for acts of torture committed in territory under the jurisdiction of that State Party.

(4) That the United States understands that international law does not prohibit the death penalty, and does not consider this Convention to restrict or prohibit the United States from applying the death penalty consistent with the Fifth, Eighth and/or Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, including any constitutional period of confinement prior to the imposition of the death penalty.

(5) That the United States understands that this Convention shall be implemented by the United States Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered by the Convention and otherwise by the state and local governments. Accordingly, in implementing articles 10–14 and 16, the United States Government shall take measures appropriate to the Federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the constituent units of the United States of America may take appropriate measures for the fulfilment of the Convention.

III. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declarations:

(1) That the United States declares that the provisions of articles 1 through 16 of the Convention are not self–executing.

Declarations recognizing the Competence of the Committee against Torture under articles 21 and 22
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

Article 21

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 21 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

Article 22

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

ARGENTINA

The Argentine Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention. It also recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the aforesaid Convention; and

The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to Australia's jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the aforesaid Convention."

AUSTRIA

"Austria recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Austria recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to Austrian jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation of the provisions of the Convention."

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that in accordance with article 21 (2) of the Convention it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention."

The Republic of Bulgaria declares that in accordance with article 22 (1) of the Convention it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of this Convention."

CANADA

13 November 1989

"The Government of Canada declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture, pursuant to article 21 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a state party claims that another state party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"The Government of Canada also declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture, pursuant to article 22 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a state party of the provisions of the Convention."

CROATIA

"[The] Republic of Croatia . . . accepts the competence of the Committee in accordance with articles 21 and 22 of the said Convention."

CYPRUS

8 April 1993

"The Republic of Cyprus recognizes the competence of the Committee established under article 17 of the Convention [...]:

I. to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention (article 21), and

II. to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention (Article 22)."

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark [. . .] recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that the State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"The Government of Denmark [. . .] recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

ECUADOR

6 September 1988

The Ecuadorian State, pursuant to article 21 of the International Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention; it also recognizes in regard to itself the competence of the Committee, in accordance with article 21.

It further declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

FINLAND

"Finland declares that it recognizes fully the competence of the Committee against Torture as specified in article 21, paragraph 1 and article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

FRANCE

23 June 1988

The Government of France declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

The Government of France declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

GREECE

Article 21

The Hellenic Republic declares, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

Article 22

The Hellenic Republic declares, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claims to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

HUNGARY

13 September 1989

[The Government of Hungary] recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Convention.

ITALY

10 October 1989

"Article 21: Italy hereby declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention;

"Article 22: Italy hereby declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of violations by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

LIECHTENSTEIN

The Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

The Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

LUXEMBOURG

Article 21

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg hereby declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

Article 22

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg hereby declares [. . .] that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

MALTA

The Government of Malta fully recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture as specified in article 21, paragraph 1, and article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

MONACO

In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

In accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

NETHERLANDS

"*With respect to article 21:*

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture under the conditions laid down in article 21, to receive and consider communications to the effect that another State Party claims that the Kingdom is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention;

"*With respect to article 22:*

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, under the conditions laid down in article 22, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Kingdom of the provisions of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

"1. In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, [the Government of New Zealand declares] that it recognises the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention; and

"2. In Accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, [the Government of New Zealand] recognises the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

NORWAY

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Norway recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

POLAND

12 May 1993

"The Government of the Republic of Poland, in accordance with articles 21 and 22 of the Convention, recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Republic of Poland is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention or communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Poland of the provisions of the Convention."

PORTUGAL

"*Article 21*

Portugal hereby declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that the State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"*Article 22*

Portugal hereby declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of violation by State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[9]

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, pursuant to article 21 of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications in respect of situations and events

occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also declares that, pursuant to article 22 of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in respect of situations or events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA

17 March 1995

"The Slovak Republic, pursuant to article 21 of the [said Convention] recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention."

"The Slovak Republic further declares, pursuant to article 22 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SLOVENIA

"1. The Republic of Slovenia declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to article 21 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

2. The Republic of Slovenia also declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to the competence of the Committee against Torture, pursuant to article 22 of the said Convention, to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SPAIN

Spain declares that, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that the Spanish State is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention. It is Spain's understanding that, pursuant to the above-mentioned article, such communications shall be accepted and processed only if they come from a State Party which has made a similar declaration.

Spain declares that, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications sent by, or on behalf of, persons subject to Spanish jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by the Spanish State of the provisions of the Convention. Such communications must be consistent with the provisions of the above-mentioned article and, in particular,of its paragraph 5.

SWEDEN

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

SWITZERLAND

(a) Pursuant to the Federal Decree of 6 October 1986 on the approval of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the Federal Council declares, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that Switzerland recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that Switzerland is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

(b) Pursuant to the above-mentioned Federal Decree, the Federal Council declares, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that Switzerland recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by Switzerland of the provisions of the Convention.

TOGO

The Government of the Republic of Togo recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Togo recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention.

TUNISIA

[The Government of Tunisia] declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture provided for in article 17 of the Convention to receive communications pursuant to articles 21 and 22, thereby withdrawing any reservation made on Tunisia's behalf in this connection.

TURKEY

"The Government of Turkey declares, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention.

The Government of Turkey declares, pursuant to article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom declares under article 21 of the said Convention that it recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications submitted by another State Party, provided that such other State Party has, not less than twelve months prior to the submission by it of a communication in regard to the United Kingdom, made a declaration under article 21 recognizing the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications in regard to itself."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States declares, pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Convention. It is the understanding of the United States that, pursuant to the above-mentioned article, such communications shall be accepted and processed only if they come from a State Party which has made a similar declaration."

URUGUAY

27 July 1988

The Government of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee Against Torture to receive and consider communications referring to the said articles [21 and 22].

VENEZUELA

26 April 1994

"The Government of the Republic of Venezuela recognizes the competence of the Committee against Torture as provided for under articles 21 and 22 of the Convention."

YUGOSLAVIA

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in compliance with article 21, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications in which one State Party to the Convention claims that another State Party does not fulfil the obligations pursuant to the Convention;

"Yugoslavia recognizes, in conformity with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the competence of the Committee against Torture to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

Notes:

[1] Including the provisions of articles 21 and 22 concerning the competence of the Committee against Torture, more than five States having, prior to that date, declared that they recognized the competence of the Committee against Torture, in accordance with the said articles.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Thirty-ninth session, Supplement No. 51* (A/39/51), p. 197.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 8 September 1986 and 7 July 1988, respectively, with the following reservations:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound, in accordance with Article 30, paragraph 2, by the provisions of Article 30, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention."

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 30 (1). See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

On 17 March 1995, the Government of Slovakia notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 20 made by Czechoslovakia upon signature and confirmed upon ratification, and which the Government of Slovakia had maintained upon succession.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 April 1986 and 9 September 1987, respectively, with the following reservations and declaration:

Reservations:

The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with article 28, paragraph 1 of the Convention that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.

The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with article 30, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article.

Declaration:

The German Democratic Republic declares that it will bear its share only of those expenses in accordance with article 17, paragraph 7, and article 18, paragraph 5, of the Convention arising from activities under the competence of the Committee as recognized by the German Democratic Republic.

In this regard, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared, in a letter accompanying its instrument of ratification, the following:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has taken note of the *reservations* formulated by the Government of the German Democratic Republic pursuant to article 28, paragraph 1, and article 30, paragraph 2, respectively, and the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic with reference to article 17, paragraph 7, and article 18, paragraph 5. It does not regard the said declaration as affecting in any way the obligations of the German Democratic Republic as a State Party to the Convention (including the obligations to meet its share of the expenses of the Committee on Torture as apportioned by the first meeting of the States Parties held on 26 November 1987 or any subsequent such meetings) and do not accordingly raise objections to it. It reserves the rights of the United Kingdom in their entirety in the event that the said declaration should at any future time be claimed to affect the obligations of the German Democratic Republic as aforesaid."

Moreover, the Secretary-General had received from the following States, objections to the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic, on the dates indicated hereinafter:

France (23 June 1988):

France makes an objection to [the declaration] which it considers contrary with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The said objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between France and the German Democratic Republic.

Luxembourg (9 September 1988):

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg objects to this declaration, which it deems to be a reservation the effect of which would be to inhibit activities of the Committee in a manner incompatible with the purpose and the goal of the Convention.

The present objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the German Democratic Republic.

Sweden (28 September 1988):

"According to article 2, paragraph 1 (d) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties a unilateral statement, whereby a State e.g. when ratifying a treaty purports to exclude the legal effect of certain provisions of the Treaty in their application, is regarded as a reservation. Thus, such unilateral statements are considered as reservations regardless of their name or phrase. The Government of Sweden has come to the conclusion that the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore is invalid according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to this declaration."

Austria (29 September 1988):

"The Declaration [...] cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from that Convention for all States Parties thereto."

Denmark (29 September 1988):

"The Government of Denmark hereby enters its formal objection to [the declaration] which it considers to be a unilateral statement with the purpose of modifying the legal effect of certain provisions of the Convention against Torture, and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in their application to the German Democratic Republic. It is the position of the Government of Denmark that the said declaration has no legal basis in the Convention or in international treaty law.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and the German Democratic Republic."

Norway (29 September 1988):

"The Government of Norway cannot accept this declaration entered by the German Democratic Republic. The Government of Norway considers that any such declaration is without legal effect, and cannot in any manner diminish the obligation of a government to contribute to the costs of the Committee in conformity with the provisions of the Convention."

Canada (5 October 1988):

The Government of Canada considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention against Torture, and thus inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Through its functions and its activities, the Committee against Torture plays an essential role in the execution of the obligations of States parties to the Convention against Torture. Any restriction whose effect is to hamper the activities of the Committee would thus be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Greece (6 October 1988):

The Hellenic Republic raises an objection to [the declaration], which it considers to be in violation of article 19, paragraph (b), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Convention against Torture expressly sets forth in article 28, paragraph 1, and article 30, paragraph 2, the reservations which may be made. The declaration of the German Democratic Republic is not, however, in conformity with these specified reservations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the said Convention as between the Hellenic Republic and the German Democratic Republic.

Spain (6 October 1988):

. . . The Government of the Kingdom of Spain feels that such a reservation is a violation of article 19, paragraph (b), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, because the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment sets forth, in article 28, paragraph 1, and article 30, paragraph 2, the only reservations that may be made to the Convention, and the above-mentioned reservation of the German Democratic Republic does not conform to either of those reservations.

Switzerland (7 October 1988):

. . . That reservation is contrary to the purpose and aims of the Convention which are, through the Committee's activities, to encourage respect for a vitally important human right and to enhance the effectiveness of the struggle against torture the world over. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between the Swiss Confederation and the German Democratic Republic.

Italy (12 January 1989):

The Convention authorizes only the reservations indicated in article 28 (1) and 30 (2). The reservation made by the German Democratic Republic is not therefore admissible under the terms of article 19 (b) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Portugal (9 February 1989):

". . . The Government of Portugal considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the present Convention. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and G.D.R."

Australia (8 August 1989):

"The Government of Australia considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and, accordingly, hereby conveys Australia's objection to the declaration."

Finland (20 October 1989):

". . . The Government of Finland considers that any such declaration is without legal effect, and cannot in any manner diminish the obligation of a government to contribute to the costs of the Committee in conformity with the provisions of the Convention."

New Zealand (10 December 1989):

". . . The Government of New Zealand considers that this declaration is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between New Zealand and the German Democratic Republic."

Netherlands (21 December 1989):

"This declaration, clearly a reservation according to article 2, paragraph 1, under (d), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, not only "purports to exclude or modify the legal effect" of articles 17, paragraph 7, and 18, paragraph 5, of the present Convention in their application to the German Democratic Republic itself, but it would also affect the obligations of the other States Parties which would have to pay additionally in order to ensure the proper functioning of the Committee Against Torture. For this reason the reservation is not acceptable to the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

"Thus, the assessment of the financial contributions of the States Parties to be made under article 17, paragraph 7, and article 18, paragraph 5, must be drawn up in disregard of the declaration of the German Democratic Republic."

Subsequently, in a communication received on 13 September 1990, the Government of the German Democratic Republic notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservations, made upon ratification, to articles 17 (7), 18 (5), 20 and 30 (1) of the Convention.

Further, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made the following declaration in respect of articles 21 and 22 of the Convention:

"The German Democratic Republic declares in accordance with article 21, paragraph 1, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention.

"The German Democratic Republic in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1, declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 4 above.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[7] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Anguilla, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Monserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this connection, on 14 April 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina an objection, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made in this regard in note 14 of chapter III.11, however also referring to General Assembly resolutions 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25.

Subsequently, on 17 April 1991, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration:

The Argentine Government rejects the extension of the application of the [said] Convention to the Malvinas Islands, effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on

8 December 1988, and reaffirms the rights of sovereignty of the Argentine Republic over those Islands, which are an integral part of its national territory.

The Argentine Republic recalls that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute and requests the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the pending questions of sovereignty, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

On 9 December 1992, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention applies to the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Bermuda and Hong Kong.

[8] On 3 June 1994, the Secretary–General received a communication from the Government of the United States of America requesting, in compliance with a condition set forth by the Senate of the United States of America, in giving advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention, and in contemplation of the deposit of an instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Government of the United States of America, that a notification should be made to all present and prospective ratifying Parties to the Convention to the effect that:

"... nothing in this Convention requires or authorizes legislation, or other action, by the United States of America prohibited by the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the United States."

[9] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 March and 20 March 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations concerning article 30 (1) made upon ratification. The reservation made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by the other two Governments, read as follows:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention.

On 1 October 1991, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation with regard to article 20 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention.

[10] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 30 (1) made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. The reservation reads as follows:

2. Pursuant to article 30, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 30, paragraph 1 of the Convention, establishing compulsory jurisdiction of international arbitration or the International Court of Justice in the settlement of disputes between States parties to the Convention. The People's Republic of Bulgaria maintains its position that disputes between two or more States can be submitted for consideration and settlement by international arbitration or the International Court of Justice only provided all parties to the dispute, in each individual case, have explicitly agreed to that.

[11] In a communication received on 7 September 1990, the Government of Chile notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration by which the Government, in accordance with article 28 (1) did not recognize the competence of the Committee against torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention. The Government of Chile further decided to withdraw the following reservations, made upon ratification, to article 2 (3) and article 3, of the Convention:

(a) [To] Article 2, paragraph 3, in so far as it modifies the principle of "obedience upon reiteration" contained in Chilean domestic law. The Government of Chile will apply the provisions of that international norm to subordinate personnel governed by the Code of Military Justice, provided that the order patently intended to lead to perpetration of the acts referred to in article 1 is not insisted on by the superior officer after being challenged by his subordinate.

(b) Article 3, by reason of the discretionary and subjective nature of the terms in which it is drafted.

It will be recalled that the Secretary-General had received various objections to the said declarations from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Italy (14 August 1989):

The Government of Italy considers that the reservations entered by Chile are not valid, as they are incompatible with the objection and purpose of the Convention. The present objection is in no way an obstacle to the entry into force of this Convention between Italy and Chile.

Denmark (7 September 1989):

"The Danish Government considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Denmark and Chile."

Luxembourg (12 September 1989):

. . . The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg objects to the reservations, which are incompatible with the intent and purpose of the Convention.

This objection does not represent an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and Chile.

Czechoslovakia (20 September 1989):

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers the reservations of the Government of Chile [. . .] as incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention.

"The obligation of each State to prevent acts of torture in any territory under its jurisdiction is unexceptional. It is the obligation of each State to ensure that all acts of torture are offences under its criminal law. This obligation is confirmed, *inter alia*, in article 2, paragraph 3 of the Convention concerned.

"The observance of provisions set up in article 3 of this Convention is necessitated by the need to ensure more effective protection for persons who might be in danger of being subjected to torture and this is obviously one of the principal purposes of the Convention.

"Therefore, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

France (20 September 1989):

France considers that the reservations made by Chile are not valid as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between France and Chile.

Sweden (25 September 1989):

". . . These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Sweden and Chile, and the said reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

Spain (26 September 1989):

. . . The aforementioned reservations are contrary to the purposes and aims of the Convention.

The present objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Spain and Chile.

Norway (28 September 1989):

"... The Government of Norway considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Norway and Chile."

Portugal (6 October 1989):

"...The Government of Portugal considers such reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Chile."

Greece (13 October 1989):

Greece does not accept the reservation since they are incompatible with the purpose and object of the Convention.

The above-mentioned objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Greece and Chile.

Finland (20 October 1989):

"...The Government of Finland considers the said reservations as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and Chile."

Canada (23 October 1989):

"The reservations by Chile are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention Against Torture and thus inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

Turkey (3 November 1989):

"The Government of Turkey considers such reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention and therefore invalid.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Turkey and Chile."

Australia (7 November 1989):

"[The Government of Australia] has come to the conclusion that these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Government of Australia therefore objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Australia and Chile, and the afore-mentioned reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention."

Netherlands (7 November 1989):

"Since the purpose of the Convention is strengthening of the existing prohibition of torture and similar practices the reservation to article 2, paragraph 3, to the effect to an order from a superior officer or a public authority may – in some cases – be invoked as a justification or torture, must be rejected as contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

"For similar reasons the reservation to article 3 must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

"These objections are not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Chile."

Switzerland (8 November 1989):

These reservations are not compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, which are to improve respect for human right of fundamental importance and to make more effective the struggle against torture throughout the world.

This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between the Swiss Confederation and the Republic of Chile.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (8 November 1989):

"The United Kingdom is unable to accept the reservation to article 2, paragraph 3, or the reservation to article 3."

In the same communication, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"(a) The reservations to article 28, paragraph 1, and to article 30, paragraph 1, being reservations expressly permitted by the Convention, do not call for any observations by the United Kingdom.

"(b) The United Kingdom takes note of the reservation referring to the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture, which cannot, however, affect the obligations of Chile in respect of the United Kingdom, as a non-Party to the said Convention."

Austria (9 November 1989):

"The reservations [. . .] are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and are therefore impermissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Republic of Austria therefore objects against these reservations and states that they cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention for all States Parties thereto."

New Zealand (10 December 1989):

"... The New Zealand Government considers the said reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not constitute and obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between New Zealand and Chile."

Bulgaria (24 January 1990):

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers the reservations made by Chile with regard to art. 2, para. 3 and art. 3 of the Convention against torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment of December 10, 1984 incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Convention.

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria holds the view that each State is obliged to take all measures to prevent any acts of torture and other forms of cruel and inhuman treatment within its jurisdiction, including the unconditional qualification of such acts as crimes in its national criminal code. It is in this sense that art. 2, para. 3 of the Convention is formulated.

"The provisions of art. 3 of the Convention are dictated by the necessity to grant the most effective protection to persons who risk to suffer torture or other inhuman treatment. For this reason these provisions should not be interpreted on the basis of subjective or any other circumstances, under which they were formulated.

"In view of this the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the reservations."

12 In a communication received on 30 May 1990, the Government of Guatemala notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the reservations concerning the provisions of articles 28 (1) and 30 (2), made upon accession to the Convention.

13 In a communication received on 13 September 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the following reservations relating to articles 20 and 30 (1) made upon ratification:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture as defined by article 20 of the Convention.

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 30 of the Convention.

(*a*) Amendments to articles 17 (7) and 18 (5) of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhumane or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

Adopted by the Conference of the States Parties on 8 September 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 29 (2)].
TEXT: Doc. CAT/sp/1992/L.1.
STATUS: Acceptances: 17.

Note: The amendments were proposed by the Government of Australia and circulated by the Secretary-General under cover of depositary notification C.N.10.1992.TREATIES–1 of 28 February 1992, in accordance with article 29 (1) of the Convention. The Conference of the States Parties convened by the Secretary–General in accordance with article 29(1), adopted, on 8 September 1992, the amendments which were subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly in resolution 47/111[1] of 16 December 1992.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*
Australia	15 Oct 1993	Netherlands[2]	24 Jan 1995
Bulgaria	2 Mar 1995	New Zealand	8 Oct 1993
Canada	8 Feb 1995	Norway	6 Oct 1993
Cyprus	22 Feb 1994	Seychelles	23 Jul 1993
Denmark	3 Sep 1993	Sweden	14 May 1993
Ecuador	6 Sep 1995	Switzerland	10 Dec 1993
Finland	5 Feb 1993	Ukraine	17 Jun 1994
France	24 May 1994	United Kingdom	7 Feb 1994
Liechtenstein	24 Aug 1994		

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Forty–seventh Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/47/49), p. 192.

[2] For the Kingdom in Euope, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

10. International Convention against *Apartheid* in Sports

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 April 1988, in accordance with article 18 (1).
REGISTRATION: 3 April 1988, No. 25822.
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/40/64 G.
STATUS: Signatories: 73. Parties: 57.

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 40/64 G[1] of 10 December 1985 at the fortieth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA) accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria	16 May 1986	27 Oct 1988
Angola		9 Aug 1990 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda	28 May 1986	9 Sep 1987
Bahamas	20 May 1986	13 Nov 1986
Barbados	16 May 1986	2 Oct 1986
Belarus	16 May 1986	1 Jul 1987
Benin	16 May 1986	
Bolivia	16 May 1986	27 Apr 1988
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	10 Jun 1986	18 Aug 1987
Burkina Faso	16 May 1986	29 Jun 1988
Burundi	16 May 1986	
Cameroon	21 Mar 1988	
Cape Verde	16 May 1986	
Central African Republic	16 May 1986	
China	21 Oct 1987	
Colombia	31 Jul 1986	
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	16 May 1986	11 Dec 1990
Cyprus	9 Jul 1987	
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Ecuador	16 May 1986	12 Jun 1991
Egypt	16 May 1986	2 Apr 1991
Equatorial Guinea		27 Mar 1987 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia	16 May 1986	22 Jul 1987
Gabon	16 May 1986	
Ghana	16 May 1986	24 Mar 1988
Guinea	16 May 1986	10 Oct 1989
Guinea-Bissau	16 May 1986	
Guyana	1 Oct 1986	1 Oct 1986
Haiti	16 May 1986	
Hungary	25 Jun 1986	
India		12 Sep 1990 *a*
Indonesia	16 May 1986	23 Jul 1993
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 May 1986	12 Jan 1988
Iraq		30 Jan 1989 *a*
Jamaica	16 May 1986	2 Oct 1986
Jordan	16 May 1986	26 Aug 1987
Kenya	16 May 1986	
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon	7 Nov 1986	
Liberia	2 May 1986	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	16 May 1986	29 Jun 1988
Madagascar	16 May 1986	
Malaysia	16 May 1986	
Maldives	3 Oct 1986	
Mali		7 Feb 1989 *a*
Mauritania	18 Jan 1988	13 Dec 1988
Mauritius		26 Jun 1990 *a*
Mexico	16 May 1986	18 Jun 1987
Mongolia	16 May 1986	16 Dec 1987 *AA*
Morocco	16 May 1986	
Nepal	24 Jun 1986	1 Mar 1989
Nicaragua	16 May 1986	
Niger	27 May 1986	2 Sep 1986
Nigeria	16 May 1986	20 May 1987
Panama	16 May 1986	
Peru	30 May 1986	7 Jul 1988
Philippines	16 May 1986	27 Jul 1987
Poland	16 May 1986	4 Mar 1988
Qatar	3 Dec 1987	19 Jan 1988
Russian Federation	16 May 1986	11 Jun 1987
Rwanda	16 May 1986	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	16 May 1986	5 Dec 1988
Saint Lucia	29 May 1987	
Senegal	16 May 1986	15 Oct 1986
Sierra Leone	16 May 1986	
Somalia	4 Jun 1986	
Sudan	16 May 1986	23 Feb 1990
Syrian Arab Republic	16 May 1986	28 Nov 1988
Togo	29 May 1986	23 Apr 1987
Trinidad and Tobago	21 May 1986	11 Oct 1990
Tunisia	16 May 1986	25 Sep 1989
Uganda	16 May 1986	29 Aug 1986
Ukraine	16 May 1986	19 Jun 1987
United Republic of Tanzania	16 May 1986	13 Jan 1989
Uruguay	28 May 1986	26 Jan 1988
Venezuela	16 May 1986	3 Oct 1989
Yemen[4]	16 May 1986	
Yugoslavia	16 May 1986	22 Dec 1989
Zaire	16 May 1986	
Zambia	10 Feb 1988	8 Mar 1988
Zimbabwe	16 May 1986	14 Jul 1987

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers, with respect to the provisions of article 19 of the Convention, that any dispute arising between Parties should be resolved by direct negotiations through the diplomatic channel.

NOTES:

1 *Official Records of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Fortieth session, Supplement No. 53* (A/40/53), p. 37.

2 The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 16 May 1986 and 15 September 1986, respectively. See note 13 in chapter I.2.

3 Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 25 February 1987 and 29 July 1987, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

4 The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

11. Convention on the Rights of the Child

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 November 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 September 1990, in accordance with article 49 (1).
REGISTRATION: 2 September 1990, No. 27531.
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/44/25 and depositary notifications C.N.147.1993.TREATIES–5 of 15 May 1993 [proposed amendments to article 43 (2)][1]; and C.N.322.1995.TREATIES7 of 7 November 1995 [proposal of amendment to article 43 (2)].
STATUS: Signatories: 140. Parties: 185.

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by resolution 44/25[2] of 20 November 1989 at the Forty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention is open for signature by all States at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	27 Sep 1990	28 Mar 1994
Albania	26 Jan 1990	27 Feb 1992
Algeria	26 Jan 1990	16 Apr 1993
Andorra	2 Oct 1995	
Angola	14 Feb 1990	5 Dec 1990
Antigua and Barbuda	12 Mar 1991	5 Oct 1993
Argentina	29 Jun 1990	4 Dec 1990
Armenia		23 Jun 1993 *a*
Australia	22 Aug 1990	17 Dec 1990
Austria	26 Jan 1990	6 Aug 1992
Azerbaijan		13 Aug 1992 *a*
Bahamas	30 Oct 1990	20 Feb 1991
Bahrain		13 Feb 1992 *a*
Bangladesh	26 Jan 1990	3 Aug 1990
Barbados	19 Apr 1990	9 Oct 1990
Belarus	26 Jan 1990	1 Oct 1990
Belgium	26 Jan 1990	16 Dec 1991
Belize	2 Mar 1990	2 May 1990
Benin	25 Apr 1990	3 Aug 1990
Bhutan	4 Jun 1990	1 Aug 1990
Bolivia	8 Mar 1990	26 Jun 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		14 Mar 1995 *a*
Brazil	26 Jan 1990	24 Sep 1990
Brunei Darussalam		27 Dec 1995 *a*
Bulgaria	31 May 1990	3 Jun 1991
Burkina Faso	26 Jan 1990	31 Aug 1990
Burundi	8 May 1990	19 Oct 1990
Cambodia		15 Oct 1992 *a*
Cameroon	25 Sep 1990	11 Jan 1993
Canada	28 May 1990	13 Dec 1991
Cape Verde		4 Jun 1992 *a*
Central African Republic	30 Jul 1990	23 Apr 1992
Chad	30 Sep 1990	2 Oct 1990
Chile	26 Jan 1990	13 Aug 1990
China	29 Aug 1990	2 Mar 1992
Colombia	26 Jan 1990	28 Jan 1991
Comoros	30 Sep 1990	22 Jun 1993
Congo		14 Oct 1993 *a*
Costa Rica	26 Jan 1990	21 Aug 1990
Côte d'Ivoire	26 Jan 1990	4 Feb 1991
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	26 Jan 1990	21 Aug 1991
Cyprus	5 Oct 1990	7 Feb 1991
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	23 Aug 1990	21 Sep 1990
Denmark	26 Jan 1990	19 Jul 1991
Djibouti	30 Sep 1990	6 Dec 1990
Dominica	26 Jan 1990	13 Mar 1991
Dominican Republic	8 Aug 1990	11 Jun 1991
Ecuador	26 Jan 1990	23 Mar 1990
Egypt	5 Feb 1990	6 Jul 1990
El Salvador	26 Jan 1990	10 Jul 1990
Equatorial Guinea		15 Jun 1992 *a*
Eritrea	20 Dec 1993	3 Aug 1994
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia		14 May 1991 *a*
Fiji	2 Jul 1993	13 Aug 1993
Finland	26 Jan 1990	20 Jun 1991
France	26 Jan 1990	7 Aug 1990
Gabon	26 Jan 1990	9 Feb 1994
Gambia	5 Feb 1990	8 Aug 1990
Georgia		2 Jun 1994 *a*
Germany[4]	26 Jan 1990	6 Mar 1992
Ghana	29 Jan 1990	5 Feb 1990
Greece	26 Jan 1990	11 May 1993
Grenada	21 Feb 1990	5 Nov 1990
Guatemala	26 Jan 1990	6 Jun 1990
Guinea		13 Jul 1990 *a*
Guinea-Bissau	26 Jan 1990	20 Aug 1990
Guyana	30 Sep 1990	14 Jan 1991
Haiti	26 Jan 1990	8 Jun 1995
Holy See	20 Apr 1990	20 Apr 1990
Honduras	31 May 1990	10 Aug 1990
Hungary	14 Mar 1990	7 Oct 1991
Iceland	26 Jan 1990	28 Oct 1992
India		11 Dec 1992 *a*
Indonesia	26 Jan 1990	5 Sep 1990
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	5 Sep 1991	13 Jul 1994
Iraq		15 Jun 1994 *a*
Ireland	30 Sep 1990	28 Sep 1992
Israel	3 Jul 1990	3 Oct 1991
Italy	26 Jan 1990	5 Sep 1991
Jamaica	26 Jan 1990	14 May 1991
Japan	21 Sep 1990	22 Apr 1994
Jordan	29 Aug 1990	24 May 1991
Kazakstan	16 Feb 1994	12 Aug 1994
Kenya	26 Jan 1990	30 Jul 1990
Kiribati		11 Dec 1995 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a), succession (d)
Kuwait	7 Jun 1990	21 Oct 1991
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		8 May 1991 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon	26 Jan 1990	14 May 1991
Lesotho	21 Aug 1990	10 Mar 1992
Liberia	26 Apr 1990	4 Jun 1993
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 Apr 1993 *a*
Liechtenstein	30 Sep 1990	22 Dec 1995
Lithuania		31 Jan 1992 *a*
Luxembourg	21 Mar 199,0	7 Mar 1994
Madagascar	19 Apr 1990	19 Mar 1991
Malawi		2 Jan 1991 *a*
Malaysia		17 Feb 1995 *a*
Maldives	21 Aug 1990	11 Feb 1991
Mali	26 Jan 1990	20 Sep 1990
Malta	26 Jan 1990	30 Sep 1990
Marshall Islands	14 Apr 1993	4 Oct 1993
Mauritania	26 Jan 1990	16 May 1991
Mauritius		26 Jul 1990 *a*
Mexico	26 Jan 1990	21 Sep 1990
Micronesia (Federated States of)		5 May 1993 *a*
Monaco		21 Jun 1993 *a*
Mongolia	26 Jan 1990	5 Jul 1990
Morocco	26 Jan 1990	21 Jun 1993
Mozambique	30 Sep 1990	26 Apr 1994
Myanmar		15 Jul 1991 *a*
Namibia	26 Sep 1990	30 Sep 1990
Nauru		27 Jul 1994 *a*
Nepal	26 Jan 1990	14 Sep 1990
Netherlands[5]	26 Jan 1990	6 Feb 1995 *A*
New Zealand[6]	1 Oct 1990	6 Apr 1993
Nicaragua	6 Feb 1990	5 Oct 1990
Niger	26 Jan 1990	30 Sep 1990
Nigeria	26 Jan 1990	19 Apr 1991
Niue		20 Dec 1995 *a*
Norway	26 Jan 1990	8 Jan 1991
Pakistan	20 Sep 1990	12 Nov 1990
Palau		4 Aug 1995 *a*
Panama	26 Jan 1990	12 Dec 1990
Papua New Guinea	30 Sep 1990	2 Mar 1993
Paraguay	4 Apr 1990	25 Sep 1990
Peru	26 Jan 1990	4 Sep 1990
Philippines	26 Jan 1990	21 Aug 1990
Poland	26 Jan 1990	7 Jun 1991
Portugal	26 Jan 1990	21 Sep 1990
Qatar	8 Dec 1992	3 Apr 1995
Republic of Korea	25 Sep 1990	20 Nov 1991
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania	26 Jan 1990	28 Sep 1990
Russian Federation	26 Jan 1990	16 Aug 1990
Rwanda	26 Jan 1990	24 Jan 1991
Saint Kitts and Nevis	26 Jan 1990	24 Jul 1990
Saint Lucia	30 Sep 1990	16 Jun 1993
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	20 Sep 1993	26 Oct 1993
Samoa	30 Sep 1990	29 Nov 1994
San Marino		25 Nov 1991 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe		14 May 1991 *a*
Senegal	26 Jan 1990	30 Jul 1990
Seychelles		7 Sep 1990 *a*
Sierra Leone	13 Feb 1990	18 Jun 1990
Singapore		5 Oct 1995 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		10 Apr 1995 *a*
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	16 Jun 1995
Spain	26 Jan 1990	6 Dec 1990
Sri Lanka	26 Jan 1990	12 Jul 1991
Sudan	24 Jul 1990	3 Aug 1990
Suriname	26 Jan 1990	1 Mar 1993
Swaziland	22 Aug 1990	7 Sep 1995
Sweden	26 Jan 1990	29 Jun 1990
Switzerland	1 May 1991	
Syrian Arab Republic	18 Sep 1990	15 Jul 1993
Tajikistan		26 Oct 1993 *a*
Thailand		27 Mar 1992 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[7]		2 Dec 1993 *d*
Togo	26 Jan 1990	1 Aug 1990
Tonga		6 Nov 1995 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	30 Sep 1990	5 Dec 1991
Tunisia	26 Feb 1990	30 Jan 1992
Turkey	14 Sep 1990	4 Apr 1995
Turkmenistan		20 Sep 1993 *a*
Tuvalu		22 Sep 1995 *a*
Uganda	17 Aug 1990	17 Aug 1990
Ukraine	21 Feb 1990	28 Aug 1991
United Kingdom[8]	19 Apr 1990	16 Dec 1991
United Republic of Tanzania	1 Jun 1990	10 Jun 1991
United States of America	16 Feb 1995	
Uruguay	26 Jan 1990	20 Nov 1990
Uzbekistan		29 Jun 1994 *a*
Vanuatu	30 Sep 1990	7 Jul 1993
Venezuela	26 Jan 1990	13 Sep 1990
Viet Nam	26 Jan 1990	28 Feb 1990
Yemen[9]	13 Feb 1990	1 May 1991
Yugoslavia	26 Jan 1990	3 Jan 1991
Zaire	20 Mar 1990	27 Sep 1990
Zambia	30 Sep 1990	6 Dec 1991
Zimbabwe	8 Mar 1990	11 Sep 1990

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan reserves the right to express, upon ratifying the Convention, reservations on all provisions of the Convention that are incompatible with the laws of Islamic Shari'a and the local legislation in effect."

ALGERIA

Interpretative declarations:

Article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2:

The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 14 shall be interpreted by the Algerian Government in compliance with the basic foundations of the Algerian legal system, in particular:

– With the Constitution, which stipulates in its article 2 that Islam is the State religion and in its article 35 that "there shall be no infringement of the inviolability of the freedom of conviction and the inviolability of the freedom of opinion";

– With Law No. 84–11 of 9 June 1984, comprising the Family Code, which stipulates that a child's education is to take place in accordance with the religion of its father.

Article 13, 16 and 17:

Articles 13, 16 and 17 shall be applied while taking account of the interest of the child and the need to safeguard its physical and mental integrity. In this framework, the Algerian Government shall interpret the provisions of these articles while taking account of:

– The provisions of the Penal Code, in particular those sections relating to breaches of public order, to public decency and to the incitement of minors to immorality and debauchery;

– The provisions of Law No. 90–07 of 3 April 1990, comprising the Information Code, and particularly its article 24 stipulating that "the director of a publication destined for children must be assisted by an educational advisory body";

– Article 26 of the same Code, which provides that "national and foreign periodicals and specialized publications, whatever their nature or purpose, must not contain any illustration, narrative, information or insertion contrary to Islamic morality, national values or human rights or advocate racism, fanaticism and treason. Further, such publications must contain no publicity or advertising that may promote violence and delinquency."

ARGENTINA

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Argentine Republic enters a reservation to subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) of article 21 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and declares that those subparagraphs shall not apply in areas within its jurisdiction because, in its view, before they can be applied a strict mechanism must exist for the legal protection of children in matters of inter-country adoption, in order to prevent trafficking in and the sale of children.

Declarations:

Concerning article 1 of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that the article must be interpreted to the effect that a child means every human being from the moment of conception up to the age of eighteen.

Concerning article 38 of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that it would have liked the Convention categorically to prohibit the use of children in armed conflicts, such a prohibition exists in its domestic law which, by virtue of article 41 of the Convention, it shall continue to apply in this regard.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

Concerning subparagraph (f) of article 24 of the Convention, the Argentine Republic considers that questions relating to family planning are the exclusive concern of parents in accordance with ethical and moral principles and understands it to be a State obligation, under this article, to adopt measures providing guidance for parents and education for responsible parenthood.

AUSTRALIA

Reservation:

"Australia accepts the general principles of article 37. In relation to the second sentence of paragraph (c), the obligation to separate children from adults in prison is accepted only to the extent that such imprisonment is considered by the responsible authorities to be feasible and consistent with the obligation that children be able to maintain contact with their families, having regard to the geography and demography of Australia. Australia, therefore ratifies the Convention to the extent that it is unable to comply with the obligation imposed by article 37 (c)."

AUSTRIA

Reservations:

"1. Article 13 and article 15 of the Convention will be applied provided that they will not affect legal restrictions in accordance with article 10 and article 11 of the European Convention on the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

"2. Article 17 will be applied to the extent that it is compatible with the basic rights of others, in particular with the basic rights of freedom of information and freedom of press."

Declarations:

"1. Austria will not make any use of the possibility provided for in article 38, paragraph 2, to determine an age limit of 15 years for taking part in hostilities as this rule is incompatible with article 3, paragraph 1, which determines that the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.

"2. Austria declares, in accordance with its constitutional law, to apply article 38, paragraph 3, provided that only male Austrian citizens are subject to compulsory military service."

BAHAMAS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas upon signing the Convention reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 2 of the said Convention insofar as those provisions relate to the conferment of citizenship upon a child having regard to the Provisions of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas".

BANGLADESH[10]

Reservations:

"[The Government of Bangladesh] ratifies the Convention with a reservation to article 14, paragraph 1.

"Also article 21 would apply subject to the existing laws and practices in Bangladesh."

BELGIUM

Interpretative declarations:

1. With regard to article 2, paragraph 1, according to the interpretation of the Belgian Government non-discrimination on grounds of national origin does not necessarily imply the obligation for States automatically to guarantee foreigners the same rights as their nationals. This concept should be understood as designed to rule out all arbitrary conduct but not differences in treatment based on objective and reasonable considerations, in accordance with the principles prevailing in democratic societies.

2. Articles 13 and 15 shall be applied by the Belgian Government within the context of the provisions and limitations set forth or authorized by said Convention in articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950.

3. The Belgian Government declares that it interprets article 14, paragraph 1, as meaning that, in accordance with the relevant provisions of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and article 9 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 4 November 1950, the right of the child to freedom of thought, conscience and religion implies also the freedom to choose his or her religion or belief.

4. With regard to article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v), the Belgian Government considers that the expression "according to law" at the end of that provision means that:

(a) This provision shall not apply to minors who, under Belgian law, are declared guilty and are sentenced in a higher court following an appeal against their acquittal in a court of the first instance;

(b) This provision shall not apply to minors who, under Belgian law, are referred directly to a higher court such as the Court of Assize.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Bosnia and Herzergovina reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina provides for the right of competent authorities (guardianship authorities) to determine on separation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

BOTSWANA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana enters a reservation with regard to the provisions of article 1 of the Convention and does not consider itself bound by the same in so far as such may conflict with the Laws and Statutes of Botswana."

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Reservation:

"[The Government of Brunei Darussalam] expresses its reservations on the provisions of the said Convention which may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the State, religion, and without prejudice to the generality of the said reservations, in particular expresses its reservation on articles 14, 20 and 21 of the Convention."

CANADA

Reservations:

"(i) *Article 21*

With a view to ensuring full respect for the purposes and intent of article 20 (3) and article 30 of the Convention, the Government of Canada reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 21 to the extent that they may be inconsistent with customary forms of care among aboriginal peoples in Canada.

"(ii) *Article 37 (c)*

The Government of Canada accepts the general principles of article 37 (c) of the Convention, but reserves the right not to detain children separately from adults where this is not appropriate or feasible.

Statement of understanding:

"*Article 30:*

It is the understanding of the Government of Canada that, in matters relating to aboriginal peoples of Canada, the fulfilment of its responsibilities under article 4 of the Convention must take into account the provisions of article 30. In particular, in assessing what measures are appropriate to implement the rights recognized in the Convention for aboriginal children, due regard must be paid to not denying their right, in community with other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practice their own religion and to use their own language."

CHINA

Reservation:

[T]he People's Republic of China shall fulfil its obligations provided by article 6 of the Convention under the prerequisite that the Convention accords with the provisions of article 25 concerning family planning of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China and in conformity with the provisions of article 2 of the Law of Minor Children of the People's Republic of China.

COLOMBIA

Upon signature:

The Colombian Government considers that, while the minimum age of 15 years for taking part in armed conflicts, set forth in article 38 of the Convention, is the outcome of serious negotiations which reflect various legal, political and cultural systems in the world, it would have been preferable to fix that age at 18 years in accordance with the principles and norms prevailing in various regions and countries, Colombia among them, for which reason the Colombian Government, for the purpose of article 38 of the Convention, shall construe the age in question to be 18 years.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Government of Colombia, pursuant to article 2, paragraph 1 (d) of the Convention, declares that for the purposes of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention, the age referred to in said paragraphs shall be understood to be 18 years, given the fact that, under Colombian law, the minimum age for recruitment into the armed forces of personnel called for military service is 18 years.

CROATIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Croatia reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Croatia provides for the right of competent authorities (Centres for Social Work) to determine on separation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

CUBA

Declaration:

With reference to article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that in Cuba, under the domestic legislation in force, majority is not attained at 18 years of age for purposes of the full exercise of civic rights.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

DENMARK[13]

Reservations:

"Article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v) shall not be binding on Denmark.

"It is a fundamental principle of the Danish Administration of Justice Act that everybody shall be entitled to have any penal measures imposed on him or her by a court of first instance reviewed by a higher court. There are, however, some provisions limiting this right in certain cases, for instance verdicts returned by a jury on the question of guilt, which have not been reversed by the legally trained judges of the court."

DJIBOUTI[10, 11, 15]

Declaration:

[The Government of Djibouti] shall not consider itself bound by any provisions or articles that are incompatible with its religion and its traditional values.

ECUADOR[16]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"In signing the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Ecuador reaffirms... [that it is] especially pleased with the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft Convention, which pointed to the need to protect the unborn child, and believed that that paragraph should be borne in mind in interpreting all the articles of the Convention, particularly article 24. While the minimum age set in article 38 was, in its view, too low, [the Government of Ecuador] did not wish to endanger the chances for the Convention's adoption by consensus and therefore would not propose any amendment to the text."

EGYPT

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Since The Islamic Shariah is one of the fundamental sources of legislation in Egyptian positive law and because the Shariah, in enjoining the provision of every means of protection and care for children by numerous ways and means, does not include among those ways and means the system of adoption existing in certain other bodies of positive law,

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt expresses its reservation with respect to all the clauses and provisions relating to adoption in the said Convention, and in particular with respect to the provisions governing adoption in articles 20 and 21 of the Convention.

FRANCE

Declarations and reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

(1) The Government of the French Republic declares that this Convention, particularly article 6, cannot be interpreted as constituting any obstacle to the implementation of the provisions of French legislation relating to the voluntary interruption of pregnancy.

(2) The Government of the Republic declares that, in the light of article 2 of the Constitution of the French Republic, article 30 is not applicable so far as the Republic is concerned.

(3) The Government of the Republic construes article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v), as establishing a general principle to which limited exceptions may be made under law. This is particularly the case for certain non-appealable offences tried by the Police Court and for offences of a criminal nature. None the less, the decisions handed down by the final court of jurisdiction may be appealed before the Court of Cassation, which shall rule on the legality of the decision taken.

GERMANY[4, 17]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to make, upon ratification, such declarations as it considers necessary, especially with regard to the interpretation of articles 9, 10, 18 and 22."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares... that it will take the opportunity afforded by the ratification of the Convention to initiate reforms in its domestic legislation that are in keeping with the spirit of the Convention and that it considers appropriate, in line with article 3 (2) of the Convention, to ensure the well-being of the child. The planned measures include, in particular, a revision of the law on parental custody in respect of children whose parents have not married, are permanently living apart while still married, or are divorced. The principal aim will be to improve the conditions for the exercise of parental custody by both parents in such cases as well. The Federal Republic of Germany also declares that domestically the Convention does not apply directly. It establishes state obligations under international law that the Federal Republic of Germany fulfils in accordance with its national law, which conforms with the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that article 18 (1) of the Convention does not imply that by virtue of the entry into force of this provision parental custody, automatically and without taking into account the best interests of the respective child, applies to both parents even in the case of children whose parents have not married, are permanently living apart while still married, or are divorced. Such an interpretation would be incompatible with article 3 (1) of the Convention. The situation must be examined in a case-by-case basis, particularly where the parents cannot agree on the joint exercise of custody.

The Federal Republic of Germany therefore declares that the provisions of the Convention are also without prejudice to the provisions of national law concerning

a) legal representation of minors in the exercise of their rights;
b) rights of custody and access in respect of children born in wedlock;
c) circumstances under family and inheritance law of children born out of wedlock;

This applies irrespective of the planned revision of the law on parental custody, the details of which remain within the discretion of the national legislator.

Reservations:

In accordance with the reservations made by it with respect to the parallel guarantees of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Federal Republic of Germany declares in respect of article 40 (2) (b) (ii) and (v) of the Convention that these provisions shall be applied in such a way that, in the case of minor infringement of the penal law, there shall not in each and every case exist:

a) a right to have "legal or other appropriate assistance" in the preparation and presentation of the defence, and/or
b) an obligation to have a sentence not calling for imprisonment reviewed by a "higher competent authority or judicial body".

Declarations:

Nothing in the Convention may be interpreted as implying that unlawful entry by an alien into the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany or his unlawful stay there is permitted; nor may any provision be interpreted to mean that it restricts the right of the Federal Republic of Germany to pass laws and regulations concerning the entry of aliens and the conditions of their stay or to make a distinction between nationals and aliens.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regrets the fact that under article 38 (2) of the Convention even fifteen-year-olds may take a part in hostilities as soldiers, because this age limit is incompatible with the consideration of a child's best

interest (article 3 (1) of the Convention). It declares that it will not make any use of the possibility afforded by the Convention of fixing this age limit at fifteen years.

GUATEMALA

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"The State of Guatemala is signing this Convention out of a humanitarian desire to strengthen the ideals on which the Convention is based, and because it is an instrument which seeks to institutionalize, at the global level, specific norms for the protection of children, who, not being legally of age, must be under the guardianship of the family, society and the State.

"With reference to article 1 of the Convention, and with the aim of giving legal definition to its signing of the Convention, the Government of Guatemala declares that article 3 of its Political Constitution establishes that: "The State guarantees and protects human life from the time of its conception, as well as the integrity and security of the individual."

HOLY SEE

Reservations:

"a) [The Holy See] interprets the phrase 'Family planning education and services' in article 24.2, to mean only those methods of family planning which it considers morally acceptable, that is, the natural methods of family planning.

"b) [The Holy See] interprets the articles of the Convention in a way which safeguards the primary and inalienable rights of parents, in particular insofar as these rights concern education (articles 13 and 28), religion (article 14), association with others (article 15) and privacy (article 16).

"c) [The Holy See declares] that the application of the Convention be compatible in practice with the particular nature of the Vatican City State and of the sources of its objective law (art. 1, Law of 7 June 1929, n. 11) and, in consideration of its limited extent, with its legislation in the matters of citizenship, access and residence."

Declaration:

"The Holy See regards the present Convention as a proper and laudable instrument aimed at protecting the rights and interests of children, who are 'that precious treasure given to each generation as a challenge to its wisdom and humanity' (Pope John Paul II, 26 April 1984).

"The Holy See recognizes that the Convention represents an enactment of principles previously adopted by the United Nations, and once effective as a ratified instrument, will safeguard the rights of the child before as well as after birth, as expressly affirmed in the 'Declaration of the Rights of the Child' [Res. 136 (XIV)] and restated in the ninth preambular paragraph of the Convention. The Holy See remains confident that the ninth preambular paragraph will serve as the perspective through which the rest of the Convention will be interpreted, in conformity with article 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969.

"By acceding to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the Holy See intends to give renewed expression to its constant concern for the well-being of children and families. In consideration of its singular nature and position, the Holy See, in acceding to this Convention, does not intend to prescind in any way from its specific mission which is of a religious and moral character."

ICELAND

Declarations:

"1. With respect to article 9, under Icelandic law the administrative authorities can take final decisions in some cases referred to in the article. These decisions are subject to judicial review in the sense that it is a principle of Icelandic law that courts can nullify administrative decisions if they conclude that they are based on unlawful premises. This competence of the courts to review administrative decisions is based on article 60 of the Constitution.

"2. With respect to article 37, the separation of juvenile prisoners from adult prisoners is not obligatory under Icelandic law. However, the law relating to prisons and imprisonment provides that when deciding in which penal institution imprisonment is to take place account should be taken of, *inter alia*, the age of the prisoner. In light of the circumstances prevailing in Iceland it is expected that decisions on the imprisonment of juveniles will always take account of the juvenile's best interest."

INDIA

Declaration:

"While fully subscribing to the objectives and purposes of the Convention, realising that certain of the rights of child, namely those pertaining to the economic, social and cultural rights can only be progressively implemented in the developing countries, subject to the extent of available resources and within the framework of international co–operation; recognising that the child has to be protected from exploitation of all forms including economic exploitation; noting that for several reasons children of different ages do work in India; having prescribed minimum ages for employment in hazardous occupations and in certain other areas; having made regulatory provisions regarding hours and conditions of employment; and being aware that it is not practical immediately to prescribe minimum ages for admission to each and every area of employment in india – the Government of India undertakes to take measures to progressively implement the provisions of article 32, particularly paragraph 2 (a), in accordance with its national legislation and relevant international instruments to which it is a State Party."

INDONESIA[11]

Reservation:

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees the fundamental rights of the child irrespective of their sex, ethnic or race. The Constitution prescribes those rights to be implemented by national laws and regulations.

The ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child by the Republic of Indonesia does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the Constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce any right beyond those prescribed under the Constitution.

With reference to the provisions of articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29 of this Convention, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that it will apply these articles in conformity with its Constitution.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)[12,15]

Upon signature:
Reservation:

"The Islamic Republic of Iran is making reservation to the articles and provisions which may be contrary to the Islamic Shariah, and preserves the right to make such particular declaration, upon its ratification".

Upon ratification:
Reservation:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran reserves the right not to apply any provisions or articles of the Convention that are incompatible with Islamic Laws and the international legislation in effect."

IRAQ

Reservation:

The Government of Iraq has seen fit to accept [the Convention] ... subject to a reservation in respect to article 14, paragraph 1, concerning the child's freedom of religion, as allowing a child to change his or her religion runs counter to the provisions of the *Islamic Shariah.*

IRELAND

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"Ireland reserves the right to make, when ratifying the Convention, such declarations or reservations as it may consider necessary."

JAPAN

Reservation:

"In applying paragraph (c) of article 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, Japan reserves the right not to be bound by the provision in its second sentence, that is, 'every child deprived of liberty shall be separated from adults unless it is considered in the child's best interest not to do so', considering the fact that in Japan as regards persons deprived of liberty, those who are below twenty years of age are to be generally separated from those who are of twenty years of age and over under its national law."

Declarations:

1. The Government of Japan declares that paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child be interpreted not to apply to a case where a child is separated from his or her parents as a result of deportation in accordance with its immigration law.

2. The Government of Japan declares further that the obligation to deal with applications to enter or leave a State Party for the purpose of family re-unification 'in a positive, humane and expeditious manner' provided for in paragraph 1 of article 10 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child be interpreted not to affect the outcome of such applications."

JORDAN[18]

Reservation:

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan expresses its reservation and does not consider itself bound by articles 14, 20 and 21 of the Convention, which grant the child the right to freedom of choice of religion and concern the question of adoption, since they are at variance with the precepts of the tolerant Islamic Shariah.

KIRIBATI

Reservation:

"In respect of article 24 paragraph (b,c,d,e and f), article 26 and article 28 paragraph (b,c and d), in accordance with article 51 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

Declaration:

The Republic of Kiribati considers that a child's rights as defined in the Convention, in particular the rights defined in articles 12 –16 shall be exercised with respect for parental authority, in accordance with the Kiribati customs and traditions regarding the place of the child within and outside the family."

KUWAIT

Upon signature:
Reservation:

"[Kuwait expresses] reservations on all provisions of the Convention that are incompatible with the laws of Islamic Shari'a and the local statutes in effect."

Upon ratification:
Declarations:

Article 7:

The State of Kuwait understands the concepts of this article to signify the right of the child who was born in Kuwait and whose parents are unknown (parentless) to be granted the Kuwaiti nationality as stipulated by the Kuwaiti Nationality Laws.

Article 21:

The State of Kuwait, as it adheres to the provisions of the Islamic shariah as the main source of legislation, strictly bans abandoning the Islamic religion and does not therefore approve adoption.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration concerning article 1:

"According to the legislation of the Principality of Liechtenstein children come of age with 20 years. However, the Liechtenstein law provides for the possibility to prolong or to shorten the duration of minority."

Reservation concerning article 7:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which Liechtenstein nationality is granted under certain conditions."

Reservation concerning article 10:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein reserves the right to apply the Liechtenstein legislation according to which family re-unification for certain categories of foreigners is not guaranteed."

LUXEMBOURG

Reservations:

1. The Government of Luxembourg believes that it si the interest of families and children to maintain the provision of article 334–6 of the Civil Code, which reads as follows:

> *Article 334–6.* If at the time of conception, the father or mother was bound in marriage to another person, the natural child may be raised in the conjugal home only with the consent of the spouse of his parent.

2. The Government of Luxembourg declares that the present Convention does not require modification of the legal status of children born to parents between whom marriage is absolutely prohibited, such status being warranted by the interest of the child, as provided under article 3 of the Convention.

3. The Government of Luxembourg declares that article 6 of the present Convention presents no obstacle to implementation of the provisions of Luxembourg legislation concerning sex information, the prevention of back-street abortion and the regulation of pregnancy termination.

4. The Government of Luxembourg believes that article 7 of the Convention presents no obstacle to the legal process in respect of anonymous births, which is deemed to be in the interest of the child, as provided under article 3 of the Convention.

5. The Government of Luxembourg declares that article 15 of the present Convention does not impede the provisions of

Luxembourg legislation concerning the capacity to exercise rights.

MALAYSIA

Reservation:

"The Government of Malaysia accepts the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child but expresses reservations with respect to articles 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 15, 22, 28, 37, 40 paras 3 and 4, 44 and 45 of the Convention and declares that the said provisions shall be applicable only if they are in conformity with the Constitution, national laws and national policies of the Government of Malaysia."

MALDIVES

Upon signature:

Reservations:

"1) Since the Islamic Shariah is one of the fundamental sources of Maldivian Law and since Islamic Shariah does not include the system of adoption among the ways and means for the protection and care of children contained in Shariah, the Government of the Republic of Maldives expresses its reservation with respect to all the clauses and provisions relating to adoption in the said Convention on the Rights of the Child.

"2) The Government of the Republic of Maldives expresses its reservation to paragraph 1 of article 14 of the said Convention on the Rights of the Child, since the Constitution and the Laws of the Republic of Maldives stipulate that all Maldivians should be Muslims."

Upon ratification:

Reservations to articles 14 and 21.

MALI

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Mali declares that, in view of the provisions of the Mali Family Code, there is no reason to apply article 16 of the Convention.

MALTA

Reservation:

"Article 26 – The Government of Malta is bound by the obligations arising out of this article to the extent of present social security legislation."

MAURITANIA

Upon signature:

Reservation:

In signing this important Convention, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania is making reservations to articles or provisions which may be contrary to the beliefs and values of Islam, the religion of the Mauritania People and State.

MAURITIUS

Reservation:

"[Mauritius]... with express reservation with regard to article 22 of the said Convention."

MONACO

Declaration:

The Principality of Monaco declares that this Convention especially article 7, shall not affect the rules laid down in Monegasque legislation regarding nationality.

Reservation:

The Principality of Monaco interprets article 40, paragraph 2(b)(v) as stating a general principle which has a number of statutory exceptions. Such, for example, is the case with respect to certain criminal offences. In any event, in all matters the Judicial Review Court rules definitively on appeals against all decisions of last resort.

MOROCCO

Reservation:

The Kingdom of Morocco, whose Constitution guarantees to all the freedom to pursue his religious affairs, makes a reservation to the provisions of article 14, which accords children freedom of religion, in view of the fact that Islam is the State religion.

MYANMAR[10,19]

NETHERLANDS

Reservations:

"Article 26:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 26 of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not imply an independent entitlement of children to social security, including social insurance.

"Article 37:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 37 (c) of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not prevent the application of adult penal law to children of sixteen years and older, provided that certain criteria laid down by law have been met.

"Article 40:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 40 of the Convention with the reservation that cases involving minor offences may be tried without the presence of legal assistance and that with respect to such offences the position remains that no provision is made in all cases for a review of the facts or of any measures imposed as a consequence."

Declarations:

"Article 14:

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that article 14 of the Convention is in accordance with the provisions of article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and that this article shall include the freedom of a child to have or adopt a religion or belief of his or her choice as soon as the child is capable of making such choice in view of his or her age or maturity.

"Article 22:

With regard to article 22 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares:

a) that it understands the term "refugee" in paragraph 1 of this article as having the same meaning as in article 1 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951; and

b) that it is of the opinion that the obligation imposed under the terms of this article does not prevent

– the submission of a request for admission from being made subject to certain conditions, failure to meet such conditions resulting in inadmissibility;

– the referral of a request for admission to a third State, in the event that such a State is considered to be primarily responsible for dealing with the request for asylum.

"Article 38

With regard to article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it is of the opinion that States would not be allowed to involve children directly or indirectly in hostilities and that the minimum age for the recruitment or incorporation of children in the armed forces should be above fifteen years.

In times of armed conflict, provisions shall prevail that are most conducive to guaranteeing the protection of children under international law, as referred to in article 41 of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

Reservations:

Nothing in this Convention shall affect the right of the Government of New Zealand to continue to distinguish as it considers appropriate in its law and practice between persons according to the nature of their authority to be in New Zealand including but not limited to their entitlement to benefits and other protections described in the Convention, and the Government of New Zealand reserves the right to interpret and apply the Convention accordingly.

The Government of New Zealand considers that the rights of the child provided for in article 32 (1) are adequately protected by its existing law. It therefore reserves the right not to legislate further or to take additional measures as may be envisaged in article 32 (2).

The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) in circumstances where the shortage of suitable facilities makes the mixing of juveniles and adults unavoidable; and further reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) where the interests of other juveniles in an establishment require the removal of a particular juvenile offender or where mixing is considered to be of benefit to the persons concerned.

NORWAY[14]

PAKISTAN[11, 15]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Provisions of the Convention shall be interpreted in the light of the principles of Islamic laws and values."

POLAND

Reservations:

– With respect to article 7 of the Convention, the Republic of Poland stipulates that the right of an adopted child to know its natural parents shall be subject to the limitations imposed by binding legal arrangements that enable adoptive parents to maintain the confidentiality of the child's origin;

– The law of the Republic of Poland shall determine the age from which call-up to military or similar service and participation in military operations are permissible. That age limit may not be lower than the age limit set out in article 38 of the Convention.

Declarations:

– The Republic of Poland considers that a child's rights as defined in the Convention, in particular the rights defined in articles 12 to 16, shall be exercised with respect for parental authority, in accordance with Polish customs and traditions regarding the place of the child within and outside the family;

– With respect to article 24, paragraph 2 (f), of the Convention, the Republic of Poland considers that family planning and education services for parents should be in keeping the with principles of morality.

QATAR[10]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[The State of Qatar] enter(s) a general reservation by the State of Qatar concerning provisions incompatible with Islamic Law.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservations:

The Republic of Korea considers itself not bound by the provisions of paragraph 3 of article 9, paragraph (a) of article 21 and sub-paragraph (b) (v) of paragraph 2 of article 40.

SAMOA

Reservation:

"The Government of Western Samoa whilst recognising the importance of providing free primary education as specified under article 28 (1)(a) of the Convention on the rights of the child

And being mindful of the fact that the greater portion of schools within Western Samoa that provide primary education are controlled by bodies outside the control of the government

Pursuant then to article 51, the Government of Western Samoa thus reserves the right to allocate resources to the primary level sector of education in Western Samoa in contrast to the requirement of article 28 (1)(a) to provide free primary education."

SINGAPORE

Declarations:

"(1) The Republic of Singapore considers that a child's rights as defined in the Convention, in particular the rights defined in article 12 to 17, shall in accordance with articles 3 and 5 be exercised with respect for the authority of parents, schools and other persons who are entrusted with the care of the child and in the best interests of the child and in accordance with the customs, values and religions of Singapore's multi-racial and multi-religious society regarding the place of the child within and outside the family.

(2) The Republic of Singapore considers that articles 19 and 37 of the Convention do not prohibit –

(a) the application of any prevailing measures prescribed by law for maintaining law and order in the Republic of Singapore;

(b) measures and restrictions which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in the interests of national security, public safety, public order, the protection of public health or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others; or

(c) the judicious application of corporal punishment in the best interest of the child.

Reservations:

(3) The Constitution and the laws of the Republic of Singapore provide adequate protection and fundamental rights and liberties in the best interests of the child. The accession to the Convention by the Republic of Singapore does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the limits prescribed by the Constitution of the Republic of Singapore nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce any right beyond those prescribed under the Constitution.

(4) Singapore is geographically one of the smallest independent countries in the world and one of the most densely populated. The Republic of Singapore accordingly reserves the right to apply such legislation and conditions concerning the entry into, stay in and departure from the Republic of Singapore of those who do not or who no longer have the right under the laws of the Republic of Singapore, to enter and remain in the Republic of Singapore, and to the acquisition and possession of citizenship, as it may deem necessary from time to time and in accordance with the laws of the Republic of Singapore.

(5) The employement legislation of the Republic of Singapore prohibits the employment of children below 12 years old and gives special protection to working children between the ages of 12 years and below the age of 16 years. The Republic of Singapore reserves the right to apply article 32 subject to such employment legislation.

(6) With respect to article 28.1(a), the Republic of Singapore–

(a) does not consider itself bound by the requirement to make primary education compulsory because such a measure is

unnecessary in our social context where in practice virtually all children attend primary school; and

(b) reserves the right to provide primary education free only to children who are citizens of Singapore."

SLOVAKIA[3]

SLOVENIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Slovenia reserves the right not to apply paragraph 1 of article 9 of the Convention since the internal legislation of the Republic of Slovenia provides for the right of competent authorities (centres for social work) to determine on separation of a child from his/her parents without a previous judicial review."

SPAIN

Declarations:

1. Spain understands that article 21, paragraph (d), of the Convention may never be construed to permit financial benefits other than those needed to cover strictly necessary expenditure which may have arisen from the adoption of children residing in another country.

2. Spain, wishing to make common cause with those States and humanitarian organizations which have manifested their disagreement with the contents of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention, also wishes to express its disagreement with the age limit fixed therein and to declare that the said limit appears insufficient, by permitting the recruitment and participation in armed conflict of children having attained the age of fifteen years.

SWAZILAND

Declaration:

"The Convention on the Rights of the Child being a point of departure to guarantee child rights; taking into consideration the progressive character of the implementation of certain social, economic and cultural rights; as recognized in article 4 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland would undertake the implementation of the right to free primary education to the maximum extent of available resources and expects to obtain the co-operation of the international Community for its full satisfaction as soon as possible."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[11, 15]

Reservations:

The Syrian Arab Republic has reservations on the Convention's provisions which are not in conformity with the Syrian Arab legislations and with the Islamic Shariaa's principles, in particular the content of article (14) related to the Right of the Child to the freedom of religion, and articles 2 and 21 concerning the adoption.

THAILAND[10]

Reservation:

"The application of articles 7, 22 and 29 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child shall be subject to the national laws, regulations and prevailing practices in Thailand."

TUNISIA

Declarations:

1. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that it shall not, in implementation of this Convention, adopt any legislative or statutory decision that conflicts with the Tunisian Constitution.

2. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that its undertaking to implement the provisions of this Convention shall be limited by the means at its disposal.

3. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia declares that the Preamble to and the provisions of the Convention, in particular article 6, shall not be interpreted in such a way as to impede the application of Tunisian legislation concerning voluntary termination of pregnancy.

Reservations:

1. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia enters a reservation with regard to the provisions of article 2 of the convention, which may not impede implementation of the provisions of its national legislation concerning personal status, particularly in relation to marriage and inheritance rights.

2. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia regards the provisions of article 40, paragraph 2 (b) (v), as representing a general principle to which exceptions may be made under national legislation, as is the case for some offences on which final judgement is rendered by cantonal or criminal courts without prejudice to the right of appeal in their regard to the Court of Cassation entrusted with ensuring the implementation of the law.

3. The Government of the Republic of Tunisia considers that article 7 of the Convention cannot be interpreted as prohibiting implementation of the provisions of national legislation relating to nationality and, in particular, to cases in which it is forfeited.

TURKEY

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of articles 17, 29 and 30 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child according to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey and those of the Treaty of Lausanne of 24 July 1923.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to formulate, upon ratifying the Convention, any reservations or interpretative declarations which it might consider necessary."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

"(a) The United Kingdom interprets the Convention as applicable only following a live birth.

"(b) The United Kingdom interprets the references in the Convention to 'parents' to mean only those persons who, as a matter of national law, are treated as parents. This includes cases where the law regards a child as having only one parent, for example where a child has been adopted by one person only and in certain cases where a child is conceived other than as a result of sexual intercourse by the woman who gives birth to it and she is treated as the only parent.

Reservations:

"(c) The United Kingdom reserves the right to apply such legislation, in so far as it relates to the entry into, stay in and departure from the United Kingdom of those who do not have the right under the law of the United Kingdom to enter and remain in the United Kingdom, and to the acquisition and possession of citizenship, as it may deem necessary from time to time.

"(d) Employment legislation in the United Kingdom does not treat persons under 18, but over the school-leaving age as children, but as 'young people'. Accordingly the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply article 32 subject to such employment legislation.

"(e) Where at any time there is a lack of suitable accommodation or adequate facilities for a particular individual in any institution in which young offenders are detained, or where the mixing

of adults and children is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) in so far as those provisions require children who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults.

"(f) In Scotland there are tribunals (known as 'children's hearing') which consider the welfare of the child and deal with the majority of offences which a child is alleged to have committed. In some cases, mainly of welfare nature, the child is temporarily deprived of its liberty for up to seven days prior to attending the hearing. The child and its family are, however, allowed access to a lawyer during this period. Although the decisions of the hearings are subject to appeal to the courts, legal representation is not permitted at the proceedings of the children's hearings themselves. Children's hearings have proved over the years to be a very effective way of dealing with the problems of children in a less formal, non-adversarial manner. Accordingly, the United Kingdom, in respect of article 37 (d), reserves its right to continue the present operation of children's hearings."

Declaration:

"The United Kingdom reserves the right to extend the Convention at a later date to any territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible."

7 September 1994[8]

Declarations:

"The United Kingdom refers to the reservation and declarations (a), (b) and (c) which accompanied its instrument of ratification and makes a similar reservation and declarations in respect to each of its dependent territories.

The United Kingdom, in respect of each of its dependent territories except Hong Kong and Pitcairn, reserves the right to apply article 32 subject to the laws of those territories which treat certain persons under 18 not as children but as 'young people'. In respect of Hong Kong, the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply article 32 (b) in so far as it might require regulation of the hours of employment of young persons who have attained the age of fifteen years in respect of work in non-industrial establishments.

Where at any time there is a lack of suitable detention facilities or where the mixing of adults and children is deemed to be mutually beneficial, the United Kingdom, in respect of each of its dependent territories, reserves the right not to apply article 37 (c) in so far as those provisions require children who are detained to be accommodated separately from adults.

The United Kingdom, in respect of Hong Kong and the Cayman Islands, will seek to apply the Convention to the fullest extent to children seeking asylum in those territories except in so far as conditions and resources make full implementation impracticable. In particular, in relation to article 22, the United Kingdom reserves the right to continue to apply any legislation in those territories governing the detention of children seeking refugee status, the determination of their status and their entry into, stay in and departure from those territories.

The Government of the United Kingdom reserves the right tot extend the Convention at a later date to any other territories for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible."

URUGUAY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

On signing this Convention, Uruguay reaffirms the right to make reservations upon ratification, if it considers it appropriate.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay affirms, in regard to the provisions of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3, that in accordance with Uruguayan law it would have been desirable for the lower age limit for taking a direct part in hostilities in the event of an armed conflict to be set at 18 years instead of 15 years as provided in the Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of Uruguay declares that, in the exercise of its sovereign will, it will not authorize any persons under its jurisdiction who have not attained the age of 18 years to take a direct part in hostilities and will not under any circumstances recruit persons who have not attained the age of 18 years.

VENEZUELA

Interpretative declarations:

1. Article 21 (b):

The Government of Venezuela understands this provision as referring to international adoption and in no circumstances to placement in a foster home outside the country. It is also its view that the provision cannot be interpreted to the detriment of the State's obligation to ensure due protection of the child.

2. Article 21 (d):

The Government of Venezuela takes the position that neither the adoption nor the placement of children should in any circumstances result in financial gain for those in any way involved in it.

3. Article 30:

The Government of Venezuela takes the position that this article must be interpreted as a case in which article 2 of the Convention applies.

YUGOSLAVIA

Reservation:

"The competent authorities (ward authorities) of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia may, under article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention, make decisions to deprive parents of their right to raise their children and give them an upbringing without prior judicial determination in accordance with the internal legislation of the SFR of Yugoslavia."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

FINLAND

25 July 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

"In the view of the Government of Finland this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform a treaty. For the above reason the Government of Finland objects to the said reservation. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and and the Republic of Indonesia."

With regard to the reservation made by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

9 June 1993

With regard to the reservations made by Qatar upon signature:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

24 June 1994

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

5 September 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic) upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

GERMANY

25 June 1992

With regard to the reservations made by Myanmar upon accession:

The Federal Republic of Germany considers that the reservations made by the Union of Myanmar regarding articles 15 and 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 51, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Union of Myanmar and the Federal Republic of Germany.

17 March 1993

With regard to the reservations made by Tunisia upon accession:

The Federal Republic of Germany considers the first of the declarations deposited by the Republic of Tunisia to be a reservation. It restricts the application of the first sentence of article 4 to the effect that any national legislative or statutory decisions adopted to implement the Convention may not conflict with the Tunisian Constitution. Owing to the very general wording of this passage the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is unable to perceive which provisions of the Convention are covered, or may be covered at some time in the future, by the reservation and in what manner. There is a similar lack of clarity with regard to the reservation relating to article 2.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to both these reservations. This objection does not prevent the Convention from entering into force as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Tunisia.

21 September 1994

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

This reservation, owing to its indefinite nature, does not meet the requirements of international law. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

11 August 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification:

... This reservation, owing to its unlimited scope and undifined character, is inadmissible under international law. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, therefore objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Islamic Republic Iran and the Federal Republic of Germany.

IRELAND

With regard to the reservations made by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Jordan, Kuwait and Tunisia upon ratification, by Myanmar and Thailand upon accession, by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification, and by Turkey upon signature:

"The Government of Ireland consider that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention, by invoking general principles of national law, may create doubts as to the commitment of those States to the object and purpose of the Convention."

"This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the aforementioned States."

5 September 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic) upon ratification:

"The reservation poses difficulties for the State Parties to the Convention in identifying the provisions of the Convention which the Islamic Government of Iran does not intent to apply and consequently makes it difficult for States Parties to the Convention to determine the extent of their treaty relations with the reserving State.

The Government of Ireland hereby formally makes objection to the reservation by the Islamic Republic of Iran."

ITALY

18 July 1994

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

"... This reservation is too comprehensive and too general as to be compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Italy therefore objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Syrian Arab Republic and Italy."

NETHERLANDS

With regard to the reservations made by Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of these States to the object and purpose of the Convention and moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to these reservations.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the aforementioned States."

NORWAY

30 December 1991

With regard to the declaration made by Djibouti upon ratification:

"A reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law may create doubts about the commitments of the reserving state to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Norway, therefore, objects to this reservation.

"This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Norway and the Republic of Djibouti."

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Djibouti.]*

With regard to the reservation made by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Djibouti.]

25 October 1994

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Djibouti.]

5 September 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Djibouti.]*

PORTUGAL

15 July 1992

With regard to the reservations made by Myanmar upon accession, by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Kuwait and Pakistan upon ratification and by Turkey upon signature:

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of National Law may create doubts on the commitments of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of International Law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government therefore objects to the reservations.

This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Myanmar.

The Government of Portugal furthermore notes that, as a matter or principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations presented by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Kuwait, Pakistan and Turkey."

13 December 1994

With regard to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Myanmar.]*

4 December 1995

With regard to the reservation made by the Malaysia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Myanmar.]*

SLOVAKIA[3]

9 August 1993

With regard to the reservation made by Qatar upon signature:

"The Slovak Republic regards the general reservation made by the State of Qatar upon signature of the Convention as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention as well as in contradiction with the well established principle of the Law of Treaties according to which a State cannot invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. Therefore, the Slovak Republic objects to the said general reservation."

SWEDEN

20 September 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

"A reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law may cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving state to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservations.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Indonesia."

20 September 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Pakistan upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

26 August 1992

With regard to the reservations made by Jordan upon ratification concerning articles 14, 20 and 21:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

29 March 1994

With regard to the reservations made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification :

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

1 September 1995

With regard to the reservation made by Iran (Islamic Republic of) upon ratification:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made with regard to Indonesia.]*

NOTES:

1 In the four months following the communication of the proposal of amendment, less than one third of the States Parties indicated that they favoured a conference of States Parties for the purpose of considering and voting upon the proposals in accordance with article 50 (1) of the Convention. Consequently the conference referred to in article 50 (1) of the Convention was not convened.

2 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/44/49), p. 166.

3 Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 30 September 1990 and 7 January 1991, respectively, with the following declaration in respect of article 7 (1):

"In cases of irrevocable adoptions, which are based on the principle of anonymity of such adoptions, and of artificial fertilization, where the physician charged with the operation is required to ensure that the husband and wife on one hand and the donor on the other hand remain unknown to each other, the non-communication of a natural parent's name or natural parents' names to the child is not in contradiction with this provision."

By a communication received on 7 June 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia had made the following objections with regard to the reservation made by Kuwait upon signature:

"These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak Government the said reservations are in contradiction to the generally recognized principle of international law according to which a state cannot invoke the provisions of its own internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. Therefore the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic does not recognize these reservations as valid."

See also note 11 in note I.2.

4 The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 March 1990 and 2 October 1990, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

5 For the Kingdom in Europe.

6 The instrument of ratification also specifies that "such ratification shall extend to Tokelau only upon notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of such extension".

7 On 12 April 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Succession of the former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 November 1989, does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

8 In a communication received on 7 September 1994, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland indicated that the Convention will apply to the Isle fo Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, St. Helena, St. Helena Dependencies, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 3 April 1995, from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

The Government of Argentina rejects the extension of the application of the [said Convention] to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 7 September 1994, and reaffirms its sovereignty over those islands, which are an integral part of its national territory.

9 The signature was affixed on behalf of the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

10 The Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden the following communications: on 20 July 1993, with regard to the reservations made upon accession by Thailand concerning articles 7, 22 and 29, upon ratification by Myanmar concerning articles 15 and 37 (see also note 19 in this chapter), upon ratification by Bangladesh concerning article 21, upon ratification by Djibouti concerning the whole Convention, and on 29 March 1994, with regard to the reservation made upon signature by Qatar:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, *as the objection made with regard to Indonesia under "Objections".]*

11 On 6 February 1995, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Netherlands the following communication with regard to the reservations made upon upon ratification by Djibouti, Indonesia, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, *as the objection made with regard to Iran (Islamic Republic of) under "Objections".]*

12 In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from the following States, on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Austria (6 September 1995):

Under article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which is reflected in article 51 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child – a reservation, in order to be admissible under international law, has to be compatible with object and purpose of the treaty concerned. A reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty if it intends to derogate provisions the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling its object and purpose.

The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran to the [said Convention]. Given the General character of this reservation a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

Until the scope of the legal effects of this reservation is sufficiently specified by the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of Austria considers this reservation as not affecting any provision the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling the object and purpose of the [said Convention].

Austria, however, objects to the admissibility of the reservation in question if the application of this reservation negatively affects the compliance by the Islamic Republic of Iran with its obligations under the [said Convention] essential for the fullfilment of its object and purpose.

Austria could not consider the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran as admissible under the regime of article 51 of the [said Convention] and article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties unless Iran, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the [said Convention]."

Italy (25 September 1995):

"This reservation, owing to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is inadmissible under international law. The Government of the Italian Republic, therefore, objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Iran. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Italian Republic."

13 On 11 May 1993, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration with regard to the application of the Convention to Greenland and the Faroe Islands which read as follows:

"Until further notice the Convention shall not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands."

[14] On 19 September 1995, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 40(2)(b)(v) made upon ratification of the Convention.

[15] In this regard, on 16 November 1995, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark, the following communication:

"Because of their unlimited scope and undefined character these reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law. Therefore, the Government of Denmark objects to these reservations. The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, the Syrian Arab Republic respectively and Denmark.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Governments of Djibouti, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic to reconsider their reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child."

[16] Statements delivered by [the Government of Ecuador] on agenda item 108, in the Third Committee on 14 November 1989, particularly as concerns the interpretation to be given to article 24, in the light of the preamble of the Convention, and article 38 (ref: A/C.3/44/SR.41).

[17] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 15 February 1990, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany indicated that "it was [its] intention to make the [said] declaration on the occasion of the signing of the Convention on the Rights of the Child". See also note 4 above.

[18] On 9 June 1993, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Finland, the following communication:

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the reservation made by Jordan [...]

In the view of the Government of Finland this reservation is subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke general principles of national law as justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations. For the above reason the Government of Finland objects to the said reservations. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this objection constitutes an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between Finland and Jordan."

[19] On 19 October 1993, the Government of Myanmar notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession with regard to articles 15 and 37:

"Article 15

1. The Union of Myanmar interprets the expression 'the law' in article 15, paragraph 2, to mean the Laws, as well as the Decrees and Executive Orders having the force of law, which are for the time being in force in the Union of Myanmar.

"2. The Union of Myanmar understands that such restrictions on freedom of association and freedom of peaceful assembly imposed in conformity with the said Laws, Decrees and Executive Orders as are required by the exigencies of the situation obtaining in the Union of Myanmar are permissible under article 15, paragraph 2.

"3. The Union of Myanmar interprets the expression 'national security' in the same paragraph as encompassing the supreme national interest, namely, the non-disintegration of the Union, the non-disintegration of national solidarity and the perpetuation of national sovereignty, which constitute the paramount national causes of the Union of Myanmar."

"Article 37

The Union of Myanmar accepts in principle the provisions of article 37 as they are in consonance with its laws, rules, regulations, procedures and practice as well as with its traditional, cultural and religious values. However, having regard to the exigencies of the situation obtaining in the country at present, the Union of Myanmar states as follows:

"1. Nothing contained in Article 37 shall prevent, or be construed as preventing, the Government of the Union of Myanmar from assuming or exercising, in conformity with the laws for the time being in force in the country and the procedures established thereunder, such powers as are required by the exigencies of the situation for the preservation and strengthening of the rule of law, the maintenance of public order (*ordre public*) and, in particular, the protection of the supreme national interest, namely, the non-disintegration of the Union, the non-disintegration of national solidarity and the perpetuation of national sovereignty, which constitute the paramount national causes of the Union of Myanmar.

"2. Such powers shall include the powers of arrest, detention, imprisonment, exclusion, interrogation, enquiry and investigation."

(*a*) Amendment to article 43 (2) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child

Adopted by the Conference of the States Parties on 12 December 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see paragraph 3 of the Resolution of the States Parties and article 50 (2) of the Convention].
TEXT: Doc. CRC/SP/1995/L.1/Rev.1.
STATUS: Parties : .

Note: The amendment was proposed by the Government of Costa Rica and circulated by the Secretary–General under cover of depositary notification C.N.138.1995.TREATIES–3 of 22 May 1995 in accordance with article 50 (1) of the Convention. The Conference of the States Parties, convened by the Secretary–General in accordance with article 50 (1) of the Convention, adopted the amendment on 12 December 1995 which was subsequently approved by General Assembly in Resolution No. 155 of 21 December 1995.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*

12. Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the Abolition of the Death Penalty

Adopted by the General Assembly on 15 December 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 July 1991, in accordance with article 8 (1).
REGISTRATION: 11 July 1991, No. 14668.
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/44/128.
STATUS: Signatories: 21. Parties: 29.

Note: The said Protocol, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by resolution 44/128[1] of 15 December 1989 at the Forty-fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and is open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by all States having signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Australia		2 Oct 1990 *a*
Austria	8 Apr 1991	2 Mar 1993
Belgium	12 Jul 1990	
Costa Rica	14 Feb 1990	
Croatia		12 Oct 1995 *a*
Denmark	13 Feb 1990	24 Feb 1994
Ecuador		23 Feb 1993 *a*
Finland	13 Feb 1990	4 Apr 1991
Germany[2]	13 Feb 1990	18 Aug 1992
Honduras	10 May 1990	
Hungary		24 Feb 1994 *a*
Iceland	30 Jan 1991	2 Apr 1991
Ireland		18 Jun 1993 *a*
Italy	13 Feb 1990	14 Feb 1995
Luxembourg	13 Feb 1990	12 Feb 1992
Malta		29 Dec 1994 *a*
Mozambique		21 Jul 1993 *a*
Namibia		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Netherlands[3]	9 Aug 1990	26 Mar 1991
New Zealand	22 Feb 1990	22 Feb 1990
Nicaragua	21 Feb 1990	
Norway	13 Feb 1990	5 Sep 1991
Panama		21 Jan 1993 *a*
Portugal	13 Feb 1990	17 Oct 1990
Romania	15 Mar 1990	27 Feb 1991
Seychelles		15 Dec 1994 *a*
Slovenia	14 Sep 1993	10 Mar 1994
Spain	23 Feb 1990	11 Apr 1991
Sweden	13 Feb 1990	11 May 1990
Switzerland		16 Jun 1994 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		26 Jan 1995 *a*
Uruguay	13 Feb 1990	21 Jan 1993
Venezuela	7 Jun 1990	22 Feb 1993

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

SPAIN

Reservation:

Pursuant to article 2, Spain reserves the right to apply the death penalty in the exceptional and extremely serious cases provided for in Fundamental Act No. 13/1985 of 9 December 1985 regulating the Military Criminal Code, in wartime as defined in article 25 of that Act.

MALTA

Reservation:

"Pursuant to article 2, Malta reserves the right to apply the death penalty to persons subject to the Malta Armed Forces Act (Chapter 220 of the revised edition of the Laws of Malta), which Act provides that the death penalty may be awarded in exceptional and serious cases defined therein, but only in times of war".

NOTES:

1 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/44/49), p. 206.

2 The German Democratic Republic signed and ratified the Protocol on 7 March 1990 and 16 August 1990, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

3 For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

13. International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 18 December 1990

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 87 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/45/158.
STATUS: Signatories: 4. Parties: 6.

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted by Resolution 45/158[1] of 18 December 1990 at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention is open for signature by all States in accordance with its article 86 (1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Colombia		24 May 1995 *a*
Chile	24 Sept 1993	
Egypt		19 Feb 1993 *a*
Mexico	22 May 1991	
Morocco	15 Aug 1991	21 Jun 1993
Philippines	15 Nov 1993	5 Jul 1995
Seychelles		15 Dec 1994 *a*
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

Articles 15, 46 and 47 of the [said Convention], which was adopted by means of Act No. 146 of 1994, shall be executed with the understanding that the State of Colombia retains the right to promulgate taxation, exchange and monetary regulations establishing equality of treatment of migrant workers and their families with that of nationals in respect of the import and export of personal and household effects and the transfer of earnings and savings abroad, and in respect of expropriation for reasons of equity and the nullification of ownership of property in the cases envisaged in article 34 of the Political Constitution.

EGYPT

Reservation concerning article 4:

For the purposes of the present Convention the term 'members of the family' refers to persons married to migrant workers or having with them a relationship that, according to applicable law, produces effects equivalent to marriage, as well as their dependent children and other dependent persons who are recognized as members of the family by applicable legislation or applicable bilateral or multilateral agreements between the States concerned.

Reservation concerning article 18, paragraph 6:

When a migrant worker or a member of his or her family has, by a final decision, been convicted of a criminal offence and when subsequently his or her conviction has been reversed or he or she has been pardoned on the ground that a new or newly discovered fact shows conclusively that there has been a miscarriage of justice, the person who has suffered punishment as a result of such conviction shall be compensated according to law, unless it is proved that the non-disclosure of the unknown fact in time is wholly or partially attributable to that person.

MOROCCO

Reservation:

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by article 92, paragraph 1 of this Convention which provides that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention, shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration.

The Government of the Kingdom of Morocco considers that any such dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties to the conflict.

UGANDA

Reservation:
Article 18:

"The Republic of Uganda cannot guarantee at all times to provide free legal assistance in accordance with the provisions of article 18 paragraph 3(d)."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/45/49), p. 261.

14. Agreement establishing the Fund for the Development of the Indigenous Peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean

Concluded at Madrid on 24 July 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 August 1993, in accordance with article 14.2.
REGISTRATION: 4 August 1993, nº 30177.
TEXT: Document of the Intergovernmental Technical Meeting for the Preparation of the Indigenous Fund, La Paz, Bolivia, of 20 June 1992.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 14.

Note: The Agreement, of which the English, Portuguese and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted during the Second Summit Meeting of Ibero-American Heads of State, held at Madrid from 23 to 24 July 1992. In accordance with its article 14 (1), the Agreement was opened for signature at Madrid on 24 July 1992 and shall remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification*
Argentina	24 Jul 1992		Guatemala	24 Jul 1992	
Belgium	18 Nov 1993		Honduras	24 Jul 1992	10 May 1995
Bolivia	24 Jul 1992	4 Aug 1993	Mexico	24 Jul 1992	12 Jul 1993
Brazil	24 Jul 1992		Nicaragua	24 Jul 1992	10 Jul 1995
Chile	24 Jul 1992	31 Oct 1995	Panama	24 Jul 1992	10 Feb 1994
Colombia	24 Jul 1992	9 May 1995	Paraguay	24 Jul 1992	1 Dec 1994
Costa Rica	24 Jul 1992		Peru	1 Oct 1992	19 Apr 1993
Cuba	24 Jul 1992	13 Dec 1994	Portugal	24 Jul 1992	23 Jun 1995
Dominican Republic	24 Jul 1992		Spain	24 Jul 1992	7 Dec 1994
Ecuador	24 Jul 1992	26 Oct 1994	Uruguay	24 Jul 1992	
El Salvador	24 Jul 1992	12 May 1995	Venezuela	11 Feb 1993	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification.)

VENEZUELA

Declaration:

In signing the present Agreement, the Republic of Venezuela understands that, under the provisions of article 1, the process of self-development of indigenous peoples, communities and organizations can in no way affect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Venezuela or the unity of its peoples.

CHAPTER V. REFUGEES AND STATELESS PERSONS

1. CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Opened for signature at Flushing Meadow, New York, on 15 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 August 1948, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 20 August 1948, No. 283.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 18, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 17. Parties: 18.

Note: The Constitution was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 62 (I)[1] of 15 December 1946. Resolution No. 108, adopted by the General Council of the International Refugee Organization at its 101st meeting on 15 February 1952, provided for the liquidation of the Organization.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*
Argentina	10 Jun 1947	
Australia		13 May 1947 *s*
Belgium	1 May 1947	30 Mar 1948
Bolivia	5 Jun 1947	
Brazil	1 Jul 1947	
Canada	16 Dec 1946	7 Aug 1947
China[2]		29 Apr 1947 *s*
Denmark		20 Aug 1948 *s*
Dominican Republic	17 Dec 1946	22 Oct 1947
France	17 Dec 1946	3 Mar 1948
Guatemala	16 Dec 1946	28 Jul 1947
Honduras	18 Dec 1946	
Iceland		12 May 1947 *s*
Italy		24 Mar 1949 *s*
Liberia	31 Dec 1946	
Luxembourg		5 Aug 1948
Netherlands	28 Jan 1947	11 Aug 1947
New Zealand		17 Mar 1947 *s*
Norway	4 Feb 1947	18 Aug 1947
Panama[3]	23 Jun 1947	
Peru	25 Jul 1947	
Philippines	18 Dec 1946	
Switzerland		28 Mar 1949
United Kingdom		5 Feb 1947 *s*
United States of America	16 Dec 1946	3 Jul 1947
Venezuela	4 Jun 1948	13 Sep 1948

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature or acceptance.)

FRANCE

The said Constitution is ratified subject to the proviso that the French Government reserves the right to pay all or part of its contribution in francs or in kind.

Furthermore, in pursuance of the tenth paragraph of the preamble of the said Constitution to the effect that the International Refugee Organization is of a non-permanent nature, the budgetary payments assigned to France may be made only for a maximum of three twelve-month periods.

GUATEMALA

Subject to the provision that, in conformity with article 10, paragraph 2, of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization, the Republic of Guatemala would pay its due contribution in kind according to the needs and ability of the country.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the Constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, . . . or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States."

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Part of the First Session, Resolutions* (A/62/Add.1), p. 97.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] In a letter of 2 September 1947 addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Representative of Panama stated that, when signing the Constitution, he omitted to indicate that his signature was subject to ratification as specified in the full powers presented for this purpose, and requested that his signature be regarded as having been affixed subject to ratification.

2. Convention relating to the Status of Refugees

Signed at Geneva on 28 July 1951

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 April 1954, in accordance with article 43.
REGISTRATION: 22 April 1954, No. 2545.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 137.
STATUS: Signatories: 20. Parties: 126.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Status of Refugees and Stateless Persons, held at Geneva from 2 to 25 July 1951. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 429 (V)[1], adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1950.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Albania		18 Aug 1992 *a*
Algeria		21 Feb 1963 *d*
Angola		23 Jun 1981 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		7 Sep 1995 *a*
Argentina		15 Nov 1961 *a*
Armenia		6 Jul 1993 *a*
Australia		22 Jan 1954 *a*
Austria	28 Jul 1951	1 Nov 1954
Azerbaijan		12 Feb 1993 *a*
Bahamas		15 Sep 1993 *a*
Belgium	28 Jul 1951	22 Jul 1953
Belize		27 Jun 1990 *a*
Benin		4 Apr 1962 *d*
Bolivia		9 Feb 1982 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		6 Jan 1969 *a*
Brazil	15 Jul 1952	16 Nov 1960
Bulgaria		12 May 1993 *a*
Burkina Faso		18 Jun 1980 *a*
Burundi		19 Jul 1963 *a*
Cameroon		23 Oct 1961 *d*
Cambodia		15 Oct 1992 *a*
Canada		4 Jun 1969 *a*
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chad		19 Aug 1981 *a*
Chile		28 Jan 1972 *a*
China		24 Sep 1982 *a*
Colombia	28 Jul 1951	10 Oct 1961
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Costa Rica		28 Mar 1978 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[2]		11 May 1993 *d*
Denmark	28 Jul 1951	4 Dec 1952
Djibouti		9 Aug 1977 *d*
Dominica		17 Feb 1994 *a*
Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 *a*
Ecuador		17 Aug 1955 *a*
Egypt		22 May 1981 *a*
El Salvador		28 Apr 1983 *a*
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 1986 *a*
Ethiopia		10 Nov 1969 *a*
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		10 Oct 1968 *a*
France	11 Sep 1952	23 Jun 1954
Gabon		27 Apr 1964 *a*
Gambia		7 Sep 1966 *d*
Germany[3, 4]	19 Nov 1951	1 Dec 1953
Ghana		18 Mar 1963 *a*
Greece	10 Apr 1952	5 Apr 1960
Guatemala		22 Sep 1983 *a*
Guinea		28 Dec 1965 *d*
Guinea-Bissau		11 Feb 1976 *a*
Haiti		25 Sep 1984 *a*
Holy See	21 May 1952	15 Mar 1956
Honduras		23 Mar 1992 *a*
Hungary		14 Mar 1989 *a*
Iceland		30 Nov 1955 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		28 Jul 1976 *a*
Ireland		29 Nov 1956 *a*
Israel	1 Aug 1951	1 Oct 1954
Italy	23 Jul 1952	15 Nov 1954
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 *d*
Japan		3 Oct 1981 *a*
Kenya		16 May 1966 *a*
Lesotho		14 May 1981 *a*
Liberia		15 Oct 1964 *a*
Liechtenstein	28 Jul 1951	8 Mar 1957
Luxembourg	28 Jul 1951	23 Jul 1953
Madagascar		18 Dec 1967 *a*
Malawi		10 Dec 1987 *a*
Mali		2 Feb 1973 *d*
Malta		17 Jun 1971 *a*
Mauritania		5 May 1987 *a*
Monaco		18 May 1954 *a*
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Mozambique		16 Dec 1983 *a*
Namibia		17 Feb 1995 *a*
Netherlands	28 Jul 1951	3 May 1956
New Zealand		30 Jun 1960 *a*
Nicaragua		28 Mar 1980 *a*
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria		23 Oct 1967 *a*
Norway	28 Jul 1951	23 Mar 1953
Panama		2 Aug 1978 *a*
Papua New Guinea		17 Jul 1986 *a*
Paraguay		1 Apr 1970 *a*
Peru		21 Dec 1964 *a*
Philippines		22 Jul 1981 *a*
Poland		27 Sep 1991 *a*
Portugal		22 Dec 1960 *a*
Republic of Korea		3 Dec 1992 *a*
Romania		7 Aug 1991 *a*
Russian Federation		2 Feb 1993 *a*
Rwanda		3 Jan 1980 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		3 Nov 1993 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Samoa		21 Sep 1988 *a*
Sao Tome and Principe		1 Feb 1978 *a*
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Seychelles		23 Apr 1980 *a*
Sierra Leone		22 May 1981 *a*
Slovakia[2]		4 Feb 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		28 Feb 1995 *a*
Somalia		10 Oct 1978 *a*
Spain		14 Aug 1978 *a*
Sudan		22 Feb 1974 *a*
Suriname[5]		29 Nov 1978 *d*
Sweden	28 Jul 1951	26 Oct 1954
Switzerland	28 Jul 1951	21 Jan 1955
Tajikistan		7 Dec 1993 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		27 Feb 1962 *d*
Tunisia		24 Oct 1957 *d*
Turkey	24 Aug 1951	30 Mar 1962
Tuvalu[6]		7 Mar 1986 *d*
Uganda		27 Sep 1976 *a*
United Kingdom	28 Jul 1951	11 Mar 1954
United Republic of Tanzania		12 May 1964 *a*
Uruguay		22 Sep 1970 *a*
Yemen[7]		18 Jan 1980 *a*
Yugoslavia	28 Jul 1951	15 Dec 1959
Zaire		19 Jul 1965 *a*
Zambia		24 Sep 1969 *d*
Zimbabwe		25 Aug 1981 *a*

Declarations under section B of article 1 of the Convention
(Unless otherwise indicated in a footnote, the declarations were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

(a) "Events occurring in Europe before 1 January 1951"

Congo
Hungary
Madagascar
Malta
Monaco
Turkey

(b) "Events occurring in Europe or elsewhere before 1 January 1951"

Albania
Algeria
Angola
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina[8, 9]
Armenia
Australia[9]
Austria
Azerbaijan
Bahamas
Belgium
Belize
Benin[9]
Bolivia
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Botswana[10]
Brazil[9]
Bulgaria
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon[9]
Canada
Central African Republic[9]
Chad
Chile[9]
China
Colombia[8, 9]
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire[9]
Croatia
Cyprus
Czech Republic[2]
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador[9]
Egypt
El Salvador
Equatorial Guinea
Ethiopia
Fiji
Finland
France[9]
Gabon
Gambia
Germany[3]
Ghana
Greece
Guatemala
Guinea
Guinea–Bissau
Haiti
Holy See[9]
Honduras
Iceland
Iran (Islamic Republic of)[9]
Ireland
Israel
Italy[9]
Jamaica
Japan
Kenya
Lesotho
Liberia
Liechtenstein
Luxembourg[9]
Malawi[11]
Mali
Mauritania
Morocco
Mozambique
Namibia
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger[9]
Nigeria
Norway
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay[8, 9]
Peru[9]
Philippines
Poland
Portugal[9]
Republic of Korea
Romania
Russian Federation
Rwanda
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Samoa
Sao Tome and Principe
Senegal[9]
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Slovakia[2]
Slovenia
Solomon Islands
Somalia
Spain
Sudan[9]
Suriname
Sweden
Switzerland
Tajikistan
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
Togo[9]
Tunisia
Tuvalu
Uganda
United Kingdom
United Republic of Tanzania
Uruguay
Yemen[7]
Yugoslavia
Zaire
Zambia
Zimbabwe

Declarations other than those made under section B of article 1 and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

ANGOLA

Declarations:

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola also declares that the provisions of the Convention shall be applicable in Angola provided that they are not contrary to or incompatible with the constitutional and legal provisions in force in the People's Republic of Angola, especially as regards articles 7, 13, 15, 18 and 24 of the Convention. Those provisions shall not be construed so as to accord to any category of aliens resident in Angola more extensive rights than are enjoyed by Angolan citizens.

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola also considers that the provisions of articles 8 and 9 of the Convention cannot be construed so as to limit its right to adopt in respect of a refugee or group of refugees such measures as it deems necessary to safeguard national interests and to ensure respect for its sovereignty, whenever circumstances so require.

Reservations:

Ad article 17: The Government of the People's Republic of Angola accepts the obligations set forth in article 17, provided that:

(*a*) Paragraph 1 of this article shall not be interpreted to mean that refugees must enjoy the same privileges as may be accorded to nationals of countries with which the People's Republic of Angola has signed special co-operation agreements;

(*b*) Paragraph 2 of this article shall be construed as a recommendation and not as an obligation.

Ad article 26:

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola reserves the right to prescribe, transfer or circumscribe the place of residence of certain refugees or groups of refugees, and to restrict their freedom of movement, whenever considerations of national or international order make it advisable to do so.

AUSTRALIA[12]

AUSTRIA[13]

The Convention is ratified:

(*a*) Subject to the reservation that the Republic of Austria regards the provisions of article 17, paragraphs 1 and 2 (excepting, however, the phrase "who was already exempt from them at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the Contracting State concerned, or . . ." in the latter paragraph) not as a binding obligation, but merely as a recommendation.

(*b*) Subject to the reservation that the provisions of article 22, paragraph 1, shall not be applicable to the establishment and maintenance of private elementary schools, that the "public relief and assistance" referred to in article 23 shall be interpreted solely in the sense of allocations from public welfare funds (Armenversorgung), and that the "documents or certifications" referred to in article 25, paragraphs 2 and 3 shall be construed to mean the identity certificates provided for in the Convention of 30 June 1928 relating to refugees.

BAHAMAS

Reservation:

"Refugees and their dependants would normally be subjected to the same laws and regulations relating generally to the employment of non-Bahamians within the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, so long as they have not acquired status in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas."

BELGIUM

1. In all cases where the Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted by the Belgian Government as necessarily involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which Belgium has concluded regional customs, economic or political agreements.

2. Article 15 of the Convention shall not be applicable in Belgium; refugees lawfully staying in Belgian territory will enjoy the same treatment, as regards the right of association, as that accorded to aliens in general.

BOTSWANA

"Subject to the reservation of articles 7, 17, 26, 31, 32 and 34 and paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention."

BRAZIL[14]

"Refugees will be granted the same treatment accorded to nationals of foreign countries in general, with the exception of the preferential treatment extended to nationals of Portugal through the Friendship and Consultation Treaty of 1953 and Article 199 of the Brazilian Constitutional Amendment No. 1, of 1969."

CANADA

Reservations to articles 23 and 24:

"Canada interprets the phrase 'lawfully staying' as referring only to refugees admitted for permanent residence: refugees admitted for temporary residence will be accorded the same treatment with respect to the matters dealt with in articles 23 and 24 as is accorded visitors generally."

CHILE

(1) With the reservation that, with reference to the provisions of article 34, the Government of Chile will be unable to grant to refugees facilities greater that those granted to aliens in general, in view of the liberal nature of Chilean naturalization laws;

(2) With the reservation that the period specified in article 17, paragraph 2 (a) shall, in the case of Chile, be extended from three to ten years;

(3) With the reservation that article 17, paragraph 2 (c) shall apply only if the refugee is the widow or the widower of a Chilean spouse;

(4) With the reservation that the Government of Chile cannot grant a longer period for compliance with an expulsion order than that granted to other aliens in general under Chilean law.

CHINA

Reservations:

"Article 14

In the territory of any other Contracting State, he shall be accorded the same protection as is accorded in that territory to nationals of the country in which he has his habitual residence.

Article 16

Application excluded."

CYPRUS[15]

With confirmation of the reservations made by the Government of the United Kingdom upon application of the Convention to the territory of Cyprus.

DENMARK[16]

25 March 1968

Rewording of the reservation:

"The obligation in article 17, paragraph 1, to accord to refugees lawfully staying in Denmark the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country as regards the right to engage in wage-earning employment shall not be construed to mean that refugees shall be entitled to the privileges which in this respect are accorded to nationals of Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden."

ECUADOR

With respect to article 1, relating to the definition of the term "refugee", the Government of Ecuador declares that its accession to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees does not imply its acceptance of the Conventions which have not been expressly signed and ratified by Ecuador.

With respect to article 15, Ecuador further declares that its acceptance of the provisions contained therein shall be limited in so far as those provisions are in conflict with the constitutional and statutory provisions in force prohibiting aliens, and consequently refugees, from being members of political bodies.

EGYPT

With reservations in respect of article 12 (1), articles 20 and 22 (1), and articles 23 and 24.

The Government of Egypt accedes to the Convention with reservations in respect of article 12 (1), articles 20 and 22 (1), and articles 23 and 24.

Clarifications (received on 24 September 1981):

1. Egypt formulated a reservation to article 12 (1) because it is in contradiction with the internal laws of Egypt. This article provides that the personal status of a refugee shall be governed by the law of the country of his domicile or, failing this, of his residence. This formula contradicts article 25 of the Egyptian civil code, which reads as follows:

> "The judge declares the applicable law in the case of persons without nationality or with more than one nationality at the same time. In the case of persons where there is proof, in accordance with Egypt, of Egyptian nationality, and at the same time in accordance with one or more foreign countries, of nationality of that country, the Egyptian law must be applied."

The competent Egyptian authorities are not in a position to amend this article (25) of the civil code.

2. Concerning articles 20, 22 (paragraph 1), 23 and 24 of the Convention of 1951, the competent Egyptian authorities had reservations because these articles consider the refugee as equal to the national.

We made this general reservation to avoid any obstacle which might affect the discretionary authority of Egypt in granting privileges to refugees on a case-by-case basis.

ETHIOPIA

"The provisions of articles 8, 9, 17 (2) and 22 (1) of the Convention are recognized only as recommendations and not as legally binding obligations."

FIJI

The Government of Fiji stated that the first and fourth reservations made by the United Kingdom are affirmed but have been redrafted as more suitable to the application of Fiji in the following terms:

"1. The Government of Fiji understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of Fiji from exercising any rights over property and interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention on behalf of Fiji were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or of the Government of Fiji respectively by reason of a state of war which existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of Fiji cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows.

"Commentary:

No arrangements exist in Fiji for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of refugees. Any need for the documents or certifications mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article would be met by affidavits.

"All other reservation made by the United Kingdom to the above-mentioned Convention is withdrawn."

FINLAND

Reservations:

"(1) A general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Finland to the nationals of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden or to the nationals of any one of those Countries;

"(2) A reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, to the effect that Finland is not prepared, as a general measure, to grant refugees who fulfil the conditions of three years residence in Finland an exemption from any legislative reciprocity which Finnish law may have stipulated as a condition governing an alien's eligibility for same right or privilege;

"(3) A reservation to article 8 to the effect that that article shall not be binding on Finland;

"(4) A reservation to article 12, paragraph 1, to the effect that the Convention shall not modify the rule of Finnish private international law, as now in force, under which the personal status of a refugee is governed by the law of his country of nationality;

"(5) A reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 3 to the effect that they shall not be binding on Finland;

"(6) A reservation to article 25, to the effect that Finland does not consider itself bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by a Finnish authority, in the place of the authorities of a foreign country, if the documentary records necessary for the delivery of such certificate do not exist in Finland;

"(7) A reservation with respect to the provisions contained in paragraph 1 of article 28. Finland does not accept the obligations stipulated in the said paragraph, but is prepared to recognize

travel documents issued by other Contracting States pursuant to this article."

FRANCE

In depositing its instrument of ratification, the Government of the French Republic, acting in accordance with article 42 of the Convention, makes the following statements:

(*a*) It considers that article 29, paragraph 2, does not prevent the application in French territory of the provisions of the Act of 7 May 1934 authorizing the levying of the Nansen tax for the support of refugee welfare, resettlement and relief work.

(*b*) Article 17 in no way prevents the application of the laws and regulations establishing the proportion of alien workers that employers are authorized to employ in France or affects the obligations of such employers in connexion with the employment of alien workers.

GAMBIA[17]

GREECE[18]

In cases or circumstances which, in its opinion, would justify exceptional procedure for reasons of national security or public order, the Hellenic Government reserves the right to derogate from the obligations imposed by the provisions of article 26.

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

The Republic of Guatemala accedes to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees and its Protocol, with the reservation that it will not apply provisions of those instruments in respect of which the Convention allows reservations if those provisions contravene constitutional precepts in Guatemala or norms of public order under domestic law.

Declaration:

The expression "treatment as favourable as possible" in all articles of the Convention and of the Protocol in which the expression is used should be interpreted as not including rights which, under law or treaty, the Republic of Guatemala has accorded or is according to nationals of the Central American countries or of other countries with which it has concluded or is entering into agreements of a regional nature.

HOLY SEE

The Holy See, in conformity with the terms of article 42, paragraph 1, of the Convention, makes the reservation that the application of the Convention must be compatible in practice with the special nature of the Vatican City State and without prejudice to the norms governing access to and sojourn therein.

HONDURAS

Reservations:

(a) With respect to article 7:

The Government of the Republic of Honduras understands this article to mean that it shall accord to refugees such facilities and treatment as it shall deem appropriate at its discretion, taking into account the economic, social, democratic and security needs of the country;

(b) With respect to article 17:

This article shall in no way be understood as limiting the application of the labour and civil service laws of the country, especially is so far as they refer to the requirements, quotas and conditions of work which an alien must fulfil in his employment;

(c) With respect to article 24:

The Government of Honduras shall apply this article to the extent that it does not violate constitutional provisions governing labour, administrative or social security legislation in force in the country;

(d) With respect to articles 26 and 31:

The Government of Honduras reserves the right to designate, change of limit the place of residence of certain refugees or groups of refugees and to restrict their freedom of movement when national or international considerations so warrant;

(e) With respect to article 34:

The Government of the Republic of Honduras shall not be obligated to guarantee refugees more favourable naturalization facilities than those ordinarily granted to aliens in accordance with the laws of the country.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

1. In all cases where, under the provisions of this Convention, refugees enjoy the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign State, the Government of Iran reserves the right not to accord refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of States with which Iran has concluded regional establishment, customs, economic or political agreements.

2. The Government of Iran considers the stipulations contained in articles 17, 23, 24 and 26 as being recommendations only.

IRELAND[19]

"2. The Government of Ireland understands the words 'public order' in article 32 (1) and the words 'in accordance with due process of law' in article 32 (2) to mean, respectively, 'public policy' and 'in accordance with a procedure provided by law'.

"3. With regard to article 17 the Government of Ireland do not undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage-earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

"4. The Government of Ireland undertake to give effect to article 25 only insofar as may be practicable and permissible under the laws of Ireland.

"5. With regard to article 29 (1) the Government of Ireland do not undertake to accord to refugees treatment more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally with respect to

...

"(c) Income Tax (including Surtax)."

ISRAEL

...

"2. Articles 8 and 12 shall not apply to Israel.

"3. Article 28 shall apply to Israel with the limitations which result from Section 6 of the Passport Law of 5712-1952, according to which the Minister may, at his discretion:

"(*a*) Refuse to grant, or to extend the validity of a passport or laissez-passer;

"(*b*) Attach conditions to the grant or the extension of the validity of a passport or laissez-passer;

"(*c*) Cancel, or shorten the period of validity of a passport or laissez-passer issued, and order the surrender thereof;

"(*d*) Limit, either at or after the issue of a passport or laissez-passer, the range of countries for which it is to be valid.

"4. Permits provided for by Article 30 shall be issued by the Minister of Finance at his discretion."

ITALY[20]

JAMAICA

"The Government of Jamaica confirms and maintains the following reservations, which were made when the Convention was extended to Jamaica by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking by the above-mentioned territory, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which, at the date of entry into force of the Convention for the above-mentioned territory, are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

"(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom accept paragraph 2 of article 17 in its application to the above-mentioned territory with the substitution of 'four years' for 'three years' in subparagraph (*a*) and with the omission of subparagraph (*c*).

"(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom can only undertake that the provisions of subparagraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24 and of paragraph 2 of that article will be applied to the above-mentioned territory so far as the law allows.

"(iv) The Government of the United Kingdom cannot undertake that effect will be given in the above-mentioned territory to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in the above-mentioned territory so far as the law allows."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Ad *article 17:* With respect to the right to engage in wage-earning employment, refugees are treated in law on the same footing as aliens in general, on the understanding, however, that the competent authorities shall make every effort insofar as possible, to apply to them the provisions of this article.

Ad *article 24, paragraphs 1 (a) and (b), and paragraph 3:* Provisions relating to aliens in general on training, apprenticeship, unemployment insurance, old-age and survivors insurance shall be applicable to refugees. Nevertheless, in the case of old-age and survivors insurance, refugees residing in Liechtenstein (including their survivors if the latter are considered as refugees) are already entitled to normal old-age or survivors' benefits after paying their contributions for at least one full year, provided that they have resided in Liechtenstein for ten years—of which five years without interruption have immediately preceded the occurrence of the event insured against. Moreover, the one-third reduction in benefits provided in the case of aliens and stateless persons under article 74 of the Act on Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, is not applicable to refugees. Refugees residing in Liechtenstein who, on the occurrence of the event insured against, are not entitled to old-age or survivors' benefits, are paid not only their own contributions but any contributions which may have been made by the employers.

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

Subject to the following reservation: in all cases where this Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted as necessarily involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements.

15 November 1984

Interpretative statement:

The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg considers that the reservation made by the Republic of Guatemala concerning the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951 and the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugee of 31 January 1967 does not affect the obligations of Guatemala deriving from those instruments.

MADAGASCAR

The provisions of article 7 (1) shall not be interpreted as requiring the same treatment as is accorded to nationals of countries with which the Malagasy Republic has concluded conventions of establishment or agreements on co-operation;

The provisions of articles 8 and 9 shall not be interpreted as forbidding the Malagasy Government to take, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, measures with regard to a refugee because of his nationality in the interests of national security.

The provisions of article 17 cannot be interpreted as preventing the application of the laws and regulations establishing the proportion of alien workers that employers are authorized to employ in Madagascar or affecting the obligations of such employers in connexion with the employment of alien workers.

MALAWI

"In respect of articles 7, 13, 15, 19, 22 and 24

The Government of the Republic of Malawi considers these provisions as recommendations only and not legally binding obligations.

"In respect of article 17

The Government of the Republic of Malawi does not consider itself bound to grant a refugee who fulfils any of the conditions set forth in subparagraphs (a) to (c) to paragraph (2) of Article 17 automatic exemption for the obligation to obtain a work permit.

"In respect of article 17 as a whole, the Government of the Republic of Malawi does not undertake to grant to refugees right of wage earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

"In respect of article 26

The Government of the Republic of Malawi reserves its right to designate the place or places of residence of the refugees and to restrict their movements whenever considerations of national security or public order so require.

"In respect of article 34

The Government of the Republic of Malawi is not bound to grant to refugees any more favourable naturalization facilities than are granted, in accordance with the relevant laws and regulations,to aliens generally."

MALTA

"Article 7, paragraph 2, articles 14, 23, 27 and 28 shall not apply to Malta, and article 7, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, articles 8, 9, 11, 17, 18, 31, 32 and 34 shall apply to Malta compatibly with its own special problems, its peculiar position and characteristics."

MONACO

Subject to the reservation that the stipulations contained in articles 7 (paragraph 2), 15, 22 (paragraph 1), 23 and 24 shall be provisionally considered as being recommendations and not legal obligations.

MOZAMBIQUE

Reservations:

In respect of articles 13 and 22:

The Government of Mozambique will take these provisions as simple recommendation not binding it to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to Mozambicans with respect to elementary education and property.

In respect of articles 17 and 19:

The Government of Mozambique will interpret [these provisions] to the effect that it is not required to grant privileges from obligation to obtain a work permit.

As regards article 15:

The Government of Mozambique will not be bound to accord to refugees or group of refugees resident in its territory more extensive rights than those enjoyed by nationals with respect to the right of association and it reserves the right to restrict them in the interest of national security.

As regards article 26:

The Government of Mozambique reserves its right to designate place or places for principal residence for refugees or to restrict their freedom of movement whenever considerations of national security make it advisable.

As regards article 34:

The Government of Mozambique does not consider itself bound to grant to refugees facilities greater than those granted to other categories of aliens in general, with respect to naturalization laws."

NAMIBIA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Namibia reserves the right to designate a place or places for principal reception and residence for refugees or to restrict their freedom of movement in consideration of national security so required or make it advisable."

NETHERLANDS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

This signature is appended subject to the reservation that in all cases where this Convention grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country this provision shall not be interpreted as involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Netherlands has concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements.

Declarations:

(1) With reference to article 26 of this Convention, the Netherlands Government reserves the right to designate a place of principal residence for certain refugees or groups of refugees in the public interest.

(2) In the notifications concerning overseas territories referred to in article 40, paragraph 2, of this Convention, the Netherlands Government reserves the right to make a declaration in accordance with section B of article 1 with respect to such territories and to make reservations in accordance with article 42 of the Convention.

Interpretative declaration:

In depositing the instrument of ratification by the Netherlands, . . . I declare on behalf of the Netherlands Government that it does not regard the Amboinese who were transported to the Netherlands after 27 December 1949, the date of the transfer of sovereignty by the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia, as eligible for the status of refugees as defined in article 1 of the said Convention.

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand can only undertake to give effect to the provisions contained in paragraph 2 of article 24 of the Convention so far as the law of New Zealand allows."

NORWAY[21]

"The obligation stipulated in article 17 (1) to accord to refugees lawfully staying in the country the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country in the same circumstances as regards the right to engage in wage-earning employment, shall not be construed as extending to refugees the benefits of agreements which may in the future be concluded between Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden, or between Norway and any one of these countries, for the purpose of establishing special conditions for the transfer of labour between these countries."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Reservation:

"The Government of Papua New Guinea in accordance with article 42 paragraph 1 of the Convention makes a reservation with respect to the provisions contained in articles 17 (1), 21, 22 (1), 26, 31, 32 and 34 of the Convention and does not accept the obligations stipulated in these articles."

POLAND

Reservation:

The Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

PORTUGAL[22]

13 July 1976

"In all cases in which the Convention confers upon the refugees the most favoured person status granted to nationals of a foreign country, this clause will not be interpreted in such a way as to mean the status granted by Portugal to the nationals of Brazil."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Korea declares pursuant to article 42 of the Convention that it is not bound by article 7 which provides for the exemption of refugees from legislative reciprocity after fulfilling the condition of three years' residence in the territory of the Contracting States."

RWANDA

Reservation to article 26:

For reasons of public policy (ordre public), the Rwandese Republic reserves the right to determine the place of residence of refugees and to establish limits to their freedom of movement.

SIERRA LEONE

"The Government of Sierra Leone wishes to state with regard to article 17 (2) that Sierra Leone does not consider itself bound to grant to refugees the rights stipulated therein.

"Further, with regard to article 17 as a whole, the Government of Sierra Leone wishes to state that it considers the article to be a recommendation only and not a binding obligation.

"The Government of Sierra Leone wishes to state that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, and it reserves the right to impose special taxes on aliens as provided for in the Constitution."

SOMALIA

"The Government of the Somali Democratic Republic acceded to the Convention and Protocol on the understanding that nothing in the said Convention or Protocol will be construed to prejudice or adversely affect the national status, or political aspiration of displaced people from Somali Territories under alien domination.

"It is in this spirit, that the Somali Democratic Republic will commit itself to respect the terms and provisions of the said Convention and Protocol."

SPAIN

(a) The expression "the most favourable treatment" shall, in all the articles in which it is used, be interpreted as not including rights which, by law or by treaty, are granted to nationals of Portugal, Andorra, the Philippines or the Latin American countries or to nationals of countries with which international agreements of a regional nature are concluded.

(b) The Government of Spain considers that article 8 is not a binding rule but a recommendation.

(c) The Government of Spain reserves its position on the application of article 12, paragraph 1. Article 12, paragraph 2, shall be interpreted as referring exclusively to rights acquired by a refugee before he obtained, in any country, the status of refugee.

(d) Article 26 of the Convention shall be interpreted as not precluding the adoption of special measures concerning the place of residence of particular refugees, in accordance with Spanish law.

SUDAN

With reservation as to article 26.

SWEDEN[23]

With the following reservations:

First, a general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Sweden to the nationals of Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway or to the nationals of any one of those countries; and, *secondly*, the following reservations: a reservation to article 8 to the effect that that article shall not be binding on Sweden; a reservation to article 12, paragraph 1, to the effect that the Convention shall not modify the rule of Swedish private international law, as now in force, under which the personal status of a refugee is governed by the law of his country of nationality . . .; a reservation to article 17, paragraph 2, to the effect that Sweden does not consider itself bound to grant a refugee who fulfils any one of the conditions set out in subparagraphs (*a*)–(*c*) an automatic exemption from the obligation to obtain a work permit; a reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (*b*), to the effect that notwithstanding the principle of national treatment for refugees, Sweden shall not be bound to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals in respect of the possibility of entitlement to a national pension under the provisions of the National Insurance Act; and likewise to the effect that, in so far as the right to a supplementary pension under the said Act and the computation of such pension in certain respects are concerned, the rules applicable to Swedish nationals shall be more favourable than those applied to other insured persons; a reservation to article 24, paragraph 3, to the effect that the provisions of this paragraph shall not be binding on Sweden; and a reservation to article 25, to the effect that Sweden does not consider itself bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by a Swedish authority, in the place of the authorities of a foreign country, if the documentary records necessary for the delivery of such a certificate do not exist in Sweden.

SWITZERLAND[24]

TURKEY

Upon signature:

The Turkish Government considers moreover, that the term "events occurring before 1 January 1951" refers to the beginning of the events. Consequently, since the pressure exerted upon the Turkish minority in Bulgaria, which began before 1 January 1951, is still continuing, the provision of this Convention must also apply to the Bulgarian refugees of Turkish extraction compelled to leave that country as a result of this pressure and who, being unable to enter Turkey, might seek refuge on the territory of another contracting party after 1 January 1951.

The Turkish Government will, at the time of ratification, enter reservations which it could make under article 42 of the Convention.

Reservation and declaration made upon ratification:

No provision of this Convention may be interpreted as granting to refugees greater rights than those accorded to Turkish citizens in Turkey;

The Government of the Republic of Turkey is not a party to the Arrangements of 12 May 1926 and of 30 June 1928 mentioned in article 1, paragraph A, of this Convention. Furthermore, the 150 persons affected by the Arrangement of 30 June 1928 having been amnestied under Act No. 3527, the provisions laid down in this Arrangement are no longer valid in the case of Turkey. Consequently, the Government of the Republic of Turkey considers the Convention of 28 July 1951 independently of the aforementioned Arrangements . . .

The Government of the Republic understands that the action of "re-availment" or "reacquisition" as referred to in article 1, paragraph C, of the Convention—that is to say: "If (1) He has voluntarily re-availed himself of the protection of the country of his nationality; or (2) Having lost his nationality, he has voluntarily reacquired it"—does not depend only on the request of the person concerned but also on the consent of the State in question.

UGANDA

"(1) *In respect of article 7:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda understands this provision as not conferring any legal, political or other enforceable right upon refugees who, at any given time may be in Uganda. On the basis of this understanding the Government of the Republic of Uganda shall accord refugees such facilities and treatment as the Government of the Republic of Uganda shall in her absolute discretion, deem fit having regard to her own security, economic and social needs.

"(2) *In respect of articles 8 and 9:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda declares that the provisions of articles 8 and 9 are recognized by it as recommendations only.

"(3) *In respect of article 13:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda reserves to itself the right to abridge this provision without recourse to courts of law or arbitral tribunals, national or international, if the Government of the Republic of Uganda deems such abridgement to be in the public interest.

"(4) *In respect of article 15:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda shall in the public interest have the full freedom to withhold any or all rights conferred by this article from any refugees as a class of residents within her territory.

"(5) *In respect of article 16:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda understands article 16 paragraphs 2 and 3 thereof as not requiring the Government of the Republic of Uganda to accord to a refugee in need of legal assistance, treatment

more favourable than that extended to aliens generally in similar circumstances.

"(6) *In respect of article 17:* The obligation specified in article 17 to accord to refugees lawfully staying in the country in the same circumstances shall not be construed as extending to refugees the benefit of preferential treatment granted to nationals of the states who enjoy special privileges on account of existing or future treaties between Uganda and those countries, particularly states of the East African Community and the Organization of African Unity, in accordance with the provisions which govern such charters in this respect.

"(7) *In respect of article 25:* The Government of the Republic of Uganda understands that this article shall not require the Government of the Republic of Uganda to incur expenses on behalf of the refugees in connection with the granting of such assistance except in so far as such assistance is requested by and the resulting expense is reimbursed to the Government of the Republic of Uganda by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees or any other agency of the United Nations which may succeed it.

"(8) *In respect of article 32:* Without recourse to legal process the Government of the Republic of Uganda shall, in the public interest, have the unfettered right to expel any refugee in her territory and may at any time apply such internal measures as the Government may deem necessary in the circumstances; so however that, any action taken by the Government of the Republic of Uganda in this regard shall not operate to the prejudice of the provisions of article 33 of this Convention.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

"(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accept paragraph 2 of article 17 with the substitution of "four years" for "three years" in sub-paragraph (*a*) and with the omission of sub-paragraph (*c*).

"(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in respect of such of the matters referred to in sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24 as fall within the scope of the National Health Service, can only undertake to apply the provisions of that paragraph so far as the law allows; and it can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 2 of that Article so far as the law allows.

"(iv) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows."

Commentary

"In connexion with sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24 relating to certain matters within the scope of the National Health Service, the National Health Service (Amendment) Act, 1949, contains powers for charges to be made to persons not ordinarily resident in Great Britain (which category would include refugees) who receive treatment under the Service. While these powers have not yet been exercised it is possible that this might have to be done at some future date. In Northern Ireland the health services are restricted to persons ordinarily resident in the country except where regulations are made to extend the Service to others. It is for these reasons that the Government of the United Kingdom while they are prepared in the future, as in the past, to give the most sympathetic consideration to the situation of refugees, find it necessary to make a reservation to sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24 of the Convention.

"The scheme of Industrial Injuries Insurance in Great Britain does not meet the requirements of paragraph 2 of article 24 of the Convention. Where an insured person has died as the result of an industrial accident or a disease due to the nature of his employment, benefit cannot generally be paid to his dependants who are abroad unless they are in any part of the British Commonwealth, in the Irish Republic or in a country with which the United Kingdom has made a reciprocal agreement concerning the payment of industrial injury benefits. There is an exception to this rule in favour of the dependants of certain seamen who die as a result of industrial accidents happening to them while they are in the service of British ships. In this matter refugees are treated in the same way as citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies and by reason of paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 24 of the Convention, the dependants of refugees will be able to take advantage of reciprocal agreements which provide for the payment of United Kingdom industrial injury benefits in other countries. By reason of paragraphs (3) and (4) of article 24 refugees will enjoy under the scheme of National Insurance and Industrial Injuries Insurance certain rights which are withheld from British subjects who are not citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies.

"No arrangements exist in the United Kingdom for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of refugees. Any need for the documents or certifications mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article would be met by affidavits."

ZAMBIA

"Subject to the following reservations made pursuant to article 42 (1) of the Convention:

"Article 17 (2)

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state with regard to article 17, paragraph 2, that Zambia does not consider itself bound to grant to a refugee who fulfils any one of the conditions set out in sub-paragraphs (a) to (c) automatic exemption from the obligation to obtain a work permit.

"Further, with regard to article 17 as a whole, Zambia does not wish to undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage-earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

"Article 22 (1)

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state that it considers article 22 (1) to be a recommendation only and

not a binding obligation to accord to refugees the same treatment as is accorded to nationals with respect to elementary education.

Article 26

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state with regard to article 26 that it reserves the right to designate a place or places of residence for refugees.

Article 28

The Government of the Republic of Zambia wishes to state with regard to article 28 that Zambia considers itself not bound to issue a travel document with a return clause in cases where a country of second asylum has accepted or indicated its willingness to accept a refugee from Zambia."

ZIMBABWE

"1. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe declares that it is not bound by any of the reservations to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, the application of which had been extended by the Government of the United Kingdom to its territory before the attainment of independence.

"2. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe wishes to state with regard to article 17, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound to grant a refugee who fulfills any of the conditions set out in subparagraphs (*a*) to (*c*) automatic exemption from the obligation to obtain a work permit. In addition, with regard to article 17 as a whole, the Republic of Zimbabwe does not undertake to grant to refugees rights of wage-earning employment more favourable than those granted to aliens generally.

"3. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe wishes to state that it considers article 22 (1) as being a recommendation only and not an obligation to accord to refugees the same treatment as it accords to nationals with respect to elementary education.

"4. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe considers articles 23 and 24 as being recommendations only.

"5. The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe wishes to state with regard to article 26 that it reserves the right to designate a place or places of residence for refugees."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

5 November 1984

[Regarding the reservation made by Guatemala upon accession] [the Belgian Government] considers that it is impossible for the other States parties to determine the scope of a reservation which is expressed in such broad terms and which refers for the most part to domestic law, and that the reservation is thus not acceptable. It therefore voices an objection to the said reservation.

ETHIOPIA

10 January 1979

"The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia wishes to place on record its objection to the declaration [made by Somalia upon accession] and that it does not recognize it as valid on the ground that there are no Somali territories under alien domination."

FRANCE

23 October 1984

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

GERMANY[3]

5 December 1984

"The Federal Government views [the reservation made by Guatemala] as being worded in such general terms that its application could conceivably nullify the provisions of the Convention and the Protocol. Consequently, this reservation cannot be accepted."

'GREECE[18]

ITALY

26 November 1984

[The Government of Italy] considers [the reservation made by Guatemala] to be unacceptable since the very general terms in which it is couched and the fact that it refers for the most part to domestic law and leaves it to the Guatemalan Government to decide whether to apply numerous aspects of the Convention make it impossible for other States parties to determine the scope of the reservation.

LUXEMBOURG

[For the interpretative statement by Luxembourg concerning the reservation by Guatemala, see under "Declarations and Reservations other than those made under section B of article 1 and Reservations" in this chapter.]

NETHERLANDS

11 December 1984

Regarding the reservation made by Guatemala upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that a reservation phrased in such general terms and referring to the domestic law only is undesirable, since its scope is not entirely clear."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	22 Jan 1954	Norfolk Island, Papua New Guinea and Nauru
Denmark	4 Dec 1952	Greenland
France	23 Jun 1954	All territories for the international relations of which France is responsible
Netherlands[5]	29 Jul 1971	Surinam
United Kingdom[6,25,26,27,28,29,30,31]	11 Mar 1954	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man
	25 Oct 1956	The following territories with reservations: British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cyprus, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Somaliland Protectorate, Zanzibar and St. Helena
	19 Jun 1957	British Honduras
	11 Jul 1960	Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	11 Nov 1960	Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland
	4 Sep 1968	St. Lucia, Montserrat
	20 Apr 1970	The Bahama Islands

Declarations and reservations made upon notifications of territorial application

DENMARK

Greenland

Subject to the reservations made on ratification by the Government of Denmark.

NETHERLANDS[5]

Surinam

The extension is subject to the following reservations, which had been made in substance by the Government of the Netherlands upon ratification:

"1. that in all cases where the Convention, in conjunction with the Protocol, grants to refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted as involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Kingdom of the Netherlands has concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements which apply to Surinam;

"2. that the Government of Surinam as regards article 26 of the Convention, in conjunction with article 1, paragraph 1, of the Protocol, reserves the right for reasons of public order to appoint for certain refugees or groups of refugees a principal place of residence."

UNITED KINGDOM[6, 15, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31]

The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking in the Isle of Man and in the Channel Islands, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of the entry into force of this Convention for the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other state.

"(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accept paragraph 2 of article 17 in its application to the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands with the substitution of "four years" for "three years" in sub-paragraph (*a*) and with the omission of subparagraph (*c*).

"(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland can only undertake that the provisions of sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24 and of paragraph 2 of that article will be applied in the Channel Islands so far as the law allows, and that the provisions of that sub-paragraph, in respect of such matters referred to therein as fall within the scope of the Isle of Man Health Service, and of paragraph 2 of that article will be applied in the Isle of Man so far as the law allows.

"(iv) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands so far as the law allows.

"The considerations upon which certain of these reservations are based are similar to those set out in the memorandum relating to the corresponding reservations made in respect of the United Kingdom, which was enclosed in my note under reference."

British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cyprus, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, St. Vincent, Seychelles and Somaliland Protectorate

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.]

Zanzibar and St. Helena

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man under Nos. (i), (iii) and (iv).]

British Honduras

[Same reservation, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man under No. (i).]

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.]

Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man under Nos. (i), (iii) and (iv).]

The Bahama Islands

"Subject to the following reservation in respect of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 17 of the Convention:

"Refugees and their dependants would normally be subject to the same laws and regulations relating generally to the employment of non–Bahamians within the Commonwealth of the Bahama Islands, so long as they have not acquired Bahamian status."

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 20* (A/1775), p. 48.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 26 November 1991 declaring that it considered itself bound by alternative *(b)* of Section B (1) of the Convention. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 4 September 1990 choosing alternative (*b*) of Section B (1) of the Convention. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] On 15 December 1955, the Secretary–General received a communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stating that the Convention also applies to *Land Berlin* as from the date of its entry into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also footnote 3 above.

[5] Upon notifying its succession (29 November1978) the Government of Suriname informed the Secretary–General that the Republic of Suriname did not succeed to the reservations formulated on 29 July 1951 by the Netherlands when the Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees were extended to Surinam.

[6] In a declaration contained in the notification of succession to the Convention, the Government of Tuvalu confirmed that it regards the Convention [...] as continuing in force subject to reservations previously made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in relation to the Colony of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands.

[7] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[8] States having previously specified alternative (*a*) under section B (1) of article 1. For the date of receipt of the modification of choice to alternative (*b*), see note 9 below.

[9] Notifications of the extension of their obligations under the Convention by adopting alternative (*b*) of section B (1) of article 1 of the Convention were received by the Secretary–General on the dates indicated:

Argentina	15	Nov	1984
Australia	6	Jul	1970
Benin	1	Dec	1967
Brazil	14	Feb	1990
Cameroon	29	Dec	1961
Central African Republic	15	Oct	1962
Chile	28	Jan	1972
Colombia	10	Oct	1961
Côte d'Ivoire	20	Dec	1966
Ecuador	1	Feb	1972
France	3	Feb	1971
Holy See	17	Nov	1961
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27	Sep	1976
Italy	1	Mar	1990
Luxembourg	22	Aug	1972
Niger	7	Dec	1964
Paraguay	10	Jan	1991
Peru	8	Dec	1980
Portugal	13	Jul	1976
Senegal	12	Oct	1964
Sudan	7	Mar	1974
Togo	23	Oct	1962

[10] On 21 January 1983, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Botswana the following communication:

"Having simultaneously acceded to the Convention and Protocol [relating to the status of refugees done at New York on 31 January 1967] on the 6th January 1969 and in view of the fact that the Protocol provides in article I (2) that the 'term 'refugee' shall ... mean any person within the definition of article 1 of the Convention' as if the words 'As a result of events occurring before 1 January 1951 and' ... and the words '... as a result of such events', in article [I (A) (2)] were omitted and thus modifies in effect the provisions of article 1 of the Convention, it is the position of the Government of Botswana that no separate declaration under article 1.B (1) of the Convention is required in the circumstances."

On the basis of the afore–mentioned communication, the Secretary–General has included Botswana in the list of States having chosen formula (b) under section B of article 1.

Subsequently, in a communication, received by the Secretary–General on 29 April 1986, and with reference to article 1 B (1) of the above–mentioned Convention, the Government of Botswana confirmed that it has no objection to be listed among the States applying the Convention without any geographical limitation.

[11] The instrument of accession contains the following declaration:

". . . The mandatory declaration specifying which of the two meanings in Article 1 (B) (l) a Contracting State applies for the purpose of its obligations under the Convention has been superceded by the provisions of Article 1 of the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees of 31 January 1967. Furthermore, the previous date–line would render Malawi's accession nugatory.

"Consequently, and since [the Government of the Republic of Malawi] is simultaneously acceding to the said Protocol, the obligations hereby assumed by the Government of the Republic of Malawi are not limited by the previous dateline or bounded by the concomitant geographic limitation in the Convention."

On the basis of the above declaration, the Secretary–General has included Malawi in the list of States having chosen formula (b) under section B of article l.

Further, on 4 February 1988, the Secretary–General received the following declaration from the Government of Malawi:

"When making the declaration under Section B of article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Malawi intended and intends to apply the Convention and the Protocol thereto liberally in the lines of article 1 of the Protocol without being bounded by the geographic limitation or the dateline specified in the Convention.

"In the view of the Government of the Republic of Malawi the formula in the Convention is static and the Government of the Republic of Malawi's position, as stated, merely seeks to assist in the progressive development of international law in this area as epitomised by the 1967 Protocol. It is therefore the view of the Government of the Republic of Malawi that the declaration is consistent with the objects and purposes of the Convention and it entails the assumption of obligation beyond but perfectly consistent with those of the Convention and the Protocol thereto."

In view of the said declaration, Malawi remains listed among those States which, in accordance with Section B of article 1 of the Convention, will apply the said Convention to events occurring Europe or elsewhere before 1 January 1951.

[12] In a communication received on 1 December 1967, the Government of Australia notified the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of the reservations to articles 17, 18, 19, 26 and 32, and, in a communication received by the Secretary–General on 11 March 1971, of the withdrawal of the reservation to paragraph 1 of article 28 of the Convention. For the text of those reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 202.

[13] These reservations replace those made at the time of signature. For the text of reservations made on signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 186.

[14] On 7 April 1972, upon its accession to the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees done at New York on 31 January 1967, the Government of Brazil withdraws its reservations excluding articles 15 and 17, paragraphs 1 and 3, from its application to the Convention. For the text of the said reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 380, p. 430.

[15] On notifying its succession to the Convention, the Government of Cyprus confirmed the reservations made at the time of the extension of the Convention to its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. For the text of these reservations, see *"Declarations and reservations made upon notification of territorial application"* under United Kingdom.

[16] In a communication received on 23 August 1962, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw as from 1 October 1961 the reservation to article 14 of the Convention.

In a communication received on 25 March 1968, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw as from that date the reservations made on ratification to paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of article 24 and partially the reservation made on ratification to article 17 by rewording the said reservation. For the text of the reservations originally formulated by the Government of Denmark on ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 198.

[17] On notifying its succession to the Convention, the Government of Gambia confirmed the reservations made at the time of the extension of the Convention to its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

[18] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 19 April 1978, the Government of Greece declared that it withdrew the reservations that it had made upon ratification pertaining to articles 8, 11, 13, 24 (3), 26, 28, 31, 32 and 34, and also the objection contained in paragraph 6 of the relevant declaration of reservations by Greece is also withdrawn.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 27 February 1995, the Government of Greece notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 17 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservations and objection so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 354, p. 402.

[19] In a communication received on 23 October 1968, the Government of Ireland notified the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of two of its reservations in respect of article 29 (1), namely those indicated at (a) and (b) of paragraph 5 of declarations and reservations contained in the instrument of accession by the Government of Ireland to the Convention; for the text of the withdrawn reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 254, p. 412.

[20] In a communication received on 20 October 1964, the Government of Italy has notified the Secretary–General that "it withdraws the reservations made at the time of signature, and confirmed at the time of ratification, to articles 6, 7, 8, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 34 of the Convention [see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189,p. 192]. The above-mentioned reservations are inconsistent with the internal provisions issued by the Italian Government since the ratification of the Convention. The Italian Government also adopted in December 1963 provisions which implement the contents of paragraph 2 of article 17".

Furthermore, the Italian Government confirms that "it maintains its declaration made in accordance with section B (1) of article 1, and that it recognizes the provisions of articles 17 and 18 as recommendations only". (See also note 9 above.)

Subsequently, in a communication received on 1 March 1990, the Government of Italy notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration by which the provisions of articles 17 and 18 were recognized by it as recommendations only. For the complete text of the reservations see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 192.

[21] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 21 January 1954, the Government of Norway gave notice of the withdrawal, with immediate effect, of the reservation to article 24 of the Convention, "as the Acts mentioned in the said reservation have been amended to accord to refugees lawfully staying in the country the same treatment as is accorded to Norwegian nationals". For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 198.

[22] The text, which was communicated in a notification received on 13 July 1976, replaces the reservations originally made by Portugal upon accession. For the text of the reservations withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 383, p. 314.

[23] In a communication received on 20 April 1961, the Government of Sweden gave notice of the withdrawal, as from 1 July 1961, of the reservation to article 14 of the Convention.

In a communication received on 25 November 1966,the Government of Sweden has notified the Secretary–General that it has decided, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 42 of the Convention, to withdraw some of its reservations to article 24, paragraph 1 (*b*), by rewording them and to withdraw the reservation to article 24, paragraph 2.

In a communication received on 5 March 1970, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of its reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

For the text of the reservations as originally formulated by the Government of Sweden upon ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 200, p. 336.

[24] In a communication received on 18 February 1963, the Government of Switzerland gave notice to the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of the reservation made at the time of ratification to article 24, paragraph 1 (*a*) and (*b*) and paragraph 3, of the Convention, in so far as that reservation concerns old–age and survivors' insurance.

In a communication received on 3 July 1972, the Government of Switzerland gave notice of its withdrawal of the reservation to article 17 formulated in its instrument of ratification of the Convention.

In a communication received on 17 December 1980, the Government of Switzerland gave notice of its withdrawal, in its entirety, of the subsisting reservation formulated in respect of article 24, number 1, letters a and b, which encompasses training, apprenticeship and unemployment insurance with effect from 1 January 1981, date of entry into force of the Swiss Law on Asylum of 5 October 1979. For the text of the reservations made initially, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 202, p. 368.

25 On 3 October 1983, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection :

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above–mentioned objection the Secretary–General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[For the text of the declaration, see note 20 in chapter IV.1.]

26 The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was dissolved immediately before 1 January 1964. In reply to the Secretariat's inquiry as to the legal effect of that dissolution, in so far as concerns the application in the territories formerly constituting the Federation, i.e., Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia, of certain multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary–General which had been extended by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Federation or to any of the territories concerned prior to the formation of the Federation, and of the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material done at Geneva on 7 November 1952 (see chapter XI.A.5), to which the Federation acceded in its capacity of a Contracting Party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (see chapter X.1), the Government of the United Kingdom in a communication received on 16 April 1964, provided the following clarification:

"Her Majesty's Government consider that in general, multilateral treaties applicable to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland continued to apply to the constituent territories of the former Federation on its dissolution. Multilateral treaties under which the Federation enjoyed membership of international organisations fall in a special category; their continued application to the constituent territories of the former Federation depends in each case on the terms of the treaty. Her Majesty's Government regard all the conventions listed in the Secretariat's letter of February 26 as applying to the constituent territories of the former Federation since its dissolution, but the accession by the Federation to the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material has not led to this result as Article XIII of the Convention allows Her Majesty's Government to extend provisions of the Convention to the three constituent territories of the former Federation if considered desirable.

"With regard to the final query by the Secretariat, I am to reply that extensions prior to the inauguration of the Federation do, of course, continue to apply to the constituent territories."

Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland have since become independent States under the names of Zambia and Malawi, respectively.

27 In a letter addressed to the Secretary–General on 22 March 1968, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951, stated the following:

"In my letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning the disposition of Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government declared that with respect to multilateral treaties which had been applied or extended to the former Nyasaland Protectorate, any Party to such a treaty could on the basis of reciprocity rely as against Malawi on the terms of such treaty until Malawi notified its depositary of what action it wished to take by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession, or accession.

"I am now to inform you as depositary of this Convention that the Government of Malawi wishes to terminate any connection with this Convention which it might have inherited. The Government of Malawi considers that any legal relationship with the aforementioned Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Geneva, 1951 which might have devolved upon it by way of succession from the ratification of the United Kingdom, is terminated as of this date."

See succession by Zambia.

28 See succession by Botswana (formerly Bechuanaland Protectorate).

29 See succession by Fiji.

30 See succession by Jamaica.

31 See succession by Kenya.

3. Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons

Done at New York on 28 September 1954

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 June 1960, in accordance with article 39.
REGISTRATION: 6 June 1960, No. 5158.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 360, p.117.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 41.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Status of Stateless Persons, held at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 13 to 23 September 1954. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 526A (XVII)[1] of 26 April 1954 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. For the Final Act, recommendation and resolution adopted by the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 360, p. 117.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		15 Jul 1964 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina		1 Jun 1972 *a*
Armenia		18 May 1994 *a*
Australia		13 Dec 1973 *a*
Barbados		6 Mar 1972 *d*
Belgium	28 Sep 1954	27 May 1960
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		25 Feb 1969 *d*
Brazil	28 Sep 1954	
Colombia	30 Dec 1954	
Costa Rica	28 Sep 1954	2 Nov 1977
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Denmark	28 Sep 1954	17 Jan 1956
Ecuador	28 Sep 1954	2 Oct 1970
El Salvador	28 Sep 1954	
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		10 Oct 1968 *a*
France	12 Jan 1955	8 Mar 1960
Germany[2,3]	28 Sep 1954	26 Oct 1976
Greece		4 Nov 1975 *a*
Guatemala	28 Sep 1954	
Guinea		21 Mar 1962 *a*
Holy See	28 Sep 1954	
Honduras	28 Sep 1954	
Ireland		17 Dec 1962 *a*
Israel	1 Oct 1954	23 Dec 1958
Italy	20 Oct 1954	3 Dec 1962
Kiribati		29 Nov 1983 *d*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liberia		11 Sep 1964 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Liechtenstein	28 Sep 1954	
Luxembourg	28 Oct 1955	27 Jun 1960
Madagascar[4]		[20 Feb 1962 *a*]
Netherlands	28 Sep 1954	12 Apr 1962
Norway	28 Sep 1954	19 Nov 1956
Philippines	22 Jun 1955	
Republic of Korea		22 Aug 1962 *a*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Sweden	28 Sep 1954	2 Apr 1965
Switzerland	28 Sep 1954	3 Jul 1972
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		29 Jul 1969 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	28 Sep 1954	16 Apr 1959
Yugoslavia		9 Apr 1959 *a*
Zambia		1 Nov 1974 *d*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

"The Government of Antigua and Barbuda can only undertake that the provisions of articles 23, 24, 25 and 31 will be applied in Antigua and Barbuda so far as the law allows."

ARGENTINA

The application of this Convention in territories whose sovereignty is the subject of discussion between two or more States, irrespective of whether they are parties to the Convention, cannot be construed as an alteration, renunciation or relinquishement of the position previously maintained by each of them.

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados ... declares with regard to the reservations made by the United Kingdom on notification of the territorial application of the Convention to the West Indies (including Barbados) on the 19th March, 1962 that it can only undertake that the provisions of Articles 23, 24, 25 and 31 will be applied in Barbados so far as the law allows.

"The application of the Convention to Barbados was also made subject to reservations to Articles 8, 9 and 26 which are hereby withdrawn."

BOTSWANA[5]

"(a) Article 31 of the said Convention shall not oblige Botswana to grant to a stateless person a status more favourable than that accorded to aliens in general;

"(b) Articles 12 1) and 7 2) of the Convention shall be recognized as recommendations only."

COSTA RICA[6]

DENMARK[7]

Denmark is not bound by article 24, paragraph 3.

The provisions of article 24, paragraph 1, under which stateless persons are in certain cases placed on the same footing as

nationals, shall not oblige Denmark to grant stateless persons in every case exactly the same remuneration as that provided by law for nationals, but only to grant them what is required for their support.

Article 31 shall not oblige Denmark to grant to stateless persons a status more favourable than that accorded to aliens in general.

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature :

El Salvador signs the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, must not be understood to include the special treatment which has been or may be granted to the nationals of Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular to the countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America and now form the Organization of Central American States.

FIJI

The Government of Fiji stated that the first and third reservations made by the United Kingdom are affirmed but have been redrafted as more suitable to the application of Fiji in the following terms:

"1. The Government of Fiji understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of Fiji from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention in respect of Fiji were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or of the Government of Fiji respectively by reason of a state of war which existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of Fiji cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows.

"*Commentary:* No arrangements exist in Fiji for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of stateless persons. Any need for the documents or certificates mentioned in paragraph 2 of that article would be met by affidavit.

"All other reservation made by the United Kingdom to the above-mentioned Convention is withdrawn."

FINLAND[8]

"(1) A general reservation to the effect that the application of those provisions of the Convention which grant to stateless persons the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country shall not be affected by the fact that special rights and privileges are now or may in future be accorded by Finland to the nationals of Denmark, Iceland, Norway and Sweden or to the nationals of any one of those Countries;

"(2) A reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, to the effect that Finland is not prepared, as a general measure, to grant stateless persons who fulfil the conditions of three years residence in Finland an exemption from any legislative reciprocity which Finnish law may have stipulated as a condition governing an alien's eligibility for same right or privilege;

"(3) A reservation to article 8 to the effect that that article shall not be binding on Finland;

"(4) . . .

"(5) A reservation to article 24, paragraph 1 (b) and paragraph 3 to the effect that they shall not be binding on Finland;

"(6) A reservation to article 25, to the effect that Finland does not consider itself bound to cause a certificate to be delivered by a Finnish authority, in the place of the authorities of a foreign country, if the documentary records necessary for the delivery of such certificate do not exist in Finland;

"(7) A reservation with respect to the provisions contained in article 28. Finland does not accept the obligations stipulated in the said article, but is prepared to recognize travel documents issued by other Contracting States pursuant to this article."

FRANCE

The provisions of article 10, paragraph 2, are regarded by the French Government as applying only to stateless persons who were forcibly displaced from French territory, and who have, prior to the date of entry into force of this Convention, returned there direct from the country to which they were forced to proceed, without in the meantime having received authorization to reside in the territory of any other State.

GERMANY[2]

1. Article 23 will be applied without restriction only to stateless persons who are also refugees within the meaning of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees and the Protocol of 31 January 1967 relating to the Status of Refugees, but otherwise only to the extent provided for under national legislation;

2. Article 27 will not be applied.

GUATEMALA

Upon signature:

Guatemala signs the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, must not be understood to include the special treatment which has been or may be granted to the nationals of Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular to the countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America and now form the Organization of Central American States.

HOLY SEE

"The Convention will be applied in the form compatible with the special nature of the State of the Vatican City and without prejudice to the norms that grant access thereunto and sojourn therein."

HONDURAS

Upon signature:

Honduras signs the present Convention with the reservation that the expression "treatment as favourable as possible", referred to in those of its provisions to which reservations may be made, must not be understood to include the special treatment which has been or may be granted to the nationals of Spain, the Latin American countries in general, and in particular to the countries which constituted the United Provinces of Central America and now form the Organization of Central American States.

IRELAND

Declaration:

"The Government of Ireland understand the words 'public order' and 'in accordance with due process of law', as they appear in article 31 of the Convention, to mean respectively, 'public policy' and 'in accordance with the procedure provided by law'."

Reservation:

"With regard to article 29 (1), the Government of Ireland do not undertake to accord to stateless persons treatment more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally with respect to

(*a*) The stamp duty chargeable in Ireland in connection with conveyances, transfers and leases of lands, tenements and hereditaments, and

(*b*) Income tax (including sur-tax)."

ITALY[9]

The provisions of articles 17 and 18 are recognized as recommendations only.

KIRIBATI

Reservations:

[*The following reservations originally made by the United Kingdom were reformulated as follows in terms suited to their direct application to Kiribati*]:

"1. The Government of Kiribati understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of Kiribati from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interest which at the date of entry into force of this Convention in respect of the Gilbert Islands were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of Kiribati can only undertake to apply the provisions of sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24 so far as the law allows.

"3. The Government of Kiribati cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows."

LESOTHO[10]

"1. In accordance with article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that it understands articles 8 and 9 as not preventing it from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interest of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore the provisions of article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention in respect of Lesotho were under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland or of the Government of Lesotho by reason of a state of war which existed between them and any other State.

"2. The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the laws of Lesotho allow.

"3. The Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho shall not be bound under article 31 to grant to a stateless person a status more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally."

NETHERLANDS

The Government of the Kingdom reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 8 of the Convention to stateless persons who previously possessed enemy nationality or the equivalent thereof with respect to the Kingdom of Netherlands;

With reference to article 26 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom reserves the right to designate a place of principal residence for certain stateless persons or groups of stateless persons in the public interest.

PHILIPPINES

Upon signature:

"(*a*) As regards Article 17, paragraph 1, granting stateless persons the right to engage in wage-earning employment, [the Government of the Philippines] finds that this provision conflicts with the Philippine Immigration Act of 1940, as amended, which classifies as excludable aliens under Section 29 those coming to the Philippines to perform unskilled labour, and permits the admission of pre-arranged employees under Section 9 (*g*) only when there are no persons in the Philippines willing and competent to perform the labour or service for which the admission of aliens is desired.

"(*b*) As regards Article 31, paragraph 1, to the effect that 'the Contracting States shall not expel a stateless person lawfully in their territory, save on grounds of national security or public order', this provision would unduly restrict the power of the Philippine Government to deport undesirable aliens under Section 37 of the same Immigration Act which states the various grounds upon which aliens may be deported.

"Upon signing the Convention [the Philippine Government], therefore hereby [registers] its non-conformity to the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 1, and Article 31, paragraph 1, thereof, for the reasons stated in (*a*) and (*b*) above."

SWEDEN[11]

Reservations:

(1) . . .

(2) To article 8. This article will not be binding on Sweden.

(3) To article 12, paragraph 1. This paragraph will not be binding on Sweden.

(4) To article 24, paragraph 1 (*b*). Notwithstanding the rule concerning the treatment of stateless persons as nationals, Sweden will not be bound to accord to stateless persons the same treatment as is accorded to nationals in respect of the possibility of entitlement to a national pension under the provisions of the National Insurance Act; and likewise to the effect that, in so far as the right to a supplementary pension under the said Act and the computation of such pension in certain respects are concerned, the rules applicable to Swedish nationals shall be more favourable than those applied to other insured persons.

(5) To article 24, paragraph 3. The provisions of this paragraph will not be binding on Sweden.

(6) To article 25, paragraph 2. Sweden does not consider itself obliged to cause a Swedish authority, in lieu of a foreign

authority, to deliver certificates for the issuance of which there is insufficient documentation in Sweden.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration:

"I have the honour further to state that the Government of the United Kingdom deposit the present instrument of ratification on the understanding that the combined effects of articles 36 and 38 permit them to include in any declaration or notification made under paragraph 1 of article 36 or paragraph 2 of article 36 respectively any reservation consistent with article 38 which the Government of the territory concerned might desire to make."

Reservations:

"When ratifying the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons which was opened for signature at New York on September 28, 1954, the Government of the United Kingdom have deemed it necessary to make certain reservations in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 38 thereof the text of which is reproduced below:

(1) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand Articles 8 and 9 as not preventing them from taking in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of Article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of Article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

(2) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in respect of such of the matters referred to in sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of Article 24 as fall within the scope of the National Health Service, can only undertake to apply the provisions of that paragraph so far as the law allows.

(3) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake to give effect to the obligations contained in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 25 and can only undertake to apply the provisions of paragraph 3 so far as the law allows."

Commentary: "In connexion with sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of Article 24 which relates to certain matters within the scope of the National Health Service, the National Health Service (Amendment) Act 1949 contains powers for charges to be made to persons not ordinarily resident in Great Britain (which category would include some stateless persons) who receive treatment under the Service. These powers have not yet been exercised but it may be necessary to exercise them at some future date. In Northern Ireland the Health Services are restricted to persons ordinarily resident in the country except where regulations are made to extend the Services to others. For these reasons, the Government of the United Kingdom, while prepared in the future, as in the past, to give the most sympathetic consideration to the situation of stateless persons, find it necessary to make reservation to sub-paragraph (*b*) of Article 24.

"No arrangements exist in the United Kingdom for the administrative assistance for which provision is made in Article 25 nor have any such arrangements been found necessary in the case of stateless persons. Any need for the documents or certifications mentioned in paragraph 2 of that Article would be met by affidavit."

ZAMBIA[12]

"Article 22 (1):

The Government of the Republic of Zambia considers paragraph 1 of article 22 to be a recommendation only, and not a binding obligation to accord to stateless persons national treatment with respect to elementary education;

"Article 26:

The Government of the Republic of Zambia reserves the right under article 26 to designate a place or places of residence for stateless persons;

"Article 28:

The Government of the Republic of Zambia does not consider itself bound under article 28 to issue a travel document with a return clause in cases where a country of second asylum has accepted or indicated its willingness to accept a stateless person from Zambia;

"Article 31:

"The Government of the Republic of Zambia shall not undertake under article 31 to grant treatment more favourable than that accorded to aliens generally with respect to expulsion."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France	8 Mar 1960	Departments of Algeria, of the Oases and of Saoura, Guadeloupe, Martinique and Guiana and the five Overseas Territories (New Caledonia and Dependencies, French Polynesia, French Somaliland, the Comoro Archipelago and the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon)
Netherlands[13]	12 Apr 1962	Surinam and Netherlands New Guinea
United Kingdom[5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]	16 Apr 1959	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man
	7 Dec 1059	High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom(cont'd)	9 Dec 1959	Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	19 Mar 1962	Aden Colony, Bermuda, Malta, Sarawak, Seychelles, St. Helena, Uganda, Virgin Islands and Zanzibar, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Kenya, Mauritius, North Borneo, State of Singapore and the West Indies

Declarations and reservations made upon notification of territorial application

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]

Channel Islands and Isle of Man

"(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand Articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking in the Isle of Man and in the Channel Islands, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality. The provisions of Article 8 shall not prevent the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from exercising any rights over property or interests which they may acquire or have acquired as an Allied or Associated Power under a Treaty of Peace or other agreement or arrangement for the restoration of peace which has been or may be completed as a result of the Second World War. Furthermore, the provisions of Article 8 shall not affect the treatment to be accorded to any property or interests which, at the date of entry into force of this Convention for the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands, are under the control of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland by reason of a state of war which exists or existed between them and any other State.

"(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland can only undertake that the provisions of sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of Article 24 and of paragraph 2 of that Article will be applied in the Channel Islands so far as the law allows, and that the provisions of that sub-paragraph, in respect of such matters referred to therein as fall within the scope of the Isle of Man Health Service, will be applied in the Isle of Man so far as the law allows.

"(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands to paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands so far as the law allows."

High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Souaziland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under Nos. (i) and (iii).]

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under No. (iii).]

British Guiana, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Kenya, Mauritius

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under Nos. (i) and (iii).]

British Honduras, Hong Kong

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man, under Nos. (i) and (iii).]

North Borneo

[Same reservations, in essence, as those made for the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.]

Fiji

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland understand articles 8 and 9 as not preventing the taking in Fiji, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, of measures in the interests of national security in the case of a stateless person on the ground of his former nationality.

(ii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in respect of the provisions of sub-paragraph (*b*) of paragraph 1 of article 24, can only undertake that effect will be given in Fiji to the provisions of that paragraph so far as the law allows.

(iii) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in Fiji to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 25 and can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 3 will be applied in Fiji so far as the law allows.

The State of Singapore

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the State of Singapore to article 23.

The West Indies

(i) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot undertake that effect will be given in the West Indies to articles 8, 9, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 31.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Seventeenth Session, Supplement, No. 1* (E/2596), p. 12.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] Instrument of ratification received by the Secretary-General on 2 August 1976 and supplemented by notification of reservation received on 26 October 1976, the date on which the instrument is deemed to have been deposited.

In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which

t enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, the Secretary-General received on 13 October 1976 from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the following communication:

The Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons of 28 September 1954 affects, in its substance, matters relating to the status of West Berlin. The USSR therefore regards the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the application of the said Convention to West Berlin as illegal and as having no legal force, since, under the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the treaty obligations of the Federal Republic of Germany affecting matters of security and status cannot be applied to West Berlin.

See also note 2 above.

[4] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 2 April 1965, the Government of Madagascar denounced the Convention; the denunciation took effect on 2 April 1966.

[5] In the notification of succession, the Government of Botswana also maintained the reservations made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on extension of the Convention to the Bechuanaland Protectorate. For the text of the reservations, see "*Declarations and reservations made upon notification of territorial application*", under United Kingdom.

[6] The reservation made upon signature was not maintained upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 360, p. 196.

[7] In a communication received on 23 August 1962, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from 1 October 1961 the reservation to article 14 of the Convention.

In a communication received on 25 March 1968, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from that date, the reservation to article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention. For the text of the reservations withdrawn by the above communications, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 360, p. 132.

[8] In a communication received on 30 September 1970, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation formulated in its instrument of accession to article 12, paragraph 1, of the Convention. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 648, p. 368.

[9] In a communication received on 25 January 1968, the Government of Italy notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservations made at the time of signature to articles 6, 7 (2), 8, 19, 22 (2), 23, 25 and 32 (see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 192).

[10] Reservations 1 and 2 had been formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom in respect of the territory of Basutoland. Reservation 3 constitutes a new reservation, which was made subject to the provisions of article 39 (2) of the Convention.

[11] In a communication received on 25 November 1966, the Government of Sweden has notified the Secretary-General that it has decided, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 38 of the Convention, to withdraw some of its reservations to article 24, paragraph 1 (*b*), and the reservation to article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention. In a communication received on 5 March 1970, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of its reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention. For the text of the reservations to article 24, paragraph 1 (*b*), as originally formulated by the Government of Sweden in its instrument of ratification, and of the reservation to article 7, paragraph 2, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 529, p. 362.

[12] In its notification of succession, the Government of Zambia declared that it withdrew the reservations made by the Government of the United Kingdom upon extension of the Convention by the latter to the former Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The reservations reproduced herein are new reservations, which were made subject to the provisions of article 39 (2) of the Convention.

[13] In the note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Netherlands stated, with reference to article 36, paragraph 3 of the Convention, that "if at any time the Government of the Netherlands Antilles agrees to the extension of the Convention to its territory, the Secretary-General shall be notified thereof without delay. Such notification will contain the reservations, if any, which the Government of the Netherlands Antilles might wish to make with respect to local requirements in accordance with article 38 of the Convention."

[14] See succession by Lesotho.

[15] See note 26 in chapter V.2.

[16] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 22 March 1968, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, done at New York on 28 September 1954, stated the following:

"In my letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning the disposition of Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government declared that with respect to multilateral treaties which had been applied or extended to the former Nyasaland Protectorate, any Party to such a treaty could on the basis of reciprocity rely as against Malawi on the terms of that treaty until Malawi notified its depositary of what action it wished to take by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession, or accession.

"I am to inform you as depositary of this Convention that the Government of Malawi now wishes to terminate any connection with this Convention which it might have inherited. The Government of Malawi considers that any legal relationship with the afore-mentioned Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, New York, 1954 which might have devolved upon it by way of succession from the ratification of the United Kingdom, is terminated as of this date."

[17] See accession by Uganda.

[18] See succession by Fiji.

4. Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness

Concluded at New York on 30 August 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13 December 1975, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 13 December 1975, No. 14458.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 989, p. 175.
STATUS: Signatories: 5. Parties: 17.

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on the Elimination or Reduction of Future Statelessness, convened by the Secretary–General of the United Nations pursuant to General Assembly resolution 896 (IX)[1] of 4 December 1954. The Conference met at the European Office of the United Nations at Geneva from 24 March to 18 April 1959 and reconvened at the Headquarters of the United Nations at New York from 15 to 28 August 1961.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Armenia		18 May 1994 *a*	Israel	30 Aug 1961	
Australia		13 Dec 1973 *a*	Kiribati		29 Nov 1983 *d*
Austria		22 Sep 1972 *a*	Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 *a*	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Canada		17 Jul 1978 *a*	Netherlands[4]	30 Aug 1961	13 May 1985
Costa Rica		2 Nov 1977 *a*	Niger		17 Jun 1985 *a*
Denmark		11 Jul 1977 *a*	Norway		11 Aug 1971 *a*
Dominican Republic	5 Dec 1961		Sweden		19 Feb 1969 *a*
France	31 May 1962		United Kingdom	30 Aug 1961	29 Mar 1966
Germany[2, 3]		31 Aug 1977 *a*			
Ireland		18 Jan 1973 *a*			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

Declarations concerning article 8, paragraph 3 (a), (i) and (ii):

"Austria declares to retain the right to deprive a person of his nationality, if such person enters, on his own free will, the military service of a foreign State.

"Austria declares to retain the right to deprive a person of his nationality, if such person being in the service of a foreign State, conducts himself in a manner seriously prejudicial to the interests or to the prestige of the Republic of Austria."

FRANCE

At the time of signature of this Convention, the Government of the French Republic declares that it reserves the right to exercise the power available to it under article 8 (3) on the terms laid down in that paragraph, when it deposits the instrument of ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the French Republic also declares, in accordance with article 17 of the Convention, that it makes a reservation in respect of article 11, and that article 11 will not apply so far as the French Republic is concerned.

The Government of the French Republic further declares, with respect to article 14 of the Convention, that in accordance with article 17 it accepts the jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to States Parties to this Convention which shall also have accepted its jurisdiction subject to the same reservations; it also declares that article 14 will not apply when there exists between the French Republic and another party to this Convention an earlier treaty providing another method for the settlement of disputes between the two States.

GERMANY[2]

The Federal Republic of Germany will apply the said Convention:

(a) in respect of elimination of statelessness, to persons who are stateless under the terms of article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons of 28 September 1954;

(b) in respect of prevention of statelessness and retention of nationality, to German nationals within the meaning of the Basic Law (Constitution) for the Federal Republic of Germany.

IRELAND

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 8 of the Convention Ireland retains the right to deprive a naturalised Irish citizen of his citizenship pursuant to section 19 (1) (b) of the Irish Nationality and Citizenship Act, 1956, on grounds specified in the aforesaid paragraph."

NIGER

With reservations in respect of articles 11, 14 and 15.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"[The Government of the United Kingdom declares that], in accordance with paragraph 3 (*a*) of Article 8 of the Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 8, the United Kingdom retains the right to deprive a naturalised person of his nationality on the following grounds, being grounds existing in United Kingdom law at the present time: that, inconsistently with his duty of loyalty to Her Britannic Majesty, the person

"(i) has, in disregard of an express prohibition of Her Britannic Majesty, rendered or continued to render services to, or received or continued to receive emoluments from, another State, or

"(ii) has conducted himself in a manner seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of Her Britannic Majesty."

Territorial Application

(Declarations made under article 15 of the Convention)

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France	31 May 1962	The Convention will apply to the Overseas Departments and the Overseas Territories of the French Republic
United Kingdom	29 Mar 1966	(*a*) The Convention shall apply to the following non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible: Antigua, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Cayman Islands, Channel Islands, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Mauritius, Montserrat, St. Helena, St. Kitts, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Swaziland, Turks and Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands (*b*) The Convention shall not apply to Aden and the Protectorate of South Arabia; Brunei; Southern Rhodesia; and Tonga, whose consent to the application of the Convention has been withheld

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Ninth Session, Supplement No. 21* (A/2890), p. 49.

[2] See footnote 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a communication accompanying the instrument of accession the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the day on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also footnote 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles.

5. Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees

Done at New York on 31 January 1967

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 October 1967, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 4 October 1967, No. 8791.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 606, p. 267.
STATUS: Parties: 126.

Note: On the recommendation of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the High Commissioner submitted the draft of the above-mentioned Protocol to the General Assembly of the United Nations, through the Economic and Social Council, in the addendum to his report concerning measures to extend the personal scope of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The Economic and Social Council, in resolution 1186 (XLI)[1] of 18 November 1966, took note with approval of the draft Protocol and transmitted the said addendum to the General Assembly. The General Assembly, in resolution 2198 (XXI)[2] of 16 December 1966, took note of the Protocol and requested the Secretary-General "to transmit the text of the Protocol to the States mentioned in article V thereof, with a view to enabling them to accede to the Protocol."

Participant	*Accession, succession (d)*
Albania	18 Aug 1992
Algeria	8 Nov 1967
Angola	23 Jun 1981
Antigua and Barbuda	7 Sep 1995
Argentina	6 Dec 1967
Armenia	6 Jul 1993
Australia[3]	13 Dec 1973
Austria	5 Sep 1973
Azerbaijan	12 Feb 1993
Bahamas	15 Sep 1993
Belgium	8 Apr 1969
Belize	27 Jun 1990
Benin	6 Jul 1970
Bolivia	9 Feb 1982
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana	6 Jan 1969
Brazil	7 Apr 1972
Bulgaria	12 May 1993
Burkina Faso	18 Jun 1980
Burundi	15 Mar 1971
Cambodia	15 Oct 1992
Cameroon	19 Sep 1967
Canada	4 Jun 1969
Cape Verde	9 Jul 1987
Central African Republic	30 Aug 1967
Chad	19 Aug 1981
Chile	27 Apr 1972
China	24 Sep 1982
Colombia	4 Mar 1980
Congo	10 Jul 1970
Costa Rica	28 Mar 1978
Côte d'Ivoire	16 Feb 1970
Croatia	12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus	9 Jul 1968
Czech Republic[4]	11 May 1993 *d*
Denmark	29 Jan 1968
Djibouti	9 Aug 1977 *d*
Dominica	17 Feb 1994
Dominican Republic	4 Jan 1978
Ecuador	6 Mar 1969
Egypt	22 May 1981
El Salvador	28 Apr 1983
Equatorial Guinea	7 Feb 1986
Ethiopia	10 Nov 1969
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland	10 Oct 1968
France	3 Feb 1971
Gabon	28 Aug 1973
Gambia	29 Sep 1967
Germany[5, 6]	5 Nov 1969
Ghana	30 Oct 1968
Greece	7 Aug 1968
Guatemala	22 Sep 1983
Guinea	16 May 1968
Guinea-Bissau	11 Feb 1976
Haiti	25 Sep 1984
Holy See	8 Jun 1967
Honduras	23 Mar 1992
Hungary	14 Mar 1989
Iceland	26 Apr 1968
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 Jul 1976
Ireland	6 Nov 1968
Israel	14 Jun 1968
Italy	26 Jan 1972
Jamaica	30 Oct 1980
Japan	1 Jan 1982
Kenya	13 Nov 1981
Lesotho	14 May 1981
Liberia	27 Feb 1980
Liechtenstein	20 May 1968
Luxembourg	22 Apr 1971
Malawi	10 Dec 1987
Mali	2 Feb 1973
Malta	15 Sep 1971
Mauritania	5 May 1987
Morocco	20 Apr 1971
Mozambique	1 May 1989
Netherlands[7]	29 Nov 1968
New Zealand	6 Aug 1973
Nicaragua	28 Mar 1980
Niger	2 Feb 1970
Nigeria	2 May 1968
Norway	28 Nov 1967
Panama	2 Aug 1978
Papua New Guinea	17 Jul 1986
Paraguay	1 Apr 1970
Peru	15 Sep 1983
Philippines	22 Jul 1981
Poland	27 Sep 1991
Portugal	13 Jul 1976
Republic of Korea	3 Dec 1992
Romania	7 Aug 1991
Russian Federation	2 Feb 1993
Rwanda	3 Jan 1980
Samoa	29 Nov 1994
Sao Tome and Principe	1 Feb 1978

Participant	Accession, succession (d)
Senegal	3 Oct 1967
Seychelles	23 Apr 1980
Sierra Leone	22 May 1981
Slovakia[4]	4 Feb 1993 *d*
Slovenia	6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands	12 Apr 1995
Somalia	10 Oct 1978
Spain	14 Aug 1978
Sudan	23 May 1974
Suriname[8]	29 Nov 1978 *d*
Swaziland	28 Jan 1969
Sweden	4 Oct 1967
Switzerland	20 May 1968
Tajikistan	7 Dec 1993
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo	1 Dec 1969
Tunisia	16 Oct 1968
Turkey	31 Jul 1968
Tuvalu	7 Mar 1986 *d*
Uganda	27 Sep 1976
United Kingdom	4 Sep 1968
United Republic of Tanzania	4 Sep 1968
United States of America	1 Nov 1968
Uruguay	22 Sep 1970
Venezuela	19 Sep 1986
Yemen[9]	18 Jan 1980
Yugoslavia	15 Jan 1968
Zaire	13 Jan 1975
Zambia	24 Sep 1969
Zimbabwe	25 Aug 1981

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

ANGOLA

The Government of Angola, in accordance with article VII, paragraph 1, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article IV of the Protocol, concerning settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation of the Protocol.

BOTSWANA

"Subject to the reservation in respect of article IV of the said Protocol and in respect of the application in accordance with article I thereof of the provisions of articles 7, 17, 26, 31, 32 and 34 and paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951."

BURUNDI

In acceding to this Protocol, the Government of the Republic of Burundi enters the following reservations:

1. The provisions of article 22 are accepted, in respect of elementary education, only
   (*a*) In so far as they apply to public education, and not to private education;
   (*b*) On the understanding that the treatment applicable to refugees shall be the most favourable accorded to nationals of other States.
2. The provisions of article 17 (1) and (2) are accepted as mere recommendations and, in any event, shall not be interpreted as necessarily involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which the Republic of Burundi may have concluded regional, customs, economic or political agreements.
3. The provisions of article 26 are accepted only subject to the reservation that refugees:
   (*a*) Do not choose their place of residence in a region bordering on their country of origin;
   (*b*) Refrain, in any event, when exercising their right to move freely, from any activity or incursion of a subversive nature with respect to the country of which they are nationals.

CAPE VERDE

In all cases where the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees grants to refugees the most favorable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, this provision shall not be interpreted as involving the régime accorded to nationals of countries with which Cape Verde has concluded regional customs, economic or political agreements.

CHILE

(1) With the reservation that, with reference to the provisions of article 34, the Government of Chile will be unable to grant to refugees facilities greater than those granted to aliens in general, in view of the liberal nature of Chilean naturalization laws;

(2) With the reservation that the period specified in article 17, paragraph 2 (a) shall, in the case of Chile, be extended from three to ten years;

(3) With the reservation that article 17, paragraph 2 (c) shall apply only if the refugee is the widow or the widower of a Chilean spouse;

(4) With the reservation that the Government of Chile cannot grant a longer period for compliance with an expulsion order than that granted to other aliens in general under Chilean law.

CHINA

With a reservation in respect of article 4.

CONGO

The Protocol is accepted with the exception of article IV.

EL SALVADOR

With the reservation that the Government of El Salvador will not apply article 4 of the Protocol.

ETHIOPIA

Subject to the following reservation in respect of the application, under article I of the Protocol, of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951:

"The provisions of articles 8, 9, 17 (2) and 22 (1) of the Convention are recognized only as recommendations and not as legally binding obligations."

FINLAND

Subject to the reservations made in relation to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees,in accordance with article I of the Protocol.

GHANA

"The Government of Ghana does not consider itself bound by article IV of the Protocol regarding the settlement of disputes."

GUATEMALA

[See chapter V.2.]

HONDURAS

Reservation:

With respect to article I (1):

The Government of the Republic of Honduras does not consider itself bound by those articles of the Convention to which it has entered reservations.

ISRAEL

"The Government of Israel accedes to the Protocol subject to the same statements and reservations made at the time of ratifying the Convention [relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951], in accordance with the provisions of article VII (2) of the Protocol."

JAMAICA

1. "The Government of Jamaica understands articles 8 and 9 of the Convention as not preventing it from taking, in time of war or other grave and exceptional circumstances, measures in the interest of national security in the case of a refugee on the ground of his nationality."
2. "The Government of Jamaica can only undertake that the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 17 of the Convention will be applied so far as the law of Jamaica allows."
3. "The Government of Jamaica can only undertake that the provisions of article 24 of the Convention will be applied so far as the law of Jamaica allows."
4. "The Government of Jamaica can only undertake that the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of article 25 of the Convention will be applied so far as the law of Jamaica allows."
5. "The Government of Jamaica does not accept the obligation imposed by article IV of the Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees with regard to the settlement of disputes."

LUXEMBOURG

[See chapter V.2.]

MALAWI

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi reiterates its declaration on recognition as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice made on 12 December, 1966 in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court. In this respect, the Government of the Republic of Malawi regards the phrase 'settled by other means' in Article 38 of the Convention and Article IV of the Protocol to be those means stipulated in Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations."

MALTA

In accordance with article VII (2), the reservations to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951 by the Government of Malta on deposit of its instrument of accession on 17 June 1971, pursuant to article 42 of the said Convention, are applicable in relation to its obligations under the present Protocol.

NETHERLANDS[7]

"In accordance with article VII of the Protocol, all reservations made by the Kingdom of the Netherlands upon signature and ratification of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which was signed in Geneva on 28 July 1951, are regarded to apply to the obligations resulting from the Protocol."

PERU

Declaration:

[The Government of Peru] hereby expressly declares, with reference to the provisions of article I, paragraph 1, and article II of the aforementioned Protocol, that compliance with the obligations undertaken by virtue of the act of accession to that instrument shall be ensured by the Peruvian State using all the means at its disposal, and the Government of Peru shall endeavour in all cases to co-operate as far as possible with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

PORTUGAL

"1. The Protocol will be applied without any geographical limitation.

"2. In all cases in which the Protocol confers upon the refugees the most favoured person status granted to nationals of a foreign country, this clause will not be interpreted in such a way as to mean the status granted by Portugal to the nationals of Brazil or to the nationals of other countries with whom Portugal may establish commonwealth type relations."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Korea declares pursuant to article 7 of the Protocol that it is not bound by article 7 of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which provides for the exemption of refugees from legislative reciprocity after fulfilling the condition of three years' residence in the territory of the Contracting States."

RWANDA

Reservation to article IV:

For the settlement of any dispute between States Parties, recourse may be had to the International Court of Justice only with the prior agreement of the Rwandese Republic.

SOMALIA

[See chapter V.2.]

SWAZILAND

Reservations:

Subject to the following reservations in respect of the application of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951, under article I of the Protocol:

"(1) The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland is not in a position to assume obligations as contained in article 22 of the said Convention, and therefore will not consider itself bound by the provisions therein;

"(2) Similarly, the Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland is not in a position to assume the obligations of article 34 of the said Convention, and must expressly reserve the right not to apply the provisions therein."

Declaration:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Swaziland deems it essential to draw attention to the accession as a Member of the United Nations, and not as a Party to the [Convention relating to the Status of Refugees] by reason of succession or otherwise."

TURKEY

The instrument of accession stipulates that the Government of Turkey maintains the provisions of the declaration made under section B of article 1 of the Convention relating to the Status of

Refugees, done at Geneva on 28 July 1951, according to which it applies the Convention only to persons who have become refugees as a result of events occurring in Europe, and also the reservation clause made upon ratification of the Convention to the effect that no provision of this Convention may be interpreted as granting to refugees greater rights than those accorded to Turkish citizens in Turkey.

UGANDA

[See chapter V.2.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"(*a*) In accordance with the provisions of the first sentence of Article VII.4 of the Protocol, the United Kingdom hereby excludes from the application of the Protocol the following territories for the international relations of which it is responsible: Jersey, Southern Rhodesia, Swaziland.

"(*b*) In accordance with the provisions of the second sentence of Article VII.4 of the said Protocol, the United Kingdom hereby extends the application of the Protocol to the following territories for the international relations of which it is responsible: St. Lucia, Montserrat."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"Subject to the reservation, hereby made, that the provisions of Article IV of the Protocol shall not be applicable to the United Republic of Tanzania except within the explicit consent of the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

With the following reservations in respect of the application, in accordance with article I of the Protocol, of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York on 28 July 1951:

"The United States of America construes Article 29 of the Convention as applying only to refugees who are resident in the United States and reserves the right to tax refugees who are not residents of the United States in accordance with its general rules relating to non-resident aliens.

"The United States of America accepts the obligation of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 24 of the Convention except insofar as that paragraph may conflict in certain instances with any provisions of title II (old age, survivors' and disability insurance) or title XVIII (hospital and medical insurance for the aged) of the Social Security Act. As to any such provision, the United States will accord to refugees lawfully staying in its territory treatment no less favorable than is accorded aliens generally in the same circumstances."

VENEZUELA

Declarations:

In implementing the provisions of the Protocol which confer on refugees the most favourable treatment accorded to nationals of a foreign country, it shall be understood that such treatment does not include any rights and benefits which Venezuela has granted or may grant regarding entry into or sojourn in Venezuela territory to nationals of countries with which Venezuela has concluded regional or subregional integration, customs, economic or political agreements.

The instrument of accession also contains a reservation in respect of article IV.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

[See chapter V.2.]

ETHIOPIA

[See chapter V.2.]

FRANCE

[See chapter V.2.]

GERMANY[5]

[See chapter V.2.]

ITALY

[See chapter V.2.]

LUXEMBOURG

[See chapter V.2.]

NETHERLANDS

[See chapter V.2.]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands	29 Jul 1971	Surinam
United Kingdom[10]	20 Apr 1970	Bahama Islands

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-first Session, Supplement No. 1A* (E/4264/Add.1), p. 1.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/6316), p. 48.

[3] With the following declaration: "The Government of Australia will not extend the provisions of the Protocol to Papua/New Guinea."

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceeded to the Protocol on 26 November 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 4 September 1990. See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Protocol "shall also apply to Land Berlin with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bulgaria and Mongolia. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3. See also note 5 above.

[7] The Kingdom of the Netherlands accedes to the said Protocol so far as the territory of the Kingdom situated in Europe is concerned; and, as from 1 January 1986, for Aruba.

[8] See note 5 in chapter V.2.

[9] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[10] Subject to the reservation which was formulated on behalf of the Bahama Islands in respect of the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.

CHAPTER VI. NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

1. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENTS, CONVENTIONS AND PROTOCOLS ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, CONCLUDED AT THE HAGUE ON 23 JANUARY 1912, AT GENEVA ON 11 FEBRUARY 1925 AND 19 FEBRUARY 1925 AND 13 JULY 1931, AT BANGKOK ON 27 NOVEMBER 1931 AND AT GENEVA ON 26 JUNE 1936

Signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 December 1946, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article VII.
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1948, No. 186.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 12, p. 179.
STATUS: Signatories (subject to acceptance): 25. Parties: 62.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 54 (I)[1] of 19 November 1946.

The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol came into force on the dates indicated in respect of the Agreements and Conventions listed below as follows in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol:[2]

Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium (with Protocol, signed at Geneva on 11 February 1925	27 Oct 1947
International Opium convention (with Protocol), signed at Geneva on 19 February 1925	3 Feb 1948
Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs (with Protocol of Signature), signed at Geneva on 13 July 1931	21 Nov 1947
Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium Smoking, signed at Bangkok on 27 November 1931	27 Oct 1947
Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936	10 Oct 1947

Signatures and acceptances of the Protocol of 11 December 1946

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Afghanistan		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Albania		23 Jun 1947
Argentina		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Australia	11 Dec 1946	28 Aug 1947
Austria		17 May 1950
Bahamas		13 Aug 1975 *d*
Belarus		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Belgium		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Bolivia		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Brazil		17 Dec 1946 *s*
Canada		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Chile		11 Dec 1946 *s*
China[4]		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Colombia		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Costa Rica[5]	11 Dec 1946	
Cuba	12 Dec 1946	
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark[5]	11 Dec 1946	15 Jun 1949
Dominican Republic		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Ecuador	14 Dec 1946	8 Jun 1951
Egypt[5]	11 Dec 1946	13 Sep 1948
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 *d*
Finland		3 Feb 1948
France[5]	11 Dec 1946	10 Oct 1947
Germany[6,7]		12 Aug 1959
Greece[5]	11 Dec 1946	21 Feb 1949
Guatemala[5]	13 Dec 1946	
Haiti	14 Dec 1946	31 May 1951
Honduras		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Hungary		16 Dec 1955
India		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Iraq[5]	12 Dec 1946	14 Sep 1950
Ireland		18 Feb 1948
Italy		25 Mar 1948 *s*
Japan		27 Mar 1952
Lebanon		13 Dec 1946 *s*
Liberia		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Liechtenstein[8]		25 Sep 1947
Luxembourg[5]	11 Dec 1946	13 Oct 1949
Mexico		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Monaco		21 Nov 1947 *s*
Netherlands[5]	11 Dec 1946	10 Mar 1948
New Zealand		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Nicaragua	13 Dec 1946	24 Apr 1950
Norway[5]	11 Dec 1946	2 Jul 1947
Panama		15 Dec 1946 *s*
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *d*
Paraguay	14 Dec 1946	
Peru	26 Nov 1948	
Philippines[5]	11 Dec 1946	25 May 1950
Poland		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Romania		11 Oct 1961
Russian Federation	11 Dec 1946	25 Oct 1947
Saudi Arabia		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa[5]	15 Dec 1946	24 Feb 1948
Spain		26 Sep 1955 *s*
Sweden		17 Oct 1947 *s*
Switzerland[8]		25 Sep 1947
Syrian Arab Republic		11 Dec 1946 *s*

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Thailand		27 Oct 1947 *s*
Turkey		11 Dec 1946 *s*
Ukraine	11 Dec 1946	8 Jan 1948
United Kingdom		11 Dec 1946 *s*
United States of America	11 Dec 1946	12 Aug 1947
Uruguay	14 Dec 1946	
Venezuela	11 Dec 1946	
Yugoslavia[5]	11 Dec 1946	19 May 1948

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Part of the First Session, Resolutions* (A/64/Add.1), p. 81.

[2] The Protocol does not contain any formal amendment in respect of the Convention of 23 January 1912. However, its article III provides as follows:

"The functions conferred upon the Netherlands Government under articles 21 and 25 of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on 23 January 1912, and entrusted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations with the consent of the Netherlands Government, by a resolution of the League of Nations Assembly dated 15 December 1920, shall henceforward be exercised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

The Convention of 23 January 1912 (which, consequently, was amended in effect by the Protocol of 11 December 1946) has been included in the present chapter.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol, definitively, on 11 December 1946. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] The signature was affixed without reservation as to approval, but the full powers provided for signature subject to this reservation.

[6] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[7] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 22 January 1960, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Protocol "also applies to *Land Berlin* as from 12 August 1959, i.e., the day on which the Protocol entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 4, chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day [3 October 1990], it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*. See also note 6 above.

[8] The instrument of acceptance of the Protocol by the Government of the Swiss Confederation stipulates that the declaration of acceptance is also valid for the Principality of Liechtenstein.

2. International Opium Convention

The Hague, January 23rd, 1912[1]

Observation:[2] This Convention, although not concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations, served as a starting-point for the system devised by the League of Nations and has, in a sense, been incorporated in that system.

Schedule[3] *containing the signatures of the Convention, the signatures of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the First Opium Conference, provided for in the penultimate paragraph of Article 22 of the Convention, the ratifications of the Convention, and the signatures of the Protocol respecting the putting into force*[4] *of the Convention provided under "B" of the Final Protocol of the Third International Opium Conference.*

[The ratifications and signatures in accordance with Article 295 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles or in accordance with a similar article of other treaties of peace are marked with an asterisk (*).]

Participant	*Signatures of the Convention*	*Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference*	*Ratification of the Convention and accessions*	*Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)*
Afghanistan			May 5, 1944	
Albania		Feb 3, 1925	Feb 3, 1925	Feb 3, 1925
Argentine Republic		Oct 17, 1912	Apr 23, 1946	
Austria			Jul 16, 1920*	Jul 16, 1920*
Belgium[5]		Jun 18, 1912	Jun 16, 1914	May 14, 1919
Belgian Congo and Mandated Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (a)				
Bolivia		Jun 4, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Brazil		Oct 16, 1912	Dec 23, 1914	Jan 10, 1920*
Bulgaria		Mar 2, 1914	Aug 9, 1920*	Aug 9, 1920*
Chile		Jul 2, 1913	Jan 16, 1923	May 18, 1923
China[6]	Jan 23, 1912		Feb 9, 1914	Feb 11, 1915
Colombia[7]		Jan 15, 1913	Jun 26, 1924	Jun 30, 1924
Costa Rica		Apr 5, 1912	Aug 1, 1924	Jul 29, 1925
Cuba		May 8, 1913	Mar 8, 1920*	Mar 8, 1920*
Czechoslovakia[8]			Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Denmark[9]		Dec 17, 1912	Jul 10, 1913	Oct 21, 1921
Dominican Republic		Nov 12, 1912	Jun 7, 1923	Apr 14, 1931
Ecuador		Jul 2, 1912	Feb 25, 1915	Aug 23, 1923
Egypt (*a*)			Jun 5, 1942	
Estonia		Jan 9, 1923	Apr 20, 1923	Jan 21, 1931
Finland		Apr 24, 1922	May 16, 1922	Dec 1, 1922
France[10]	Jan 23, 1912		Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Germany	Jan 23, 1912		Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Great Britain[11]				
Burma[12]	Jan 23, 1912		Jul 15, 1914	Jan 10, 1920*
Greece			Mar 30, 1920*	Mar 30, 1920*
Guatemala		Jun 17, 1912	Aug 27, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*
Haiti		Aug 21, 1912	Jun 30, 1920*	Jun 30, 1920*
Honduras		Jul 5, 1912	Aug 29, 1913	Apr 3, 1915
Hungary			Jul 26, 1921*	Jul 26, 1921*
Iran[13]	Jan 23, 1912			
Italy	Jan 23, 1912		Jun 28, 1914	Jan 10, 1920*
Japan	Jan 23, 1912		Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Latvia		Feb 6, 1922	Mar 25, 1924	Jan 18, 1932
Liberia			Jun 30, 1920*	Jun 30, 1920*
Liechtenstein[14]				

Participant	*Signatures of the Convention*	*Signatures of the Protocol of the Powers not represented at the Opium Conference*	*Ratification of the Convention and accessions*	*Signatures of the Protocol relative to the bringing into force of the Convention (dates of the entry into force)*
Lithuania		Apr 7, 1922		
Luxembourg		Jun 18, 1912	Aug 21, 1922	Aug 21, 1922
Mexico		May 15, 1912	Apr 2, 1925	May 8, 1925
Monaco		May 1, 1923	Feb 20, 1925	May 26, 1925
Netherlands	Jan 23, 1912		Jul 28, 1914	Feb 11, 1915
Nicaragua		Jul 18, 1913	Nov 10, 1914	Nov 3, 1920
Norway		Sep 2, 1913	Nov 12, 1914	Sep 20, 1915
Panama		Jun 19, 1912	Nov 25, 1920*	Nov 25, 1920*
Paraguay (*a*)		Dec 14, 1912	Mar 17, 1943	
Peru		Jul 24, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Poland			Jan 10, 1920*	Jan 10, 1920*
Portugal	Jan 23, 1912		Dec 15, 1913	Apr 8, 1920*
Romania		Dec 27, 1913	Sep 14, 1920*	Sep 14, 1920*
Russia	Jan 23, 1912			
Salvador		Jul 30, 1912	Sep 19, 1922	May 29, 1931
Saudi Arabia (*a*)			Feb 19, 1943	
Spain		Oct 23, 1912	Jan 25, 1919	Feb 11, 1921
Sweden[15]		Aug 27, 1913	Apr 17, 1914	Jan 13, 1921
Switzerland[16]		Dec 29, 1913	Jan 15, 1925	Jan 15, 1925
Thailand[17]	Jan 23, 1912		Jul 10, 1913	Jan 10, 1920*
Turkey	Sep 15, 1933		Sep 15, 1933	Sep 15, 1933
United States of America	Jan 23, 1912		Dec 15, 1913	Feb 11, 1915
Uruguay		Mar 9, 1914	Apr 3, 1916	Jan 10, 1920*
Venezuela		Sep 10, 1912	Oct 28, 1913	Jul 12, 1927
Yugoslavia	Feb 10, 1920*	Feb 10, 1920*		

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[18,19]	*Accession, succession (d)*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975 *d*
Cambodia[19]	3 Oct 1951 *d*
Cameroon	20 Nov 1961 *d*
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 *d*
Congo	15 Oct 1962 *d*
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 *d*
Cyprus	16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[8]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Ethiopia	28 Dec 1948
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 *d*
Ghana	3 Apr 1958 *d*
Indonesia	29 May 1958
Israel	12 May 1952
Jamaica	26 Dec 1963 *d*
Jordan	12 May 1958
Lao People's Democratic Republic	7 Oct 1950 *d*
Lebanon	24 May 1954 *d*
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974 *d*

Participant	*Accession, succession (d)*
Malawi	22 Jul 1965 *d*
Malaysia	21 Aug 1958 *d*
Malta	3 Jan 1966 *d*
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Niger	25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria	26 Jun 1961 *d*
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 *d*
Philippines	30 Sep 1959 *d*
Rwanda	5 May 1964 *d*
Senegal	2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[8]	28 May 1993 *d*
Sri Lanka	4 Dec 1957 *d*
Syrian Arab Republic	20 Jan 1954 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Apr 1966 *d*
Zaire	31 May 1962 *d*
Zambia	9 Apr 1973 *d*

NOTES:

1 Registered No. 222. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 8, p. 187.

2 See note 2 in chapter VI.1.

3 This Schedule which appeared in the Annexes to the Supplementary Report on the Work of the League is reproduced here for purposes of information.

4 The Convention came into force initially on 11 February 1915, in accordance with the provisions of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention.

5 Subject to adherence or denunciation as regards the Belgian Congo.

6 See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1)

7 Subject to approval of the Colombian Parliament.

8 See note 11 in chapter I.2.

9 The signature of the Protocol of Signature of the Powers not represented at the Conference as well as its ratification were given by Denmark for Iceland and the Danish Antilles: the signature of the Protocol respecting the putting into force of the Convention was given by Denmark and Iceland.

10 With the reservation that a separate and special ratification or denunciation may subsequently be obtained for the French Protectorates. France and Great Britain signed the Convention for the New Hebrides, August 21st, 1924.

11 Subject to the following declaration:

The articles of the present Convention, if ratified by His Britannic Majesty's Government, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong-Kong, and Wei-Hai-Wei in every respect in the same way as they shall apply to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland: but His Britannic Majesty's Government reserve the right of signing or denouncing separately the said Convention in the name of any Dominion, Colony, Dependency, or Protectorate of His Majesty other than those which have been specified.

In virtue of the above-mentioned reservation, Great Britain signed the Convention for the following Dominions, Colonies, Dependencies, and Protectorates: on December 17th, 1912, for Canada, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Brunei, Cyprus, the East Africa Protectorate, Falkland Islands, Malay Protectorates, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Jamaica, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan Perlis, Trengganu, Malta, Northern Nigeria, Northern Borneo, Nyasaland, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Somaliland, Southern Nigeria, Trinidad, Uganda; on February 27th, 1913, for the Colony of Fiji; on April 22nd, 1913, for the Colony of Sierra Leone, the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate and the Solomon Islands Protectorate; on June 25th, 1913, for the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Commonwealth of Australia; on November 14th, 1913, for the Bahama Islands and for the three Colonies of the Windward Islands, that is to say, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent; on January 30th, 1914, for the Leeward Islands; on February 11th, 1914, for British Guiana as well as for British Honduras; on March 28th, 1914, for the Government of the Union of South Africa; on March 28th, 1914, for Zanzibar, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland; on April 4th, 1914, for the Colony of Barbados; on April 8th, 1914, for Mauritius and its dependencies; on July 11th, 1914, for the Bermuda Islands; on August 21st, 1924, for Palestine and together with France for the New Hebrides; on October 20th, 1914, for Iraq.

12 See note 3 in part II.2 in the League of Nations Treaties.

13 With the reservation of articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Iran having no treaty with China) and paragraph (*a*) of article 3.

14 The Netherlands Minister for Foreign Affairs, by a letter dated October 14th, 1936, transmitted to the Secretariat, at the request of the Swiss Legation at The Hague, the following declaration:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

15 Subject to the following declaration:

"Opium not being manufactured in Sweden, the Swedish Government will for the moment confine themselves to prohibiting the importation of prepared opium, but they declare at the same time that they are ready to take the measures indicated in Article 8 of the Convention if experience proves their expediency."

16 Subject to ratification and with the declaration that the Swiss Government will be unable to issue the necessary legal enactments within the terms fixed by the Convention.

17 With the reservation of articles 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 (Thailand having no treaty with China).

18 In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 16 December 1957.

In this connexion, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 7 February 1974 concerning the application, as from 16 December 1957, of the International Opium Convention of 23 January 1912, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Opium Convention, January 23rd, 1912, to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

19 By joint notifications received from the Governments of France and Viet-Nam (see note 31 in chapter I.2.) on 11 August 1950; from the Governments of France and Laos (see note 15 in chapter I.2.) on 7 October 1950; and from the Governments of France and Cambodia (see note 6 in chapter I.2.) on 3 October 1951, notice was given of the transfer of functions by the French Government to the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia of the duties and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in these countries. It should be noted that the Republic of Viet-Nam succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950 (see note 1 in chapter III.6).

3. Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium

Signed at Geneva on 11 February 1925, and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 October 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Agreement, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946 entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, notification (d) in respect of the Agreement as amended*	*Participant*	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, notification (d) in respect of the Agreement as amended*
Cambodia[1]	3 Oct 1951 *d*	Lao People's Democratic Republic[1]	7 Oct 1950 *d*
France	10 Oct 1947	Netherlands	10 Mar 1948
India	11 Oct 1946	Thailand	27 Oct 1947
Japan	27 Mar 1952	United Kingdom	11 Dec 1946

Notes:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Agreement on 11 August 1950. In this regard and in regard to the successions by Cambodia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, see note 19 in chapter VI.2.

4. Agreement concerning the Suppression of the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in, and Use of, Prepared Opium

Geneva, February 11th, 1925[1]

IN FORCE since July 28th, 1926 (article 14).

Ratifications

BRITISH EMPIRE (February 17th, 1926

The signature of this Protocol is subject, in respect of British Protectorates, to the conditions contained in Article XIII of the Agreement.

Burma[2]

INDIA (February 17th, 1926)

FRANCE (April 29th, 1926)

JAPAN (October 10th, 1928)

THE NETHERLANDS (including the *Netherlands Indies*, *Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (March 1st, 1927)

PORTUGAL (September 13th, 1926)

While accepting the principle of a monopoly as formulated in Article I, does so, as regards the moment at which the measures provided for in the first paragraph thereof shall come into force, subject to the limitation contained in the second paragraph of the article.

The Portuguese Government, being bound by a contract consistent with the provisions of The Hague Convention of 1912, will not be able to put into operation the provisions of paragraph I of Article VI of the present Agreement so long as its obligations under this contract are in force.

THAILAND (May 6th, 1927)

Under reservation of Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), with regard to the time when this provision shall come into force, and of Article V. The reason for these reservations had been stated by the First Delegate of Thailand on November 14th, 1924. The Thai Government is hoping to put into force the system of registration and rationing within the period of three years. After that date, the reservation in regard to Article I, paragraph 3 (*a*), will fall to the ground.

Notes:

[1] Registered under No. 1239. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 51, p. 337.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.2.

5. International Opium Convention

Signed at Geneva on 19 February 1925 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1948, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, or succession to the Convention and the said Protocol*	*Accession (a), succession (d) to the Convention as amended*
Afghanistan		29 Jan 1957 *a*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Argentina	11 Dec 1946	
Australia	28 Aug 1947	
Austria	17 May 1950	
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975	
Belgium	11 Dec 1946	
Benin		5 Dec 1961 *d*
Bolivia	14 Dec 1946	
Brazil	17 Dec 1946	
Burkina Faso		26 Apr 1963 *a*
Cambodia[1]		3 Oct 1951 *d*
Cameroon		20 Nov 1961 *d*
Canada	11 Dec 1946	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	11 Dec 1946	
Colombia	11 Dec 1946	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	15 Jun 1949	
Dominican Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Ecuador	8 Jun 1951	
Egypt	13 Sep 1948	
Ethiopia		9 Sep 1947 *a*
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	
Finland	3 Feb 1948	
France	10 Oct 1947	
Germany[3]	12 Aug 1959	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	21 Feb 1949	
Haiti	31 May 1951	
Honduras	11 Dec 1946	
Hungary	16 Dec 1955	
India	11 Dec 1946	
Indonesia		3 Apr 1958 *a*
Iraq	14 Sep 1950	
Ireland	18 Feb 1948	
Israel		16 May 1952 *a*
Italy	25 Mar 1948	
Jamaica		26 Dec 1963 *d*
Japan	27 Mar 1952	
Jordan		7 May 1958 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic[1]		7 Oct 1950 *d*
Lebanon	13 Dec 1946	
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liechtenstein[4]	25 Sep 1947	
Luxembourg	13 Oct 1949	
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 *d*
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Monaco	21 Nov 1947	
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Netherlands	10 Mar 1948	
New Zealand	11 Dec 1946	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	2 Jul 1947	
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *d*
Poland	11 Dec 1946	
Romania	11 Oct 1961	
Russian Federation	25 Oct 1947	
Rwanda		5 Aug 1964 *d*
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa	24 Feb 1948	
Spain	26 Sep 1955	
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 *d*
Sweden	17 Oct 1947	
Switzerland[4]	25 Sep 1947	
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Thailand	27 Oct 1947	
Togo		27 Feb 1962 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	11 Dec 1946	
Uganda		20 Oct 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	11 Dec 1946	
Yugoslavia	19 May 1948	
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*
Zambia		9 Apr 1973 *d*

Notes:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. In this regard and in regard to the successions by Cambodia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, see note 19 in chapter VI.2.

[2] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its definitive signature on 11 December 1946 of the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Convention of 1925, became a party to the Convention on the date of that signature. See also note 11 in note I.2.

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] With a declaration of application to the Principality of Liechtenstein.

6. (a) International Opium Convention

Geneva, February 19th, 1925[1]

IN FORCE since September 25th, 1928 (article 36).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Argentina (Apr 18th, 1946)
Austria (Nov 25th, 1927)
Belgium (Aug 24th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.
Belgian Congo and Mandated Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (Dec 17th, 1941 *a)*
Bolivia (Apr 15th, 1932 *a)*
1. Bolivia does not undertake to restrict the home cultivation or production of coca, or to prohibit the use of coca leaves by the native population.
2. The exportation of coca leaves shall be subject to control by the bolivian Government, by means of export certificates.
3. The Bolivian Government designates the following as places from which coca may be exported: Villazon, Yacuiba, Antofagasta, Arica and Mollendo.

Brazil (Jun 10th, 1932)
British Empire (Feb 17th, 1926)
His Britannic Majesty's ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada or the Irish Free State and, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 39 of the Convention, the instrument shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Colony of the Bahamas or the State of Sarawak under His Britannic Majesty's protection.
State of Sarawak (Mar 11th, 1926 *a)*
Bahamas (Oct 22nd, 1926 *a)*
Burma[2]
Canada (Jun 27th, 1928)
Australia (Feb 17th, 1926)
New Zealand (Feb 17th, 1926)
Including the mandated territory of *Western Samoa.*
Union of South Africa (Feb 17th, 1926)
Ireland (Sep 1st, 1931)
India (Feb 17th, 1926)
Iraq (Aug 8th, 1931 *a)*
Bulgaria (Mar 9th, 1927)
Chile (Apr 11th, 1933)
Colombia (Dec 3rd, 1930 *a)*
Costa Rica (Jan 8th, 1935 *a)*
Cuba (Jul 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia[3] (Apr 11th, 1927)
Denmark (Apr 23rd, 1930)
Dominican Republic (Jul 19th, 1928 *a)*
Ecuador (Oct 23rd, 1934 *a)*
Egypt (Mar 16th, 1926 *a)*
Estonia (Aug 30th, 1930 *a)*
Finland (Dec 5th, 1927 *a)*
France (Jul 2nd, 1927)
The French Government is compelled to make all reservations, as regards the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing, within the strictly prescribed time-limit, the quarterly statistics provided for in paragraph 2 of Article 22.
Germany (Aug 15th, 1929)
Subject to the reservation annexed to the Procès-verbal of the plenary meeting of February 16th, 1925. (The validity of the signature and ratification of this Convention are subject to the condition that a German expert will be appointed as a member of the Central Board.)
Greece (Dec 10th, 1929)
Haiti (Nov 30th, 1938 *a)*
Hungary (Aug 27th, 1930)
Honduras (Sep 21st, 1934 *a)*
Italy (for the Kingdom and *Colonies*) (Dec 11th, 1929 *a)*
Japan (Oct 10th, 1928)
Latvia (Oct 31st, 1928)
Liechtenstein[4]
Lithuania (Feb 13th, 1931 *a)*
Luxembourg (Mar 27th, 1928)
Monaco (Feb 9th, 1927 *a)*
The Netherlands
(including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao*) (Jun 4th, 1928)
Norway (Mar 16th, 1931 *a)*
New Hebrides (Dec 27th, 1927 *a)*
Paraguay (Jun 25th, 1941 *a)*
Poland (Jun 16th, 1927)
Portugal (Sep 13th, 1926)
Romania (May 18th, 1928 *a)*
Salvador (Dec 2nd, 1926 *a)*
San Marino (Apr 21st, 1926 *a)*
Spain (Jun 22nd, 1928)
Includes also the *Spanish Colonies and the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco*
Sudan (Feb 20th, 1926)
Sweden (Dec 6th, 1930 *a)*
Switzerland[4] (Apr 3rd, 1929)
With reference to the declaration made by the Swiss delegation at the 36th plenary meeting of the Conference concerning the forwarding of the quarterly statistics provided for in Article 22, paragraph 2.
Thailand (Oct 11th, 1929)
Turkey (Apr 3rd, 1933 *a)*
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Oct 31st, 1935 *a)*
Uruguay (Sep 11th, 1930)
Venezuela (Jun 19th, 1929 *a)*
Yugoslavia (Sep 4th, 1929)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
Iran
Ad referendum and subject to the League of Nations complying with the request made by Iran in the Memorandum O.D.C.24.
Nicaragua

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[5]	*Succession*	*Participant*	*Succession*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975	Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993	Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	Tonga	5 Sep 1973

(*b*) Protocol

Geneva, February 19th, 1925

IN FORCE since September 25th, 1928.

Ratifications or definitive accessions		*Ratifications or definitive accessions*	
Argentina	(Apr 18th, 1946)	Estonia	(Aug 30th, 1930 *a)*
British Empire	(Feb 17th, 1926)	Finland	(Dec 5th, 1927 *a)*
(Same reservation as for the Convention.)		Germany	(Aug 15th, 1929)
State of Sarawak	(Mar 11th, 1926 *a)*	Greece	(Dec 10th, 1929)
Bahamas	(Oct 22nd, 1926 *a)*	Haiti	(Nov 30th, 1938 *a)*
Burma[2]		Honduras	(Sep 21st, 1934 *a)*
Canada	(Jun 27th, 1928)	Japan	(Oct 10th, 1928)
Australia	(Feb 17th, 1926)	Latvia	(Oct 31st, 1928)
New Zealand	(Feb 17th, 1926)	Luxembourg	(Mar 27th, 1928)
Union of South Africa	(Feb 17th, 1926)	The Netherlands	
India	(Feb 17th, 1926)	(including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao*)	(Jun 4th, 1928)
Iraq	(Aug 8th, 1931 *a)*	Portugal	(Sep 13th, 1926)
Bolivia	(Apr 15th, 1932 *a)*	Romania	(May 18th, 1928 *a)*
Bulgaria	(Mar 9th, 1927)	Salvador	(Dec 2nd, 1926 *a)*
Chile	(Apr 11th, 1933)	Spain	(Apr 19th, 1930 *a)*
Colombia	(Dec 3rd, 1930 *a)*	*Sudan*	(Feb 20th, 1926)
Costa Rica	(Jan 8th, 1935 *a)*	Thailand	(Oct 11th, 1929)
Cuba	(Jul 6th, 1931)	Turkey	(Apr 3rd, 1933 *a)*
Czechoslovakia[3]	(Apr 11th, 1927)	Venezuela	(Jun 19th, 1929 *a)*
Ecuador	(Oct 23rd, 1934 *a)*	Yugoslavia	(Sep 4th, 1929)
Egypt	(Mar 16th, 1926 *a)*		

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania Iran Nicaragua

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Succession*	*Participant*	*Succession*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975	Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993	Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	Tonga	5 Sep 1973

NOTES:

[1] Registered under No. 1845. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 81, p. 317.

[2] See note 3 in part II.2 in the League of Nations Treaties.

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

[5] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the re-application of the Convention as from 7 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application as from 7 April 1958, of the International Opium Convention of 19 February 1925, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Opium Convention, February 19th 1925 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

7. Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs

Signed at Geneva on 13 July 1931 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 November 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, or succession or ratification in respect of the Convention and the said Protocol*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) in respect of the Convention as amended*
Afghanistan	11 Dec 1946	
Albania	23 Jun 1947	
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Argentina	11 Dec 1946	
Australia	28 Aug 1947	
Austria	17 May 1950	
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975	
Belgium	11 Dec 1946	
Benin		5 Dec 1961 *d*
Brazil	17 Dec 1946	
Burkina Faso		26 Apr 1963 *a*
Cambodia[1]		3 Oct 1951 *d*
Cameroon		20 Nov 1961 *d*
Canada	11 Dec 1946	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	11 Dec 1946	
China[2]	11 Dec 1946	
Colombia	11 Dec 1946	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	15 Jun 1949	
Dominican Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Ecuador	8 Jun 1951	
Egypt	13 Sep 1948	
Ethiopia		9 Sep 1947
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	
Finland	3 Feb 1948	
France	10 Oct 1947	
Germany[4]	12 Aug 1959	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	21 Feb 1949	
Guinea		26 Apr 1962 *d*
Haiti	31 May 1951	
Honduras	11 Dec 1946	
Hungary	16 Dec 1955	
India	11 Dec 1946	
Indonesia		3 Apr 1958 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	11 Dec 1946	
Iraq	14 Sep 1950	
Ireland	18 Feb 1948	
Israel		16 May 1952 *a*
Italy	25 Mar 1948	
Jamaica		26 Dec 1963 *d*
Japan	27 Mar 1952	
Jordan		12 Apr 1954 *a*

Participant	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, or succession or ratification in respect of the Convention and the said Protocol*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) in respect of the Convention as amended*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		7 Oct 1950 *d*
Lebanon	13 Dec 1946	
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liechtenstein[5]	25 Sep 1947	
Luxembourg	13 Oct 1949	
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 *d*
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	11 Dec 1946	
Monaco	21 Nov 1947	
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Netherlands	10 Mar 1948	
New Zealand	11 Dec 1946	
Nicaragua	24 Apr 1950	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	2 Jul 1947	
Panama	15 Dec 1946	
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980	
Philippines	25 May 1950	
Poland	11 Dec 1946	
Romania	11 Oct 1961	
Russian Federation	25 Oct 1947	
Rwanda		5 Aug 1964 *d*
Saudi Arabia	11 Dec 1946	
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa	24 Feb 1948	
Spain	26 Sep 1955	
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 *d*
Sweden	17 Oct 1947	
Switzerland[5]	25 Sep 1947	
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Dec 1946	
Thailand	27 Oct 1947	
Togo		27 Feb 1962 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	11 Dec 1946	
Uganda		20 Oct 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	11 Dec 1946	
United Republic of Tanzania		3 Jul 1964 *a*
United States of America	12 Aug 1947	
Yugoslavia		10 Jun 1949 *a*
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*
Zambia		9 Apr 1973 *d*

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France, United Kingdom	17 Mar 1950	Archipelago of the New Hebrides under French and British Condominium
United Kingdom	7 Mar 1949	Aden, Malta, Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia
	5 Apr 1949	Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony
	13 Feb 1952	Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate and Swaziland

NOTES:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Convention on 11 August 1950. In this regard and in regard to the successions by Cambodia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, see note 19 in chapter VI.2.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its definitive signature on 11 December 1946 of the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Convention of 1931, became a party to the Convention on the date of that signature. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] See note 8 in chapter VI.1.

8. (*a*) Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs

Geneva, July 13th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since July 9th, 1933 (Article 30).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan (June 21st, 1935 *a*)
Albania (October 9th, 1937 *a*)
United States of America (April 28th, 1932)

1. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purpose of internal control and control of import into, and export from, territory under its jurisdiction, of opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures stricter than the provisions of the Convention.
2. The Government of the United States of America reserves the right to impose, for purposes of controlling transit through its territories of raw opium, coca leaves, all of their derivatives and similar substances produced by synthetic process, measures by which the production of an import permit issued by the country of destination may be made a condition precedent to the granting of permission for transit through its territory.
3. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to send statistics of import and export to the Permanent Central Opium Board short of 60 days after the close of the three-months period to which such statistics refer.
4. The Government of the United States of America finds it impracticable to undertake to state separately amounts of drugs purchased or imported for Government purposes.
5. Plenipotentiaries of the United States of America formally declare that the signing of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs by them on the part of the United States of America on this date is not to be construed to mean that the Government of the United States of America recognises a régime or entity which signs or accedes to the Convention as the Government of a country when that régime or entity is not recognised by the Government of the United States of America as the Government of that country.
6. The plenipotentiaries of the United States of America further declare that the participation of the United States of America in the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed on this date, does not involve any contractual obligation on the part of the United States of America to a country represented by a régime or entity which the Government of the United States of America does not recognise as the government of that country until such country has a government recognised by the Government of the United States of America.

Saudi Arabia (August 15th, 1936)
Argentina (April 18th, 1946)
Austria (July 3rd, 1934)
Belgium (April 10th, 1933)
This ratification does not include the Belgian Congo, nor the Territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate.
Belgian Congo and Mandated Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (December 17th, 1941 *a*)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (April 5th, 1933)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2] (April 1st, 1933)
His majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of any of his Colonies, Protectorates and Overseas Territories or territories under suzerainty or under mandate exercised by his Government in the United Kingdom.
British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gilbraltar, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong-Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], North Borneo (State of), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland Protectorate, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Zanzibar Protectorate (May 18th, 1936 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia (July 14th, 1937 a)
Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, Fiji, Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Kedah, Perlis and Brunei], Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena and Ascension, Trans-Jordan, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent), Burma (August 24th, 1938 a)
Newfoundland (June 28th, 1937 *a*)
Canada (October 17th, 1932)
Australia (January 24th, 1934 *a*)
This accession applies to *Papua, Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.
New Zealand (June 17th, 1935 *a*)
Union of South Africa (January 4th, 1938 *a*)
Ireland (April 11th, 1933 *a*)
India (November 14th, 1932)
Bulgaria (March 20th, 1933 *a*)
Chile (March 31st, 1933)
China[3] (January 10th, 1934 *a*)
Colombia (January 29th, 1934 *a*)
Costa Rica (April 5th, 1933)
Cuba (April 4th, 1933)
Czechoslovakia[4] (April 12th, 1933)
Denmark (June 5th, 1936)
Dominican Republic (April 8th, 1933)
Ecuador (April 13th, 1935 *a*)
Egypt (April 10th, 1933)
Estonia (July 5th, 1935 *a*)
Finland (September 25th, 1936 *a*)
France (April 10th, 1933)
The French Government makes every reservation, with regard to the Colonies, Protectorates and mandated Territories under its authority, as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.
Germany (April 10th, 1933)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Greece (December 27th, 1934)
Guatemala (May 1st, 1933)
Haiti (May 4th, 1933 *a*)
Honduras (September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Hungary (April 10th, 1933 *a*)
Iran (September 28th, 1932)
Iraq (May 30th, 1934 *a*)
Italy (March 21st, 1933)
Japan[5] (June 3rd, 1935)

The Japanese Government declare that, in view of the necessity of close co-operation between the High Contracting Parties in order to carry out most effectively the provisions of the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on July 13th, 1931, they understand that the present position of Japan, regardless of whether she be a Member of the League of Nations or not, is to be maintained in the matter of the composition of the organs and the appointment of the members thereof mentioned in the said Convention.

Latvia (August 3rd, 1937 *a*)
Liechtenstein[6]
Lithuania (April 10th, 1933)
Luxembourg (May 30th, 1936)
Mexico (March 13th, 1933)

The Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory—as it had already done—measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the preparation, use, possession, importation, exportation and consumption of the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Monaco (February 16th, 1933)
The Netherlands (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (May 22nd, 1933)
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway (September 12th, 1934 *a*)
Panama (April 15th, 1935)
Paraguay (June 25th, 1941)
Peru (May 20th, 1932 *a*)
Poland (April 11th, 1933)
Portugal (June 17th, 1932)

The Portuguese Government makes every reservation with regard to its colonies as to the possibility of regularly producing the quarterly statistics referred to in Article 13 within the strict time-limit laid down.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Romania (April 11th, 1933)
Salvador (April 7th, 1933 *a*)

(a) The Republic of Salvador does not agree to the provisions of Article 26, on the ground that there is no reason why the High Contracting Parties should be given the option of not applying the Convention to their colonies, protectorates, and overseas mandated territories.

(b) The Republic of Salvador states that it disagrees with the reservations embodied in Nos. 5 and 6 of the Declarations made by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America regarding Governments not recognised by the Government of that country; in its opinion, those reservations constitute an infringement of the national sovereignty of Salvador, whose present Government, though not as yet recognised by the United States Government, has been recognised by the majority of the civilised countries of the world. Their recognition is due to their conviction that that Government is a perfectly constitutional one and affords a full and complete guarantee of the performance of its international duties, inasmuch as it enjoys the unanimous, decided and effective support of all the inhabitants of the Republic, whether citizens of the country or foreigners resident therein.

As it respects the internal régimes of other nations, the Republic of Salvador considers that the Convention in question, being of a strictly hygienic and humanitarian character, does not offer a suitable occasion to formulate such political reservations as have called forth this comment.

San Marino (June 12th, 1933)
Spain (April 7th, 1933)
Sudan (August 25th, 1932 *a*)
Sweden (August 12th, 1932)
Switzerland[6] (April 10th, 1933)
Thailand (February 22nd, 1934)

As its harmful-habit-forming drugs law goes beyond the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the present Convention on certain points, the Thai Government reserves the right to apply its existing law.

Turkey (April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (October 31st, 1935 *a*)
Uruguay (April 7th, 1933)
Venezuela (November 15th, 1933)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia

Liberia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7]	*Ratification, succession (d)*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975
Czech Republic[4]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 *d*
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 *d*
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 *d*

(*b*) Protocol of Signature

Geneva, July 13th, 1931

IN FORCE since July 9th, 1933.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania	(October 9th, 1937 *a*)
Austria	(July 3rd, 1934)
United States of America	(April 28th, 1932)
Saudi Arabia	(August 15th, 1936)
Belgium	(April 10th, 1933)
Brazil	(April 5th, 1933)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	(April 1st, 1933)
Same reservation as for the Convention.	
British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate) Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong-Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], North Borneo (State of), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland Protectorate, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Zanzibar Protectorate	(May 18th, 1936 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia	*(July 14th, 1937 a)*
Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, Fiji, Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Kedah, Perlis and Brunei], Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena and Ascension, Trans-Jordan, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Vincent), Burma	(August 24th, 1938 *a*)
Newfoundland	(June 28th, 1937 *a*)
Canada	(October 17th, 1932)
Australia	(January 24th, 1934 *a*)
New Zealand	(June 17th, 1935 *a*)
Union of South Africa	(January 4th, 1938 *a*)
Ireland	(April 11th, 1933 *a*)
India	(November 14th, 1932)
Chile	(November 20th, 1933)
Colombia	(January 29th, 1934 *a*)
Costa Rica	(April 5th, 1933)
Cuba	(April 4th, 1933)
Czechoslovakia[4]	(April 12th, 1933 *a*)
Denmark	(June 5th, 1936)
Dominican Republic	(April 8th, 1933)
Ecuador	(April 13th, 1935 *a*)
Egypt	(April 10th, 1933)
Estonia	(July 5th, 1935 *a*)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 *a*)
France	(April 10th, 1933)
Germany	(April 10th, 1933)
Greece	(December 27th, 1934)
Honduras	(September 21st, 1934 *a*)
Hungary	(April 10th, 1933 *a*)
Iran	(September 28th, 1932)
Italy	(March 21st, 1933)
Japan	(June 3rd, 1935)
Liechtenstein[6]	
Lithuania	(April 10th, 1933)
Luxembourg	(May 30th, 1936)
Mexico	(March 13th, 1933)
Monaco	(March 20th, 1933)
The Netherlands[8] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*)	(May 22nd, 1933)
Nicaragua	(March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway	(September 12th, 1934 *a*)
Peru	(May 20th, 1932 *a*)
Poland	(April 11th, 1933)
Portugal	(June 17th, 1932)
Romania	(April 11th, 1933)
San Marino	(June 12th, 1933)
Spain	(April 7th, 1933)
Sudan	(January 18th, 1933 *a*)
Sweden	(August 12th, 1932)
Switzerland[6]	(April 10th, 1933)
Thailand	(February 22nd, 1934)
Turkey	(April 3rd, 1933 *a*)
Uruguay	(April 7th, 1933)
Venezuela	(September 11th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia Guatemala Paraguay
Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7]	*Ratification, succession (d)*
Bahamas	13 Aug 1975
Czech Republic[4]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 *d*
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980 *d*
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 *d*

NOTES:

1 Registered under No. 3219. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 139, p. 301.

2 On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension made by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands and (dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[*For the text of the declaration see note 20 chapter IV.1.*]

3 See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

4 See note 11 in chapter I.2.

5 Before ratifying the Convention with the declaration here set out, the Japanese Government consulted the Contracting Parties, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General. A summary of the correspondence which took place was published in the League of Nations *Official Journal* for September 1935 (16th Year, No. 9).

6 The Swiss Federal Political Department, by a letter dated July 15th, 1936, informed the Secretariat of the following:

"Under the terms of the arrangements concluded between the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Swiss Government in 1929 and 1935, in application of the Customs Union Treaty concluded between these two countries on March 29th, 1923, the Swiss legislation on narcotic drugs, including all the measures taken by the Federal authorities to give effect to the different international Conventions on dangerous drugs, will be applicable to the territory of the Principality in the same way as to the territory of the Confederation, as long as the said Treaty remains in force. The Principality of Liechtenstein will accordingly participate, so long as the said Treaty remains in force, in the international Conventions which have been or may hereafter be concluded in the matter of narcotic drugs, it being neither necessary nor advisable for that country to accede to them separately."

7 In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the re-application of the Conventions as from 7 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 16 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 7 April 1958, of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic this declaration has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the re-application of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, July 13th, 1931 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession,"

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

8 The instrument of ratification specifies that the reservation relating to paragraph 2 of article 22, as formulated by the Representative of the Netherlands at the time of signature of the Protocol, should be considered as withdrawn.

9. Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium Smoking

Signed at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 October 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Agreement, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, notification (d) in respect of the Agreement as amended*	*Participant*	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946, notification (d) in respect of the Agreement as amended*
Cambodia[1]	3 Oct 1951 *d*	Lao People's Democratic Republic[1]	7 Oct 1950 *d*
France	10 Oct 1947	Netherlands	10 Mar 1948
India	11 Dec 1946	Thailand	27 Oct 1947
Japan	27 Mar 1952	United Kingdom	11 Dec 1946

Notes:

[1] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeeded to the Agreement on 11 August 1950. In this regard and in regard to the successions by Cambodia and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, see note 19 in chapter VI.2.

10. Agreement concerning the Suppression of Opium Smoking

Bangkok, November 27th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since April 22nd, 1937 (Article VI).

Participant	*Ratifications*	*Participant*	*Ratifications*
France	(May 10th, 1933)	Thailand	(Nov 19th, 1934)
India	(Dec 4th, 1935)	With reservation to Article I.	
Japan	(Jan 22nd, 1937)	United Kingdom of Great Britain	
Netherlands	(May 22nd, 1933)	and Northern Ireland	(Apr 3rd, 1933)
Portugal	(Jan 27th, 1934)		

Notes:

[1] Registration No. 4100. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 177, p. 373.

11. Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs

Signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 October 1947, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 11 December 1946, entered into force in accordance with paragraph 2 of article VII of the Protocol.

Participant	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 11 December 1946*	*Ratification, accession (a) in respect of the Convention as amended*
Austria		17 May 1950
Belgium	11 Dec 1946	
Brazil	17 Dec 1946	
Cambodia		3 Oct 1951 *a*
Cameroon		15 Jan 1962 *a*
Canada	11 Dec 1946	
Chile		21 Nov 1972 *a*
China[1]	11 Dec 1946	
Colombia	11 Dec 1946	
Côte d'Ivoire		20 Dec 1961 *a*
Cuba		9 Aug 1967
Dominican Republic		9 Jun 1958 *a*
Egypt	13 Sep 1948	
Ethiopia		9 Sep 1947 *a*
France	10 Oct 1947	
Greece	21 Feb 1949	
Haiti	31 May 1951	
India	11 Dec 1946	
Indonesia		3 Apr 1958 *a*
Israel		16 May 1952 *a*
Italy		3 Apr 1961 *a*
Japan		7 Sep 1955
Jordan		7 May 1958 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		13 Jul 1951 *a*
Liechtenstein		24 May 1961 *a*
Luxembourg		28 Jun 1955 *a*
Madagascar		11 Dec 1974 *a*
Malawi		8 Jun 1965 *a*
Mexico		6 May 1955
Netherlands[2,3]		[19 Mar 1959]
Romania	11 Oct 1961	
Rwanda		15 Jul 1981 *a*
Spain[4]		5 Jun 1970
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 *a*
Switzerland		31 Dec 1952
Turkey	11 Dec 1946	

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba expressly reserves its position on the provisions of article 17 of the Convention, being ready to settle any dispute which may arise on the interpretation or application of the Convention bilaterally, by means of diplomatic consultations.

ITALY

. . . In exercise of the right accorded to it by article 13, paragraph 2, of the said Convention, the Government of Italy desires that, in the case of letters of request concerning narcotic drugs, the procedure hitherto followed in previous relations with the other Contracting States should continue to be used and, failing that, the diplomatic channel, provided, however, that the method specified in article 13, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (*c*) should be adopted in cases of emergency.

MEXICO

In accepting the provisions of articles 11 and 12 of this Convention, the Government of the United States of Mexico wishes to state explicitly that its Central Office will exercise the powers granted to it by the said Convention unless such powers have been expressly conferred by the General Constitution of the Republic on an agency of a constituent State, being an agency established before the date of the entry into force of this Convention, and that the Government of the United States of Mexico reserves the right to impose in its territory—as it has already done—measures more severe than those laid down by the Convention itself, for the restriction of the cultivation or the manufacture, extraction, possession, offering for sale, importation or exportation of or traffic in the drugs to which the present Convention refers.

Notes:

[1] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[2] The instrument of ratification stipulates that the Convention and the Protocol of signature will be applicable to the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands New Guinea. In a communication received on 4 August 1960, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will be applicable to the Netherlands Antilles. The ratification was made subject to the reservation recorded in the Protocol of Signature annexed to the Convention; for the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 327, p. 322.

[3] In a communication received on 14 December 1965, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General of the denunciation of the Convention for the territory of the Kingdom in Europe and the Territories of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The denunciation took effect on 14 December 1966.

[4] Instrument of ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention. Spain, on behalf of which the Protocol of 11 December 1946 amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs concluded at the Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936 was signed definitively on 26 September 1955 (see chapter VI.1), has, as a result of the said definitive signature and of its ratification of the unamended 1936 Convention, become a party to the said Convention of 1936 as amended by the said Protocol of 1946.

12. (*a*) Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs

Geneva, June 26th, 1936[1]

IN FORCE since October 26th, 1939 (Article 22).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (Nov 27th, 1937)
Belgium does not assume any obligation as regards the Belgian Congo and the Territories of Ruanda–Urundi in respect of which a mandate is being exercised by her on behalf of the League of Nations.
Brazil (Jul 2nd, 1938)
Canada (Sep 27th, 1938)
China[2] (Oct 21st, 1937)
Colombia (Apr 11th, 1944)
Egypt (Jan 29th, 1940)
France (Jan 16th, 1940)
The French Government does not assume any obligations as regards its Colonies or Protectorates or the territories placed under its mandate.
Greece (Feb 16th, 1938)
Guatemala (Aug 2nd, 1938 *a*)
Haiti (Nov 30th, 1938 *a*)
India (Aug 4th, 1937)
Romania (Jun 28th, 1938)
Turkey (Jul 28th, 1939 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Bulgaria
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[3]
Denmark
Ecuador
Estonia
Honduras
Hungary
Monaco
Panama
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary–General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Spain[4]	5 Jun 1970
Pakistan[5]	

(*b*) Protocol of Signature

Geneva, June 26th, 1936

IN FORCE since October 26th, 1939.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (Nov 27th, 1937)
Brazil (Jul 2nd, 1938)
Canada (Sep 27th, 1938)
China[2] (Oct 21st, 1937)
Colombia (Apr 11th, 1944)
Egypt (Jan 29th, 1940)
France (Jan 16th, 1940)
Same reservation as for the Convention.
Greece (Feb 16th, 1938)
Guatemala (Aug 2nd, 1938 *a*)
Haiti (Nov 30th, 1938 *a*)
India (Aug 4th, 1937)
Romania (Jun 28th, 1938)
Turkey (Jul 28th, 1939 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Bulgaria
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[3]
Denmark
Ecuador
Estonia
Honduras
Hungary
Monaco
Panama
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Uruguay
Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Spain[4]	5 Jun 1970
Pakistan[5]	

NOTES:

[1] Registration No. 4648. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 198, p. 299.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note 4 in chapter VI.11.

[5] A notification of denunciation by the Government of Pakistan was received by the Secretary-General on 9 July 1965. It should be noted, however, that the Government of Pakistan, not having previously notified its succession to the Convention, was not, under the international practice to which the Secretary-General adheres to as the depositary of multilateral treaties, considered at that time as a party to the Convention.

13. Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946

Signed at Paris on 19 November 1948[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1949, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1949, No. 688.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 44, p. 277.
STATUS: Signatories: 40. Parties: 87.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 211 (III)[1] of 8 October 1948.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Afghanistan		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Albania	19 Nov 1948	25 Jul 1949
Argentina	19 Nov 1948	
Australia		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Austria		17 May 1950
Bahamas		13 Aug 1975 *d*
Belarus		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Belgium	19 Nov 1948	21 Nov 1951
Benin		5 Dec 1961 *d*
Bolivia	19 Nov 1948	
Brazil	19 Nov 1948	9 Dec 1959
Burkina Faso		26 Apr 1963
Cameroon		20 Nov 1961 *d*
Canada		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	19 Nov 1948	
China[3]		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Colombia	19 Nov 1948	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Costa Rica	19 Nov 1948	
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Cuba		30 Jun 1961
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	19 Nov 1948	19 Oct 1949
Dominican Republic	19 Nov 1948	9 Jun 1958
Ecuador	19 Nov 1948	30 Aug 1962
Egypt	6 Dec 1948	16 Sep 1949
El Salvador	19 Nov 1948	31 Dec 1959
Ethiopia		5 May 1949 *s*
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 *d*
Finland		31 Oct 1949
France	19 Nov 1948	11 Jan 1949
Germany[5,6]		12 Aug 1959
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	7 Dec 1948	29 Jul 1952
Guatemala	19 Nov 1948	
Honduras	19 Nov 1948	
Hungary		2 Jul 1957
India	19 Nov 1948	10 Nov 1950
Indonesia		21 Feb 1951
Iraq	12 Jul 1949	27 Jul 1954
Ireland		11 Aug 1952
Israel		16 May 1952
Italy		14 Mar 1949 *s*
Jamaica		26 Dec 1963 *d*
Japan		5 May 1952
Jordan		7 May 1958
Lao People's Democratic Republic[2]		7 Oct 1950 *d*
Lebanon		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liberia	19 Nov 1948	
Liechtenstein	19 Nov 1948	24 May 1961
Luxembourg	19 Nov 1948	17 Oct 1952
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 *d*
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Monaco		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Myanmar	19 Nov 1948	2 Mar 1950
Netherlands	19 Nov 1948	26 Sep 1950
New Zealand		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Nicaragua	19 Nov 1948	13 Jan 1961
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	19 Nov 1948	24 May 1949
Pakistan	21 Nov 1948	27 Aug 1952
Panama	19 Nov 1948	
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *d*
Paraguay	19 Nov 1948	
Peru	19 Nov 1948	
Philippines	10 Mar 1949	7 Dec 1953
Poland		26 Jan 1949 *s*
Romania	19 Nov 1948	11 Oct 1961
Russian Federation		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Rwanda		30 Apr 1964 *d*
San Marino	19 Nov 1948	
Saudi Arabia		19 Nov 1948 *s*
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa		8 Dec 1948 *s*
Spain		26 Sep 1955 *s*
Sri Lanka		17 Jan 1949
Sweden		3 Mar 1949 *s*
Switzerland	19 Nov 1948	18 Mar 1953
Togo		27 Feb 1962 *d*
Tonga		5 Sep 1973 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	19 Nov 1948	14 Jul 1950
Uganda		15 Apr 1965
Ukraine	19 Nov 1948	7 May 1959
United Kingdom		19 Nov 1948 *s*
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Oct 1964
United States of America	19 Nov 1948	11 Aug 1950
Uruguay	22 Nov 1948	
Venezuela	19 Nov 1948	
Yemen[7]		12 Dec 1949 *s*
Yugoslavia	19 Nov 1948	10 Jun 1949
Zaire		13 Aug 1962 *d*
Zambia		9 Apr 1973 *d*

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territorial Application: Territories
Australia	19 Nov 1948	All territories including the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru
Belgium	27 Jan 1953	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
Denmark	19 Oct 1949	Greenland
France	15 Sep 1949	Departments of Algeria, Overseas Departments (Guadeloupe, Guiana, Martinique, Réunion), Overseas Territories (French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, French Somaliland, Madagascar and Dependencies, Comoro Islands, French Establishments in India, New Caledonia and Dependencies, French Establishments in Oceania, Saint-Pierre and Miquelon); Tunisia and Morocco (French zone of the Sherifian Empire); Trust Territories of Togoland and the Cameroons under French Administration
	25 Nov 1949	Viet-Nam
	28 Dec 1949	Laos
France/United Kingdom	15 Sep 1949/ 27 Feb 1950	The New Hebrides Archipelago under Anglo-French Condominium
Italy	12 Mar 1954	Somaliland
Netherlands	14 Aug 1952	Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand	19 Nov 1948	All the territories, including the Trust Territory of Western Samoa
South Africa	5 Oct 1954	South West Africa
United Kingdom	19 Nov 1948	Aden, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya, Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Malayan Federation, Malta, Mauritius, Newfoundland, Nigeria, North Borneo, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands Protectorate, Somaliland Protectorate, Southern Rhodesia, St. Helena, Tanganyika, Tonga, Trinidad, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar Protectorate
United States of America	11 Aug 1950	All territories for the foreign relations of which it is responsible

NOTES:

[1] Resolution 211 (III). *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Resolutions* (A/810), p. 62.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had succeded to the Protocol on 11 August 1950. In this regard and in regard to the succession by the Lao People's Democratic Republic, see note 19 in chapter VI.2.

[3] See note concerning signature, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Protocol on 19 November 1948 and 17 January 1950, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a communication received on 22 January 1960, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Protocol "also applies to *Land Berlin* as from 12 September 1959, i.e., the day on which the Protocol entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*. See also note 5 above.

[7] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

14. Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium

Done at New York on 23 June 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 March 1963, in accordance with article 21.
REGISTRATION: 8 March 1963, No. 6555.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 456, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 33. Parties: 49.

Note: The Protocol was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Opium Conference, held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 11 May to 18 June 1953. The Conference was convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to resolution 436 A (XIV)[1] of 27 May 1952 of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The Conference also adopted the Final Act and seventeen resolutions, for the text of which see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 456, p. 3.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina		24 Mar 1958 *a*
Australia		13 Jan 1955 *a*
Belgium		30 Jun 1958 *a*
Brazil		3 Nov 1959 *a*
Cambodia	29 Dec 1953	22 Mar 1957
Cameroon		15 Jan 1962 *d*
Canada	23 Dec 1953	7 May 1954
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	9 Jul 1953	9 May 1957
China[3]		
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Costa Rica	16 Oct 1953	
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Cuba		8 Sep 1954 *a*
Denmark	23 Jun 1953	20 Jul 1954
Dominican Republic	23 Jun 1953	9 Jun 1958
Ecuador	23 Jun 1953	17 Aug 1955
Egypt	23 Jun 1953	8 Mar 1954
El Salvador		31 Dec 1959 *a*
France	23 Jun 1953	21 Apr 1954
Germany[4, 5]	23 Jun 1953	12 Aug 1959
Greece	23 Jun 1953	6 Feb 1963
Guatemala		29 May 1956 *a*
India	23 Jun 1953	30 Apr 1954
Indonesia		11 Jul 1957 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Dec 1953	30 Dec 1959
Iraq	29 Dec 1953	
Israel	30 Dec 1953	8 Oct 1957
Italy	23 Jun 1953	13 Nov 1957
Japan	23 Jun 1953	21 Jul 1954
Jordan		7 May 1958 *a*
Lebanon	11 Nov 1953	
Liechtenstein	23 Jun 1953	24 May 1961
Luxembourg		28 Jun 1955 *a*
Madagascar		31 Jul 1963 *d*
Monaco	26 Jun 1953	12 Apr 1956
Netherlands	30 Dec 1953	
New Zealand[6]	[28 Dec 1953]	[2 Nov 1956]
Nicaragua		11 Dec 1959 *a*
Niger		7 Dec 1964 *d*
Pakistan	3 Dec 1953	10 Mar 1955
Panama	28 Dec 1953	13 Apr 1954
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *d*
Philippines	23 Jun 1953	1 Jun 1955
Republic of Korea	23 Jun 1953	29 Apr 1958
Rwanda		30 Apr 1964 *d*
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
South Africa	29 Dec 1953	9 Mar 1960
Spain	22 Oct 1953	15 Jun 1956
Sri Lanka		4 Dec 1957 *a*
Sweden		16 Jan 1958 *a*
Switzerland	23 Jun 1953	27 Nov 1956
Turkey	28 Dec 1953	15 Jul 1963
United Kingdom	23 Jun 1953	
United States of America	23 Jun 1953	18 Feb 1955
Venezuela	30 Dec 1953	
Yugoslavia	24 Jun 1953	
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CAMBODIA

The Royal Government of Cambodia expresses its intention of availing itself of the provisions of article 19 of the Protocol.

FRANCE

It is expressly declared that the French Government reserves the right, in respect of French establishments in India, to apply the transitional measures of article 19 of this Protocol, it being understood that the period mentioned in paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (*b*) (iii) of that article shall be fifteen years after the coming into effect of this Protocol.

The French Government likewise reserves the right in accordance with the transitional measures of article 19 to authorize the export of opium to French establishments in India for the same period of time.

INDIA

"1. It is hereby expressly declared that the Government of India, in accordance with the provisions of article 19 of this Protocol, will permit

"(i) The use of opium for quasi-medical purposes until 31 December 1959;

"(ii) The production of opium and the export thereof, for quasi-medical purposes, to Pakistan, Ceylon, Aden and the

French and Portuguese possessions on the subcontinent of India for a period of fifteen years from the date of the coming into force of this Protocol; and

"(iii) The smoking of opium, for their lifetime,by addicts not under 21 years of age, registered by the appropriate authorities for that purpose on or before 30 September 1953.

"2. The Government of India expressly reserve to themselves the right to modify this declaration or to make any other declaration under article 19 of this Protocol, at the time of the deposit by them of their instrument of ratification."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

"The Imperial Government of Iran, in accordance with article 25 of the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium, done at New York on 23 June 1953, and in accordance with article 16 of the Bill approved by the Iranian Parliament on 16 Bahman 1337 (7 February 1959), declares its ratification of the Protocol, and hereby further specifies that its ratification of the Protocol will in no way affect the status of the Law providing for the Prohibition of the Poppy Cultivation, as approved by Parliament on 7 Aban 1334 (30 October 1955)."

PAKISTAN

"The Government of Pakistan will permit for a period of fifteen years after the coming into effect of the said Protocol: (i) the use of opium for quasi-medical purposes; and (ii) the production of opium and/or import thereof from India or Iran for such purposes."

Territorial Application
(Article 20 of the Protocol)

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	13 Jan 1955	Papua and Norfolk Island and the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru
Belgium	30 Jun 1958	Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi
France	21 Apr 1954	Territories of the French Union
New Zealand[6]	2 Nov 1956	[The Cook Islands (including Niue), the Tokelau Island] and the Trust Territory of Western Samoa
South Africa	29 Dec 1953	South West Africa
United States of America	18 Feb 1955	All areas for the international relations of which the United States is responsible

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fourteenth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2332), p. 28.

[2] The Protocol had been signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 23 June 1953. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 18 September 1953 and 25 May 1954 respectively. See note concerning signatures,ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations stated that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legal Government which represented China and the Chinese people in international relations and that, therefore, the allegations made in the above-mentioned communications as to the lack of validity of the signature or ratification in question had no legal foundation whatever.

[4] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a communication received on 27 April 1960, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that "the Protocol . . . will also apply to Land Berlin as from the day on which the Protocol will enter into force".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement,communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America,on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4, in chapter III.3. See also note 4 above.

[6] The instrument of denunciation of the Protocol was deposited by the Government of New Zealand on 17 December 1968 in respect of the metropolitan territory of New Zealand and in respect of the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau Islands, the denunciation to take effect on 1 January 1969.

15. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

Done at New York on 30 March 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13 December 1964, in accordance with article 41.
REGISTRATION: 13 December 1964, No. 7515.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, p. 151, vol. 557, p. 280 (corrigendum to the Russian text), vol. 570, p. 346 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Russian text), and vol. 590, p. 325 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Spanish text).
STATUS: Signatories: 62. Parties: 135.

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, held at United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 24 January to 25 March 1961. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 689 J (XXVI)[1] of 28 July 1958 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The Conference also adopted the Final Act and five resolutions for the text of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, p. 151. For the proceedings of the Conference, see *Official Records of the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs* volumes I and II, United Nations publications, Sales Nos. 63.XI.4 and 63.XI.5.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Mar 1961	19 Mar 1963
Algeria		7 Apr 1965 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Argentina	31 Jul 1961	10 Oct 1963
Australia	30 Mar 1961	1 Dec 1967
Austria		1 Feb 1978 *a*
Bahamas		13 Aug 1975 *d*
Bangladesh		25 Apr 1975 *a*
Barbados		21 Jun 1976 *d*
Belarus	31 Jul 1961	20 Feb 1964
Belgium	28 Jul 1961	17 Oct 1969
Benin	30 Mar 1961	27 Apr 1962
Botswana		27 Dec 1984 *a*
Brazil	30 Mar 1961	18 Jun 1964
Brunei Darussalam		25 Nov 1987 *a*
Bulgaria	31 Jul 1961	25 Oct 1968
Burkina Faso		16 Sep 1969 *a*
Cambodia	30 Mar 1961	
Cameroon		15 Jan 1962 *a*
Canada	30 Mar 1961	11 Oct 1961
Chad	30 Mar 1961	29 Jan 1963
Chile	30 Mar 1961	7 Feb 1968
China[3]		
Colombia		3 Mar 1975 *a*
Congo	30 Mar 1961	
Costa Rica	30 Mar 1961	7 May 1970
Côte d'Ivoire		10 Jul 1962 *a*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		30 Aug 1962 *a*
Cyprus		30 Jan 1969 *a*
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	30 Mar 1961	15 Sep 1964
Dominica		24 Sep 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		26 Sep 1972 *a*
Ecuador		14 Jan 1964 *a*
Egypt	30 Mar 1961	20 Jul 1966
El Salvador	30 Mar 1961	
Ethiopia		29 Apr 1965 *a*
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 *d*
Finland	30 Mar 1961	6 Jul 1965
France		19 Feb 1969 *a*
Gabon		29 Feb 1968 *a*
Germany[5,6]	31 Jul 1961	3 Dec 1973
Ghana	30 Mar 1961	15 Jan 1964
Greece		6 Jun 1972 *a*
Guatemala	26 Jul 1961	1 Dec 1967
Guinea		7 Oct 1968 *a*
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 *a*
Haiti	3 Apr 1961	29 Jan 1973
Holy See	30 Mar 1961	1 Sep 1970
Honduras		16 Apr 1973 *a*
Hungary	31 Jul 1961	24 Apr 1964
Iceland		18 Dec 1974 *a*
India	30 Mar 1961	13 Dec 1964
Indonesia	28 Jul 1961	3 Sep 1976
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Mar 1961	30 Aug 1972
Iraq	30 Mar 1961	29 Aug 1962
Ireland		16 Dec 1980 *a*
Israel		23 Nov 1962 *a*
Italy	4 Apr 1961	14 Apr 1975
Jamaica		29 Apr 1964 *a*
Japan	26 Jul 1961	13 Jul 1964
Jordan	30 Mar 1961	15 Nov 1962
Kenya		13 Nov 1964 *a*
Kuwait		16 Apr 1962 *a*
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Jun 1973 *a*
Latvia		16 Jul 1993 *a*
Lebanon	30 Mar 1961	23 Apr 1965
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liberia	30 Mar 1961	13 Apr 1987
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		27 Sep 1978 *a*
Liechtenstein[7]	14 Jul 1961	31 Oct 1979
Lithuania		28 Feb 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	28 Jul 1961	27 Oct 1972
Madagascar	30 Mar 1961	20 Jun 1974
Malawi		8 Jun 1965 *a*
Malaysia		11 Jul 1967 *a*
Mali		15 Dec 1964 *a*
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 *a*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	24 Jul 1961	18 Apr 1967
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 *a*
Monaco		14 Aug 1969 *a*
Mongolia		6 May 1991 *a*
Morocco		4 Dec 1961 *a*
Myanmar	30 Mar 1961	29 Jul 1963

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Netherlands[8]	31 Jul 1961	16 Jul 1965
New Zealand	30 Mar 1961	26 Mar 1963
Nicaragua	30 Mar 1961	21 Jun 1973
Niger		18 Apr 1963 *a*
Nigeria	30 Mar 1961	6 Jun 1969
Norway	30 Mar 1961	1 Sep 1967
Oman		24 Jul 1987 *a*
Pakistan	30 Mar 1961	9 Jul 1965
Panama	30 Mar 1961	4 Dec 1963
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *d*
Paraguay	30 Mar 1961	3 Feb 1972
Peru[10]	30 Mar 1961	22 Jul 1964
Philippines	30 Mar 1961	2 Oct 1967
Poland	31 Jul 1961	16 Mar 1966
Portugal[11]	30 Mar 1961	30 Dec 1971
Republic of Korea	30 Mar 1961	13 Feb 1962
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 *a*
Romania		14 Jan 1974 *a*
Russian Federation	31 Jul 1961	20 Feb 1964
Saint Kitts and Nevis		9 May 1994 *a*
Saint Lucia		5 Jul 1991 *d*
Saudi Arabia		21 Apr 1973 *a*
Senegal		24 Jan 1964 *a*
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 *a*
Singapore		15 Mar 1973 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		17 Mar 1982 *d*
Somalia		9 Jun 1988 *a*
South Africa		16 Nov 1971 *a*
Sri Lanka		11 Jul 1963 *a*
Spain	27 Jul 1961	1 Mar 1966
Sudan		24 Apr 1974 *a*
Suriname		29 Mar 1990 *d*
Sweden	3 Apr 1961	18 Dec 1964
Switzerland	20 Apr 1961	23 Jan 1970
Syrian Arab Republic		22 Aug 1962 *a*
Thailand	24 Jul 1961	31 Oct 1961
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[9]		13 Oct 1993 *a*
Togo		6 May 1963 *a*
Tonga		5 Sep 1973 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		22 Jun 1964 *a*
Tunisia	30 Mar 1961	8 Sep 1964
Turkey		23 May 1967 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1988 *a*
Ukraine	31 Jul 1961	15 Apr 1964
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	30 Mar 1961	2 Sep 1964
United States of America		25 May 1967 *a*
Uruguay		31 Oct 1975 *a*
Venezuela	30 Mar 1961	14 Feb 1969
Yugoslavia	30 Mar 1961	27 Aug 1963
Zaire	28 Apr 1961	19 Nov 1973
Zambia		12 Aug 1965 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not approve the present wording of article 42 which might prevent the application of the Convention to "non-metropolitan" territories.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 48, paragraph 2, which prescribe the compulsory referral of any dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria declares that the agreement of all parties to a dispute shall in every case be necessary for the referral thereof to the International Court of Justice.

ARGENTINA[12]

Reservation to article 48, paragraph 2:

The Argentine Republic does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

AUSTRIA

"The Republic of Austria interprets article 36, paragraph 1, as follows: The obligation of the Party contained therein may also be implemented by administrative regulations providing adequate sanction for the offences enumerated therein."

BANGLADESH

"[Subject to the reservations] referred to in article 49 (1) (*a*), (*d*) and (*e*) of the Convention, namely, subject to the right of the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to permit temporarily in its territory:

(*a*) The quasi-medical use of opium,

(*d*) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for nonmedical purposes, and

(*e*) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (*a*) and (*d*) above for the purposes mentioned therein."

BELARUS

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, under the terms of which certain States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention. The Single Convention concerns matters which are of interest to all States and has as its objective the enlistment of the efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social evil of the abuse of narcotics. The Convention should therefore be open to all countries. According to the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no States have the right to deny

to other countries the possibility of participating in a Convention of this type.

BULGARIA[13]

Declaration

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to stress that the wording of article 40, paragraph 1; article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; and article 31, paragraph 1 "b" has a discriminatory character as it excludes the participation of a certain number of States. These texts are obviously inconsistent with the character of the Convention, aiming at unifying the efforts of all Parties with a view to achieving regulation of the questions, affecting the interests of all countries in this field."

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

EGYPT[14]

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic declares that it accedes to this Convention while reserving the possibility provided for in article 44, paragraph 2 *in fine* of continuing in force article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

HUNGARY[15]

"(2) As regards countries which have been deprived of the possibility of becoming parties, on the basis of the provisions of article 40 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, to the Convention, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic does not consider as obligatory upon herself points 2 and 3 of article 12, point 2 of article 13, points 1 and 2 of article 14 and sub-point 1 (*b*) of article 31.

"The Hungarian People's Republic deems it necessary to state that the provisions in article 40 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs by which certain States are barred from becoming Parties to the Convention are at variance with the principle of sovereign equality of States and are detrimental to the interests attached to the universality of the Convention."

INDIA

Reservations:

"Subject to the reservations referred to in Article 49 (1) (*a*), (*b*), (*d*) and (*e*) of the Convention, namely, subject to the right of the Government of India to permit temporarily in any of its territories:

"(*a*) The quasi-medical use of opium,

"(*b*) Opium smoking,

"(*d*) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes, and

"(*e*) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (*a*), (*b*), and

(d) above for the purposes mentioned therein.

Declarations:

"Since the Government of India do not recognise the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the competent Government of China, they cannot regard signature of the said Convention by a Nationalist Chinese Representative as a valid signature on behalf of China."

INDONESIA[16]

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"(1) ...

"(2) ...

"(3) With respect to article 48, paragraph 2, the Indonesian Government does not consider itself bound by the provisions of this paragraph which provide for a mandatory reference to the International Court of Justice of any dispute which cannot be resolved according to the terms of paragraph 1. The Indonesian Government takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case."

LIECHTENSTEIN

The Principality of Liechtenstein maintains in force article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

MYANMAR

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Subject to the understanding that the Shan State is being allowed to have reservation of the right:

"(1) To allow addicts in the Shan State to smoke opium for a transitory period of 20 years with effect from the date of coming into force of this Single Convention;

"(2) To produce and manufacture opium for the above purpose;

"(3) To furnish a list of opium consumers in the Shan State after the Shan State Government has completed the taking of such list on the 31st December, 1963."

NETHERLANDS

In view of the equality from the point of view of public law between the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the term "non-metropolitan" mentioned in article 42 of this Convention no longer has its original meaning so far as Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles are concerned, and will consequently be deemed to mean "non-European".

PAKISTAN

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan will permit temporarily in any of its territories:

"(i) The quasi-medical use of opium;

"(ii) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes, and

"(iii) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (i) and (ii) above."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA[17]

"In accordance with article 50, paragraph 2, the Government of Papua New Guinea hereby lodges a reservation in relation to article 48, paragraph 2, which provides for reference of a dispute to the International Court of Justice."

POLAND

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself being bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and concerning States deprived of the opportunity to participate in the above Convention.

"In the opinion of the Government of the Polish People's Republic it is inadmissible to impose obligations contained in the mentioned provisions, upon States which in result of other provisions of the same Convention may be deprived of the opportunity to adhere to it.

"The Polish People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw the attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, on the basis of which certain States have been deprived of the opportunity of becoming Parties to this Convention. The Single Convention deals with the question of interest to all States and is meant to mobilize efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social danger which is the abuse of narcotic drugs. This Convention therefore should be open to all States. In accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, no State has the right to deprive any other State of the opportunity to participate in a Convention of such type."

ROMANIA

Reservations:

(*a*) The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 48, paragraph 2, whereby any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation or by any other means shall, at the request of one of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

(*b*) The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2, article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*), in so far as those provisions refer to States which are not Parties to the Single Convention.

Declarations:

(*a*) The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of article 42 and article 46, paragraph 1, of the Convention apply is not in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the documents adopted by the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, unanimously adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV) of 1970, which solemnly proclaims the obligation of States to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring an end to colonialism without delay.

(*b*) The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 40 of the Convention are not in accordance with the principle that international multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the international community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, under the terms of which certain States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention. The Single Convention concerns matters which are of interest to all States and has as its objective the enlistment of the efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social evil of the abuse of narcotics. The Convention should therefore be open to all countries. According to the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no States have the right to deny to other countries the possibility of participating in a Convention of this type.

SAUDI ARABIA[18]

"The accession of the Government of Saudi Arabia to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs shall not be construed as implying recognition of the so-called State of Israel nor does the accession, in any way, imply the intention of the Government of Saudi Arabia to enter into any intercourse whatsoever with the latter in matters bearing on this Convention."

SLOVAKIA[4]

SOUTH AFRICA

"Subject to a reservation in respect of article 48 of the Convention, as provided for in article 50, paragraph 2."

SRI LANKA

The Government of Ceylon notified the Secretary-General that in respect of article 17 of the Convention, "the existing administration will be maintained for the purpose of applying the provisions of the Convention without setting up a 'special administration' for the purpose."

The Government added that this was to be considered a statement and not a reservation.

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland maintains in force article 9 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

UKRAINE

The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory character of article 40, paragraph 1, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, under the terms of which certain States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention. The Single Convention concerns matters which are of interest to all States and has as its objective the enlistment of the efforts of all countries in the struggle against the social evil of the abuse of narcotics. The Convention should therefore be open to all countries. According to the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no States have the right to deny to other countries the possibility of participating in a Convention of this type.

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territorial Application: Territories
Australia	1 Dec 1967	All non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible, namely, the territories of Papua, Norfolk Island, Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, Heard and MacDonald Islands, Ashmore and Cartier Islands, the Australian Antarctic Territory and the Trust Territories of New Guinea and Nauru
France	19 Feb 1969	The whole of the territory of the French Republic
India	13 Dec 1964	Sikkim
Netherlands	16 Jul 1965	For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles
New Zealand	26 Mar 1963	Cook Islands (including Niue) and the Tokelau Islands, being non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which the Government of New Zealand is responsible
United Kingdom[19]	26 Jan 1965	Antigua, Bahamas, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, Brunei, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Falkland Islands,Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Hong Kong, Mauritius, Montserrat, St. Helena, St. Lucia, St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Southern Rhodesia, Swaziland, Tonga, Turks and Caicos Islands, Virgin Islands
	27 May 1965	Aden and Protectorate of South Arabia
	3 May 1966	Barbados
	24 Jun 1977	Channel Islands and Isle of Man
United States of America	25 May 1967	All areas for the international relations of which the United States is responsible

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/3169), p. 17.

[2] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 14 September 1970. In this regard, see also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 November 1970, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Albania had stated that the Albanian Government considered the above-mentioned accession to be without any legal validity, since the only representative of the people of South Viet-Nam qualified to speak on its behalf and to enter into international commitments were the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam.

A similar communication was received by the Secretary-General on 11 January 1971 from the Permanent Representative of the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 30 March 1961 and 12 May 1969 respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1). See also the declaration made by the Government of India upon ratification.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 July 1961 and 20 March 1964, respectively, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, pp. 361 and 412. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 December 1975 with reservations and declarations. For the text of the reservations and declarations see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 987, p. 425.

The Secretary-General had also received on 15 March 1976 a communication from the Government of the German Democratic Republic stating in part as follows:

> In acceding to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 30 March 1961, the German Democratic Republic started solely from the provisions on accession to this Convention as set forth in its article 40. There was no intention of acceding to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 25 March 1972.

Later, upon its accession to the 1972 Protocol, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared that the said communication was to be considered as withdrawn. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations made the following declaration on behalf of his Government:

> "... The said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 3 May 1974 a communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stating as follows:

> The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs,1961, contains as is well known, provisions relating to both the territories of the States parties and the exercise by them of their jurisdiction. As a result of the unconditional extension by the Federal Republic of Germany of the operation of that Convention to Berlin (West), matters concerning the status of the western sectors of Berlin would be affected, which would be contrary to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, in accordance with which the western sectors of Berlin are not a part of the Federal Republic of Germany and will not be governed by it in the future.
>
> In the light of the foregoing, the Soviet Union can take note of the statement of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the operation of the aforesaid Convention to Berlin (West) only on the understanding that it will be so extended subject to conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and to observance of the established procedure and that the application of the provisions of

that Convention to the western sectors of Berlin will not affect matters of status.

An identical communication in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, was received on 6 August 1974 from the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Upon accession, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made the following declaration:

Concerning the application of the Convention to Berlin (West), the German Democratic Republic states, in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic, that Berlin (West) is no constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and must not be governed by it.

In the light of the foregoing, the German Democratic Republic takes note of the declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the operation of the Convention to Berlin (West) only on the understanding that it will be so extended in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement and that the application of the provisions of the Convention to Berlin (West) will not affect matters of the status of Berlin (West).

See also note 3 above.

[7] By a communication received by the Secretary-General on 11 March 1980, the Government of Liechtenstein confirmed that it was not its intention to become a Party to the Convention as modified by the Protocol of 23 March 1972.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

[9] On 12 April 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Single [Convention on] Narcotic Drugs of the United Nations of 1961 does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

[10] In the instrument of ratification, the Government of Peru withdrew the reservation made on its behalf at the time of signing the Convention; for the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, p. 376.

[11] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 15 February 1972, the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Republic of Uganda to the United Nations informed him of the following:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of Uganda that in ratifying the said Convention, the Government of Portugal did not purport to act on behalf of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau which are distinct and separate political entities for which Portugal lacks any legal, moral or political capacity to represent."

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 25 April 1972, the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations informed him as follows with respect to the above-mentioned communication:

"The Government of Portugal is surprised that communications containing meaningless statements such as that from the Chargé d'Affaires of Uganda should be circulated, since they show clear ignorance of the fact that Portugal was admitted to the membership of the United Nations with the territorial composition that it has today,and including Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea."

[12] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 24 October 1979, the Government of Argentina declared that it withdrew the reservation relating to article 49 of the Convention. (For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, p. 353.)

[13] For the text of reservations as formulated by the Government of Bulgaria in respect of the same articles of the Convention at the time of its signature, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, p. 355.

In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservations made by Bulgaria upon ratification with respect to article 48 (2). For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 649, p. 362.

[14] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration relating to Israel. For the text of the said declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 568 p. 364. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

A communication was received by the Secretary-General on 21 September 1966 from the Government of Israel with reference to the above-mentioned declaration. For the text of the communication see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 573,p. 347.

[15] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 48 (2) of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 520, p. 364.

[16] In its instrument of ratification the Government of Indonesia withdraws the declarations made upon signature regarding its intention to make reservations with respect to article 40 (1) and article 42 of the said Convention. For the text of these declarations, corresponding to paragraphs 1 and 2, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 520, p. 368.

[17] Inasmuch as the reservation in question was not formulated by Australia at the time the Convention was originally extended to Papua and New Guinea, it will become effective on the date when it would have done so, pursuant to article 41 (2) and 50 (2) of the Convention, had it been formulated on accession, that is to say the thirtieth day after the deposit of the notification of succession by the Government of Papua New Guinea, i.e., on 27 November 1980.

[18] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 May 1972 the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations made the following declaration:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the reservation made by the Government of Saudi Arabia on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said pronouncement by the Government of Saudi Arabia cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Saudi Arabia, under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Saudi Arabia an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[19] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection :

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[For the text of the declaration see note 20 in chapter IV.1.]

16. Convention on Psychotropic Substances

Concluded at Vienna on 21 February 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 August 1976, in accordance with article 26 (1).
REGISTRATION: 16 August 1976, No. 14956.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1019, p. 175 (including procès-verbal of rectification of the English and Russian authentic texts).
STATUS: Signatories: 35. Parties: 140.

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Protocol on Psychotropic Substances, held at Vienna from 11 January to 21 February 1971. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 1474 (XLVIII)[1] of 24 March 1970 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		21 May 1985 *a*
Algeria		14 Jul 1978 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Argentina	21 Feb 1971	16 Feb 1978
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia	23 Dec 1971	19 May 1982
Bahrain		7 Feb 1990 *a*
Bahamas		31 Aug 1987 *a*
Bangladesh		11 Oct 1990 *a*
Barbados		28 Jan 1975 *a*
Belarus	30 Dec 1971	15 Dec 1978
Belgium		25 Oct 1995 *a*
Benin		6 Nov 1973 *a*
Bolivia		20 Mar 1985 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	21 Feb 1971	14 Feb 1973
Botswana		27 Dec 1984 *a*
Brunei Darussalam		24 Nov 1987 *a*
Bulgaria		18 May 1972 *a*
Burkina Faso		20 Jan 1987 *a*
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 *a*
Cameroon		5 Jun 1981 *a*
Canada		10 Sep 1988 *a*
Cape Verde		24 May 1990 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile	21 Feb 1971	18 May 1972
China[2]		23 Aug 1985 *a*
Colombia		12 May 1981 *a*
Costa Rica	2 Sep 1971	16 Feb 1977
Côte d'Ivoire		11 Apr 1984 *a*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		26 Apr 1976 *a*
Cyprus		26 Nov 1973 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	21 Feb 1971	18 Apr 1975
Dominica		24 Sep 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		19 Nov 1975 *a*
Ecuador		7 Sep 1973 *a*
Egypt	21 Feb 1971	14 Jun 1972
Ethiopia		23 Jun 1980 *a*
Fiji		25 Mar 1993 *a*
Finland	15 Oct 1971	20 Nov 1972
France[4]	17 Dec 1971	28 Jan 1975
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 *a*
Germany[5, 6]	23 Dec 1971	2 Dec 1977
Ghana	21 Feb 1971	10 Apr 1990
Greece	21 Feb 1971	10 Feb 1977
Grenada		25 Apr 1980 *a*
Guatemala		13 Aug 1979 *a*
Guinea		27 Dec 1990 *a*
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 *a*
Guyana	21 Feb 1971	4 May 1977
Holy See	21 Feb 1971	7 Jan 1976
Hungary	30 Dec 1971	19 Jul 1979
Iceland		18 Dec 1974 *a*
India		23 Apr 1975 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	21 Feb 1971	
Iraq		17 May 1976 *a*
Ireland		7 Aug 1992 *a*
Israel		10 Jun 1993 *a*
Italy		27 Nov 1981 *a*
Jamaica		6 Oct 1989 *a*
Japan	21 Dec 1971	31 Aug 1990
Jordan		8 Aug 1975 *a*
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Kuwait		13 Jul 1979 *a*
Latvia		16 Jul 1993 *a*
Lebanon	21 Feb 1971	15 Dec 1994
Lesotho		23 Apr 1975 *a*
Liberia	21 Feb 1971	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		24 Apr 1979 *a*
Lithuania		28 Feb 1994 *a*
Luxembourg		7 Feb 1991 *a*
Madagascar		20 Jun 1974 *a*
Malawi		9 Apr 1980 *a*
Malaysia		22 Jul 1986 *a*
Mali		31 Oct 1995 *a*
Malta		22 Feb 1990 *a*
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 *a*
Mauritania		24 Oct 1989 *a*
Mauritius		8 May 1973 *a*
Mexico		20 Feb 1975 *a*
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 *a*
Monaco	21 Feb 1971	6 Jul 1977
Morocco		11 Feb 1980 *a*
Myanmar[7]		21 Sep 1995 *a*
Netherlands[8]		8 Sep 1993 *a*
New Zealand[9]	13 Sep 1971	7 Jun 1990
Nicaragua		24 Oct 1973 *a*
Niger		10 Nov 1992 *a*
Nigeria		23 Jun 1981 *a*
Norway		18 Jul 1975 *a*
Pakistan		9 Jun 1977 *a*

Participant	Signature	Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Panama		18 Feb 1972 *a*
Papua New Guinea		20 Nov 1981 *a*
Paraguay[10]	28 Jul 1971	3 Feb 1972
Peru		28 Jan 1980 *a*
Philippines		7 Jun 1974 *a*
Poland	30 Dec 1971	3 Jan 1975
Portugal		20 Apr 1979 *a*
Qatar		18 Dec 1986 *a*
Republic of Korea		12 Jan 1978 *a*
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 *a*
Romania		21 Jan 1993 *a*
Russian Federation	30 Dec 1971	3 Nov 1978
Rwanda	21 Feb 1971	15 Jul 1981
Saint Kitts and Nevis		9 May 1994 *a*
Saudi Arabia		29 Jan 1975 *a*
Senegal		10 Jun 1977 *a*
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 *a*
Sierra Leone		6 Jun 1994 *a*
Singapore		17 Sep 1990 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Somalia		2 Sep 1986 *a*
South Africa		27 Jan 1972 *a*
Spain[11]		20 Jul 1973 *a*
Sri Lanka		15 Mar 1993 *a*
Sudan		26 Jul 1993 *a*
Suriname		29 Mar 1990 *a*
Swaziland		3 Oct 1995 *a*
Sweden	21 Feb 1971	5 Dec 1972
Syrian Arab Republic		8 Mar 1976 *a*
Thailand		21 Nov 1975 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[12]		13 Oct 1993 *a*
Togo	21 Feb 1971	18 May 1976
Tonga		24 Oct 1975 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	21 Feb 1971	14 Mar 1979
Tunisia		23 Jul 1979 *a*
Turkey	21 Feb 1971	1 Apr 1981
Uganda		15 Apr 1988 *a*
Ukraine	30 Dec 1971	20 Nov 1978
United Arab Emirates		17 Feb 1988 *a*
United Kingdom[13]	21 Feb 1971	24 Mar 1986
United States of America	21 Feb 1971	16 Apr 1980
Uruguay		16 Mar 1976 *a*
Uzbekistan		12 Jul 1995 *a*
Venezuela	21 Feb 1971	23 May 1972
Yugoslavia	21 Feb 1971	15 Oct 1973
Zaire		12 Oct 1977 *a*
Zambia		28 May 1993 *a*
Zimbabwe		30 Jul 1993 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, while acceding to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, declares that it does not consider itself bound to the provision of the second paragraph of article 31, since this paragraph calls for the submission to the International Court of Justice upon the request of one of the Parties, of differences of opinion that may arise between two or several Parties to the Convention on its interpretation and implementation.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, therefore, declares in this connection that in the event of a conflict of opinion on such cases, the issue at conflict shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice not at the request of one of the sides, but upon the agreement of all Parties concerned.

ARGENTINA

"With a reservation concerning the effects of the application of the Convention to non–metropolitan Territories whose sovereignty is in dispute, as indicated in our vote on article 27."

AUSTRALIA

"The Convention shall not apply to the non–metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible."

BAHRAIN[14]

Reservation:

With regard to article 31, paragraph 2:

"The State of Bahrain does not recognise the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

Declaration:

"Moreover, the accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

BANGLADESH

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, having considered the Convention, hereby accedes to the aforesaid Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971, and undertakes to abide by its provisions albeit having permissible reservations on paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 under article 32 of the Convention."

BELARUS

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 25 of that Convention.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute and declares that the referral of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all the Parties to the dispute.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian SSR states that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, under the terms of which a number of States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States the Convention should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to state that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

BRAZIL

Upon signature (confirmed upon ratification except as far as concerns the reservation to article 27):

"With a reservation to article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, articles 27 and 31."

BULGARIA[15]

CANADA[16]

Reservation:

"Whereas Canada is desirous of acceding to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971, and whereas Canada's population includes certain small clearly determined groups who use in magical or religious rites certain psychotropic substances of plant origin included in the schedules to the said Convention, and whereas the said substance occur in plants which grow in North America but not in Canada, a reservation of any present or future application, if any, of the provisions of the said Convention to peyote is hereby made pursuant to article 32, paragraph 3 of the Convention."

CHINA

Reservation:

"1. The Chinese Government has reservation on paragraph 2, article 48 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 [as amended] and on paragraph 2, article 31 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971.

Declaration:

2. The signature and ratification by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China respectively on 30 March 1961 and 12 May 1969 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 and their signature of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 on 21 February 1971 are all illegal and therefore null and void."

CUBA

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention, since, in its view, disputes between Parties should be settled only by direct negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

Declaration:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that, despite the fact that the Convention deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, the provisions of article 25, paragraph 1, and article 26 of the Convention are discriminatory in character in that they deny a number of States the right of signature and accession, thus violating the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

EGYPT

Upon signature:

"Subject to reservation as to:

(*a*) Article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2

(*b*) Article 27, and

(*c*) Article 31."

Upon ratification:

The United Arab Republic [Arab Republic of Egypt] reserves its position on article 19, paras. 1, 2 (concerning measures by the Board to ensure the execution of the provision of the Convention and its right of contestation).

The UAR [Arab Republic of Egypt] reserves its position on article 27 (concerning the existence of territories or colonies pertaining to certain states).

The UAR [Arab Republic of Egypt] reserves its position on article 31 (concerning the method of settlement of disputes between members).

FRANCE

With regard to article 31, France does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 and declares that disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention which have not been settled through the channels provided for in paragraph 1 of the said article may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

GERMANY[5, 17]

Reservations:

1. *In respect of article II, paragraph 2 (only regarding schedule III):*

In the Federal Republic of Germany, manufacturers, wholesale distributors, importers and exporters are not required to keep records of the type described but instead to mark specifically those items in their invoices which contain substances and preparations in Schedule III. Invoices and packaging slips showing such items are to be preserved by these persons for a minimum period of five years.

2. *In respect of article 11, paragraph 4:*

In the Federal Republic of Germany, the persons and institutions named in this provision will keep separate files, for at least five years,of invoices showing items that contain substances and preparations in Schedule III which they have received from the persons named in article 11, paragraph 2, and will once a year determine their stock of substances and preparations in Schedule III. Any other acquisition and any disposal or removal without prescription of substances and preparations in Schedule III will be recorded separately. These records will likewise be preserved for five years.

HUNGARY[18]

Upon signature:

"The Hungarian Government avails itself of the possibility accorded to it in paragraph 2 of article 32 and makes reservations

in respect of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, article 27 and article 31 of the present Convention."

Upon ratification:

"Reservations in respect of article 19 (1) and (2) and article 31 (2):

(a) The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 19 concerning the States which, under article 25 of the Convention, are deprived of the opportunity to become parties to the Convention."

...

Declarations:

"(a) The Hungarian People's Republic calls attention to the fact that article 25 of the Convention is of a discriminative nature and is at variance with the principle of sovereign equality of States and it considers that the Convention should be open to all interested States.

"(b) The Hungarian People's Republic deems it necessary to declare further that article 27 of the Convention is inconsistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations."

INDIA

"The Government of India reserve their position with regard to paragraph 2 of article 31 of the aforesaid Convention and do not consider themselves bound by the provisions of that paragraph."

IRAQ

Reservations:

1. The Government of the Republic of Iraq hereby declare that they do not consider themselves bound by the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of article19 of the Convention inasmuch as those two paragraphs are considered to be an interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Iraq.

2. The Government of the Republic of Iraq declare that they do not consider themselves to be bound by the provisions of paragraph (2) of article 31 of the said Convention. The Government of the Republic of Iraq consider that recourse to the International Court of Justice in a dispute to which they are party shall not be had except with their approval.

Declaration:

Entry into the above Convention by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations therewith.

KUWAIT[14]

"It is understood that the accession of the State of Kuwait to the Convention on psychotropic substances done at Vienna on the 21st of February, 1971, does not in any way mean recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya does not consider itself bound by its provisions concerning the compulsory reference to the International Court of Justice [of] disputes resulting from this Convention.

MEXICO

The Government of Mexico, in acceding to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances adopted on 21 February 1971, makes, pursuant to the provisions of article 32, paragraph 4, of the Convention, an express reservation with regard to the application of the said international instrument, since there still exist in its territory certain indigenous ethnic groups which, in magical or religious rites, traditionally make use of wild plants which contain psychotropic substances from among those in schedule I.

MYANMAR[7]

Reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2.

The Government wishes to express reservation on article 22, paragraph 2(b) relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same.

The Government of the Union of Myanmar further wishes to express that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31, paragraph of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA[19]

28 October 1980

Reservations:

"The Government of Papua New Guinea in accordance with article 32, paragraph 2 of the Convention hereby lodges a reservation in relation to article 31, paragraph 2, of the Convention which provides for reference of a dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of Papua New Guinea in accordance with article 32, paragraph 3 of the Convention hereby lodges a reservation in relation to article 10, paragraph 1 which provides for warnings on packages and advertising."

PERU[20]

Reservations are made with respect to articles 7 and 19 (1) and (2) of the Convention. The reservation to article 7 does not extend to the provisions relating to international trade, in accordance with the provisions of article 32 (4) of the Convention.

POLAND

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic wishes to make reservations concerning the following provisions:

"(1) Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 19 of the above-said Convention as applicable to states deprived of the opportunities of becoming Parties to the Convention in view of the procedure provided for in Article 25 of the Convention.

"In the considered opinion of the Government of the Polish People's Republic the provisions of Article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 are of discriminatory character. In this connection the Government of the Polish People's Republic reiterates its firm position that the above-said Convention, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of states, should be open to all interested states without any discrimination.

"(2) Paragraph 2 of Article 31 of the Convention which provides that disputes which cannot be settled by negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, recourse to regional bodies, judicial process or other peaceful means of their own choice, shall be referred, at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute, to the International Court of Justice for

decision. In this connection the Government of the Polish People's Republic wishes to state that a submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice, for its decision can be made only with full consent to such a procedure by all parties to the dispute and not at the request of one or some of them."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 25 of that Convention.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute and declares that the referral of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all Parties to the dispute.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, under the terms of which a number of States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States the Convention should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it essential to state that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

SLOVAKIA[3]

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Government of the Republic of South Africa deem it advisable to accede to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, subject to reservations in respect of Article 19 paragraphs 1 and 2, Article 27 and Article 31 as provided for in article 32 paragraph 2 of the Convention."

TUNISIA

Reservation in respect of article 31 (2):

Any such disputes which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed shall be referred, with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute, to the International Court of Justice for decision.

TURKEY

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Reservation with respect to article 31 (2) of the Convention, made in accordance with its article 32 (2).

UKRAINE

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 25 of that Convention.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute and declares that the referral of any such dispute to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all Parties to the dispute.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, under the terms of which a number of States are not entitled to become Parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and considers that in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States the Convention should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic deems it essential to state that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of "bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations".

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"In accord with paragraph 4 of article 32 of the Convention, peyote harvested and distributed for use by the Native American Church in its religious rites is excepted from the provisions of article 7 of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances".

YUGOSLAVIA

Subject to a reservation to article 27 of the Convention.

Amendments to Schedules I, II, III and IV annexed to the Convention (Article 2 of the Convention)

Schedule	*Decision by the Narcotics Commission*		*Date of the notification of the decision by the Narcotics Division of the Secretariat*
	No.	*Date*	
I–IV	6 (XXVII)	24 Feb 1977	10 Jun 1977 (NAR/CL.1/1977)
I	3 (S–V)	16 Feb 1978	20 Jun 1978 (NAR/CL.4/1978)

Schedule	*Decision by the Narcotics Commission*		*Date of the notification of the decision by the Narcotics Division of the Secretariat*
	No.	*Date*	
II, IV	4 (XXVIII)	22 Feb 1979	28 Mar 1979 (NAR/CL.3/1979)
II	4 (S–VI)	14 Feb 1980	31 Mar 1980 (NAR/CL.6/1980)
I	5 (S–VI)	14 Feb 1980	31 Mar 1980 (NAR/CL.7/1980)
IV	2 (XXIX)	4 Feb 1981	3 Apr 1981 (NAR/CL.2/1981)
IV	3 (XXIX)	4 Feb 1981	3 Apr 1981 (NAR/CL.8/1981)
IV	5 (XXIX)	4 Feb 1981	3 Apr 1981 (NAR/CL.10/1981)

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-eighth Session, Resolutions* (E/4832).

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 21 February 1971. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China, preface (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 13 October 1988, with the following reservations and declarations:

Reservations:

[The Government of Czechoslovakia] declares, in accordance with article 32, para 2, of the Convention, that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paras 1 and 2, of the Convention as far as they concern States that are disqualified from becoming parties to the Convention under its article 25.

[The Government of Czechoslovakia] does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31, para 2, of the Convention which regulates obligatory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and declares that for submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision consent of all parties to the dispute is required in every case.

Declarations:

In respect of article 25 of the Convention:"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of article 25 of the Convention are contrary to the principle of sovereign equality, and of a discriminatory nature. In this context, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic reaffirms its position that the Convention should be open for participation by all States."

In respect of article 27 of the Convention:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers it necessary also to declare that the provisions of article 27 of the Convention are at variance with the declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514/XV of December 14, 1960, which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations."

Subsequently, on 22 January 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 31 (2) made upon accession. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] With a declaration that the provisions of the Convention will apply throughout the territory of the French Republic (European and overseas departments and overseas territories).

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 December 1975 with reservations and declarations. For the text of the reservations and declarations see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1019, p. 348. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] With the following declaration:

The Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Secretary–General received on 18 April 1977 from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the following communication concerning the above declaration:

In connexion with the declaration of 8 November 1976 by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 21 February 1971 to Berlin (West), the Soviet side declares that it does not object to the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) in such measure and to such an extent as is permissible from the standpoint of the Four–Power Agreement of 3 September 1971, according to which West Berlin is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not governed by it.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary–General on 8 July 1977, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared as follows:

"The German Democratic Republic takes notice of the statement made by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the application of the provisions of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 21 February 1971 to Berlin (West) and understands that the application of these provisions to Berlin (West) is only possible to the extent that it is in keeping with the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, under which Berlin (West) is no constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and must not be governed by it."

[7] On 20 June 1994, the instrument of accession by the Government of Myanmar to the Convention was received by the Secretary–General. The instrument of accession was accompanied by the following reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19, paragraphs 1 and 2.

The Government wishes to express reservation on article 22, paragraph 2 (b) relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same.

The Government of the Union of Myanmar further wishes to express that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 31, paragraph 2 of the Convention concerning the referral to the International Court of Justice of a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention."

As regards the reservation made in respect of article 22, article 32 (3) of the Convention provides that "unless by the end of twelve months after the date of the Secretary–General's communication of the reservation concerned (*i.e.* 20 September 1994), this reservation has been objected to by one third of the States that have signed without reservation of ratification, ratified or acceded to this Convention before the end of that period, it shall be deemed to be permitted, it being understood however that States which have objected to the reservation need not assume towards the reserving Sate any legal obligation under this Convention which is affected by the reservation."

By the end of twelve months after the date of its circulation (i.e. 20 September 1994), none of the States Parties had objected to the reservation. Consequently, in accordance with article 32 (3) of the Convention, the reservation is deemed permitted and the instrument of accession was accepted for deposit on 21 September 1995.

See also note 5 above.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[9] With a declaration of application to Niue and Tokelau.

[10] The signature on behalf of the Government of Paraguay was affixed "*Ad Referendum*" in accordance with the instructions contained

in the full powers. In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 12 October 1971, the Permanent Representative of Paraguay to the United Nations indicated that the words "Ad Referendum" should be taken as meaning that the Convention concerned was subject to ratification by the Republic of Paraguay in accordance with its constitutional requirements and to the deposit of an instrument of ratification under article 25 of said Convention.

[11] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 20 December 1973, the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations made the following statement:

> Spain considers itself to be internationally responsible for the territory of the Sahara; consequently, the provisions of the 1971 Vienna Convention on Psychotropic Substances shall also apply to that territory.

[12] On 12 April 1994, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

> "Accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, concluded at Vienna on 21 February 1971, does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

[13] On 13 December 1990, the Secretary–General received a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the effect that the said Convention shall extend to Hong Kong and to the British Virgin Islands and that, in accordance with article 28 thereof, Hong Kong and the British Virgin Islands are each a separate region for the purposes of the Convention.

Subsequently, on 3 June 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary–General that the Convention shall extend to Anguilla, Bermuda, the British Antarctic Territory, the Cayman Islands, the Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, on 4 February 1994, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Argentina the following declaration:

> The Argentine Republic rejects the extension by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the application of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, signed at Vienna on 21 February 1972, to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and reaffirms its sovereignty over these islands, which are an integral part of the national territory.

Subsequently, on 4 January 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary–General of the following:

> "The British Government have no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands, as well as South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and have no doubt, therefore, about their right to extend the said Convention to these territories. The British Government can only reject as unfounded the claim by the Government of Argentina that these Islands are a part of Agentine territory."

[14] With respect to the above declaration, the Secretary–General received on 29 October 1979 from the Government of Israel the following communications:

> "The Government of the State of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Kuwait. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait under general international law or under particular conventions. The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[15] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 31. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1019, p. 346.

[16] None of the States Parties having objected to the reservation made by the Government of Canada before the expiry of a period of twelve months after the date (9 September 1987) of its circulation by the Secretary–General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 32.

[17] None of the States Parties having objected to the reservations made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany before the expiry of a period of twelve months after the date (1 December 1976) of their circulation by the Secretary–General, the said reservations are deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 32.

[18] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 31 (2) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1141, p. 457.

Subsequently, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Israel an objection, identical essence, *mutatis mutandis*, with regard to a reservation made by Bahrain.

[19] None of the States Parties having objected to the reservation regarding article 10 (1) made by the Government of Papua New Guinea before the expiry of a period of twelve months after the date (19 November 1980) of its circulation by the Secretary–General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in accordance with the provisions of article 32.

[20] The Secretary–General received, on 29 January 1981, from the Government of Peru the following clarification in respect of the reservation made to article 7:

> "The reservation referred to was motivated by the following two wild plant species: Ayahuasca, a liana which grows in the Amazon region and which contains the active element N, N–dimethyltryptamine, and a columnar cactus known as San Pedro, which grows in the desert coastal regions and in the Andean region and contains mescaline. Ayahuasca is used by certain Amazon ethnic groups in magical and religious rites and in rites of initiation into adulthood; San Pedro is used in magical rites by indigenous medicine men or shamans. Because of their psychotropic content, both plant species are included in the reservation option made possible by article 32, paragraph 4, of the Convention.

17. Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

Concluded at Geneva on 25 March 1972

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 August 1975, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 8 August 1975, No. 14151.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 976, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 55. Parties: 102.

Note: The Protocol was adopted on 24 March 1972 by the United Nations Conference to consider amendments to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, held at Geneva from 6 to 25 March 1972. The Conference was convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to resolution 1577 (L)[1] of 20 May 1971 of the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Argentina	25 Mar 1972	16 Nov 1973
Australia	22 Nov 1972	22 Nov 1972
Austria		1 Feb 1978 *a*
Bahamas		23 Nov 1976 *a*
Bangladesh		9 May 1980 *a*
Barbados		21 Jun 1976 *a*
Belgium	25 Mar 1972	13 Jun 1984
Benin		6 Nov 1973 *a*
Botswana		27 Dec 1984 *a*
Brazil	25 Mar 1972	16 May 1973
Brunei Darussalam		25 Nov 1987 *a*
Cambodia	25 Mar 1972	
Cameroon		30 May 1974 *a*
Canada		5 Aug 1976 *a*
Chile	25 Mar 1972	19 Dec 1975
Colombia		3 Mar 1975 *a*
Costa Rica	25 Mar 1972	14 Feb 1973
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Mar 1972	28 Feb 1973
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		14 Dec 1989 *a*
Cyprus	25 Mar 1972	30 Nov 1973
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	25 Mar 1972	18 Apr 1975
Dominica		24 Sep 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		21 Sep 1993 *a*
Ecuador	25 Mar 1972	25 Jul 1973
Egypt	25 Mar 1972	14 Jan 1974
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 *a*
Fiji		21 Nov 1973 *a*
Finland	16 May 1972	12 Jan 1973
France[4]	25 Mar 1972	4 Sep 1975
Gabon	25 Mar 1972	
Germany[5, 6]	25 Mar 1972	20 Feb 1975
Ghana	25 Mar 1972	
Greece	25 Mar 1972	12 Jul 1985
Guatemala	25 Mar 1972	9 Dec 1975
Guinea-Bissau		27 Oct 1995 *a*
Haiti	25 Mar 1972	29 Jan 1973
Holy See	25 Mar 1972	7 Jan 1976
Honduras		8 Aug 1979 *a*
Hungary		12 Nov 1987 *a*
Iceland		18 Dec 1974 *a*
India		14 Dec 1978 *a*
Indonesia	25 Mar 1972	3 Sep 1976
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	25 Mar 1972	
Iraq		25 Sep 1978 *a*
Ireland		16 Dec 1980 *a*
Israel	27 Mar 1972	1 Feb 1974
Italy	25 Mar 1972	14 Apr 1975
Jamaica		6 Oct 1989 *a*
Japan	15 Dec 1972	27 Sep 1973
Jordan	25 Mar 1972	28 Feb 1973
Kenya		9 Feb 1973 *a*
Kuwait		7 Nov 1973 *a*
Latvia		16 Jul 1993 *a*
Lebanon	25 Mar 1972	
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *a*
Liberia	25 Mar 1972	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		27 Sep 1978 *a*
Liechtenstein	25 Mar 1972	
Luxembourg	25 Mar 1972	13 Oct 1976
Madagascar	25 Mar 1972	20 Jun 1974
Malawi		4 Oct 1973 *a*
Malaysia		20 Apr 1978 *a*
Mali		31 Oct 1995 *a*
Mauritius		12 Dec 1994 *a*
Mexico		27 Apr 1977 *a*
Monaco	25 Mar 1972	30 Dec 1975
Mongolia		6 May 1991 *a*
Morocco	28 Dec 1972	
Netherlands[7]		29 May 1987 *a*
New Zealand[8]	15 Dec 1972	7 Jun 1990
Nicaragua	25 Mar 1972	
Niger	28 Nov 1972	28 Dec 1973
Norway	25 Mar 1972	12 Nov 1973
Pakistan	29 Dec 1972	
Panama	18 May 1972	19 Oct 1972
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *a*
Paraguay[9]	18 Oct 1972	20 Jun 1973
Peru	25 Mar 1972	12 Sep 1977
Philippines	25 Mar 1972	7 Jun 1974
Poland		9 Jun 1993 *a*
Portugal		20 Apr 1979 *a*
Republic of Korea	29 Dec 1972	25 Jan 1973
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 *a*
Romania		14 Jan 1974 *a*
Saint Kitts and Nevis		9 May 1994 *a*
Senegal	16 Aug 1972	25 Mar 1974
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 *a*
Singapore		9 Jul 1975 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa	25 Mar 1972	16 Dec 1975
Spain	25 Mar 1972	4 Jan 1977
Sri Lanka		29 Jun 1981 *a*
Sudan		5 Jul 1994 *a*
Suriname		29 Mar 1990 *a*

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Sweden	25 Mar 1972	5 Dec 1972
Syrian Arab Republic		1 Feb 1974 *a*
Thailand		9 Jan 1975 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993 *a*
Togo	25 Mar 1972	10 Nov 1976
Tonga		5 Sep 1973 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		23 Jul 1979 *a*
Tunisia	22 Dec 1972	29 Jun 1976
Turkey	25 Mar 1972	
Uganda		15 Apr 1988 *a*
United Kingdom	25 Mar 1972	20 Jun 1978
United States of America	25 Mar 1972	1 Nov 1972
Uruguay		31 Oct 1975 *a*
Venezuela	25 Mar 1972	4 Dec 1985
Yugoslavia	25 Mar 1972	23 Jun 1978
Zaire		15 Jul 1976 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

With a reservation concerning the following articles:

1. Article 5 amending article 12 (5) of the Single Convention;
2. Article 9 amending article 29 (1), (2) and (5) of the Single Convention.

BRAZIL

"Brazil wishes to take this opportunity to repeat the declaration that was made at the appropriate occasion during the plenary session of the Protocol's Negotiating Conference which took place in Geneva from March 6th to March 24th, 1972, to the effect that the amendments to article 36 of the Convention do not oblige States with laws against extradition of nationals to extradite them."

"Under the terms of article 21 of the Protocol, Brazil wishes to make it clear that it does not accept the amendment introduced by article 1 of the Protocol to article 2, para. 4, of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs."

CANADA

"Subject to a reservation with respect to subparagraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) of paragraph 2 (b) of the amending article 14."

CUBA

The accession of the Republic of Cuba to the 1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, shall not be interpreted as recognition of acceptance on the part of the Government of the Republic of Cuba to the racist Government of South Africa, which does not represent the South African people and which, because of its systematic practice of the discriminatory policy of *apartheid*, has been expelled from international agencies, condemned by the United Nations and rejected by all the peoples of the world.

The accession of the Republic of Cuba to the 1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, shall not be interpreted as recognition or acceptance on the part of the Government of the Republic of Cuba of the Government of the Republic of Korea, because Cuba considers that it does not genuinely represent the interests of the Korean people

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares with respect to the provisions contained in article 14, paragraph (2) (b) (ii), that in accordance with its legal system, and its national laws and practice, it makes extradition conditional only on the existence of bilateral treaties.

EGYPT[10]

GREECE

"With a reservation to article 1 (4) amending the article 2 of the Single Convention."

INDIA[11]

"The Government of India reserve their position with regard to articles 5, 6, 9, 11 and 14 of the aforesaid Protocol and do not consider themselves bound by the provisions of these articles."

IRAQ[12]

This accession shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relations therewith.

ISRAEL

Upon signature:

". . . The Government of Israel will not proceed to the ratification of the Protocol until it has received assurances that all the neighbouring States who intend to become parties to it will do so without reservation or declaration, and that the so-called reservation or declaration referring to Israel and made by one of Israel's neighbours in connection with its participation in the 1961 Single Convention, and which was quoted at the meeting of the Second Committee on 18 March 1972, is withdrawn."

Upon ratification:

"... The Government of the State of Israel, in accordance with the powers vested in it by the law, decided to ratify the Protocol while maintaining all its rights to adopt toward all other parties an attitude of complete reciprocity."

KUWAIT[12]

The Government of the State of Kuwait takes the view that its accession to the said Protocol does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige it to apply the provisions of the aforementioned Protocol in respect of the said country.

MEXICO

In accordance with the provisions of article 21 'Reservations' of the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, adopted in Geneva on 25 March 1972, the Government of Mexico, in acceding to that international instrument, makes an explicit reservation in respect of the application of articles 5 (amendment to article 12, paragraph 5, of the Single Convention); 6 (amendment to article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Single Convention); and 11 (new article 21 *bis*, Limitation of Production of Opium). Accordingly, as

regards the articles in respect of which this reservation is made, Mexico will be bound by the corresponding texts of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, in their original form.

PANAMA

Reservation:

"With a reservation regarding article 36, paragraph 2 that appears on document of May 3, 1972 signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Panama."

[The reservation reads as follows:

With the express reservation that the amendment which article 14 of the Protocol makes to article 36, paragraph 2, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 (a) does not modify the extradition treaties to which the Republic of Panama is a party in any manner which may compel it to extradite its own nationals; (b) does not require the Republic of Panama to include, in such extradition treaties as it may conclude in the future, any provision requiring it to extradite its own nationals; and (c) may not be interpreted or applied in any manner which gives rise to an obligation on the part of the Republic of Panama to extradite any of its own nationals.]

PERU

[The Government of Peru] entertains reservations concerning the last part of the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol, amending article 12, paragraph 5, of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, as it considers that the powers conferred therein on the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) are incompatible with its role as a co–ordinating body for national control systems and give it supranational supervisory functions.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in article 6, insofar as those provisions relate to States which are not parties to the Single Convention.

Declaration:

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 17 of the Protocol are not in accordance with the principle that international multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the world community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

YUGOSLAVIA

With the reservations that articles 9 and 11 of the Protocol shall not apply in the territory of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom[13]	20 Jun 1978	Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Saint Kitts–Nevis–Anguilla, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent), Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Solomon Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and Tuvalu

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/5044), p. 8.

[2] The Protocol had been signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 25 March 1972. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceeded to the Protocol on 4 June 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] With a declaration that the provisions of the Protocol shall apply to the entire territory of the French Republic (European and overseas departments and overseas territories).

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 4 October 1988. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] With a declaration that the said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this regard, the Secretary–General received on 9 June 1975 a communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stating in part: the Soviet Union can take note of the declaration by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension to Berlin (West) of the sphere of application of the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, signed in Geneva on 25 March 1972 only on the understanding that this extension is carried out in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, that the established procedures are respected, and that in the application of the provisions of the Protocol questions concerning status will not be raised. See also note 5 above.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[8] Applicable to Niue and Tokelau.

[9] Upon signature on behalf of the Government of Paraguay was affixed "Ad Referendum" in accordance with the instructions contained in the full powers. In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 18 October 1972, the Permanent Representative of Paraguay to the United Nations confirmed that the words "Ad Referendum" which preceded his signature should be considered to mean that the Protocol concerned is subject to ratification by the Republic of Paraguay, in accordance with the procedure established by the National Constitution, and to deposit of the instrument of ratification, as provided in the Protocol.

[10] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to Israel. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 976, p. 101. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.

[11] In a note received by the Secretary–General on 14 December 1978, the Government of India clarified that the reservation made with regard to article 14 of the Protocol relates only to paragraph 2 (b) of article 36 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961.

[12] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 26 December 1973, the Acting Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations made the following statement:

"The instrument of acceptance by the Government of Kuwait of the Protocol contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Protocol. That statement, therefore, possesses no legal validity whatsoever.

"The Government of Israel utterly rejects that statement and will proceed on the assumption that it has no validity as to the rights and duties of any State Party to the said treaties.

"The declaration of the Government of Kuwait cannot in any way affect Kuwait's obligations under whatever other obligations are binding upon that State by virtue of general international law.

"The Government of Israel, will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt toward the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

A communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, was received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 11 May 1979 in respect of the declaration made upon accession by Iraq.

[13] On 3 October 1983 the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the declaration of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

18. Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

Done at New York on 8 August 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 August 1975, in accordance with article 18 of the Protocol of 25 March 1972.
REGISTRATION: 8 August 1975, No. 14152.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 976, p. 105.
STATUS: Parties: 134.

Note: The text of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as amended by the Protocol of 25 March 1972 was established by the Secretary-General in accordance with article 22 of the Protocol.

Participant	*Ratification or accession in respect of the Protocol of 25 March 1972 or participation upon deposit of an instrument of accession to the Convention of 1961 (in accordance with article 19 of the Protocol)*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) in respect of the Convention as amended*
Antigua and Barbuda	5 Apr 1993	
Argentina	16 Nov 1973	
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia	22 Nov 1972	
Austria	1 Feb 1978	
Bahamas	23 Nov 1976	
Bahrain		7 Feb 1990 *a*
Bangladesh	9 May 1980	
Barbados	21 Jun 1976	
Belgium	13 Jun 1984	
Benin	6 Nov 1973	
Bolivia		23 Sep 1976 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana	27 Dec 1984	
Brazil	16 May 1973	
Brunei Darussalam	25 Nov 1987	
Burkina Faso		2 Jun 1992 *a*
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 *a*
Cameroon	30 May 1974	
Canada	5 Aug 1976	
Cape Verde		24 May 1990 *a*
Chile	19 Dec 1975	
China		23 Aug 1985 *a*
Colombia	3 Mar 1975	
Costa Rica	14 Feb 1973	
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Feb 1973	
Croatia	26 Jul 1993	
Cuba	14 Dec 1989	
Cyprus	30 Nov 1973	
Czech Republic[1]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	18 Apr 1975	
Dominica	24 Sep 1993	
Dominican Republic	21 Sep 1993	
Ecuador	25 Jul 1973	
Egypt	14 Jan 1974	
Ethiopia	11 Oct 1994	
Fiji	21 Nov 1973	
Finland	12 Jan 1973	
France	4 Sep 1975	
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 *a*
Ghana		10 Apr 1990 *a*
Germany[2]	20 Feb 1975	
Greece	12 Aug 1985	
Guatemala	9 Dec 1975	
Guinea		27 Dec 1990 *a*
Guinea-Bissau	27 Oct 1995	
Haiti	29 Jan 1973	
Holy See	7 Jan 1976	
Honduras	8 Aug 1979	
Hungary	12 Nov 1987	
Iceland	18 Dec 1974	
India	14 Dec 1978	
Indonesia	3 Sep 1976	
Iraq	25 Sep 1978	
Ireland	16 Dec 1980	
Israel	1 Feb 1974	
Italy	14 Apr 1975	
Jamaica	6 Oct 1989	
Japan	27 Sep 1973	
Jordan	28 Feb 1973	
Kenya	9 Feb 1973	
Kuwait	7 Nov 1973	
Kyrgyzstan	7 Oct 1994	
Latvia	16 Jul 1993	
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974	
Liberia		13 Apr 1987
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	27 Sep 1978	
Lithuania	28 Feb 1994	
Luxembourg	13 Oct 1976	
Madagascar	20 Jun 1974	
Malawi	4 Oct 1973	
Malaysia	20 Apr 1978	
Mali	31 Oct 1995	
Malta		22 Feb 1990 *a*
Marshall Islands	9 Aug 1991	
Mauritania		24 Oct 1989 *a*
Mauritius	12 Dec 1994	
Mexico	27 Apr 1977	
Micronesia (Federated States of)	29 Apr 1991	
Monaco	30 Dec 1975	
Mongolia	6 May 1991	
Nepal		29 Jun 1987 *a*

Participant	*Ratification or accession in respect of the Protocol of 25 March 1972 or participation upon deposit of an instrument of accession to the Convention of 1961 (in accordance with article 19 of the Protocol)*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) in respect of the Convention as amended*
Netherlands	29 May 1987	
New Zealand[3]	7 Jun 1990	
Niger	28 Dec 1973	
Nigeria		24 Jun 1981 *a*
Norway	12 Nov 1973	
Oman	24 Jul 1987	
Panama	19 Oct 1972	
Papua New Guinea	28 Oct 1980	
Paraguay	20 Jun 1973	
Peru	12 Sep 1977	
Philippines	7 Jun 1974	
Poland	9 Jun 1993	
Portugal	20 Apr 1979	
Qatar		3 Oct 1986 *a*
Republic of Korea	25 Jan 1973	
Republic of Moldova	15 Feb 1995	
Romania	14 Jan 1974	
Rwanda		15 Jul 1981 *a*
Saint Kitts and Nevis	9 May 1994	
Saint Lucia	5 Jul 1993	
Senegal	25 Mar 1974	
Seychelles	27 Feb 1992	
Sierra Leone		6 Jun 1994 *a*
Singapore	9 Jul 1975	
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands	17 Mar 1982	
Somalia	9 Jun 1988	
South Africa	16 Dec 1975	
Spain	4 Jan 1977	
Sri Lanka	29 Jun 1981	
Sudan	5 Jul 1994	
Suriname	29 Mar 1990	
Swaziland		18 Oct 1995 *a*
Sweden	5 Dec 1972	
Syrian Arab Republic	1 Feb 1974	
Thailand	9 Jan 1975	
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	13 Oct 1993	
Togo	10 Nov 1976	
Tonga	5 Sep 1973	
Trinidad and Tobago	23 Jul 1979	
Tunisia	29 Jun 1976	
Uganda	15 Apr 1988	
United Arab Emirates		17 Feb 1988 *a*
United Kingdom	20 Jun 1978	
United States of America	1 Nov 1972	
Uruguay	31 Oct 1975	
Uzbekistan		24 Aug 1995 *a*
Venezuela	4 Dec 1985	
Yugoslavia	23 Jun 1978	
Zaire	15 Jul 1976	
Zimbabwe		30 Jul 1993 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

With regard to article 48, paragraph 2:

[See chapter VI.16 for the text of the reservation.]

Declaration:

[See chapter VI.16 for the text of the declaration and the objection thereto.]

CHINA

[See chapter VI.16.]

NEPAL

"His Majesty's Government of Nepal in accordance with article 49 paragraph 1 of the said Convention hereby reserves the right to permit temporarily in its territory:

i. the quasi-medical use of opium;
ii. The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes; and
iii. The production and manufacture of an trade in the drugs referred to under (i) and (ii) above."

[See also text of the declarations and reservations made in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VI.15) and of the amending Protocol of 25 March 1972 (chapter VI.17).]

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its accession on 4 June 1991 to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention, became as of the date of its accession a participant in the Convention. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic, by virtue of its accession on 4 October 1988 to the Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention, became as of the date of its accession a participant in the Convention. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note 8 in chapter VI.17.

19. United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances

Concluded at Vienna on 20 December 1988

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 November 1990, in accordance with article 29 (1).
REGISTRATION: 11 November 1990, No. 27627.
TEXT: Document of the United Nations Economic and Social Council E/CONF.82/15, Corr.1 and Corr.2 (English only); and depositary notification C.N.31.1990.TREATIES–1 of 9 April 1990 (procès–verbal of rectification of original French and Spanish texts).
STATUS: Signatories: 88. Parties: 122.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, held at Vienna from 25 November to 20 December 1988. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 1988/8 of 25 May 1988 of the Economic and Social Council acting on the basis of the General Assembly resolutions 39/141 of 14 December1984 and 42/111 of 7 December 1987. The Convention was open for signature at the United Nations Office at Vienna, from 20 December 1988 to 28 February 1989, and thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations at New York, until 20 December 1989.

In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain resolutions which are annexed to the Final Act. The text of the Final Act was published in document E/CONF.82/14.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), formal confirmation (C), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	20 Dec 1988	14 Feb 1992
Algeria	20 Dec 1988	9 May 1995
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Argentina	20 Dec 1988	28 Jun 1993
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia	14 Feb 1989	16 Nov 1992
Austria	25 Sep 1989	
Azerbaijan		22 Sep 1993 *a*
Bahamas	20 Dec 1988	30 Jan 1989
Bahrain	28 Sep 1989	7 Feb 1990
Bangladesh	14 Apr 1989	11 Oct 1990
Barbados		15 Oct 1992 *a*
Belarus	27 Feb 1989	15 Oct 1990
Belgium	22 May 1989	25 Oct 1995
Bhutan		27 Aug 1990 *a*
Bolivia	20 Dec 1988	20 Aug 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	20 Dec 1988	17 Jul 1991
Brunei Darussalam	26 Oct 1989	12 Nov 1993
Bulgaria	19 May 1989	24 Sep 1992
Burkina Faso		2 Jun 1992 *a*
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 *a*
Cameroon	27 Feb 1989	28 Oct 1991
Canada	20 Dec 1988	5 Jul 1990
Cape Verde		8 May 1995 *a*
Chad		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Chile	20 Dec 1988	13 Mar 1990
China	20 Dec 1988	25 Oct 1989
Colombia	20 Dec 1988	10 Jun 1994
Costa Rica	25 Apr 1989	8 Feb 1991
Côte d'Ivoire	20 Dec 1988	25 Nov 1991
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba	7 Apr 1989	
Cyprus	20 Dec 1988	25 May 1990
Czech Republic[1]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	20 Dec 1988	19 Dec 1991
Dominica		30 Jun 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		21 Sep 1993 *a*
Ecuador	21 Jun 1989	23 Mar 1990
Egypt	20 Dec 1988	15 Mar 1991
El Salvador		21 May 1993 *a*
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 *a*
European Community	8 Jun 1989	31 Dec 1990 *C*
Fiji		25 Mar 1993 *a*
Finland	8 Feb 1989	15 Feb 1994 *A*
France	13 Feb 1989	31 Dec 1990 *AA*
Gabon	20 Dec 1989	
Germany[2]	19 Jan 1989	30 Nov 1993
Ghana	20 Dec 1988	10 Apr 1990
Greece	23 Feb 1989	28 Jan 1992
Grenada		10 Dec 1990 *a*
Guatemala	20 Dec 1988	28 Feb 1991
Guinea		27 Dec 1990 *a*
Guinea–Bissau		27 Oct 1995 *a*
Guyana		19 Mar 1993 *a*
Haiti		18 Sep 1995 *a*
Holy See	20 Dec 1988	
Honduras	20 Dec 1988	11 Dec 1991
Hungary	22 Aug 1989	
India		27 Mar 1990 *a*
Indonesia	27 Mar 1989	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	20 Dec 1988	7 Dec 1992
Ireland	14 Dec 1989	
Israel	20 Dec 1988	
Italy	20 Dec 1988	31 Dec 1990 *AA*
Jamaica	2 Oct 1989	29 Dec 1995
Japan	19 Dec 1989	12 Jun 1992
Jordan	20 Dec 1988	16 Apr 1990
Kenya		19 Oct 1992 *a*
Kuwait	2 Oct 1989	
Kyrgyzstan		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Latvia		24 Feb 1994 *a*
Lesotho		28 Mar 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	26 Sep 1989	29 Apr 1992
Madagascar		12 Mar 1991 *a*
Malawi		12 Oct 1995 *a*
Malaysia	20 Dec 1988	11 May 1993
Maldives	5 Dec 1989	
Mali		31 Oct 1995 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), formal confirmation (C), succession (d)
Mauritania	20 Dec 1988	1 Jul 1993
Mauritius	20 Dec 1988	
Mexico	16 Feb 1989	11 Apr 1990
Monaco	24 Feb 1989	23 Apr 1991
Morocco	28 Dec 1988	28 Oct 1992
Myanmar		11 Jun 1991 *a*
Nepal		24 Jul 1991 *a*
Netherlands[3]	18 Jan 1989	8 Sep 1993 *A*
New Zealand	18 Dec 1989	
Nicaragua	20 Dec 1988	4 May 1990
Niger		10 Nov 1992 *a*
Nigeria	1 Mar 1989	1 Nov 1989
Norway	20 Dec 1988	14 Nov 1994
Oman		15 Mar 1991 *a*
Pakistan	20 Dec 1989	25 Oct 1991
Panama	20 Dec 1988	13 Jan 1994
Paraguay	20 Dec 1988	23 Aug 1990
Peru	20 Dec 1988	16 Jan 1992
Philippines	20 Dec 1988	
Poland	6 Mar 1989	26 May 1994
Portugal	13 Dec 1989	3 Dec 1991
Qatar		4 May 1990 *a*
Republic of Moldova		15 Feb 1995 *a*
Romania		21 Jan 1993 *a*
Russian Federation	19 Jan 1989	17 Dec 1990
Saint Kitts and Nevis		19 Apr 1995 *a*
Saint Lucia		21 Aug 1995 *a*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		17 May 1994 *a*
Saudi Arabia		9 Jan 1992 *a*
Senegal	20 Dec 1988	27 Nov 1989
Seychelles		27 Feb 1992 *a*
Sierra Leone	9 Jun 1989	6 Jun 1994
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain	20 Dec 1988	13 Aug 1990
Sri Lanka		6 Jun 1991 *a*
Sudan	30 Jan 1989	19 Nov 1993
Suriname	20 Dec 1988	28 Oct 1992
Swaziland		3 Oct 1995 *a*
Sweden	20 Dec 1988	22 Jul 1991
Switzerland	16 Nov 1989	
Syrian Arab Republic		3 Sep 1991 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993 *a*
Togo	3 Aug 1989	1 Aug 1990
Trinidad and Tobago	7 Dec 1989	17 Feb 1995
Tunisia	19 Dec 1989	20 Sep 1990
Turkey	20 Dec 1988	
Uganda		20 Aug 1990 *a*
Ukraine	16 Mar 1989	28 Aug 1991
United Arab Emirates		12 Apr 1990 *a*
United Kingdom[4]	20 Dec 1988	28 Jun 1991
United Republic of Tanzania	20 Dec 1988	
United States of America	20 Dec 1988	20 Feb 1990
Uruguay	19 Dec 1989	10 Mar 1995
Uzbekistan		24 Aug 1995 *a*
Venezuela	20 Dec 1988	16 Jul 1991
Yemen[5]	20 Dec 1988	
Yugoslavia	20 Dec 1988	3 Jan 1991
Zaire	20 Dec 1988	
Zambia	9 Feb 1989	28 May 1993
Zimbabwe		30 Jul 1993 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 2, the compulsory referral of any dispute de the International Court of Justice.

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria delcares that for a dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each case.

BAHRAIN[6]

Reservation:

The State of Bahrain, by the ratification of this Convention, does not consider itself bound by paragraph (2) of article 32 in connection with the obligation to refer the settlement of the dispute relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention to the International Court of Justice.

Declaration:

Moreover, the State of Bahrain hereby declares that its ratification of this Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

BOLIVIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Republic of Bolivia places on record its express reservation to article 3, paragraph 2, and declares the inapplicability to Bolivia of those provisions of that paragraph which could be interpreted as establishing as a criminal offence the use, consumption, possession, purchase or cultivation of the coca leaf for personal consumption.

For Bolivia such an interpretation of that paragraph is contrary to principles of its Constitution and basic concepts of its legal system which embody respect for the culture, legitimate

practices, values and attributes of the nationalities making up Bolivia's population.

Bolivia's legal system recognizes the ancestral nature of the licit use of the coca leaf which, for much of Bolivia's population, dates back over centuries. In formulating this reservation, Bolivia considers that:

- The coca leaf is not, in and of itself, a narcotic drug or psychotropic substance;
- The use and consumption of the coca leaf do not cause psychological or physical changes greater than those resulting from the consumption of other plants and products which are in free and universal use;
- The coca leaf is widely used for medicinal purposes in the practice of traditional medicine, the validity of which is upheld by WHO and confirmed by scientific findings;
- The coca leaf can be used for industrial purposes;
- The coca leaf is widely used and consumed in Bolivia, with the result that, if such an interpretation of the above-mentioned paragraph was accepted, a large part of Bolivia's population could be considered criminals and punished as such, such an interpretation is therefore inapplicable;
- It must be placed on record that the coca leaf is transformed into cocaine paste, sulphate and hydrochlorate when it is subjected to chemical processes which involve the use of precursors, equipment and materials which are neither manufactured in or originate in Bolivia.

At the same time, the Republic of Bolivia will continue to take all necessary legal measures to control the illicit cultivation of coca for the production of narcotic drugs, as well as the illicit consumption, use and purchase of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

"a) The signature of the Convention is made subject to the process of ratification established by the Brazilian Constitution;

b) It is the understanding of the Brazilian Government that paragraph 11 of article 17 does not prevent a coastal State from requiring prior authorization for any action under this article by other States in its Exclusive Economic Zone."

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Reservation:

"In accordance with article 32 of the Convention Brunei Darussalam hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of the said article 32."

CHINA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Under the Article 32, paragraph 4, China does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of that article.

COLOMBIA

Upon signature:

Colombia formulates a reservation to article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention, specifically subparagraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e) thereof, since its legislation does not permit outside co-operation with the judiciary in investigating offences nor the establishment of joint teams with other countries to that end. Likewise inasmuch as samples of the substances that have given rise to investigations belong to the proceedings, only the judge, as previously, can take decisions in that regard.

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

1. Colombia is not bound by article 3, paragraphs 6 and 9, or article 6 of the Convention since they contravene article 35 of the Political Constitution of Colombia regarding the prohibition on extraditing Colombians by birth.

2. With respect to article 5, paragraph 7, of the Convention, Colombia does not consider itself bound to reverse the onus of proof.

3. Colombia has reservations in connection with article 9, paragraphs 1 (b), (c), (d) and (e), inasmuch as they conflict with the autonomy and independence of the judicial authorities in their jurisdiction over the investigation and judgement of offences.

Declarations:

1. No provision of the Convention may be interpreted as obliging Colombia to adopt legislative, judicial, administrative or other measures that might impair or restrict its constitutional or legal system or that go beyond the terms of the treaties to which the Colombian State is a contracting party.

2. It is the view of Colombia that treatment under the Convention of the cultivation of the coca leaf as a criminal offence must be harmonized with a policy of alternative development, taking into account the rights of the indigenous communities involved and the protection of the environment. In this connection it is the view of Colombia that the discriminatory, inequitable and restrictive treatment accorded its agricultural export products on international markets does nothing to contribute to the control of illicit crops, but, rather, is a cause of social and environmental degradation in the areas affected. Further, Colombia reserves the right to make an independent evaluation of the ecological impact of drug control policies, since those that have a negative impact on ecosystems contravene the Constitution.

3. It is the understanding of Colombia that article 3, paragraph 7, of the Convention will be applied in accordance with its penal system, taking into account the benefits of its policies regarding the indictment of and collaboration with alleged criminals.

4. A request for reciprocal legal assistance will not be met when the Colombian judicial and other authorities consider that to do so would run counter to the public interest or the constitutional or legal order. The principle of reciprocity must also be observed.

5. It is the understanding of Colombia that article 3, paragraph 8, of the Convention does not imply the non-applicability of the statutory limitation of penal action.

6. Article 24 of the Convention, on "more strict or severe measures", may not be interpreted as conferring on the Government powers that are broader than those conferred by the Political Constitution of Colombia, including in states of exception.

7. It is the understanding of Colombia that the assistance provided for under article 17 of the Convention will be effective only on the high seas and at the express request and with the authorization of the Colombian Government.

8. Colombia declares that it considers contrary to the principles and norms of international law, in particular those of sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-intervention, any attempt to abduct or illegally deprive of freedom any person within the territory of one State for the purpose of bringing that person before the courts of another State.

9. It is the understanding of Colombia that the transfer of proceedings referred to in article 8 of the Convention will take place in such a way as not to impair the constitutional guarantees of the right of defence. Further, Colombia declares with respect

to article 6, paragraph 10, of the Convention that, in the execution of foreign sentences, the provisions of article 35, paragraph 2, of its Political Constitution and other legal and constitutional norms must be observed

The international obligations deriving from article 3, paragraphs 1 (c) and 2, as well as from article 11 are conditional on respect for Colombian constitutional principles and the above three reservations and nine declarations making the Convention compatible with the Colombian constitutional order.

CYPRUS

Upon signature:

"[Signature is effected] subject to ratification, at the time of which reservations in respect of specific provisions of the Convention may be made and deposited in the prescribed manner. [It is understood] that such reservations, if any, cannot be incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"As a result of the occupation of 37% of the territory of the Republic of Cyprus, which since 1974 is occupied by Turkish troops in violation of the United Nations Charter and of basic principles of international law, the Government of the Republic of Cyprus is prevented from exercising its legitimate control and jurisdiction throughout the territory of the Republic of Cyprus and consequently over those activities in the illegally occupied area which are related to illicit drug trafficking."

DENMARK

Declarations:

"The Convention shall not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

With regard to article 17:

"Authorization granted by Danish authority pursuant to article 17 denotes only that Denmark will abstain from pleading infringement of Danish sovereignty in connection with the requesting State's boarding of a vessel. Danish authorities cannot authorize another State to take legal action on behalf of the Kingdom of Denmark."

FRANCE

Reservations:

The Government of the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 2, and declares that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of the said article may not be referred to the International Court of Justice unless all the parties to the dispute agree thereto.

Similarly, the Government of the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 32, paragraph 3.

GERMANY

Declaration:

It is the understanding of the Federal Republic of Germany that the basic concepts of the legal system referred to in article 3 paragraph 2 of the Convention may be subject to change.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran wishes to express reservation to article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, since this provision is incompatible with our domestic law.

"The Government furthermore wishes to make a reservation to article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, since it does not consider itself bound to compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and feels that any disputes arising between the Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention should be resolved through direct negotiations by diplomatic means."

JAMAICA

Declaration:

"The Government of Jamaica understands paragraph 11 of article 17 of the said Convention to mean that the consent of the coastal State is required as a pre–condition for action under paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 17 of the said Convention in relation to the Exclusive Economic Zone and all other maritime areas under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the coastal State."

MALAYSIA

Declaration:

"The Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 32 of the said Convention, wherein if there should arise between two or more Parties a dispute and such dispute cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of article 32 of the Convention, Malaysia is not bound to refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

MYANMAR

Reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar wishes to express reservation on article 6 relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same in so far as its own Myanmar nationals are concerned.

"The Government further wishes to make a reservation on article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3 and does not consider itself bound by obligations to refer the disputes relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention to the International Court of Justice."

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

Understanding:

"1. Article 1 – *Definition of Illicit Traffic*

During the initial stages of this Conference, [the Government of the Netherlands] proposed to amend Articles 15, 17, 18 and 19 (final numbering)in order to replace the generic phrase 'illicit traffic' by more specific language (e.g. 'illicit transport').

"To some extent the underlying concerns have been met by the introduction in Article 15 of a specific reference to the 'offences established in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 2'. On the other hand, articles 17, 18 and 19 still contain references to 'illicit traffic in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and substances in table I and table II'.

"It is the understanding [of the Government of the Netherlands] that, given the scope of these articles, the term 'illicit traffic' has to be understood in a limited sense, in each case taking into account the specific context. In applying these articles, [it] would therefore have to rely on the chapeau of article 1, allowing for a contextual application of the relevant definition.

2. *Article 3*

"(a). [The Government the Netherlands] notes with respect to article 3, paragraph 2 (subparagraph (b) (i) and (ii), and subparagraph (c) (i)) that the Drafting Committee has replaced the terms 'knowing that such property is derived from an offence or offences *set forth* in paragraph 2' by: 'knowing that such property is derived from an offence or offences *established in accordance with* paragraph 1'. [The

Government of the Netherlands] accepts this change with the understanding that this does not affect the applicability of the paragraphs referred to in cases where the offender knows that property is derived from an offence or offences that may have been established and committed under the jurisdiction of a foreign State.

"(b). With respect of article 3, paragraph 6, [the Government of the Netherlands] notes that its provisions cover offences established both under paragraph 1 and paragraph 2. In view of the provisions of paragraph 4 (d) and paragraph 11 of the same article, [the Government of the Netherlands] understands that the measure of discretionary legal powers relating to the prosecution for offences established in accordance with paragraph 2 may in practice be wider than for offences established in accordance with paragraph 1.

"(c). With respect to article 3, paragraphs 7 and 8, it is the understanding of [the Government of the Netherlands] that these provisions do not require the establishment of specific rules and regulations on the early release of convicted persons and the statute of limitations in respect of offences, covered by paragraph 1 of the article, which are different from such rules and regulations in respect of other, equally serious, offences. Consequently, it is [the Government's] understanding that the relevant legislation presently in force within the Kingdom sufficiently and appropriately meets the concerns expressed by the terms of these provisions.

"*Article 17*

[The Government of the Netherlands] understands the reference (in para.3) to 'a vessel exercising freedom of navigation' to mean a vessel navigating beyond the external limits of the territorial sea.

"The safeguard–clause contained in para. 11 of the article aims in [its] view at safeguarding the rights and obligations of Coastal States within the contiguous zone.

"To the extent that vessels navigating in the continguous zone act in infringement of the Coastal State's customs and other regulations, the Coastal State is entitled to exercise, in conformity with the relevant rules of the international law of the sea, jurisdiction to prevent and/or punish such infringement."

Upon acceptance:

Reservation:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of article 3, paragraphs 6, 7, and 8, only in so far as the obligations under these provisions are in accordance with Dutch criminal legislation and Dutch policy on criminal matters.

PANAMA

Reservation:

The Republic of Panama does not consider itself obligated to apply the measures of confiscation or seizure provided for in article 5, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention to property the value of which corresponds to that of the proceeds derived from offences established in accordance with the said Convention, in so far as such measures would contravene the provisions of article 30 of the Constitution of Panama, under which there is no penalty of confiscation of property.

PERU

Upon signature:

Peru formulates an express reservation to paragraph 1 (a) (ii) of article 3, concerning offences and sanctions; that paragraph includes cultivation among the activities established as criminal offences, without drawing the necessary clear distinction between licit and illicit cultivation. Accordingly, Peru also formulates an express reservation to the scope of the definition of illicit traffic contained in article 1 in so far as it refers to article 3, paragraph 1 (a) (ii).

In accordance with the provisions of article 32, paragraph 4, Peru declares, on signing the Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, that it does not consider itself bound by article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, since, in respect of this Convention, it agrees to the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice only if all the parties, and not just one, agree to such a procedure.

SAUDI ARABIA[6]

Declarations:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not regard itself bound by article 32, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention;

2. This ratification does not constitute recognition of Israel and shall not give rise to entry with it into any dealings or to the establishment with it of any relations under the Convention.

SWEDEN

Declaration:

"Regarding article 3, paragraph 10, Swedish constitutional legislation on extradition implies that in judging whether a specific offence is to be regarded as a political offence, regard shall be paid to the circumstances in each individual case."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[6]

Declaration:

The accession to this Convention shall not constitute a recognition of Israel or lead to any kind of intercourse with it.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Reservation:

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will only consider the granting of immunity under article 7, paragraph 18, where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated, under article 7, paragraph 8, of the Party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of the United Kingdom consider that to do so would be contrary to the public interest."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Upon signature:

"Subject to a further determination on ratification, the United Republic of Tanzania declares that the provisions of article 17 paragraph 11 shall not be construed as either restraining in any manner the rights and privileges of a coastal State as envisaged by the relevant provisions relating to the Economic Exclusive Zone of the Law of the Sea Convention, or, as according third parties rights other than those so recognized under the Convention."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Understandings:

"(1) Nothing in this Treaty requires or authorizes legislation or other action by the United States of America prohibited by the Constitution of the United States.

"(2) The United States shall not consider this Convention as the legal basis for extradition of citizens to any country with which the United States has no bilateral extradition treaty in force.

"(3) Pursuant to the rights of the United States under article 7 of this treaty to deny requests which prejudice its essential interests, the United States shall deny a request for assistance when the designated authority, after consultation with all

appropriate intelligence, anti-narcotic, and foreign policy agencies, has specific information that a senior government official who will have access to information to be provided under this treaty is engaged in or facilitates the production or distribution of illegal drugs."

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 32 (4), the United States of America shall not be bound by article 32 (2)."

VENEZUELA

Interpretative declarations:

1. With respect to article 6: (Extradition)

It is the understanding of the Government of Venezuela that this Convention shall not be considered a legal basis for the extradition of Venezuelan citizens, as provided for in the national legislation in force.

2. With respect to article 11: (Controlled Delivery)

It is the understanding of the Government of Venezuela that publicly actionable offences in the national territory shall be prosecuted by the competent national police authorities and that the controlled delivery procedure shall be applied only in so far as it does not contravene national legislation in this matter.

YEMEN[5]

Upon signature:

[Yemen reserves its] right to enter reservations in respect of such articles as it may see fit at a time subsequent to this signature.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession.)

BELGIUM

27 December 1989

Belgium, member State of the European Community, attached to the principle of freedom of navigation, notably in the exclusive economic zone, considers that the declaration of Brazil concerning paragraph 11 of article 17, of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, adopted at Vienna on 20 December 1988, goes further than the rights accorded to coastal States by international law.

DENMARK

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

FRANCE

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

GERMANY[2]

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

GREECE

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

IRELAND

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

ITALY

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

LUXEMBOURG

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

MEXICO

10 July 1990

With regard to the interpretative declarations made by the United States of America:

The Government of the United Mexican States considers that the third declaration submitted by the Government of the United States of America (. . .) constitutes a unilateral claim to justification, not envisaged in the Convention, for denying legal assistance to a State that requests it, which runs counter to the purposes of the Convention. Consequently, the Government of the United Mexican States considers that such a declaration constitutes a reservation to which it objects.

This objection should not be interpreted as impeding the entry into force of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 as between the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America.

NETHERLANDS

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

PORTUGAL

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

SPAIN

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

27 December 1989

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

23 October 1995

With regard to the reservations and declarations made by Colombia upon ratification:

"The Government of the United States of America understands the first reservation to exempt Colombia from the obligations imposed by article 3, paragraphs 6 and 9, and article 6 of the Convention only insofar as compliance with such obligations would prevent Colombia from abiding by article 35

of its Political Constitution (regarding the extradition of Colombian nationals by birth), to the extent that the reservation is intended to apply other than to the extradition of Colombian nationals by birth, the Government of the United States objects to the reservation.

The Government of the United States of America objects to the first declaration, as it purports to subordinate Colombia's obligations under the Convention to its Constitution and international treaties, as well as to that nation's domestic legislation generally.

The Government of the United States of America objects to the seventh declaration to the extent it purports to restrict the right of other States to freedom of navigation and other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to that freedom seaward of the outer limits of any State's territorial sea, determined in accordance with the International Law of the Sea as reflected in the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 December 1989 and 4 June 1991, respectively. See also I1 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 June 1989 and 21 February 1990, respectively. The instrument of ratification contained the following declarations:

Requests for mutual legal assistance under article 7 shall be directed to the German Democratic Republic through diplomatic channel in one of the official United Nations languages or in the German language unless existing agreements on mutual legal assistance include other provisions or direct communication between legal authorities has been determined or developed on a mutual basis.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs shall be the competent authority to receive and respond to requests of another state to board or search a vessel suspected of being involved in illicit traffic (article 17). See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] The signature was affixed for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. The instrument of acceptance specifies that it is for the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] On 2 December 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to the Isle of Man with the following reservation:

"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will only consider the granting of immunity under article 7, paragraph 18, in relation to the Isle of Man, where this is specifically requested by the person to whom the immunity would apply or by the authority designated under article 7, paragraph 8 of the party from whom assistance is requested. A request for immunity will not be granted where the judicial authorities of the Isle of Man consider that to do so would be contrary to the public interest.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 8 February 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General that the Convention should apply, as from that same date, to the following territories: Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Monserrat and Turks and Caicos Islands.

[5] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[6] The Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel objections identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one referenced in note 14 in chapter VI.16, on 14 May 1990 in regard to the declaration made by Bahrain upon ratification, on 15 November 1991 in regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession and on 10 April 1992 in regard to the declaration made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

CHAPTER VII. TRAFFIC IN PERSONS

1. PROTOCOL TO AMEND THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN AND CHILDREN, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 30 SEPTEMBER 1921, AND THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRAFFIC IN WOMEN OF FULL AGE, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 11 OCTOBER 1933

Signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 November 1947, in accordance with article V.[1]
REGISTRATION: 24 April 1950, No. 770.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 53, p. 13.
STATUS: Signatories: 8. Parties: 42.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 126 (II)[2] of 20 October 1947.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance or succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance or succession (d)*
Afghanistan		12 Nov 1947 *s*	Lebanon		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Albania		25 Jul 1949	Luxembourg	12 Nov 1947	14 Mar 1955
Australia		13 Nov 1947 *s*	Malta		27 Feb 1975
Austria		7 Jun 1950 *s*	Mexico		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Belgium		12 Nov 1947 *s*	Myanmar		13 May 1949 *s*
Brazil	17 Mar 1948	6 Apr 1950	Netherlands	12 Nov 1947	7 Mar 1949
Canada		24 Nov 1947 *s*	Nicaragua	12 Nov 1947	24 Apr 1950
China[3]		12 Nov 1947 *s*	Niger		7 Dec 1964
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Nov 1962 *s*	Norway	12 Nov 1947	28 Nov 1947
Cuba		16 Mar 1981	Pakistan		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Czech Republic[4]		30 Dec 1993 *d*	Poland		21 Dec 1950
Denmark	12 Nov 1947	21 Nov 1949	Romania		2 Nov 1950 *s*
Egypt		12 Nov 1947 *s*	Russian Federation		18 Dec 1947 *s*
Finland		6 Jan 1949	Sierra Leone		13 Aug 1962 *s*
Germany[5,6]		29 May 1973	Singapore		26 Oct 1966
Greece	9 Mar 1951	5 Apr 1960	Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Hungary		2 Feb 1950 *s*	South Africa		12 Nov 1947 *s*
India		12 Nov 1947 *s*	Sweden		9 Jun 1948 *s*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953		Syrian Arab Republic		17 Nov 1947 *s*
Ireland		19 Jul 1961	Turkey		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Italy		5 Jan 1949	Yugoslavia		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Jamaica		16 Mar 1965			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature or acceptance.)

CUBA

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that article 10 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and article 7 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, as amended in the annex to the Protocol done at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947, are discriminatory in that they deny States which are not Members of the United Nations and to which the Economic and Social Council does not officially communicate the Conventions as amended by the Protocol the right to accede to the Conventions as so amended, this being in contrary to the principle of sovereign equality of States.

MALTA

"In accepting the above-mentioned Protocol, Malta considers itself bound only in so far as the Protocol applies to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921 to which Malta is a party."

PAKISTAN

"In accordance with paragraph 4 of the *Schedule to the Indian Independence Order, 1947*, Pakistan considers herself a party to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic of Women and Children concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921 by the fact that India became a party to the above-mentioned Convention before 15 August 1947."

NOTES:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force in respect of both Conventions on 24 April 1950, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Resolutions* (A/519), p. 32.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1)..

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol definitively on 12 November 1947. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol on 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] The instrument of acceptance by the Federal Republic of Germany was accompanied by the following declaration:

". . . The said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

With reference to the above declaration, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (communication received on 4 December 1973):

The 1921 Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children and the 1933 Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, as amended by the 1947 Protocol, and also the 1904 International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic and the 1910 International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, as amended by the 1949 Protocol, deal with matters related to the territory of the countries Parties to the Conventions and to the exercise of authority by the Parties. As is well known, the western sector of Berlin is not an integral part of the Federal Republic of Germany and cannot be governed by it. In that connexion, the Soviet Union regards the above-mentioned statement by the Federal Republic of Germany as unlawful and as having no legal force, with all the consequences that flow therefrom, since the extension of the force of the said treaty instruments to the western sector of Berlin raises questions relating to its status, thus conflicting with the relevant provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971.

Czechoslovakia (communication received on 6 December 1973):

"The Czechoslovak party is willing to take due notice of the above declaration of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the extension of force of the Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921 and of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933 and of the Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of White Slave Traffic signed at Paris on 4 May 1910 to apply also to Berlin (West) only on the understanding that this extension of force is carried out in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and in accordance with the established procedures."

German Democratic Republic (communication accompanying the instrument of acceptance):

With regard to the application to Berlin (West) of the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children of 30 September 1921 as amended by the Protocol of 12 November 1947 the German Democratic Republic states in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic that Berlin (West) is no constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and must not be governed by it. The statement of the Federal Republic of Germany that this Convention as amended by the said Protocol was also to be extended to Berlin (West) is contrary to the Quadripartite Agreement which stipulates that agreements concerning the status of Berlin (West) must not be extended to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany. Consequently, the statement of the Federal Republic of Germany can have no legal effects.

France, United Kingdom, United States of America (communication received on 17 July 1974):

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America reaffirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

"The purpose and effect of the established procedures referred to above, which were specifically endorsed in Annex IV A and B to the Quadripartite Agreement, are precisely to ensure that agreements and arrangements to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that questions of security and status remain unaffected and to take account of the fact that these Sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it. The extension to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Conventions of 1921 and 1933, as amended by the Protocol of 1947, and of the Agreement of 1904 and the Convention of 1910, as amended by the Protocol of 1949, received the prior authorization, under these established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States. The rights and responsibilities of the Governments of those three countries remain unaffected thereby. There is thus no question that the extension to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Conventions of 1921 and 1933, as amended by the Protocol of 1947, and the Agreement of 1904 and the Convention of 1910, as amended by the Protocol of 1949, is in any way inconsistent with the Quadripartite Agreement.

"Accordingly, the application to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Conventions of 1921 and 1933, as amended by the Protocol of 1947, and the Agreement of 1904 and the Convention of 1910, as amended by the Protocol of 1949, continues in full force and effect."

Federal Republic of Germany (communication received on 27 August 1974):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shares the position set out in the Note of the Three Powers. The extension of the Protocols to Berlin (West) continues in full force and effect."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America(8 July 1975—in relation to the declaration by the German Democratic Republic received on 27 August 1974):

"The communication mentioned in above-mentioned [the note] refers to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. This Agreement was concluded in Berlin between the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. [The Government sending these communications is not a party to the Quadripartite Agreement and is] therefore not competent to make authoritative comments on its provisions.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to bring the following to the attention of the States Parties to the instruments referred to in the above-mentioned communications. When authorising the extension of these instruments to the Western Sectors of Berlin the authorities of the Three Powers, acting in the exercise of their supreme authority, ensured in accordance with established procedures that those instruments are applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin in such a way as not to affect matters of security and status.

"Accordingly, the application of these instruments to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications of similar nature by States which are not signatories to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (communication received on 19 September 1975):

"By their note of 8 July 1975, [. . .] the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communications referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the

application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned instruments extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

See also note 5 above.

2. Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1950, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 12 November 1947 entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 24 April 1950, No. 771.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 53, p. 39.
STATUS: Parties: 45.

Participant	*Definitive signature, acceptance of, or succession to the Protocol of 12 November 1947*	*Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 12 November 1947*
Afghanistan	12 Nov 1947	
Albania	25 Jul 1949	
Algeria		31 Oct 1963
Australia	13 Nov 1947	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Belgium	12 Nov 1947	
Brazil	6 Apr 1950	
Canada	24 Nov 1947	
China[1]	12 Nov 1947	
Cuba	16 May 1981	
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Denmark	21 Nov 1949	
Egypt	12 Nov 1947	
Finland	6 Jan 1949	
Germany[3]	29 May 1973	
Greece	5 Apr 1960	
Hungary	2 Feb 1950	
India	12 Nov 1947	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Italy	5 Jan 1949	
Jamaica	16 Mar 1965	
Lebanon	12 Nov 1947	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		17 Feb 1959
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		18 Feb 1963
Malawi		25 Feb 1966
Malta	27 Feb 1975	
Mexico	12 Nov 1947	
Myanmar	13 May 1949	
Netherlands	7 Mar 1949	
Nicaragua	24 Apr 1950	
Norway	28 Nov 1947	
Pakistan	12 Nov 1947	
Philippines		30 Sep 1954
Poland	21 Dec 1950	
Romania	2 Nov 1950	
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947	
Sierra Leone	13 Aug 1962	
Singapore	26 Oct 1966	
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	12 Nov 1947	
Sweden	9 Jun 1948	
Syrian Arab Republic	17 Nov 1947	
Turkey	12 Nov 1947	
Yugoslavia	12 Nov 1947	

Declarations and Reservations

[See the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VII.5) and the amending Protocol of 12 November 1947 (chapter VII.1).]

NOTES:

[1] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[2] The Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Agreement, having been signed definitively on 12 November 1947 by the Government of Czechoslovakia, the latter applied the Convention as amended as from that date. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Convention of 30 September 1921 was received on 21 February 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. An instrument of acceptance of the Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Agreement having been deposited with the Secretary-General on 16 July 1974 on behalf of the German Democratic Republic, the latter applied the Convention as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

3. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children

Geneva, September 30th, 1921[1]

IN FORCE (Article 11).[2]

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935 *a*)
Albania (October 13th, 1924)
Austria (August 9th, 1922)
Belgium (June 15th, 1922)
Brazil (August 18th, 1933)
British Empire (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the Island of Newfoundland, the British Colonies and Protectorates, the Island of Nauru, or any territories administered under mandates by Great Britain.
Bahamas, Barbados, British Honduras, Ceylon, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Grenada, Hong-Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Malta, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Seychelles, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Southern Rhodesia, Straits Settlements, Trinidad and Tobago (September 18th, 1922 *a*)
British Guiana and Fiji (October 24th, 1922 *a*)
Jamaica and Mauritius (March 7th, 1924 *a*)
Leeward Islands (March 7th, 1924 *a*)
Falkland Islands and Dependencies (May 8th, 1924 *a*)
Gold Coast Colony (July 3rd, 1924 *a*)
Sierra Leone (Colony) (November 16th, 1927 *a*)
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Tanganyika (Territory), Uganda (Protectorate) (April 10th, 1931 *a*)
British Solomon Islands (Protectorate), Gilbert and Ellice Islands (Colony), Palestine (including Trans-Jordan), Sarawak (Protected State) (November 2nd, 1931 *a*)
Zanzibar (Protectorate) (January 14th, 1932 *a*)
Burma[3]
Burma reserves the right at her discretion to substitute the age of 16 years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limit prescribed in paragraph B of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and under Article 5 of the 1921 Convention.
Canada (June 28th, 1922)
Australia (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territory of New Guinea.
Papua, Norfolk Island, New Guinea, Nauru (September 2nd, 1936)
New Zealand (June 28th, 1922)
Does not include the mandated territory of Western Samoa.
Union of South Africa (June 28th, 1922)
Ireland (May 18th, 1934 *a*)
India (June 28th, 1922)
Reserves the right at its discretion to substitute the age of 16 years or any greater age that may be subsequently decided upon for the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of May 4th, 1910, and in Article 5 of the present Convention.
Bulgaria (April 29th, 1925 *a*)
Chile (January 15th, 1929)
China[4] (February 24th, 1926)
Colombia (November 8th, 1934)
Cuba (May 7th, 1923)
Czechoslovakia[5] (September 29th, 1923)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Denmark[6] (April 23rd, 1931 *a*)
This ratification does not include Greenland, the Convention, in view of the special circumstances, being of no interest for that possession.
Egypt (April 13th, 1932 *a*)
Estonia (February 28th, 1930)
Finland (August 16th, 1926 *a*)
France (March 1st, 1926 *a*)
Does not include the French Colonies, the countries in the French Protectorate or the territories under French mandate.
Syria and Lebanon (June 2nd, 1930 *a*)
Germany (July 8th, 1924)
Greece (April 9th, 1923)
Hungary (April 25th, 1925)
Iran (March 28th, 1933)
Iraq (May 15th, 1925 *a*)
The Government of Iraq desire to reserve to themselves the right to fix an age-limit lower than that specified in Article 5 of the Convention.
Italy (June 30th, 1924)
Italian Colonies (July 27th, 1922 *a*)
Subject to the age-limit for native women and children, referred to in Article 5, being reduced from twenty-one to sixteen years.
Japan (December 15th, 1925)
Does not include Chosen, Taiwan, the leased Territory of Kwantung, the Japanese portion of Saghalien Island and Japan's mandated territory in the South Seas.
Latvia (February 12th, 1924)
Lithuania (September 14th, 1931)
Luxembourg (December 31st, 1929 *a*)
Mexico (May 10th, 1932 *a*)
Monaco (July 18th, 1931 *a*)
The Netherlands (including *Netherlands Indies*, *Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (September 19th, 1923)
Nicaragua December 12th, 1935 *a*)
Norway (August 16th, 1922)
Poland (October 8th, 1924)
Portugal (December 1st, 1923)
Romania (September 5th, 1923)
Spain (May 12th, 1924 *a*)
Does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.
Sudan (June 1st, 1932 *a*)
Sweden (June 9th, 1925)
Switzerland (January 20th, 1926)
Thailand (July 13th, 1922)
With reservation as to the age-limit prescribed in paragraph (*b*) of the Final Protocol of the Convention of 1910 and Article 5 of this Convention, in so far as concerns the nationals of Thailand.
Turkey (April 15th, 1937 *a*)
Uruguay (October 21st, 1924 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929 *a*)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Argentine Republic (*a*)
Costa Rica
Panama (*a*)
Peru (*a*)

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7]	*Accession, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession, succession (d)*
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 *d*	Pakistan	12 Nov 1947 *d*
Belarus	21 May 1948	Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947
Cyprus	16 May 1963 *d*	Sierra Leone	13 Mar 1962 *d*
Czech Republic[5]	30 Dec 1993 *d*	Singapore	7 Jun 1966 *d*
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 *d*	Slovakia[5]	28 May 1993 *d*
Ghana	7 Apr 1958 *d*	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 Jan 1994 *d*
Jamaica	30 Jul 1964 *d*	Trinidad and Tobago	11 Apr 1966 *d*
Malta	24 Mar 1967 *d*	Zambia	26 Mar 1973 *d*
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 269. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 9, p. 415.

[2] Article 11.—"The present Convention shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date of the deposit of its ratification or act of accession".

[3] See note 3 in Part II.2 in the League of Nations Treaties.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] According to a reservation made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Denmark, only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 8 March 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 2 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application, as from 8 March 1958, of the International Convention of 30 September 1921 for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention when it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

4. Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 April 1950, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 12 November 1947 entered into force, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 24 April 1950, No. 772.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 53, p. 49.
STATUS: Parties: 31.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature, acceptance of, or succession to the Protocol of 12 November 1947*	*Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 12 November 1947*
Afghanistan	12 Nov 1947	
Algeria		31 Oct 1963
Australia	13 Nov 1947	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Belgium	12 Nov 1947	
Brazil	6 Apr 1950	
Côte d'Ivoire	5 Nov 1962	
Cuba	16 May 1981	
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Finland	6 Jan 1949	
Greece	5 Apr 1960	
Hungary	2 Feb 1950	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		17 Feb 1959
Luxembourg		14 Mar 1955
Madagascar		12 Feb 1964
Mali		2 Feb 1973
Mexico	12 Nov 1947	
Netherlands	7 Mar 1949	
Nicaragua	24 Apr 1950	
Niger	7 Dec 1964	
Norway	28 Nov 1947	
Philippines		30 Sep 1954
Poland	21 Dec 1950	
Romania	2 Nov 1950	
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947	
Singapore		26 Oct 1966
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	12 Nov 1947	
Sweden	9 Jun 1948	
Turkey	12 Nov 1947	

Declarations and Reservations

[See also the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VII.5) and the amending Protocol of 12 November 1947 (chapter VII.1).]

[1] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, as amended by the Protocol of 12 November 1947, with a reservation and a declaration, on 16 July 1974. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 943, p. 335. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] The Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Convention having been signed definitively on 12 November 1947 by the Government of Czechoslovakia, the latter applied the Convention as amended as from that date. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

5. International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age

Geneva, October 11th, 1933[1]

IN FORCE since August 24th, 1934 (Article 8).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan (April 10th, 1935 *a*)
Australia (September 2nd, 1936)
(Including *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.)
Austria (August 7th, 1936)
Union of South Africa (November 20th, 1935)
Belgium (June 11th, 1936)
With reservation as regards Article 10.
Brazil (June 24th, 1938 *a*)
Bulgaria (December 19th, 1934)
Chile (March 20th, 1935)
Cuba (June 25th, 1936 *a*)
Czechoslovakia[2] (July 27th, 1935)
Finland (December 21st, 1936 *a*)
Greece (August 20th, 1937)
Hungary (August 12th, 1935)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Iran (April 12th, 1935 *a*)
Ireland (May 25th, 1938 *a*)
Latvia (September 17th, 1935)
Mexico (May 3rd, 1938 *a*)
The Netherlands (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (September 20th, 1935)
Nicaragua (December 12th, 1935 *a*)
Norway (June 26th, 1935 *a*)
Poland (December 8th, 1937)
Portugal (January 7th, 1937)
Romania (June 6th, 1935 *a*)
Sudan (June 13th, 1934 *a*)
Sweden (June 25th, 1934)
Switzerland (July 17th, 1934)
Turkey (March 19th, 1941 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.*
China
Germany
Lithuania
Monaco
Panama
Spain
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Belarus	21 May 1948 *a*	Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Benin	4 Apr 1962 *d*	France	8 Jan 1947
Cameroon	27 Oct 1961 *d*	Niger	25 Aug 1961 *d*
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 *d*	Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947 *a*
Congo	15 Oct 1962 *d*	Senegal	2 May 1963 *d*
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 *d*	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*

Notes:

[1] Registered under No. 3476. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 150, p. 431.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

6. Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910

Signed at Lake Success, New York, on 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 May 1949, in accordance with article 5.[1]
REGISTRATION: 4 May 1949, No. 446.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 30, p. 23.
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 33.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 256 (III)[2] of 3 December 1948.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Australia[3]		8 Dec 1949 *s*
Austria		7 Jun 1950 *s*
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 *d*
Belgium	20 May 1949	13 Oct 1952
Brazil	4 May 1949	
Canada		4 May 1949 *s*
Chile		20 Jun 1949 *s*
China[4]		4 May 1949 *s*
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Cuba	4 May 1949	4 Aug 1965
Denmark	21 Nov 1949	1 Mar 1950
Egypt	9 May 1949	16 Sep 1949
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		31 Oct 1949
France		5 May 1949 *s*
Germany[6,7]		29 May 1973
India	12 May 1949	28 Dec 1949
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 Dec 1949	30 Dec 1959
Iraq		1 Jun 1949 *s*
Ireland		19 Jul 1961
Italy		13 Nov 1952
Luxembourg	4 May 1949	14 Mar 1955
Netherlands	2 Jun 1949	26 Sep 1950
Norway		4 May 1949 *s*
Pakistan	13 May 1949	16 Jun 1952
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa	22 Aug 1950	14 Aug 1951
Sri Lanka		14 Jul 1949 *s*
Sweden		25 Feb 1952 *s*
Switzerland		23 Sep 1949
Turkey	4 May 1949	13 Sep 1950
United Kingdom		4 May 1949 *s*
United States of America	4 May 1949	14 Aug 1950
Yugoslavia	4 May 1949	26 Apr 1951

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, acceptance or succession.)

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba ratifies the present Protocol in order to co-operate in the supervision by the United Nations, as depositary, of all treaties drawn up prior to its establishment by international organizations which have ceased to exist, since, owing to the social and economic measures taken in Cuba under the revolutionary laws to increase employment opportunities for the mass of the people, the white slave traffic has been stamped out, the social evils inherited from former periods which were its main cause, unemployment and idleness, having been eliminated; and moreover, the fact that this Protocol shall likewise apply to colonial countries on a basis of equality shall not be taken to mean any acceptance of the position of subjection of these countries, since not only is it a fundamental principle of Cuba's present policy strongly to condemn colonialism and to proclaim the right of peoples under colonial rule to achieve national liberation, but colonialism has been denounced by the United Nations.

Notes:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force on 21 June 1951 in respect of the Agreement of 18 May 1904, and on 14 August 1951 in respect of the Convention of 4 May 1910, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Resolutions* (A/810), p. 164.

[3] In a notification made on signature, the Government of Australia declared that it extends the application of the Protocol to all territories for the conduct of whose foreign relations Australia is responsible.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and accepted the Protocol of 4 May 1949 on 9 May 1949 and 21 June 1951, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol with a declaration on 16 July 1974. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 943, p. 329. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[7] With the following declaration:

". . . The said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications were received from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (on 4 December 1973), Czechoslovakia (6 December 1973), the German Democratic Republic (16 July 1974), France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (17 July 1974 and 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany (27 August 1974 and 19 September 1975). The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 6 in chapter VII.1.

See also note 6 above.

7. International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 4 May 1949 entered into force, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 21 June 1951, No. 1257.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 92, p. 19.
STATUS: Parties: 57.

Participant	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 4 May 1949, or succession to the Agreement and the said Protocol*	*Accession, succession (d) to the Agreement as amended by the Protocol of 4 May 1949*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963
Australia	8 Dec 1949	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976	
Belgium	13 Oct 1952	
Benin		4 Apr 1962 *d*
Cameroon		3 Nov 1961 *d*
Canada	4 May 1949	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	20 Jun 1949	
China[1]	4 May 1949	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Cuba	4 Aug 1965	
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Denmark	1 Mar 1950	
Egypt	16 Sep 1949	
Fiji	12 Jun 1972	
Finland	31 Oct 1949	
France	5 May 1949	
Germany[3]	29 May 1973	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
India	28 Dec 1949	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Dec 1959	
Iraq	1 Jun 1949	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Italy	13 Nov 1952	
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 *d*
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		9 Oct 1963 *d*
Malawi		10 Jun 1965
Mali		2 Feb 1973 *d*
Malta		24 Mar 1967 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico		21 Feb 1956
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Netherlands	26 Sep 1950	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	4 May 1949	
Pakistan	16 Jun 1952	
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		7 Jun 1966 *d*
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	14 Aug 1951	
Sri Lanka	14 Jul 1949	
Sweden	25 Feb 1952	
Switzerland	23 Sep 1949	
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	13 Sep 1950	
United Kingdom	4 May 1949	
United Republic of Tanzania		18 Mar 1963
United States of America	14 Aug 1950	
Yugoslavia	26 Apr 1951	
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 *d*

Declarations and Reservations

[See the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Agreement (chapter VII.8) and the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 (chapter VII.6).]

NOTES:

[1] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[2] Czechoslovakia had accepted the Protocol of 4 May 1949, on 21 June 1951. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Agreement of 18 May 1904 was received on 16 July 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. As an instrument of acceptance of the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 was deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the latter has been applying the Agreement as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

8. International Agreement for the Suppression of the "White Slave Traffic"

Signed at Paris on 18 May 1904[1]

IN FORCE since 18 July 1905 (article 8).

The following list was provided by the Government of France at the time of the transfer to the Secretary-General of the depositary functions in respect of the Agreement.

(1) States which ratified the Agreement

Belgium
Denmark
France
Germany
Italy
Netherlands
Portugal
Russia
Spain
Sweden and Norway
Switzerland
United Kingdom

(2) States which acceded to the Agreement

Austria-Hungary
Brazil
Bulgaria
Colombia
Czechoslovakia[2]
Lebanon[3]
Luxembourg
Poland
United States of America

(3) The Agreement was declared applicable to the following colonies, dominions and protectorates

German colonies
Iceland and Danish West Indies
Australia
Bahamas
Barbados
British Central Africa
British Guinea and Guiana
British Solomon Islands
Canada
Fiji Islands
Gambia
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Hong Kong
India
Jamaica
Leeward Islands
Malta
Myanmar
New Zealand
Northern Nigeria
Palestine and Transjordan
St. Helena
Sarawak
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Somaliland
Southern Rhodesia
Ceylon
Trinidad
Uganda
Wei-hai-wei
Windward Islands
Zanzibar
French colonies
Eritrea
Netherlands colonies

(4) The following colonies, dominions and protectorates consented to concur in article I of the Agreement

Basutoland
Bechuanaland
Bermuda
British East Africa
British Honduras
Cape Town
Cyprus
Natal
Orange River Colony
Southern Nigeria
Straits Settlements
Transvaal

(5) States and territories on behalf of which accession to the Convention of 4 May 1910 on the White Slave Traffic entailed ipso facto *accession to the Agreement of 18 May 1904 by virtue of article 8 of the Convention of 1910*

Chile
Cuba
Egypt
Finland
Irish Free State
Lithuania
Norway
Persia
Siam
Estonia
Newfoundland
Tanganyika
Union of South Africa
Kenya
Nyasaland
Papua and Norfolk
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Isle of Man
Japan
China
Yugoslavia
New Guinea
Nauru
Jersey
Guernsey
Falkland Islands
Iraq
Sudan
Turkey
Uruguay
Monaco
Morocco
Tunisia
Mauritius

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Succession*
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993
Fiji	12 Jun 1972
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993

NOTES:

[1] Registered under No. 11: see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. I, p. 83.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The instrument of accession by the Government of Lebanon was deposited with the Secretary-General on 20 June 1949.

[4] In a notification received on 16 July 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Agreement as from 10 August 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 17 June 1974, concerning the application, as from 10 August 1958, of the International Agreement of 18 May 1904 for the Suppression of the "White Slave Traffic", the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Agreement for the Suppression of the 'White Slave Traffic', May 18th, 1904 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

9. International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 August 1951, the date on which the amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 4 May 1949 entered into force, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 14 August 1951, No. 1358.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 98, p. 101.
STATUS: Parties: 55.

Participant	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 4 May 1949, or succession to the Convention and the said Protocol*	*Accession, succession (d) to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 4 May 1949*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963
Australia	8 Dec 1949	
Austria	7 Jun 1950	
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976	
Belgium	13 Oct 1952	
Benin		4 Apr 1962 *d*
Cameroon		3 Nov 1961 *d*
Canada	4 May 1949	
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	20 Jun 1949	
China[1]	4 May 1949	
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Cuba	4 Aug 1965	
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[2]	30 Dec 1993	
Denmark	1 Mar 1950	
Egypt	16 Sep 1949	
Fiji	12 Jun 1972	
Finland	31 Oct 1949	
France	5 May 1949	
Germany[3]	9 May 1973	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
India	28 Dec 1949	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Dec 1959	
Iraq	1 Jun 1949	
Ireland	19 Jul 1961	
Italy	13 Nov 1952	
Jamaica		17 Mar 1965 *d*
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		9 Oct 1963 *d*
Malawi		10 Jun 1965
Mali		2 Feb 1973 *d*
Malta		24 Mar 1967 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico		21 Feb 1956
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Netherlands	26 Sep 1950	
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Norway	4 May 1949	
Pakistan	16 Jun 1952	
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		7 Jun 1966
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993	
South Africa	14 Aug 1951	
Sri Lanka	14 Jul 1949	
Sweden	25 Feb 1952	
Switzerland	23 Sep 1949	
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	13 Sep 1950	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4 May 1949	
United Republic of Tanzania		18 Mar 1963
Yugoslavia	26 Apr 1951	
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 *d*

Declarations and Reservations

[See the text of the declarations and reservations in respect of the unamended Convention (chapter VII.10) and the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 (chapter VII.6).]

Notes:

[1] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[2] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its acceptance of the Protocol of 4 mai 1949 amending the Convention of 1910, became a party to the Convention on that same date. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Convention of 4 May 1910 was received on 16 July 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. An instrument of acceptance of the amending Protocol of 4 May 1949 was deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the latter has been applying the Convention as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

10. International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic

Signed at Paris on 4 May 1910[1]

The following list was provided by the Government of France at the time of the transfer to the Secretary-General of the depositary functions in respect of the Convention.

(1) States which ratified the Convention

Austria-Hungary
Belgium
Brazil
Denmark
France
Germany
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Italy
Netherlands
Portugal
Russia
Spain
Sweden

(2) States which acceded to the Convention

Bulgaria
Chile
China[2]
Colombia
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[3]
Egypt
Estonia
Finland
Irish Free State
Japan
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Monaco
Norway
Persia
Poland
Siam
Switzerland
Turkey
Uruguay
Yugoslavia

(3) The Convention was declared applicable to the following colonies, dominions and protectorates

French colonies, Morocco, Tunisia,
Netherlands East and West Indies, Surinam and Curaçao
Canada
Union of South Africa
Newfoundland
New Zealand
Bahamas
Ceylon
Cyprus
Kenya
Fiji Islands
Gibraltar
Hong Kong
Jamaica
Malta
Nyasaland
Southern Rhodesia
Straits Settlements
Trinidad
Australia
Papua and Norfolk
India
Barbados
British Honduras
Grenada
St. Lucia
St. Vincent
Seychelles
British Guiana
Isle of Man
Jersey
Guernsey
Mauritius
Leeward Islands
Falkland Islands
Gold Coast
Iraq
Gambia
Uganda
Tanganyika
Burma
New Guinea
Nauru
Sudan
Sierra Leone
Palestine and Transjordan
Sarawak
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
British Solomon Islands
Zanzibar

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Accession, succession (d)*
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 *d*
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 *d*
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 *d*
Lebanon	22 Sep 1949
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 *d*

Notes:

[1] *Great Britain, Treaty Series* No. 20 (1912). This Convention is listed under No. 8 *a*) in the League of Nations *Treaty Series* and in the United Nations *Treaty Series* (Annex C).

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a notification received on 16 July 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 10 August 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 2 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 17 June 1974, concerning the application, as from 10 August 1958, of the International Convention of 4 May 1910 for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, May 4th 1910 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

11. *(a)* Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others

Opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on 21 March 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 July 1951, in accordance with article 24.
REGISTRATION: 25 July 1951, No. 1342.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 96, p. 271.
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 70.

Note: The Convention was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 317 (IV)[1] of 2 December 1949.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		21 May 1985 *a*
Albania		6 Nov 1958 *a*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Argentina		15 Nov 1957 *a*
Bangladesh		11 Jan 1985 *a*
Belarus		24 Aug 1956 *a*
Belgium		22 Jun 1965 *a*
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	5 Oct 1951	12 Sep 1958
Bulgaria		18 Jan 1955 *a*
Burkina Faso		27 Aug 1962 *a*
Cameroon		19 Feb 1982 *a*
Central African Republic		29 Sep 1981 *a*
Congo		25 Aug 1977 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba		4 Sep 1952 *a*
Cyprus		5 Oct 1983 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	12 Feb 1951	
Djibouti		21 Mar 1979 *a*
Ecuador	24 Mar 1950	3 Apr 1979
Egypt[4]		12 Jun 1959 *a*
Ethiopia		10 Sep 1981 *a*
Finland	27 Feb 1953	8 Jun 1972
France		19 Nov 1960 *a*
Guinea		26 Apr 1962 *a*
Haiti		26 Aug 1953 *a*
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	15 Jun 1993
Hungary		29 Sep 1955 *a*
India	9 May 1950	9 Jan 1953
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953	
Iraq		22 Sep 1955 *a*
Israel		28 Dec 1950 *a*
Italy		18 Jan 1980 *a*
Japan		1 May 1958 *a*
Jordan		13 Apr 1976 *a*
Kuwait		20 Nov 1968 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		14 Apr 1978 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Liberia	21 Mar 1950	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		3 Dec 1956 *a*
Luxembourg	9 Oct 1950	5 Oct 1983
Malawi		13 Oct 1965 *a*
Mali		23 Dec 1964 *a*
Mauritania		6 Jun 1986 *a*
Mexico		21 Feb 1956 *a*
Morocco		17 Aug 1973 *a*
Myanmar	14 Mar 1956	
Niger		10 Jun 1977 *a*
Norway		23 Jan 1952 *a*
Pakistan	21 Mar 1950	11 Jul 1952
Philippines	20 Dec 1950	19 Sep 1952
Poland		2 Jun 1952 *a*
Portugal		30 Sep 1992 *a*
Republic of Korea		13 Feb 1962 *a*
Romania		15 Feb 1955 *a*
Russian Federation		11 Aug 1954 *a*
Senegal		19 Jul 1979 *a*
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Singapore		26 Oct 1966 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
South Africa	16 Oct 1950	10 Oct 1951
Spain		18 Jun 1962 *a*
Sri Lanka		15 Apr 1958 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic[4]		12 jun 1959 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		14 Mar 1990 *a*
Ukraine		15 Nov 1954 *a*
Venezuela		18 Dec 1968 *a*
Yemen[5]		6 Apr 1989 *a*
Yugoslavia	6 Feb 1951	26 Apr 1951
Zimbabwe		15 Nov 1995 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

"Whereas, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not agree with the procedure of referring disputes arising between the Parties to the Convention relating to its interpretation of application, to the International Court of Justice, at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute, therefore, it does not undertake any commitment regarding observation of article 22 of the present Convention."

ALBANIA

Declaration:

Thanks to the conditions created by the popular democratic régime in Albania, the offences covered by this Convention do not find favourable ground for development there, since the social conditions which give rise to such offences have been eliminated. Nevertheless, in view of the importance of the campaign

against these offences in the countries where they still exist and the international importance of that campaign, the People's Republic of Albania has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted on 2 December 1949 at the fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Reservation to article 22:

The People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 which stipulates that any dispute between the parties to the Convention relating to its interpretation, application or execution shall, at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. The People's Republic of Albania declares that with respect to the competence of the International Court in that connexion, it will continue to maintain as in the past that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, which provides for the compulsory competence of the International Court of Justice and declares that the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision.

BELARUS[6,7,8]

BULGARIA[6]

Declaration:

The offences referred to in the Convention are unknown under the socialist régime of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, for the conditions favouring them have been eliminated. Nevertheless, since it is important to counteract these offences in the countries where they still exist, and since it is important to the international community that such action should be taken, the People's Republic of Bulgaria has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted by the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on 2 December 1949.

ETHIOPIA

Reservation:

"Socialist Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by article 22 of the Convention."

FINLAND

Reservation to article 9:

"Finland reserves itself the right to leave the decision whether its citizens will or will not be prosecuted for a crime committed abroad to Finland's competent authority;"

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic declares that, until further notice, this Convention will only be applicable to the metropolitan territory of the French Republic.

HUNGARY[6,7,9]

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 which state that disputes between the Parties to the Convention relating to its interpretation or application shall, at the request of any one of the Parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that, with respect to the competence of the International Court concerning disputes relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention, for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is necessary.

MALAWI

"The Government of Malawi accedes to this Convention with the exception of article 22 thereof, the effects of which are reserved."

ROMANIA[6]

Reservation to article 22:

The People's Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 which provides that disputes between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and declares that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[8]

Declaration:

In the Soviet Union the social conditions which give rise to the offences covered by the Convention have been eliminated. Nevertheless, in view of the international importance of suppressing these offences, the Government of the Soviet Union has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted on 2 December 1949 at the fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

UKRAINE[8]

Declaration:

In the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic the social conditions which give rise to the offences covered by the Convention have been eliminated. Nevertheless, in view of the international importance of suppressing these offences, the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has decided to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others adopted on 2 December 1949 at the fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, Resolutions* (A/125 and Corr.1 and 2), p. 33.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 16 July 1974 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 943, p. 339. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 14 March 1958. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

[5] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a communication received on 13 May 1955, the Government of Haiti informed the Secretary–General that it considers that in case of dispute it should be possible for either of the Contracting Parties concerned, without previous agreement between them, to refer a dispute to the International Court of Justice and that consequently it does not accept the reservation entered into by Bulgaria.

On that same date, the Government of South Africa informed the Secretary–General that it regards article 22 as fundamental to the Convention and cannot, therefore, accept the reservation entered into by Bulgaria.

Similar communications were received by the Secretary–General from the Governments of Haiti and South Africa in respect of the reservations made by the Governments of Belarus, Hungary and Romania.

On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 of the Convention made upon accession which read as follows:

> The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares, with respect to the competence of the International Court of Justice in disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention, that the consent of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each particular case before any dispute whatsoever can be referred to the Court.

[7] The Government of the Philippines informed the Secretary–General that it objects to the reservations made by the Governments of Belarus and Hungary because it feels that the reference to the International Court of Justice of any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention should not be made dependent on the consent of all parties.

[8] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 April 1989 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Belarus and Ukraine, notified the Secretary–General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations relating to article 22 made upon accession. For the texts of the reservations see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 196, p. 349, vol. 1527 and vol. 201, p. 372, respectively.

[9] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation relating to article 22 made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1427.

11. *(b)* Final Protocol to the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others

Opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on 21 March 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 July 1951, in accordance with the second paragraph of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 25 July 1951, No. 1342.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 96, p. 316.
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 34.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Albania		6 Nov 1958 *a*
Argentina		1 Dec 1960 *a*
Belarus[1]		24 Aug 1956 *a*
Belgium		22 Jun 1965 *a*
Brazil	5 Oct 1951	12 Sep 1958
Bulgaria		18 Jan 1955 *a*
Cuba		4 Sep 1952 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	12 Feb 1951	
Ecuador	24 Mar 1950	
Egypt[1,3]		12 Jun 1959 *a*
Finland	27 Feb 1953	
Guinea		26 Apr 1962 *a*
Haiti		26 Aug 1953 *a*
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	
India	9 May 1950	9 Jan 1953
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953	
Israel		28 Dec 1950 *a*
Japan		1 May 1958 *a*
Kuwait		20 Nov 1968 *a*
Liberia	21 Mar 1950	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya[1]		3 Dec 1956 *a*
Luxembourg	9 Oct 1950	5 Oct 1983
Mexico[1]		21 Feb 1956 *a*
Myanmar	14 Mar 1956	
Niger		10 Jun 1977 *a*
Norway		23 Jan 1952 *a*
Pakistan	21 Mar 1950	
Philippines	20 Dec 1950	19 Sep 1952
Poland		2 Jun 1952 *a*
Republic of Korea		13 Feb 1962 *a*
Romania		15 Feb 1955 *a*
Russian Federation		11 Aug 1954 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa	16 Oct 1950	10 Oct 1951
Spain[1]		18 Jun 1962 *a*
Sri Lanka		7 Aug 1958 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic[1,3]		12 Jun 1959 *a*
Togo		14 Mar 1990 *a*
Ukraine		15 Nov 1954 *a*
Venezuela		18 Dec 1968 *a*
Yugoslavia	6 Feb 1951	26 Apr 1951

NOTES:

[1] In communications received on the dates indicated in parentheses, the Governments of the following States notified the Secretary-General that their instruments of accession to the Convention also apply to the Final Protocol: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (15 November 1956); Libyan Arab Republic (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (7 January 1957); Mexico (16 April 1956); Spain (23 August 1962); United Arab Republic (Egypt) (Syrian Arab Republic) (20 October 1959).

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 14 March 1958. See also note 11 in chapter I.2

[3] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

CHAPTER VIII. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS

1. PROTOCOL TO AMEND THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE CIRCULATION OF, AND TRAFFIC IN, OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS, CONCLUDED AT GENEVA ON 12 SEPTEMBER 1923

Signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 November 1947, in accordance with article V.[1]
REGISTRATION: 2 February 1950, No. 709.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 46, p. 169.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 34.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 126 (II)[2] of 20 October 1947.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Afghanistan		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Albania		25 Jul 1949
Australia		13 Nov 1947 *s*
Austria		4 Aug 1950 *s*
Belgium		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Brazil	17 Mar 1948	3 Apr 1950
Canada		24 Nov 1947 *s*
China[4]		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Cuba		2 Dec 1983
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark[6]	[12 Nov 1947]	[21 Nov 1949]
Egypt		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 *d*
Finland		6 Jan 1949
Greece	9 Mar 1951	5 Apr 1960
Guatemala	9 Jul 1948	26 Aug 1949
Hungary		2 Feb 1950 *s*
India		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	16 Jul 1953	
Ireland		28 Feb 1952
Italy		16 Jun 1949 *s*
Luxembourg	12 Nov 1947	14 Mar 1955
Mexico		4 Feb 1948
Myanmar		13 May 1949 *s*
Netherlands[7]	[12 Nov 1947]	[7 Mar 1949]
New Zealand		28 Oct 1948 *s*
Norway	12 Nov 1947	28 Nov 1947
Pakistan		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Poland		21 Dec 1950
Romania		2 Nov 1950 *s*
Russian Federation		18 Dec 1947 *s*
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa		12 Nov 1947 *s*
Turkey		12 Nov 1947 *s*
United Kingdom		16 May 1949 *s*
Yugoslavia		12 Nov 1947 *s*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, acceptance or succession.)

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that the content of article 9 of the Convention of 1923, as amended by the Protocol, is discriminatory in character in that it denies a number of States the right of accession, thus violating the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers, with respect to the provisions contained in article 15 of the Convention of 1923, as amended by the Protocol, that differences in interpretation or implementation of that article must be resolved by direct negotiations through the diplomatic channel.

NOTES:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force on 2 February 1950, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Second Session, Resolutions* (A/519), p. 32.

[3] An instrument of acceptance of the Protocol was deposited on 2 December 1975 with the Secretary-General on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic. A "notification of reapplication" of the Convention of 1923 by the German Democratic Republic had been deposited with the Secretary-General on 21 February 1974 (see note 1 in chapter VIII.2). See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol definitively on 12 November 1947. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] See note 4 in chapter VIII.2.

[7] See note 5 in chapter VIII.2.

2. Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of, and Traffic in, Obscene Publications, concluded at Geneva on 12 September 1923 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 12 November 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 February 1950, the date on which the amendments, set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 12 November 1947, entered into force in accordance with paragraph 2 of article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 2 February 1950, No. 710.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 46, p. 201.
STATUS: Parties: 53.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 12 November 1947, or succession to the Convention and the said Protocol*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 12 November 1947*
Afghanistan	12 Nov 1947	
Albania	25 Jul 1949	
Australia	13 Nov 1947	
Austria	4 Aug 1950	
Belgium	12 Nov 1947	
Brazil	3 Apr 1950	
Cambodia		30 Mar 1959 *a*
Canada	24 Nov 1947	
China[2]	12 Nov 1947	
Cuba	2 Dec 1983	
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark[4]	[21 Nov 1949]	
Egypt	12 Nov 1947	
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	
Finland	6 Jan 1949	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	5 Apr 1960	
Guatemala	26 Aug 1949	
Haiti		26 Aug 1953
Hungary	2 Feb 1950	
India	12 Nov 1947	
Ireland	28 Feb 1952	
Italy	16 Jun 1949	
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 *d*
Jordan		11 May 1959 *a*
Lesotho		28 Nov 1975 *d*
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		10 Apr 1963 *a*
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 *a*
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 *d*
Malta		24 Mar 1967 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	4 Feb 1948	
Myanmar	13 May 1949	
Netherlands[5]	[7 Mar 1949]	
New Zealand	28 Oct 1948	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	28 Nov 1947	
Pakistan	12 Nov 1947	
Poland	21 Dec 1950	
Romania	2 Nov 1950	
Russian Federation	18 Dec 1947	
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa	12 Nov 1947	
Sri Lanka		15 Apr 1958 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	2 Nov 1947	
United Kingdom	16 May 1949	
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
Yugoslavia	12 Nov 1947	
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*
Zambia		1 Nov 1974 *d*

Notes:

[1] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that [it] had declared the reapplication of the Convention as from 18 December 1958. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its definitive signature of the Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the Convention of 1923, was a participant in the Convention on that same date. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] A notification of denunciation was received on 16 August 1967. In communicating this notification, the Government of Denmark has informed the Secretary-General that the denunciation was intended to apply also in relation to the States parties to the 1923 Convention (chapter VIII.3) which had not yet become parties to the Protocol of 12 November 1947 amending the said Convention (chapter VIII.1). The denunciation took effect on 16 August 1968.

[5] On 30 July 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Netherlands a notification of denunciation of the said Protocol and Convention. The notification specifies that the denunciation shall apply in respect of the Kingdom in Europe only and that the Protocol and the Convention will therefore remain in force in the Netherlands Antilles. The notification also indicated that the reason for the denunciation is the following:

"... under the Act of 3 July 1985 (Bulletin of Acts, Orders and Decrees No. 385) the provisions of the Dutch Criminal Code were amended in such a way that it is no longer possible for the Netherlands to comply fully with the international obligations it

assumed under the Convention. Article I of the Convention contains – inter alia – the obligation to make it a punishable offence to make, produce or have in possession, to import, convey or export obscene publications or any other obscene objects for the purposes of distribution or public exhibition.

"The new provisions of the Dutch Criminal Code fulfill this requirement only with regard to the portrayal of – or to any medium of information which portrays – sexual activity involving persons under the age of sixteen (i.e. child pornography). As regards the other forms of pornography, the shop windows, to send such images or objects unsolicited through the mail or to supply, offer or show them to children. Since the Convention does not contain any provision which would allow the Netherlands to make punishable only those offences included in the amended Criminal Code, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has no other choice than to denounce the Convention for the Netherlands."

3. International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications

Geneva, September 12th, 1923[1]

IN FORCE since August 7th, 1924 (Article 11).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan (May 10th, 1937 *a*)
Albania (October 13th, 1924)
Austria (January 12th, 1925)
Belgium (July 31st, 1926)
Includes also the *Belgian Congo* and the mandated territory of *Rwanda–Urundi*.
Brazil (September 19th, 1931)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (December 11th, 1925)
Does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions, Protectorates or Territories under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority.
Newfoundland (December 31st, 1925 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia *(December 31st, 1925 a)*
Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Gold Coast, Hong–Kong, Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands, Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States; (b) Non–Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Trengganu], Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland, Straits Settlements, Swaziland, Tanganyika Territory, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Windward Islands, Zanzibar *(November 3rd 1926 a)*
Bahamas, Bermuda, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Palestine, St. Helena, Trans–Jordan *(May 23rd, 1927 a)*
Jamaica *(August 22nd, 1927 a)*
British Guiana *(September 23rd, 1929 a)*
Burma[2]
Canada (May 23rd, 1924 *a*)
Australia (including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*) (June 29th, 1935 *a*)
New Zealand, including the mandated territory of *Western Samoa* (December 11th, 1925)
Union of South Africa, including the mandated territory of *South West Africa* (Dec. 11th, 1925)
Ireland (September 15th, 1930)
India (December 11th, 1925)
Bulgaria (July 1st, 1924)
China[3] (February 24th, 1926)
Colombia (November 8th, 1934)
Cuba (September 20th, 1934)
Czechoslovakia[4] (April 11th, 1927)
Denmark[5] (May 6th, 1930)
With regard to Article IV, see also Article I. The acts mentioned in Article I are punishable under the rules of Danish law only if they fall within the provisions of Article 184 of the Danish Penal Code, which inflicts penalties upon any person publishing obscene writings, or placing on sale, distributing, or otherwise circulating or publicly exposing obscene images. Further, it is to be observed that the Danish legislation relating to the Press contains special provisions on the subject of the persons who may be prosecuted for Press offences. The latter provisions apply to the acts covered by Article 184 in so far as these acts can be considered as Press offences. The modification of Danish legislation on these points must await the revision of the Danish Penal Code, which is likely to be effected in the near future.
Egypt (October 29th, 1924 *a*)
Estonia (March 10th, 1936 *a*)
Finland (June 29th, 1925)
France (January 16th, 1940)
The French Government does not assume any obligation as regards its colonies or Protectorates or the Territories placed under its mandate.
Morocco *(May 7th, 1940 a)*
Germany (May 11th, 1925)
Greece (October 9th, 1929)
Guatemala (October 25th, 1933 *a*)
Hungary (February 12th, 1929)
Iran (September 28th, 1932)
Iraq (April 26th, 1929 *a*)
Italy (July 8th, 1924)
Japan[6] (May 13th, 1936)
The provisions of Article 15 of the Convention are in no way derogatory to the acts of the Japanese judicial authorities in the application of Japanese laws and decrees.
Latvia (October 7th, 1925)
Luxembourg[7] (August 10th, 1927)
Subject to reservation "that, in the application of the penal clauses of the Convention, the Luxembourg authorities will observe the closing paragraph of Article 24 of the Constitution of the Grand–Duchy, which provides that proceedings may not be taken against the publisher, printer or distributor if the author is known and if he is a Luxembourg subject residing in the Grand–Duchy".
San Marino (April 21st, 1926 *a*)
Monaco (May 11th, 1925)
Netherlands[8] (including *Netherlands Indies*, *Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (September 13th, 1927)
Norway (May 8th, 1929 *a*)
Paraguay (October 21st, 1933 *a*)
Poland (March 8th, 1927)
Portugal (October 4th, 1927)
Romania (June 7th, 1926)
Salvador (July 2nd, 1937)
Spain (December 19th, 1924)
Switzerland (January 20th, 1926)
Thailand (July 28th, 1924)
The Thai Government reserve full right to enforce the provisions of the present Convention against foreigners in Thailand in accordance with the principles prevailing for applying Thai legislation to such foreigners.
Turkey (September 12th, 1929)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Argentine Republic (*a*)	Lithuania	Peru (*a*)
Costa Rica	Panama	Uruguay
Honduras		

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[9]	*Accession, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession, succession (d)*
Czech Republic[4]	30 Dec 1993 *d*	Mexico	9 Jan 1948
Denmark[5]	[21 Nov 1949]	Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 *d*
Fiji	1 Nov 1971 *d*	Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*
Germany[10]			

Notes:

[1] Registered No. 685. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 27, p. 213.

[2] See note 3 in part II.2 in the League of Nations Treaties.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (see note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] See note 4 in chapter VIII.2.

[6] By a communication dated February 14th, 1936, the Japanese Government withdrew the declaration regarding Taiwan, Chosen, the leased territory of Kwantung, Karafuto and the territories under Japanese mandate, expressed at the time of signing the Convention. For the text of that declaration, see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 27, p. 232.

[7] This ratification, given subject to reservation, has been submitted to the signatory States for acceptance.

[8] See note 5 in chapter VIII.2.

[9] See note 1 in chapter VIII.2.

[10] In a notification received on 25 January 1974, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany denounced the Convention. The denunciation was accompanied by the following declaration:

Under the Fourth Law for the Reform of Criminal Law, Section 184 of the German Criminal Code as amended by Article 1 of this Law, departs in certain respects from the rules laid down in the International Convention of 12 September 1923 for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany found it necessary, therefore, to denounce this International Convention.

In its original version Section 184 of the Criminal Code contained a general prohibition to produce and circulate obscene publications. The newly adopted paragraphs of that Section, which will enter into force 14 months after the promulgation of the Fourth Law of 25 November 1973 for the Reform of Criminal Law, contain the following provisions:

1. It is prohibited to make or produce and to distribute sadistic, pedophilic and sodomitic publications of a pornographic nature.

2. It continues to be prohibited to show pornographic motion pictures in public cinemas.

3. In respect of other pornographic publications, the following rules are upheld:

Protection of the general public (e.g. the exhibition of pornographic publications is prohibited), protection of persons who do not wish to be confronted with pornography (it is forbidden to send unsolicited pornographic publications), and protection of youth (to protect the young, certain marketing methods such as mail order trade are prohibited; in addition, the Law places a total ban on advertising pornographic publications).

See also note 9 above.

4. Protocol amending the Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910

Signed at Lake Success, New York, on 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 May 1949, in accordance with article 5.[1]
REGISTRATION: 4 May 1949, No. 445.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 30, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 35.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 256 (III)[2] of 3 December 1948.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Australia		8 Dec 1949 s	Ireland		28 Feb 1952
Austria		4 Aug 1950 s	Italy		13 Nov 1952
Belgium	20 May 1949	13 Oct 1952	Luxembourg	4 May 1949	14 Mar 1955
Brazil	4 May 1949		Mexico		22 Jul 1952
Canada		4 May 1949 s	Netherlands	2 Jun 1949	26 Sep 1950
China[4]		4 May 1949 s	New Zealand		14 Oct 1950 *s*
Colombia	1 Jun 1949		Norway		4 May 1949 *s*
Cuba	4 May 1949	2 Dec 1983	Pakistan	13 May 1949	4 May 1951
Czech Republic[5]		30 Dec 1993 *d*	Romania[6]		2 Nov 1950 *s*
Denmark	21 Nov 1949	1 Mar 1950	Russian Federation[6]		14 May 1949 *s*
Egypt	9 May 1949	16 Sep 1949	Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 *d*
El Salvador	5 May 1949		Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Fiji		1 Nov 1971 *d*	South Africa		1 Sep 1950 *s*
Finland		31 Oct 1949	Sri Lanka		14 Jul 1949 *s*
France		5 May 1949 *s*	Switzerland		23 Sep 1949
Iceland		25 Oct 1950	Turkey	4 May 1949	13 Sep 1950
India	12 May 1949	28 Dec 1949	United Kingdom		4 May 1949 *s*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 Dec 1949	30 Dec 1959	United States of America	4 May 1949	14 Aug 1950
Iraq	1 Jun 1949	14 Sep 1950	Yugoslavia	4 May 1949	29 Apr 1953

Notes:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force on 1 March 1950, in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I, Resolutions* (A/810), p. 164.

[3] An instrument of acceptance of the Protocol was deposited on 2 December 1975 with the Secretary-General by the Government of the German Democratic Republic with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 987, p. 410. A "notification of reapplication" of the Agreement of 4 May 1910 on behalf of the German Democratic Republic had been deposited with the Secretary-General on 4 October 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Protocol on 9 May 1949 and 21 June 1951, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] In signing the Protocol, the Governments of the People's Republic of Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declared that they are not in agreement with article 7 of the annex to the said Protocol.

5. Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910 and amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 4 May 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1950, the date on which the amendments to the Agreement, set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 4 May 1949, entered into force in accordance with the second paragraph of article 5 of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1950, No. 728.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 47, p. 159.
STATUS: Parties: 54.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 4 May 1949, or succession to the Agreement and the said Protocol*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) to the Agreement as amended by the Protocol of 14 May 1949*
Australia	8 Dec 1949	
Austria	4 Aug 1950	
Belgium	13 Oct 1952	
Cambodia		30 Mar 1959 *a*
Canada	4 May 1949	
China[2]		4 May 1949
Cuba	2 Dec 1983	
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Dec 1993 *d*
Denmark	1 Mar 1950	
Egypt	16 Sep 1949	
Fiji	1 Nov 1971	
Finland	31 Oct 1949	
France	5 May 1949	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Haiti[4]		26 Aug 1953
Iceland	25 Oct 1950	
India	28 Dec 1949	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Dec 1959	
Iraq	14 Sep 1950	
Ireland	28 Feb 1952	
Italy	13 Nov 1952	
Jamaica[4]		30 Jul 1964 *a*
Jordan[4]		11 May 1959 *a*
Lesotho		28 Nov 1975 *d*
Luxembourg	14 Mar 1955	
Madagascar		10 Apr 1963 *a*
Malawi		22 Jul 1965 *a*
Malaysia		31 Aug 1957 *d*
Malta		24 Mar 1967 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	22 Jul 1952	
Myanmar[4]		13 May 1949 *a*
Netherlands	26 Sep 1950	
New Zealand	14 Oct 1950	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	4 May 1949	
Pakistan	4 May 1951	
Romania	2 Nov 1950	
Russian Federation	14 May 1949	
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa	1 Sep 1950	
Sri Lanka	14 Jul 1949	
Switzerland	23 Sep 1949	
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey	13 Sep 1950	
United Kingdom	4 May 1949	
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
United States of America	14 Aug 1950	
Yugoslavia	29 Apr 1953	
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*
Zambia		1 Nov 1974 *d*

Notes:

[1] See note 3 in chapter VIII.4.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 3 in chapter I.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia, by virtue of its acceptance on 21 June 1951 of the Protocol of 4 May 1949 amending the Agreement of 1910, was a participant in the Agreement on that same date. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] States whose ratification of or accession to the Convention of 12 September 1923 as amended, in accordance with its article 10, *ipso facto* and without special notification involved concomitant and full acceptance of the Agreement of 4 May 1910 as amended.

6. Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications

Signed at Paris on 4 May 1910[1]

The following list was provided by the Government of France at the time of the transfer to the Secretary-General of the depositary functions in respect of the Agreement

(1) States which ratified the Agreement

Austria-Hungary
Belgium
Brazil
Denmark
France
Germany
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Italy
Netherlands
Portugal
Russia
Spain
Switzerland
United States of America

(2) States which acceded the Agreement

Albania
Bulgaria
China[2]
Czechoslovakia[3]
Egypt
Estonia
Finland
Ireland
Latvia
Luxembourg
Monaco
Norway
Poland
Romania
San Marino
Siam

(3) The Agreement was declared applicable to the following colonies, dominions and protectorates

Australia
Bahamas
Barbados
Basutoland
Bechuanaland
Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi
Bermuda
British East Africa
British Guiana
British Honduras
Canada
Ceylon
Cyprus
Falkland Islands
Fiji
Gambia
German Colonies
Gibraltar
Gilbert and Ellice Islands
Gold Coast
Hong Kong
Iceland and Danish West Indies
India
Iraq
Jamaica
Kenya
Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis)
Malay States
Malta
Mauritius
Netherlands East Indies, Surinam and Curaçao
Newfoundland
New Zealand
Northern Nigeria
Northern Rhodesia
Nyasaland
Palestine
St. Helena
Samoa
Seychelles
Sierra Leone
Solomon Islands
Somaliland
Southern Nigeria
Southern Rhodesia
South West Africa
Straits Settlements
Swaziland
Tanganyika
Transjordan
Trinidad and Tobago
Turks and Caicos Islands
Uganda
Union of South Africa
Virgin Islands
Wei-hai-wei
Western Pacific Islands
Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent)
Zanzibar

(4) States which by their accession to or their ratification of the Convention of 12 September 1923 for the Suppression of the Circulation of, and Traffic in, Obscene Publications, ipso facto *accepted the Agreement of 4 May 1910 by virtue of article 10 of the Convention of 12 September 1923*

Afghanistan
Colombia
Cuba
Salvador
Greece
Guatemala
Iran
Japan
Mexico
Paraguay
Turkey
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Succession*
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993
Fiji	1 Nov 1971
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993

NOTES:

1 *British and Foreign State Papers*, vol. 103, p. 251. This Agreement is listed under No. 22*a* in the League of Nations *Treaty Series* and in the United Nations *Treaty Series* (Annex C).

2 See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

3 See note 11 in chapter I.2.

4 In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 4 October 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 18 December 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 2 March 1976 the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 30 September 1974, concerning the application, as from 18 December 1958, of the Agreement of 4 May 1910 for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications, May 4th 1910 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

CHAPTER IX. HEALTH

1. CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Signed at New York on 22 July 1946

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 April 1948, in accordance with article 80.
REGISTRATION: 7 April 1948, No. 221.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 14, p. 185 (with regard to the text of subsequent amendments, see further under each series of amendments).
STATUS: Signatories: 60. Parties: 190.

Note: The Constitution was drawn up by the International Health Conference, which had been convened pursuant to resolution 1 (I)[1] of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, adopted on 15 February 1946. The Conference was held at New York from 19 June to 22 July 1946. In addition to the Constitution, the Conference drew up the Final Act, the Arrangements for the Establishment of an Interim Commission of the World Health Organization and the Protocol concerning the *Office international d'hygiène publique*, for the text of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 9, p. 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*
Afghanistan		19 Apr 1948
Albania	22 Jul 1946	26 May 1947
Algeria		8 Nov 1962
Angola		15 May 1976
Antigua and Barbuda		12 Mar 1984
Argentina	22 Jul 1946	22 Oct 1948
Armenia		4 May 1992
Australia	22 Jul 1946	2 Feb 1948
Austria	22 Jul 1946	30 Jun 1947
Azerbaijan		2 Oct 1992
Bahamas		1 Apr 1974
Bahrain		2 Nov 1971
Bangladesh		19 May 1972
Barbados		25 Apr 1967
Belarus	22 Jul 1946	7 Apr 1948
Belgium	22 Jul 1946	25 Jun 1948
Belize		23 Aug 1990
Benin		20 Sep 1960
Bhutan		8 Mar 1982
Bolivia	2 Jul 1946	23 Dec 1949
Bosnia and Herzegovina		10 Sep 1992
Botswana		26 Feb 1975
Brazil	2 Jul 1946	2 Jun 1948
Brunei Darussalam		25 Mar 1985
Bulgaria	22 Jul 1946	9 Jun 1948
Burkina Faso		4 Oct 1960
Burundi		22 Oct 1962
Cambodia		17 May 1950
Cameroon		6 May 1960
Canada	22 Jul 1946	29 Aug 1946
Cape Verde		5 Jan 1976
Central African Republic		20 Sep 1960
Chad		1 Jan 1961
Chile	22 Jul 1946	15 Oct 1948
China[2]		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Colombia	22 Jul 1946	14 May 1959
Comoros		9 Dec 1975
Congo		26 Oct 1960
Cook Islands		9 May 1984
Costa Rica	22 Jul 1946	17 Mar 1949
Côte d'Ivoire		28 Oct 1960
Croatia		11 Jun 1992
Cuba	22 Jul 1946	9 May 1950
Cyprus		16 Jan 1961
Czech Republic[3]		22 Jan 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		19 May 1973
Denmark	22 Jul 1946	19 Apr 1948
Djibouti		10 Mar 1978
Dominica		13 Aug 1981
Dominican Republic	22 Jul 1946	21 Jun 1948
Ecuador	22 Jul 1946	1 Mar 1949
Egypt	22 Jul 1946	16 Dec 1947
El Salvador	22 Jul 1946	22 Jun 1948
Equatorial Guinea		5 May 1980
Eritrea		24 Jul 1993
Ethiopia	22 Jul 1946	11 Apr 1947
Fiji		1 Jan 1972
Finland	22 Jul 1946	7 Oct 1947
France	22 Jul 1946	16 Jun 1948
Gabon		21 Nov 1960
Gambia		26 Apr 1971
Georgia		26 May 1992
Germany[4,5]		29 May 1951
Ghana		8 Apr 1957
Greece	22 Jul 1946	12 Mar 1948
Grenada		4 Dec 1974
Guatemala	22 Jul 1946	26 Aug 1949
Guinea		19 May 1959
Guinea-Bissau		29 Jul 1974
Guyana		27 Sep 1966
Haiti	22 Jul 1946	12 Aug 1947
Honduras	22 Jul 1946	8 Apr 1949
Hungary	19 Feb 1947	17 Jun 1948
Iceland		17 Jun 1948
India	22 Jul 1946	12 Jan 1948
Indonesia		23 May 1950
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	22 Jul 1946	23 Nov 1946
Iraq	22 Jul 1946	23 Sep 1947
Ireland	22 Jul 1946	20 Oct 1947
Israel		21 Jun 1949
Italy	22 Jul 1946	11 Apr 1947
Jamaica		21 Mar 1963
Japan		16 May 1951
Jordan	22 Jul 1946	7 Apr 1947
Kazakstan		19 Aug 1992
Kenya		27 Jan 1964

Participant	Signature	Definitive signature (s), acceptance
Kiribati		26 Jul 1984
Kuwait		9 May 1960
Kyrgyzstan		29 Apr 1992
Lao People's Democratic Republic		17 May 1950
Latvia		4 Dec 1991
Lebanon	22 Jul 1946	19 Jan 1949
Lesotho		7 Jul 1967
Liberia	22 Jul 1946	14 Mar 1947
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1952
Lithuania		25 Nov 1991
Luxembourg	22 Jul 1946	3 Jun 1949
Madagascar		16 Jan 1961
Malawi		9 Apr 1965
Malaysia		24 Apr 1958
Maldives		5 Nov 1965
Mali		17 Oct 1960
Malta		1 Feb 1965
Marshall Islands		5 Jun 1991
Mauritania		7 Mar 1961
Mauritius		9 Dec 1968
Mexico	22 Jul 1946	7 Apr 1948
Micronesia (Federated States of)		14 Aug 1991
Monaco		8 Jul 1948
Mongolia		18 Apr 1962
Morocco		14 May 1956
Mozambique		11 Sep 1975
Myanmar		1 Jul 1948
Namibia		23 Apr 1990
Nauru		9 May 1994
Nepal		2 Sep 1953
Netherlands	22 Jul 1946	25 Apr 1947
New Zealand	22 Jul 1946	10 Dec 1946
Nicaragua	22 Jul 1946	24 Apr 1950
Niger		5 Oct 1960
Nigeria		25 Nov 1960
Niue		5 May 1994
Norway	22 Jul 1946	18 Aug 1947
Oman		28 May 1971
Pakistan		23 Jun 1948
Palau		9 Mar 1995
Panama	22 Jul 1946	20 Feb 1951
Papua New Guinea		29 Apr 1976
Paraguay	22 Jul 1946	4 Jan 1949
Peru	22 Jul 1946	11 Nov 1949
Philippines	22 Jul 1946	9 Jul 1948
Poland	22 Jul 1946	6 May 1948
Portugal	22 Jul 1946	13 Feb 1948
Qatar		11 May 1972
Republic of Korea		17 Aug 1949
Republic of Moldova		4 May 1992
Romania		8 Jun 1948
Russian Federation	22 Jul 1946	24 Mar 1948
Rwanda		7 Nov 1962
Saint Kitts and Nevis		3 Dec 1984
Saint Lucia		11 Nov 1980
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		1 Sep 1983
Samoa		16 May 1962
San Marino		12 May 1980
Sao Tome and Principe		23 Mar 1976
Saudi Arabia	2 Jul 1946	26 May 1947
Senegal		31 Oct 1960
Seychelles		11 Sep 1979
Sierra Leone		20 Oct 1961
Singapore		25 Feb 1966
Slovakia[3]		4 Feb 1993
Slovenia		7 May 1992
Solomon Islands		4 Apr 1983
Somalia		26 Jan 1961
South Africa	22 Jul 1946	7 Aug 1947
Spain		28 May 1951
Sri Lanka		7 Jul 1948
Sudan		14 May 1956
Suriname		25 Mar 1976
Swaziland		16 Apr 1973
Sweden	13 Jan 1947	28 Aug 1947
Switzerland	22 Jul 1946	26 Mar 1947
Syrian Arab Republic	22 Jul 1946	18 Dec 1946
Tajikistan		4 May 1992
Thailand	22 Jul 1946	26 Sep 1947
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		22 Apr 1993
Togo		13 May 1960
Tonga		14 Aug 1975
Trinidad and Tobago		3 Jan 1963
Tunisia		14 May 1956
Turkey	22 Jul 1946	2 Jan 1948
Turkmenistan		2 Jul 1992
Tuvalu		7 May 1993
Uganda		7 Mar 1963
Ukraine	22 Jul 1946	3 Apr 1948
United Arab Emirates		30 Mar 1972
United Kingdom		22 Jul 1946 *s*
United Republic of Tanzania[6]		
for Tanganyika		15 Mar 1962
for Zanzibar		29 Feb 1964
United States of America[7]	22 Jul 1946	21 Jun 1948
Uruguay	22 Jul 1946	22 Apr 1949
Uzbekistan		22 May 1992
Vanuatu		7 Mar 1983
Venezuela	22 Jul 1946	7 Jul 1948
Viet Nam[8]		17 May 1950
Yemen[9]		20 Nov 1953 *s*
Yugoslavia	22 Jul 1946	19 Nov 1947
Zaire		24 Feb 1961
Zambia		2 Feb 1965 *s*
Zimbabwe		16 May 1980

Amendments to the Constitution of the World Health Organization

(*a*) Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Twelfth World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 12.43 of 28 May 1959

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 October 1960 for all Members of the World Health Organization, in accordance with article 73 of the Constitution.
REGISTRATION: 25 October 1960, No. 221.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 377, p. 380.
STATUS: Acceptances: 117.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*
Afghanistan	11 Aug 1960	Jamaica	21 Mar 1963
Albania	27 Jul 1960	Jordan	25 Mar 1960
Algeria	8 Nov 1962	Kazakstan	19 Aug 1992
Argentina	11 Apr 1962	Kuwait	9 May 1960
Armenia	4 May 1992	Kyrgyzstan	29 Apr 1992
Australia	12 Aug 1959	Lao People's Democratic Republic	4 May 1960
Austria	29 Mar 1960	Latvia	4 Dec 1991
Azerbaijan	2 Oct 1992	Lebanon	3 Jan 1961
Belgium	20 Nov 1959	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	8 Feb 1960
Belize	23 Aug 1990	Lithuania	25 Nov 1991
Benin	20 Sep 1960	Luxembourg	25 Oct 1960
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10 Sep 1992	Madagascar	16 Jan 1961
Brazil	18 Mar 1963	Malaysia	4 Feb 1960
Brunei Darussalam	25 Mar 1985	Mali	17 Oct 1960
Bulgaria	11 Feb 1960	Marshall Islands	5 Jun 1991
Burkina Faso	4 Oct 1960	Mauritania	7 Mar 1961
Burundi	22 Oct 1962	Mexico	2 Aug 1960
Cambodia	8 Dec 1959	Micronesia (Federated States of)	14 Aug 1991
Cameroon	6 May 1960	Morocco	28 Mar 1960
Canada	25 Feb 1960	Myanmar	19 Apr 1960
Central African Republic	20 Sep 1960	Nauru	9 May 1994
Chad	1 Jan 1961	Nepal	12 May 1960
Chile	28 Apr 1960	Netherlands[11]	14 Sep 1960
China[10]		New Zealand	4 Apr 1960
Congo	26 Oct 1960	Niger	5 Oct 1960
Cook Islands	9 May 1984	Nigeria	25 Nov 1960
Côte d'Ivoire	28 Oct 1960	Niue	5 May 1994
Croatia	11 Jun 1992	Norway	2 Nov 1959
Cuba	27 Jul 1960	Pakistan	12 Feb 1960
Cyprus	16 Jan 1961	Palau	9 Mar 1995
Czech Republic[3]	22 Jan 1993	Paraguay	8 Feb 1960
Denmark	15 Jan 1960	Philippines	25 Mar 1960
Dominican Republic	16 Sep 1960	Poland	18 Feb 1960
Ecuador	10 Jun 1960	Republic of Korea	29 Dec 1959
Egypt	25 Mar 1960	Republic of Moldova	4 May 1992
El Salvador	10 Feb 1960	Romania	2 Dec 1960
Eritrea	24 Jul 1993	Russian Federation	17 Jun 1960
Ethiopia	3 May 1960	Rwanda	7 Nov 1962
Finland	4 May 1960	Samoa	16 May 1962
France	10 Mar 1961	Slovakia[3]	4 Feb 1993
Gabon	21 Nov 1960	Slovenia	7 May 1992
Georgia	26 May 1992	Somalia	26 Jan 1961
Ghana	16 Sep 1960	Spain	4 Nov 1959
Greece	23 May 1960	Sri Lanka	9 May 1960
Guinea	5 Aug 1960	Sudan	1 Apr 1960
Honduras	23 Feb 1960	Sweden	1 Dec 1959
Iceland	5 Jan 1961	Switzerland	15 Jan 1960
India	23 Feb 1960	Syrian Arab Republic[12]	25 Mar 1960
Indonesia	4 Nov 1959	Tajikistan	4 May 1992
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	2 May 1960	Thailand	24 Sep 1959
Iraq	25 Nov 1959	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	22 Apr 1993
Ireland	15 Oct 1960	Togo	13 May 1960
Israel	4 Jan 1960	Trinidad and Tobago	3 Jan 1963
Italy	28 Dec 1960		

Participant	*Acceptance*
Tunisia	18 Mar 1960
Turkey	10 Jan 1962
Turkmenistan	2 Jul 1992
Tuvalu	7 May 1993
Uganda	7 Mar 1963
United Kingdom	1 Apr 1960
Uzbekistan	22 May 1992
Venezuela	20 Mar 1961
Viet Nam[13]	7 Sep 1959
Yugoslavia	8 Apr 1960
Zaire	24 Feb 1961

(*b*) Amendment to article 7 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Eighteenth World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 18.48 of 20 May 1965

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 73 of the Constitution).
TEXT: World Health Assembly resolution 18.48; *Official Records of the World Health Organization*, No. 143, p. 32.
STATUS: Acceptances: 52.

Participant[14]	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*
Afghanistan	16 Nov 1966	Mali	18 Oct 1966
Algeria	27 May 1966	Mauritania	26 Oct 1965
Bahrain	25 Jun 1975	Mauritius	8 Apr 1969
Barbados	3 Jul 1967	Mongolia	5 Oct 1971
Benin	2 Feb 1966	Morocco	2 Mar 1967
Bulgaria	26 Jan 1973	Myanmar	8 Mar 1966
Burkina Faso	6 May 1966	Niger	9 May 1966
Burundi	11 May 1970	Nigeria	30 Jun 1966
Cameroon	5 Sep 1967	Oman	25 Jun 1971
Central African Republic	30 Dec 1970	Pakistan	8 Jul 1966
Costa Rica	15 Jun 1967	Peru	20 Jun 1967
Côte d'Ivoire	6 Dec 1965	Philippines	20 Nov 1967
Cuba	17 Jun 1975	Poland	19 Feb 1971
Dominican Republic	13 Dec 1965	Russian Federation	2 Feb 1972
Egypt	20 Jul 1966	Rwanda	5 Jan 1966
Ethiopia	19 Sep 1966	San Marino	28 Oct 1980
Ghana	9 Feb 1966	Saudi Arabia	26 May 1967
Guinea	22 Dec 1965	Senegal	7 Jul 1966
India	10 May 1966	Sierra Leone	3 Mar 1966
Iraq	12 Feb 1968	Somalia	26 Apr 1971
Jamaica	28 Sep 1970	Syrian Arab Republic	2 Jun 1966
Jordan	11 May 1970	Trinidad and Tobago	2 Dec 1965
Kuwait	11 May 1966	Tunisia	9 Mar 1966
Lebanon	5 Feb 1968	United Republic of Tanzania	17 Aug 1966
Madagascar	26 Nov 1965	Yugoslavia	29 Mar 1966
Maldives	10 Jul 1968	Zambia	22 Nov 1965

(c) Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Twentieth World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 20.36 of 23 May 1967

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 May 1975 for all Members of the World Health Organization in accordance with article 73 of the Constitution.
REGISTRATION: 21 May 1975, No. 221.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 970, p. 360.
STATUS: Acceptances: 136.

Participant	*Acceptance*
Afghanistan	28 Apr 1975
Albania	17 Oct 1974
Argentina	5 Feb 1971
Armenia	4 May 1992
Australia	14 Oct 1968
Austria	10 Feb 1970
Azerbaijan	2 Oct 1992
Bahrain	25 Jun 1975
Bangladesh	25 Apr 1975
Barbados	27 Dec 1967
Belgium	3 May 1968
Belize	23 Aug 1990
Benin	14 Dec 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10 Sep 1992
Brazil	8 Aug 1968
Brunei Darussalam	25 Mar 1985
Bulgaria	26 Jan 1973
Burkina Faso	10 Jan 1972
Burundi	11 May 1970
Cameroon	2 Dec 1970
Canada	24 May 1968
Central African Republic	30 Dec 1970
Chile	17 Jun 1975
China[15]	14 Jan 1974
Congo	28 May 1975
Cook Islands	9 May 1984
Côte d'Ivoire	12 Sep 1967
Croatia	11 Jun 1992
Cuba	17 Jun 1975
Cyprus	24 Nov 1969
Czech Republic[3]	22 Jan 1993
Denmark	20 Nov 1967
Dominican Republic	29 Oct 1975
Ecuador	22 Oct 1974
Egypt	26 Jul 1968
Eritrea	24 Jul 1993
Ethiopia	1 May 1972
Fiji	29 Jan 1975
Finland	21 Dec 1967
France	24 Feb 1970
Gabon	13 Dec 1974
Gambia	13 May 1974
Georgia	26 May 1992
Germany[16,17]	23 Dec 1971
Ghana	30 Aug 1968
Greece	29 May 1975
Guatemala	30 Apr 1975
Guinea	12 Nov 1973
Guinea-Bissau	12 May 1976
Haiti	5 Sep 1974
Honduras	31 Oct 1974
Hungary	9 Oct 1975
Iceland	12 Jul 1972
India	16 Mar 1971
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	31 Jul 1972
Iraq	9 Apr 1970
Ireland	3 Mar 1975
Israel	20 Oct 1970
Jamaica	28 Sep 1970
Japan	21 Jun 1972
Jordan	11 May 1970
Kazakstan	19 Aug 1992
Kenya	3 Jan 1972
Kuwait	2 Jan 1968
Kyrgyzstan	29 Apr 1992
Lao People's Democratic Republic	29 Jul 1968
Latvia	4 Dec 1991
Lesotho	21 Feb 1974
Lithuania	25 Nov 1991
Luxembourg	5 Apr 1972
Madagascar	19 Oct 1967
Malawi	20 May 1970
Malaysia	24 Jan 1974
Maldives	2 Dec 1968
Mali	6 Aug 1968
Marshall Islands	5 Jun 1991
Mauritania	21 May 1975
Mauritius	8 Apr 1969
Mexico	6 Sep 1968
Micronesia (Federated States of)	14 Aug 1991
Monaco	14 May 1970
Mongolia	5 Oct 1971
Morocco	2 Jun 1975
Myanmar	27 Feb 1969
Nauru	9 May 1994
Nepal	20 May 1975
Netherlands	7 Jun 1968
New Zealand	28 Dec 1967
Nicaragua	6 Dec 1974
Niger	4 Sep 1968
Nigeria	24 Jan 1968
Niue	5 May 1994
Norway	7 Feb 1968
Oman	25 Jun 1971
Pakistan	29 Jul 1975
Palau	9 Mar 1995
Panama	26 Feb 1975
Paraguay	15 Jan 1976
Peru	18 Oct 1967
Philippines	10 Nov 1971
Poland	19 Feb 1971
Portugal	8 Jul 1975
Qatar	8 Oct 1975
Republic of Korea[18]	13 Dec 1967
Republic of Moldova	4 May 1992
Romania	24 Feb 1972
Russian Federation	10 Jun 1975
Samoa	19 Feb 1975
Saudi Arabia	9 Nov 1967
Senegal	12 Jun 1970
Sierra Leone	26 Jan 1970
Slovakia[3]	4 Feb 1993

Participant	*Acceptance*
Slovenia	7 May 1992
Somalia	26 Apr 1971
Spain	21 Apr 1970
Sri Lanka	12 Apr 1974
Sudan	28 May 1975
Sweden	9 Sep 1968
Switzerland	5 Dec 1967
Tajikistan	4 May 1992
Thailand	27 Jan 1975
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	22 Apr 1993
Togo	29 Dec 1969
Trinidad and Tobago	27 Feb 1968
Tunisia	5 Oct 1967
Turkey	15 Aug 1969
Turkmenistan	2 Jul 1992
Tuvalu	7 May 1993
Uganda	22 May 1975
United Kingdom	19 Jun 1968
United States of America[19]	19 May 1975
Uzbekistan	22 May 1992
Viet Nam[20]	
Yemen[21]	17 Jan 1975
Yugoslavia	3 Sep 1968
Zaire	23 Jul 1975
Zambia	25 Jan 1968

(*d*) Amendments to articles 34 and 55 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Twenty–sixth World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 26.37 of 22 May 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1977 for all Members of the World Health Organization in accordance with article 73 of the Constitution.
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1977, No. 221.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 315.
STATUS: Acceptances: 147.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*
Afghanistan	28 Feb 1975	Honduras	8 Nov 1974
Algeria	6 Jun 1977	Iceland	5 Dec 1975
Angola	3 Mar 1977	Indonesia	4 May 1977
Argentina	4 Oct 1976	Iraq	28 Jan 1977
Armenia	4 May 1992	Ireland	3 Mar 1975
Australia	11 Mar 1975	Israel	8 Sep 1976
Azerbaijan	2 Oct 1992	Jamaica	25 Mar 1977
Bahamas	14 Dec 1976	Jordan	30 Nov 1976
Bahrain	25 Jun 1975	Kazakstan	19 Aug 1992
Bangladesh	26 Feb 1976	Kenya	17 Sep 1976
Barbados	7 Jun 1974	Kuwait	17 Jul 1975
Belgium	6 Aug 1974	Kyrgyzstan	29 Apr 1992
Belize	23 Aug 1990	Lao People's Democratic Republic	28 Sep 1976
Benin	24 Nov 1975	Latvia	4 Dec 1991
Bolivia	17 Oct 1975	Lesotho	4 Feb 1977
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10 Sep 1992	Lithuania	25 Nov 1991
Botswana	4 Feb 1977	Luxembourg	22 Jun 1982
Brazil	7 Aug 1974	Madagascar	27 Sep 1976
Brunei Darussalam	25 Mar 1985	Malawi	21 Oct 1974
Bulgaria	27 Jan 1976	Malaysia	3 Jul 1975
Burkina Faso	20 Mar 1979	Maldives	16 Sep 1975
Cameroon	30 May 1974	Mali	27 Mar 1975
Canada	12 Jun 1974	Malta	19 Jul 1976
Cape Verde	28 Dec 1977	Marshall Islands	5 Jun 1991
Central African Republic	13 Jan 1977	Mauritania	21 Sep 1976
Chad	3 Nov 1976	Mauritius	26 Jan 1976
Chile	14 Sep 1977	Mexico	25 Jul 1975
China	5 Mar 1976	Micronesia (Federated States of)	14 Aug 1991
Comoros	27 Jan 1977	Monaco	4 Nov 1975
Congo	3 Jan 1977	Mongolia	19 Jan 1977
Cook Islands	9 May 1984	Morocco	30 Dec 1975
Côte d'Ivoire	16 Dec 1977	Mozambique	9 Apr 1979
Croatia	11 Jun 1992	Myanmar	30 Dec 1975
Cuba	7 Feb 1977	Nauru	9 May 1994
Cyprus	20 Jun 1975	Nepal	10 Feb 1976
Czech Republic[3]	22 Jan 1993	Netherlands[24]	27 Jan 1975
Denmark	7 Oct 1974	New Zealand	19 Feb 1976
Dominican Republic	16 Oct 1975	Nicaragua	5 Nov 1976
Ecuador	12 Mar 1975	Niger	11 Jul 1974
Egypt	14 Jan 1974	Nigeria	15 Oct 1975
El Salvador	17 Oct 1975	Niue	5 May 1994
Eritrea	24 Jul 1993	Norway	14 Nov 1975
Ethiopia	9 Jan 1976	Oman	10 Apr 1974
Fiji	15 Nov 1973	Pakistan	29 Apr 1976
Finland	17 Jun 1974	Palau	9 Mar 1995
France	28 Jan 1975	Panama	18 Feb 1975
Gambia	25 Jan 1977	Paraguay	15 Jan 1976
Georgia	26 May 1992	Philippines	17 Sep 1976
Germany[22,23]	9 Jul 1975	Portugal	20 Feb 1975
Ghana	22 Apr 1977	Qatar	8 Dec 1975
Greece	4 Nov 1975	Republic of Korea	16 Nov 1976
Grenada	16 Jul 1976	Republic of Moldova	4 May 1992
Guatemala	18 Dec 1978	Romania	18 Jul 1977
Guinea	22 Sep 1975	Rwanda	19 Nov 1976
Guinea–Bissau	18 Nov 1975	Samoa	6 Jan 1976
Guyana	24 May 1974	Sao Tome and Principe	16 Feb 1977

Participant	*Acceptance*
Saudi Arabia	13 Jan 1977
Senegal	4 Feb 1977
Singapore	22 Sep 1975
Slovakia[3]	4 Feb 1993
Slovenia	7 May 1992
Somalia	8 Oct 1975
Spain	10 Oct 1975
Sri Lanka	12 Nov 1974
Sudan	3 Jun 1977
Suriname	27 Jan 1977
Swaziland	18 Nov 1975
Sweden	13 May 1974
Switzerland	21 Aug 1974
Syrian Arab Republic	18 Jun 1975
Tajikistan	4 May 1992
Thailand	27 Jan 1975
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	22 Apr 1993
Togo	16 Jan 1975
Tonga	8 Feb 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	30 Jan 1975
Tunisia	6 Jan 1976
Turkmenistan	2 Jul 1992
Tuvalu	7 May 1993
Uganda	24 Nov 1975
United Arab Emirates	2 Jul 1974
United Kingdom	23 Jul 1974
United Republic of Tanzania	6 Jan 1976
United States of America[19]	19 May 1975
Uruguay	10 Apr 1978
Uzbekistan	22 May 1992
Venezuela	23 Jul 1975
Viet Nam[25]	23 Feb 1977
Yemen[26]	3 Feb 1977
Yugoslavia	22 Apr 1975
Zaire	15 Jul 1976

(e) Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Twenty–ninth World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 29.33 of 17 May 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 January 1984, in accordance with article 73 of the Constitution.
REGISTRATION: 20 January 1984, No. 221.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.1347, 289.
STATUS: Acceptances: 139.

Participant	*Acceptance*
Afghanistan	20 Sep 1982
Algeria	23 Nov 1983
Armenia	4 May 1992
Australia	30 Mar 1977
Azerbaijan	2 Oct 1992
Bahamas	29 May 1980
Bahrain	25 Apr 1980
Bangladesh	3 Aug 1978
Barbados	3 Aug 1977
Belgium	29 Dec 1977
Belize	23 Aug 1990
Benin	4 May 1983
Bhutan	8 Sep 1982
Bolivia	16 Jun 1982
Bosnia and Herzegovina	10 Sep 1992
Botswana	24 Feb 1978
Brazil	27 Aug 1982
Bulgaria	18 Jan 1983
Burundi	21 Jul 1981
Cambodia	17 Aug 1983
Cameroon	25 Sep 1978
Canada	20 Jan 1984
Cape Verde	13 Jan 1978
Chile	5 Aug 1982
China	20 May 1982
Comoros	13 Dec 1982
Côte d'Ivoire	16 Dec 1977
Croatia	11 Jun 1992
Cyprus	27 Nov 1985
Czech Republic[3]	22 Jan 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	2 Mar 1982
Denmark	1 Jul 1981
Djibouti	5 Dec 1983
Ecuador	22 Nov 1976
Egypt	21 Dec 1976
Eritrea	24 Jul 1993
Ethiopia	6 Jan 1977
Fiji	20 May 1981
Finland	14 Jun 1977
France	22 Jul 1981
Gabon	11 May 1982
Georgia	26 May 1992
Germany[27,28]	16 Jan 1985
Greece	27 Feb 1978
Guatemala	16 Jan 1979
Guinea–Bissau	5 Feb 1980
Guyana	30 Sep 1982
Hungary	4 May 1983
Iceland	22 Jul 1983
India	23 Jan 1978
Indonesia	24 May 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	22 Feb 1980
Iraq[29]	25 Sep 1978
Ireland	16 Feb 1982
Italy	17 May 1983
Jamaica	11 Apr 1983
Jordan	10 Jun 1983
Kazakstan	19 Aug 1992
Kenya	1 Mar 1983
Kuwait	7 Jun 1984
Kyrgyzstan	29 Apr 1992
Lao People's Democratic Republic	23 Jan 1978
Latvia	4 Dec 1991
Lebanon	21 Jun 1982
Liberia	25 May 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	16 Jun 1982
Lithuania	25 Nov 1991
Luxembourg	22 Jun 1982
Madagascar	8 Mar 1983
Malawi	9 Apr 1980
Malaysia	25 Jan 1984
Maldives	20 Sep 1977
Malta	20 Jul 1977
Marshall Islands	5 Jun 1991
Mauritania	28 Apr 1982
Mauritius	3 Sep 1981
Mexico	23 Feb 1979
Micronesia (Federated States of)	14 Aug 1991
Monaco	13 Jan 1983
Mongolia	10 Nov 1981
Mozambique	27 Feb 1978
Myanmar	15 Jun 1979
Nauru	9 May 1994
Nepal	23 Apr 1980
Netherlands[24]	18 Oct 1977
New Zealand	26 Mar 1980
Nicaragua	16 Feb 1983
Niger	28 Dec 1976
Niue	5 May 1994
Norway	29 Dec 1976
Oman	8 Aug 1980
Palau	9 Mar 1995
Panama	12 Nov 1984
Papua New Guinea	1 Jul 1983
Peru	10 Oct 1978
Philippines	7 Oct 1981
Portugal	26 Jun 1978
Qatar	7 Dec 1982
Republic of Moldova	4 May 1992
Romania	18 Jul 1977
Russian Federation	1 Apr 1982
Samoa	9 May 1980
San Marino	28 Oct 1980
Sao Tome and Principe	12 Apr 1982
Saudi Arabia	13 Jan 1977
Senegal	12 Jan 1983
Seychelles	22 Feb 1980
Singapore	9 Jun 1983
Slovakia[3]	4 Feb 1993
Slovenia	7 May 1992
Spain	4 Nov 1976
Sri Lanka	6 Oct 1978
Sudan	13 Jul 1982
Suriname	4 Oct 1976

Participant	*Acceptance*
Sweden	4 Feb 1980
Switzerland	21 Jul 1978
Tajikistan	4 May 1992
Thailand	7 Jun 1978
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	22 Apr 1993
Togo	18 Oct 1982
Tonga	28 Nov 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	4 Jun 1985
Tunisia	30 Sep 1983
Turkey	29 Dec 1982
Turkmenistan	2 Jul 1992
Tuvalu	7 May 1993
Uganda	10 Jan 1978
United Arab Emirates	7 Oct 1982
United Kingdom	24 Feb 1978
United States of America	11 Nov 1982
Uruguay	10 Apr 1978
Uzbekistan	22 May 1992
Venezuela	17 Aug 1983
Viet Nam	30 Dec 1981
Yemen[30]	8 Mar 1982
Yugoslavia	2 Sep 1983
Zambia	10 Aug 1984
Zaire	2 May 1983
Zimbabwe	13 Oct 1982

(f) Amendment to article 74 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Thirty-first World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 31.18 of 18 May 1978

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 73 of the Constitution).
TEXT: *World Health Assembly*, resolution WHA 31.18, *Official Records of the World Health Organization*, No. 247, p. 11.
STATUS: Acceptances: 35.

Participant	*Acceptance*
Algeria	14 Sep 1987
Australia	29 Sep 1981
Bahrain	19 May 1982
Belgium	1 Feb 1980
Cape Verde	26 Nov 1979
Cyprus	3 Apr 1987
Egypt	4 Mar 1981
Finland	15 May 1980
France	6 Oct 1980
Guatemala	12 Feb 1980
Iceland	22 Jul 1983
Iraq	17 Sep 1984
Jordan	30 Aug 1982
Kuwait	2 Jan 1980
Lebanon	10 Jan 1986
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	20 Apr 1981
Luxembourg	22 Jun 1982
Malawi	3 Jul 1979
Mauritania	27 May 1982
Monaco	3 Feb 1983
Morocco	2 Mar 1987
Netherlands[24]	5 Jan 1982
Niger	18 Apr 1979
Norway	18 Apr 1979
Oman	18 Jul 1985
Qatar	25 Apr 1985
Russian Federation	1 Apr 1982
San Marino	28 Oct 1980
Saudi Arabia	30 Oct 1978
Singapore	17 Apr 1979
Syrian Arab Republic	18 Dec 1979
Tunisia	30 Sep 1983
United Arab Emirates	18 Aug 1982
United States of America	10 Dec 1980
Yemen[31]	8 Mar 1982

(g) Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization

Adopted by the Thirty-ninth World Health Assembly by resolution WHA 39.6 of 12 May 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 July 1994, in accordance with article 73 of the Constitution.
TEXT: *Resolutions of the World Health Assembly*, 39th session, WHA 39.6, p. 1.
STATUS: Acceptances: 135.

Participant	*Acceptance*
Afghanistan	7 Dec 1989
Argentina	11 Apr 1995
Australia	25 Feb 1987
Bahamas	2 Jun 1987
Bahrain	21 Jun 1991
Bangladesh	18 May 1994
Barbados	2 Nov 1993
Belarus	16 Feb 1993
Belgium	5 Feb 1987
Bhutan	23 Oct 1990
Bolivia	18 Mar 1992
Bosnia and Herzegovina	16 Jul 1993
Botswana	10 Jan 1992
Brunei Darussalam	4 Mar 1987
Bulgaria	4 May 1994
Burkina Faso	1 Apr 1992
Cambodia	17 Nov 1993
Cameroon	15 Oct 1987
Chad	26 May 1993
Chile	21 Aug 1995
China	4 Dec 1986
Colombia	24 Sep 1993
Comoros	29 Jul 1994
Congo	13 Jul 1993
Cook Islands	2 Jan 1990
Côte d'Ivoire	30 Apr 1993
Croatia	11 Feb 1993
Cyprus	18 Jan 1990
Denmark	8 Jul 1991
Djibouti	2 Jun 1993
Dominica	1 Mar 1990
Ecuador	14 Apr 1993
Egypt	10 Sep 1990
El Salvador	13 Jan 1994
Ethiopia	4 Dec 1990
Fiji	23 Oct 1989
Finland	19 Dec 1986
France	17 Mar 1987
Gabon	20 May 1987
Germany[32,33]	15 Sep 1987
Ghana	4 Oct 1991
Greece	23 Jan 1991
Grenada	31 Dec 1991
Guatemala	21 Jul 1994
Guinea	27 Dec 1991
Guinea-Bissau	7 Nov 1991
Honduras	9 Jan 1991
Hungary	2 June 1992
Iceland	2 Apr 1991
India	12 Dec 1988
Indonesia	6 Jul 1988
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	22 Oct 1990
Iraq	20 Mar 1990
Ireland	6 Oct 1993
Italy	30 Jun 1995
Jamaica	4 Dec 1986
Japan	23 Jun 1987
Jordan	26 Mar 1987
Kiribati	11 May 1988
Kuwait	27 Apr 1987
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5 Apr 1988
Latvia	19 Apr 1993
Lebanon	9 Sep 1993
Lithuania	11 Mar 1993
Luxembourg	29 Sep 1987
Madagascar	24 Nov 1986
Malaysia	29 Sep 1988
Maldives	26 Oct 1990
Malta	23 Jan 1990
Marshall Islands	12 Jul 1993
Mauritius	23 Apr 1993
Mexico	17 Feb 1989
Micronesia (Federated States of)	13 Mar 1992
Monaco	22 Feb 1990
Mongolia	26 Mar 1993
Morocco	2 Mar 1987
Mozambique	8 Oct 1991
Myanmar	17 Nov 1993
Namibia	11 Nov 1991
Nepal	30 Aug 1990
Netherlands[24]	6 Nov 1987
New Zealand	30 Dec 1986
Nicaragua	14 Apr 1994
Nigeria	3 Jan 1991
Niue	11 Jul 1994
Norway	1 Feb 1990
Oman	3 Jul 1990
Pakistan	22 Aug 1994
Palau	9 Mar 1995
Panama	14 Jun 1990
Papua New Guinea	17 Oct 1990
Peru	21 Sep 1995
Philippines	16 Mar 1989
Portugal	22 Mar 1994
Qatar	17 May 1993
Republic of Korea	5 May 1987
Romania	17 Nov 1993
Russian Federation	2 Apr 1990
Samoa	21 Feb 1991
Saint Lucia	26 Sep 1991
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	24 Sep 1991
San Marino	30 Jul 1987
Saudi Arabia	10 Jan 1990
Senegal	16 Apr 1987
Seychelles	30 Jul 1993
Sierra Leone	25 Jul 1994
Singapore	2 Mar 1987
Slovenia	21 Jun 1993
Solomon Islands	9 Mar 1987
South Africa	5 May 1994
Spain	17 Apr 1991
Sri Lanka	21 May 1993
Sudan	13 Nov 1990
Swaziland	10 Dec 1991
Sweden	10 Oct 1986

Participant	*Acceptance*
Switzerland	19 Feb 1987
Syrian Arab Republic	6 Feb 1990
Thailand	15 Aug 1990
Togo	30 Jan 1987
Tonga	2 Jan 1987
Trinidad and Tobago	15 Oct 1986
Tunisia	4 Oct 1990
Turkmenistan	16 Apr 1993
Tuvalu	27 Jan 1994
Uganda	9 Oct 1991
United Arab Emirates	11 Feb 1987
United Kingdom	18 Mar 1987
United States of America	1 May 1990
Uzbekistan	27 Aug 1993
Vanuatu	19 Mar 1987
Venezuela	22 Apr 1988
Viet Nam	14 Oct 1987
Yemen	9 Sep 1993
Yugoslavia	12 Apr 1993
Zimbabwe	15 Jun 1992

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon acceptance.)

FRANCE

13 October 1983

The Secretariat should take note that France not recognizing the Government of the [Democratic Kampuchea], considers as being without effect the acceptance by that Government of the 1976 amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, adopted by the Twenty-ninth World Health Assembly on 17 May 1976.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, First Session, Supplement No. 1*, p. 86.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and accepted the Convention on 22 July 1946 and 1 March 1948, respectively. Subsequently, Czechoslovakia had accepted the amendments to articles 24 and 25 adopted by the Twentieth and Thirty-ninth sessions of the World Health Assembly by resolutions WHA 20.36 and WHA 39.6, on 4 September 1968 and 16 August 1991, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Constitution on 8 May 1973. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 6 October 1964, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Constitution of the World Health Organization, including the amendments which came into force on 25 October 1960, applies to *Land Berlin*. With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 of chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*. See also note 4 above.

[6] See note 30 in chapter I.2.

[7] Accepted subject to the provisions of the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of America approved 14 June 1948 (Public Law 643, 80th Congress), section 4 of which reads as follows: "In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that, in the absence of any provision in the World Health Organization Constitution for withdrawal from the organization, the United States reserves its right to withdraw from the organization on a one-year notice, provided, however, that the financial obligations of the United States to the organization shall be met in full for the organization's current fiscal year."

"The World Health Assembly adopted unanimously on 2 July 1948 the following resolution: "The Assembly recognized the validity of the ratification by the United States of America and resolved that the Secretary-General of the United Nations be advised of this decision."

[8] By a letter dated at Hanoi on 12 July 1976, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet-Nam notified the Director-General of the World Health Organization that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam had united to form the Socialist Republic of Viet-Nam, and that the latter would continue to exercise the official membership in the World Health Organization of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam. The above-mentioned communication from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Viet-Nam was brought to the attention of the Member States of the World Health Organization by a circular letter from the Director-General of that Organization dated 30 August 1976. The Thirtieth World Health Assembly took note of the said notification in its resolution WHA 30.13 dated 10 May 1977. The Constitution of the World Health Organization had been accepted on behalf of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam on 22 October 1975 and on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam (later replaced by the Republic of South Viet-Nam) on 17 May 1950.

[9] Democratic Yemen had accepted the Constitution on 6 May 1968. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[10] Acceptance on behalf of the Republic of China on 25 April 1960. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[11] The instrument of acceptance stipulates that the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the amendments for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and Netherlands New Guinea.

[12] Acceptance by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

[13] See note 8. The amendments had been accepted on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam (later replaced by the Republic of South Viet-Nam) on 7 September 1959.

[14] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the amendment to article 7 on 21 February 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[15] With a declaration to the effect that the acceptance of the Amendments by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China is illegal and null and void. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1). An instrument of acceptance on behalf of the Republic of China had been deposited with the Secretary-General on 19 January 1971. In this connection, the Secretary-General had received communications from the Governments of Mongolia, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics objecting to the said acceptance, as well as

communications in reply on behalf of the Government of the Republic of China.

[16] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the amendments to articles 24 and 25 on 21 February 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[17] With a declaration to the effect that "the said amendments will also apply to *Land Berlin* with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 of chapter III.3. See also note 16 above.

[18] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 24 February 1972 with reference to the above-mentioned acceptance, the Permanent Representative of Romania to the United Nations stated that his Government considers that the said acceptance constitutes an illegal act, inasmuch as the South Korean authorities can, in no case, act on behalf of Korea.

[19] The instrument of acceptance contains the following statement:

"As was the case in the original acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, the present acceptance is subject to the provisions of the joint resolution of the Congress of the United States of America approved June 14, 1948 (Public Law 643, 80th Congress)."

[20] See note 8. The amendments had been accepted on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam (later replaced by the Republic of South Viet-Nam) on 12 July 1973.

[21] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[22] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the amendments to articles 34 and 55 on 13 July 1976. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[23] With a declaration that the said amendments shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 22 above.

[24] On behalf of the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.

[25] See note 8. The amendments had been accepted on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam (later replaced by the Republic of South Viet-Nam) on 10 October 1974.

[26] The Yemen Arab Republic had accepted the amendments to articles 34 and 35 on 11 February 1977. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[27] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[28] In a note accompanying the instrument, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the amendments shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which they entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 27 above.

[29] The instrument of acceptance contains the following declaration: The acceptance shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

In this respect the Secretary-General received on 11 May 1979 from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The Instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon it under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[30] Democratic Yemen had accepted the amendments to articles 24 and 25 adopted on 17 May 1976, on 3 May 1982. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[31] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[32] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[33] In a letter accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said amendments shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 32 above.

2. PROTOCOL CONCERNING THE *OFFICE INTERNATIONAL D'HYGIÈNE PUBLIQUE*

Signed at New York on 22 July 1946[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 October 1947, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 20 October 1947, No. 125.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 9, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 43. Parties: 55.

Participant [the States parties to the Arrangement for the creation at Paris of an Office international d'hygiène publique, signed at Rome on 9 December 1907, are designated by an asterisk (*).][2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*
Afghanistan		19 Apr 1948
Albania		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Argentina*	22 Jul 1946	22 Oct 1948
Australia*	22 Jul 1946	8 May 1947
Austria		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Belarus		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Belgium*	22 Jul 1946	25 Jun 1948
Bolivia*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Brazil*	22 Jul 1946	2 Jun 1948
Bulgaria*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Canada*	22 Jul 1946	29 Aug 1946
Chile*	22 Jul 1946	
China[3]		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Colombia		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Costa Rica		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Cuba	22 Jul 1946	9 May 1950
Denmark*	22 Jul 1946	21 Apr 1947
Dominican Republic	22 Jul 1946	
Ecuador	22 Jul 1946	
Egypt	22 Jul 1946	16 Dec 1947
Ethiopia	22 Jul 1946	11 Apr 1947
Finland		22 Jul 1946 *s*
France*	22 Jul 1946	
Greece*	22 Jul 1946	12 Mar 1948
Guatemala	22 Jul 1946	26 Aug 1949
Haiti	22 Jul 1946	12 Aug 1947
Honduras	22 Jul 1946	8 Apr 1949
Hungary*	19 Feb 1947	17 Jun 1948
India*	22 Jul 1946	12 Jan 1948
Iran (Islamic Republic of)*	22 Jul 1946	27 Jan 1947
Iraq*	22 Jul 1946	23 Sep 1947
Ireland*	22 Jul 1946	20 Oct 1947
Italy*	22 Jul 1946	11 Apr 1947
Japan*		11 Dec 1951

Participant [the States parties to the Arrangement for the creation at Paris of an Office international d'hygiène publique, signed at Rome on 9 December 1907, are designated by an asterisk (*).]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*
Jordan		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Lebanon*	22 Jul 1946	
Liberia	22 Jul 1946	
Luxembourg*	22 Jul 1946	3 Jun 1949
Mexico*	22 Jul 1946	7 Apr 1948
Myanmar*		1 Jul 1948
Netherlands*	22 Jul 1946	25 Apr 1947
New Zealand*	22 Jul 1946	10 Dec 1946
Nicaragua	22 Jul 1946	
Norway*	22 Jul 1946	18 Aug 1947
Pakistan*		23 Jun 1948
Panama	22 Jul 1946	20 Feb 1951
Paraguay	22 Jul 1946	
Peru*	22 Jul 1946	
Philippines		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Poland*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Portugal*	22 Jul 1946	11 Aug 1948
Russian Federation*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Saudi Arabia*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
South Africa*	22 Jul 1946	19 Mar 1948
Sri Lanka		23 May 1949
Sweden*	13 Jan 1947	28 Aug 1947
Switzerland*	22 Jul 1946	26 Mar 1947
Syrian Arab Republic	22 Jul 1946	
Thailand		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Turkey*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
Ukraine		22 Jul 1946 *s*
United Kingdom*		22 Jul 1946 *s*
United States of America*	22 Jul 1946	7 Aug 1947
Uruguay*	22 Jul 1946	
Venezuela	22 Jul 1946	7 Mar 1949
Yugoslavia*	22 Jul 1946	19 Nov 1947

NOTES:

[1] See note at the beginning of chapter IX.1.

[2] Czechoslovakia, who was a participating party to the Arrangement for the creation at Paris of an *Office international d'hygiène publique*, had signed and accepted the Protocol on 22 July 1946 and 1 March 1948, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accession, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1.)

CHAPTER X. INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

1. (a) General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, with Annexes and Schedules of Tariffs Concessions

Authenticated by the Final Act adopted at the conclusion of the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment and signed at Geneva on 30 October 1947

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Applied provisionally as from 1 January 1948, pursuant to the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 30 October 1947. (See tables 1 and 2 hereafter for the list of Contracting Parties applying the General Agreement).
REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 I (b).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 55, p. 187.
STATUS: Parties: 126.

Participant	*Ratification*	*Participant*	*Ratification*
Liberia	17 May 1950	Haiti	7 Mar 1952

List of GATT instruments which are deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations
(See tables 1 and 2 hereafter for the list of Contracting Parties applying these GATT instruments.)

Note: All multilateral instruments relating to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (protocols, declarations, etc., hereinafter referred to as GATT instruments) which were concluded prior to 1 February 1955, are deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Those which have been concluded since that date are deposited with the Director-General of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

A list of the GATT instruments deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations is given below, showing—in respect of each instrument—the date of entry into force and particulars regarding registration and publication in the United Nations *Treaty Series*. Thereafter a list of the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is given and then two tables indicating the effective dates of the said instruments in respect of each Contracting Party.

For the list of the GATT instruments deposited with the Director-General of the Contracting Parties and their status, see GATT publication *Status of Legal Instruments* (GATT/LEG/1, September 1971, and Supplements).

1. **Protocol of Provisional Application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 30 October 1947**
   ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1948.
   REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 I (c).
   TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 55, p. 308.
2. **Protocol of Rectifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Havana on 24 March 1948**
   ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 March 1948.
   REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 II (a).
   TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 2.
3. **Declaration, signed at Havana on 24 March 1948**
   ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 March 1948.
   REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 II (b).
   TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 26.
4. **Protocol modifying certain provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Havana on 24 March 1948**
   ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 March 1948.
   REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 II (c).
   TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 30.
5. **Special Protocol modifying article XIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Havana on 24 March 1948**
   ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 May 1949.
   REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 II (d).
   TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 40.
6. **Special Protocol relating to article XXIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Havana on 24 March 1948**
   ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 June 1948.
   REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 II (e).
   TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 56.

7. **Second Protocol of Rectifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 14 September 1948**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 September 1948.
REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 III (b).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 74.

8. **Protocol modifying part I and article XXIX of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 14 September 1948**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 September 1952.
REGISTRATION: 24 September 1952, No. 814 III (d).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 138, p. 334.

9. **Protocol modifying part II and article XXVI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 14 September 1948**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 December 1948.
REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 III (c).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 80.

10. **Protocol for the Accession of Signatories of the Final Act of 30 October 1947, signed at Geneva on 14 September 1948**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 September 1948.
REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 III (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 68.

11. **Third Protocol of Rectifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Annecy on 13 August 1949**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 October 1951.
REGISTRATION: 21 October 1951, No. 814 IV (c).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 107, p. 311.

12. **First Protocol of Modifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Annecy on 13 August 1949**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 September 1952.
REGISTRATION: 24 September 1952, No. 814 IV (e).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 138, p. 381.

13. **Protocol modifying article XXVI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Annecy on 13 August 1949**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 March 1950.
REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 IV (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 113.

14. **Protocol replacing schedule I (Australia) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Annecy on 13 August 1949**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 October 1951.
REGISTRATION: 21 October 1951, No. 814 IV (b).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 107, p. 83.

15. **Protocol replacing schedule VI (Ceylon) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Annecy on 13 August 1949**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 September 1952.
REGISTRATION: 24 September 1952, No. 814 IV (d).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 138, p. 346.

16. **Annecy Protocol of Terms of Accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on 10 October 1949**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1950.
REGISTRATION: 30 May 1950, No. 814 V.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 62, p. 121.

17. **Fourth Protocol of Rectifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 3 April 1950**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 September 1952.
REGISTRATION: 24 September 1952, No. 814 IX.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 138, p. 398.

18. **Fifth Protocol of Rectifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Torquay on 16 December 1950**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 June 1953.
REGISTRATION: 30 June 1953, No. 814 X.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 167, p. 265.

19. **Decisions agreeing to the accession of certain Governments to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade**

(a) **Decision by the Contracting Parties agreeing to the accession of the Republic of Austria to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 9.

(b) **Decision by the Contracting Parties agreeing to the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 13.

(c) **Decision by the Contracting Parties agreeing to the accession of the Republic of Korea to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 18.

(d) **Decision by the Contracting Parties agreeing to the accession of Peru to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 22.

(e) **Decision by the Contracting Parties agreeing to the accession of the Republic of the Philippines to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 26.

(f) **Decision by the Contracting Parties agreeing to the accession of the Republic of Turkey to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 30.

20. **Torquay Protocol to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, opened for signature at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 June 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (b).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 142, p. 34.

21. **Declaration on the continued application of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, done at Torquay on 21 April 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 April 1951.
REGISTRATION: 24 October 1952, No. 814 VIII (c).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 147, p. 390.

22. **First Protocol of Rectifications and Modifications to the texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, done at Geneva on 27 October 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 October 1953.
REGISTRATION: 21 October 1953, No. 814 XI.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 176, p. 2.

23. **First Protocol of Supplementary Concessions to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Union of South Africa and Federal Republic of Germany), done at Geneva on 27 October 1951**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 May 1952.
REGISTRATION: 25 May 1952, No. 814 VII (a).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 131, p. 316.

24. **Second Protocol of Rectifications and Modifications to the texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 8 November 1952**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 February 1959.
REGISTRATION: 2 February 1959, No. 814 XXV.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 321, p. 245.

25. **Second Protocol of Supplementary Concessions to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (Austria and Federal Republic of Germany), done at Innsbruck on 22 November 1952**

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 August 1953.
REGISTRATION: 30 August 1953, No. 814 VII (b).
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 172, p. 340.

26. Third Protocol of Rectifications and Modifications to the texts of the schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed at Geneva on 24 October 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 February 1959.
REGISTRATION: 2 February 1959, No. 814 XXVI.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 321, p. 266.

27. Declaration on the Continued Application of schedules to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, done at Geneva on 24 October 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1954.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1954, No. 814 XII.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 183, p. 351.

List of Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade[1]

Angola
Antigua and Barbuda
Argentina
Australia
Austria
Bahrain
Bangladesh
Barbados
Belgium
Belize
Benin
Bolivia
Botswana
Brazil
Brunei Darussalam
Burkina Faso
Burundi
Cameroon
Canada
Central African Republic
Chad
Chile
Colombia
Congo
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire
Cuba
Cyprus
Czech Republic[2]
Denmark
Djibouti
Dominica
Dominican Republic
Egypt
El Salvador
Finland
France
Gabon
Gambia
Germany[3]
Ghana
Greece
Grenada
Guatemala
Guinea-Bissau
Guyana
Haiti
Honduras
Hong Kong
Hungary
Iceland
India
Indonesia
Ireland
Israel
Italy
Jamaica
Japan
Kenya
Kuwait
Lesotho
Liechtenstein
Luxembourg
Macau
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Maldives
Malta
Mali
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mexico
Morocco
Mozambique
Myanmar
Namibia
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Nigeria
Norway
Pakistan
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Qatar
Republic of Korea
Romania
Rwanda
Saint Kitts and Nevis
Senegal
Saint Lucia
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
Sierra Leone
Singapore
Slovakia[2]
Slovenia
Solomon Islands
South Africa
Spain
Sri Lanka
Suriname
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland
Thailand
Togo
Trinidad and Tobago
Tunisia
Turkey
Uganda
United Arab Emirates
United Kingdom
United Republic of Tanzania
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia
Zaire
Zambia
Zimbabwe

Tables indicating the effective dates of the GATT instruments deposited with the Secretary–General for the Contracting Parties

Note: The GATT instruments deposited with the Secretary–General are identified by Arabic numerals in the order in which they appear in the list preceding these tables. Roman numerals are used in the tables to indicate the months.

Table 1 gives the list of States for which the said instruments became effective as the result of procedures effected by those States with the Secretary–General, together with the date of such procedures in respect of each instrument. Table 2 gives the list of States for which certain of these instruments became effective simultaneously in consequence of the States concerned having become Contracting Parties to the General Agreement through procedures [Protocol of accession or procedure provided for by article XXVI.5 (*c*)] not effected with the Secretary–General, and the effective date of the respective instruments in respect of each of those States.

TABLE 1

Effective dates of the GATT instruments deposited with the Secretary–General for Contracting Parties which effected separate procedures in respect of each of them with the Secretary–General

GATT instruments

Contracting Party[2]	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*
Australia[4]	1. I.1948	24. III.1948		24. III.1948	9. V.1949	17. XI.1950
Austria		19. X.1951		19. X.1951	19. X.1951	19. X.1951
Belgium	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	7. VI.1948
Brazil	30. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	20 X.1952
Canada	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	7. VI.1948
Chile		24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	16. III.1949
Cuba	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	7. VI.1948
Denmark		28. V.1950		28. V.1950	28. V.1950	28. V.1950
Dominican Republic		19. V.1950		19. V.1950	19. V.1950	19. V.1950
Finland		25. V.1950		25. V.1950	25. V.1950	25. V.1950
France	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	14. VI.1948
Germany[3]		1. X.1951		1. X.1951	1. X.1951	1. X.1951
Ghana		6. III.1957		6. III.1957	6. III.1957	6. III.1957
Greece		1. III.1950		1. III.1950	1. III.1950	1. III.1950
Haiti		1. I.1950		1. I.1950	1. I.1950	1. I.1950
India	8. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	31. III.1949
Indonesia		27. XII.1949		27. XII.1949	9. V.1949	27. XII.1949
Italy		30. V.1950		30. V.1950	27. XII.1949	30. V.1950
Japan		10. IX.1955		10. IX.1955	30. V.1950	10. IX.1955
Luxembourg	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	10. IX.1955	7. VI.1948
Malaysia		31. VIII.1957		31. VIII.1957	9. V.1949	31. VIII.1957
Myanmar	29. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	8. X.1951
Netherlands	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	31. VIII.1957	7. VI.1948
New Zealand	30. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	9. VII.1951
Nicaragua		28. V.1950		28. V.1950	9. V.1949	28. V.1950
Norway	10. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	28. V.1950	25. XI.1949
Pakistan	30. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	9. IX.1949
Peru		7. X.1951		7. X.1951	9. V.1949	7. X.1951
South Africa	13. VI.1948	24. III.1948		16. II.1949	7. X.1951	19. IX.1950
Southern Rhodesia	11. VII.1948	24. III.1948		9. V.1949	9. V.1949	18. IV.1950
Sri Lanka	29. VII.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	12. IX.1950
Sweden		30. IV.1950		30. IV.1950	30. IV.1950	30. IV.1950
Turkey		17. X.1951		17. X.1951	17. X.1951	17. X.1951
United Kingdom	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	9. V.1949	7. VI.1948
United States of America	1. I.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	24. III.1948	16. XII.1953	7. VI.1948
Uruguay		16. XII.1953		16. XII.1953	9. V.1949	16. XII.1953

TABLE I (*continued*)

GATT instruments

Contracting Party[2]	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*
Australia[4]	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	25. II.1949	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Austria	19. X.1951	19 X.1951	19. X.1951		21. X.1951	19. X,1951
Belgium	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Brazil	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	3. VIII.1950	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Canada	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Chile	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	24. IX.1952	14. II.1949	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Cuba	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Denmark	28. V.1950	24. IX.1952	28. V.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Dominican Republic	19. V.1950	24. IX.1952	19. V.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Finland	25. V.1950	24. IX.1952	25. V.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
France	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Germany[3]	1. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. X.1951		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Ghana	6. III.1957	6. III.1957	6. III.1957		6. III.1957	6. III.1957
Greece	1. III.1950	24. IX.1952	1. III.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Haiti	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
India	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Indonesia		24. IX.1952	27. XII.1949		21. X.1951	
Italy	30. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. V.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Japan	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955		10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955
Luxembourg	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Malaysia	31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957		31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957
Myanmar	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. II.1949	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Netherlands	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
New Zealand	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	9. II.1949	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Nicaragua	28. V.1950	24. IX.1952	28. V.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Norway	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Pakistan	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Peru	7. X.1951	7. X.1951	7. X.1951		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
South Africa	14. IX.1948	11. I.1949	11. I.1949	16. II.1949	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Southern Rhodesia	14. IX.1948	1. II.1949	1. II.1949	8. II.1949	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Sri Lanka	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Sweden	30. IV.1950	24. IX.1952	30. IV.1950		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Turkey	17. X.1951	24. IX.1952	17. X.1951		21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
United Kingdom	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
United States of America	14. IX.1948	24. IX.1952	14. XII.1948	14. IX.1948	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952
Uruguay	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953		16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953

TABLE 1 (*continued*)

GATT instruments

Contracting Party[2]	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*18*
Australia[4]	28. III.1950	24. IX.1951	24. IX.1952	28. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Austria	19. X.1951	19. X.1951	24. IX.1952	19. X.1951	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Belgium	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Brazil	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	26. I.1952	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Canada	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	I. I.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Chile	24. IX.1952	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	26. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Cuba	29. IX.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	29. III.1951	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Denmark	28. V.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	28. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Dominican Republic	19. V.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	19. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Finland	25. V.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	25. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
France	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	19. IV.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Germany[3]	1. X.1951	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. X.1951	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Ghana	6. III.1957	6. III.1957	6. III.1957	6. III.1957	6. III.1957	6. III.1957
Greece	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. III.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Haiti	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
India	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	21. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Indonesia	24. XI.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952		24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Italy	30. IV.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	30. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Japan	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955	10. IX.1955
Luxembourg	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Malaysia	31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957	31. VIII.1957	30. VI.1953
Myanmar	8. X.1951	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952		24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Netherlands	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	31. VIII.1957
New Zealand	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	28. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Nicaragua	28. V.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	28. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Norway	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	29. VII.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Pakistan	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	19. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Peru	7. X.1951	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	7. X.1951	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
South Africa	18. V.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	4. V.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Southern Rhodesia .	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952		24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Sri Lanka	12. IX.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	3. III.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Sweden	30. IV.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	30. IV.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Turkey	17. X.1951	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	17. X.1951	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
United Kingdom ..	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
United States of America	28. III.1950	21. X.1951	24. IX.1952	1. I.1950	24. IX.1952	30. VI.1953
Uruguay	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953	16. XII.1953

TABLE 1 (*continued*)

GATT instruments

Contracting Party[2]	*19 (a)*	*19 (b)*	*19 (c)*	*19 (d)*	*19 (e)*	*19 (f)*
Australia[4]	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Austria						
Belgium	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Brazil	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Canada	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Chile	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Cuba	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Denmark	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Dominican Republic	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Finland	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951		21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
France	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Germany[3]						
Ghana						
Greece	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Haiti	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
India	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Indonesia						
Italy	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Japan						
Luxembourg	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Malaysia	21. VI.1951					
Myanmar	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Netherlands	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
New Zealand	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Nicaragua	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Norway	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Pakistan	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Peru						
South Africa	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Southern Rhodesia .	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21 VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Sri Lanka	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Sweden	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Turkey						
United Kingdom ..	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
United States of America			21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951	21. VI.1951
Uruguay						

TABLE 1 (*continued*)

GATT instruments

Contracting Party[2]	*20*	*21*	*22*	*23*	*24*	*25*
Australia[4]	17. XI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Austria	19. X.1951		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	30. VIII.1953
Belgium	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Brazil	21. III.1953	19. II.1953	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Canada	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Chile	24. X.1952	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	24. IX.1952	2. II.1959	
Cuba	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Denmark	20. I.1952		21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Dominican Republic	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Finland	4. VIII.1951	5. VII.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
France	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Germany[3]	1. X.1951		21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	30. VIII.1953
Ghana	6. III.1957		6. III.1957		2. II.1959	
Greece	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Haiti	8. XI.1951	9. X.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
India	18. XI.1951	21. X.1953	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Indonesia	18. XI.1951		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Italy	17. XI.1951		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Japan	10. IX.1955		10. IX.1955		2. II.1959	
Luxembourg	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Malaysia	31. VIII.1957		31. VIII.1957		2. II.1959	
Myanmar	20. XI.1951		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Netherlands	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
New Zealand	11. XI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Nicaragua	30. VII.1953		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Norway	2. VIII.1951		21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Pakistan	18. XI.1951		21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Peru	7. X.1951		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
South Africa	18. XI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Southern Rhodesia	20. VII.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Sri Lanka	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. V.1952	2. II.1959	
Sweden	7. VII.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
Turkey	17. X.1951		21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
United Kingdom	18. I.1952	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953		2. II.1959	
United States of America	6. VI.1951	21. IV.1951	21. X.1953	25. X.1952	2. II.1959	
Uruguay	16. XII.1953		16. XII.1953		2. II.1959	

TABLE 1 (*continued*)
GATT instruments

Contracting Party[2]	*26*		*27*	
Australia[4]	2.	II.1959	23.	II.1954
Austria	2.	II.1959	30.	IV.1954
Belgium	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Brazil	2.	II.1959		
Canada	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Chile	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Cuba	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Denmark	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Dominican Republic	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Finland	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
France	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Germany[3]	2.	II.1959	15.	VI.1954
Ghana	2.	II.1959		
Greece	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Haiti	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
India	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Indonesia	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Italy	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Japan	2.	II.1959		
Luxembourg	2.	II.1959	I.	I.1954
Malaysia	2.	II.1959		
Myanmar	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Netherlands	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
New Zealand	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Nicaragua	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Norway	2.	II.1959	28.	IV.1954
Pakistan	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Peru	2.	II.1959	26.	IV.1954
South Africa	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Southern Rhodesia .	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Sri Lanka	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Sweden	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Turkey	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
United Kingdom ..	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
United States of America	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954
Uruguay	2.	II.1959	1.	I.1954

TABLE 2

Effective dates of certain GATT instruments deposited with the Secretary–General (Nos. 2, 4 to 9, 11 to 18, 20, 22, 24 and 26 in the preceding list unless otherwise indicated) for States which became bound by them through becoming Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in accordance with procedures not effected with the Secretary–General. (In the case of succession, the effective date is the date of independence).

Contracting Party	*Effective date*
Angola (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	11.XI.1975
Antigua and Barbuda (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	1. XI.1981
Argentina	11. X.1967
Bahrain (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	15 VIII.1971
Bangladesh (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	16. XII.1972
Barbados	30. XI.1966
Belize (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	21. IX.1981
Benin	1. VIII.1960
Bolivia (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	8. IX.1990
Botswana (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	30. IX.1966
Brunei Darussalam (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	31 XII.1983
Burkina Faso	5. VIII.1960
Burundi	1. VII.1962
Cameroon	1. I.1960
Central African Republic	14. VIII.1960
Chad	11. VIII.1960
Colombia (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	3. X.1981
Congo	15. VIII.1960
Costa Rica (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	24. XI.1990
Côte d'Ivoire	7. VIII.1960
Cyprus	16. VIII.1960
Czech Republic[2] (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	1. I.1993
Djibouti (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	27. VI.1977
Dominica (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	3. XI.1978
Egypt (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	9. V.1970
El Salvador (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	22. V.1991
Gabon	17. VIII.1960
Gambia	18. II.1965
Grenada (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	7. II.1974
Guatemala (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	10. X.1991
Guinea–Bissau (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	10 IX.1974
Guyana	26. V.1966
Honduras (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	10. IV.1994
Hong Kong (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	23. IV.1986
Hungary (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	9. IX.1973
Iceland	21. IV.1968
Ireland	22. XII.1967
Israel [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (No.1 in the list of GATT instruments).]	5. VII.1962
Jamaica	6. VIII.1962
Kenya	12. XII.1963
Kuwait	19. VI.1961
Lesotho (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	4. X.1966
Liechtenstein (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	29. III.1994
Macau (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	11. I.1991
Madagascar	25. VI.1960
Malawi	6. VII.1964
Maldives (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	26. VII.1965
Mali (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	20 VI.1960
Malta	21. IX.1964
Mauritania	28. XI.1960
Mauritius (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	12. III.1968
Mexico (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	24. VIII.1986
Morocco (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	17. VI.1987

Contracting Party	*Effective date*
Mozambique (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	25. VI.1975
Namibia (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	21. III.1990
Niger	3. VIII.1960
Nigeria	1. X.1960
Papua New Guinea (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	16. IX.1975
Paraguay (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	6 I.1994
Philippines (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	27. X.1981
Poland	18. X.1967
Portugal [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (No.1 in the list of GATT instruments).]	6. V.1962
Qatar (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	3.IX.1971
Republic of Korea [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (No.1 in the list of GATT instruments).]	14. IV.1967
Romania (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	14. XI.1971
Rwanda	1. VII.1962
Saint Kitts and Nevis (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	19 IX.1983
Saint Lucia (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	22. II.1979
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	27. X.1979
Senegal	20. VI.1960
Sierra Leone	27. IV.1961
Singapore	9. VIII.1965
Slovakia[2] (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.) [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (No.1 in the list of GATT instruments).]	1. I.1993
Slovenia (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	30 X.1994
Solomon Islands (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	7 VII.1978
Spain	29. VIII.1963
Suriname (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	25. XI.1975
Swaziland (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	6 IX.1968
Switzerland [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (No.1 in the list of GATT instruments).]	1. VIII.1966
Thailand [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of accession of 21.X.82. (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18).]	30. VI.1982
Togo	27. IX.1960
Trinidad and Tobago	31. VIII.1962
Tunisia (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	19. VIII.1990
Uganda	9. X.1962
United Arab Emirates (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	1 XII.1971
United Republic of Tanzania	9. XII.1961
Venezuela (GATT instruments Nos. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	31. VIII.1990
Yugoslavia [Also bound, as from the date shown herein, by the Protocol of Provisional application of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (No.1 in the list of GATT instruments).]	25. VIII.1966
Zaire (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 17 and 18.)	11. IX.1971
Zambia (GATT instruments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 17 and 18.)	24. X.1964

1. *(b)* Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization

Authenticated by the Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, signed at Havana on 24 March 1948

Note: The conditions for the entry into force of the Havana Charter, set forth in its article 103, were not fulfilled within the prescribed time-limit. No instrument of acceptance was deposited with the Secretary-General. For the text of the Havana Charter, see *United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment, Final Act and Related Documents*, E/CONF.2/78, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1948.II.D.4.

---

1. *(c)* Agreement on most-favoured-nation treatment for areas of Western Germany under military occupation

Signed at Geneva on 14 September 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 October 1948, in accordance with article V.
REGISTRATION: 14 October 1948, No. 296.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 18, p. 267.

Note: The Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding (1 (c) and 1 (*d*)) were concluded within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade which were signatories of the Agreement of 14 September 1948 met informally at Geneva on 16 October 1951. At that meeting, it was recommended that all signatories to the latter Agreement who wished to do so should, if possible, notify their withdrawal from it by depositing a notice of intention of withdrawal with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the same date, such notices to cover also the Memorandum of understanding. The date of 14 December 1951 was generally considered as appropriate for such an action, the withdrawal to take effect on 15 June 1952. For the States which were parties to the Agreement and the Memorandum of understanding, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 18, p. 267; vol. 19, p. 328; vol. 20, p. 308; vol. 24, p. 320; vol. 35, p. 370; vol. 42, p. 356; vol. 43, p. 339; vol. 44, p. 339; vol. 46, p. 350; vol. 53, p. 419, and vol. 70, p. 272. For the dates of receipt of the notices of withdrawal, see *ibid.*, vol. 117, p. 385; vol. 121, p. 327, and vol. 128, p. 293.

---

1. *(d)* Memorandum of understanding relative to application to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Agreement on most-favoured-nation treatment for areas of Western Germany under military occupation

Signed at Annecy on 13 August 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13 August 1949 by signature.
REGISTRATION: 24 September 1949, No. 296.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 42, p. 356.

Note: See *"Note:"* under 1. *(c)* above.

Notes:

[1] The following States which had provisionally applied the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade notified the Secretary-General of the cessation of such application:

Participant	*Effective date of provisional application*	*Effective date of withdrawal*
China*	21 May 1948	
Lebanon	29 Jul 1948	25 Feb 1951
Liberia	20 May 1950	13 Jun 1953
Syrian Arab Republic	30 Jul 1948	6 Aug 1951

* See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1). Notification of withdrawal on behalf of the Republic of China received on 6 March 1950.

[2] Czechoslovakia had effected the relevant formalities with respect to the following GATT instruments (the dates of entry into force appear in brackets): 1 (24.IV.1948), 2 (24.III.1948), 4 (24.III.1948), 5 (9.V.1949), 6 (7.VI.1948), 7 (14.IX.1948), 8 (24.IX.1952), 9 (22.III.1949), 11 (21.X.1951), 12 (24.IX.1952), 13 (28.III.1950), 14 (21.X.1951), 15 (24.IX.1952), 16 (11.II.1950), 17 (24.IX.1952), 18 (30.VI.1953), 19 a) (21.VI.1951), 19 d)(21.VI.1951), 19 e) (21.VI.1951), 19 f) (21.VI.1951), 20 (8.VII.1951), 21 (21.IV.1951), 22 (21.X.1953), 24 (2.II.1959), 26 (2.II.1959) and 27 (1.I.1954). See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a notification received on 4 August 1975 the Government of Australia declared that the General Agreement would apply provisionally to Papua New Guinea.

2. Agreement establishing the African Development Bank

Done at Khartoum on 4 August 1963

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 September 1964, in accordance with article 65.
REGISTRATION: 10 September 1964, No. 7408.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 510, p. 3, and vol. 569, p. 353 (corrigendum to vol. 510).
STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 51.

Note: The Agreement was approved and opened for signature by the Conference of Finance Ministers on the Establishment of an African Development Bank convened pursuant to resolution 52 (IV)[1] of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. The Conference was convened at Khartoum from 31 July to 4 August 1963. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 510, p. 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Algeria	4 Aug 1963	10 Sep 1964
Angola[2]		9 Jan 1981 *a*
Benin	8 Oct 1963	25 Aug 1964
Botswana[2]		31 Mar 1972 *a*
Burkina Faso	21 Nov 1963	22 Sep 1964
Burundi[2]	4 Aug 1963	2 Jan 1968 *a*
Cameroon	8 Oct 1963	7 May 1964
Cape Verde[2]		15 Apr 1976 *a*
Central African Republic[2]	4 Aug 1963	26 Aug 1970 *a*
Chad[2]		26 Aug 1968 *a*
Comoros[2]		3 May 1976 *a*
Congo	29 Nov 1963	10 Feb 1965
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Aug 1963	20 Mar 1964
Djibouti[2]		12 Jul 1978 *a*
Egypt	4 Aug 1963	14 Sep 1964
Equatorial Guinea[2]		30 Jun 1975 *a*
Ethiopia	4 Aug 1963	14 Jul 1964
Gabon[2]		31 Dec 1972 *a*
Gambia[2]		2 Jul 1973 *a*
Ghana	4 Aug 1963	30 Jun 1964
Guinea	4 Aug 1963	21 May 1964
Guinea-Bissau[2]		5 May 1975 *a*
Kenya	4 Aug 1963	24 Jan 1964
Lesotho[2]		2 Jul 1972 *a*
Liberia	4 Aug 1963	23 Jun 1964
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya[2]	4 Aug 1963	21 Jul 1972 *a*
Madagascar[2]		3 May 1976 *a*
Malawi[2]		25 Jul 1966 *a*
Mali	4 Aug 1963	23 Apr 1964
Mauritania	4 Aug 1963	9 Sep 1964
Mauritius[2]		1 Jan 1974 *a*
Morocco	4 Aug 1963	2 Jun 1964
Mozambique[2]		4 Jun 1976 *a*
Niger	25 Oct 1963	29 Jul 1964
Nigeria	4 Aug 1963	12 Mar 1964
Rwanda	18 Dec 1963	18 Jan 1965
Sao Tome and Principe[2]		14 Apr 1976 *a*
Senegal	17 Dec 1963	11 Sep 1964
Seychelles[2]		20 Apr 1977 *a*
Sierra Leone	4 Aug 1963	18 Feb 1964
Somalia	4 Aug 1963	22 Oct 1964
Spain	13 Feb 1984	13 Feb 1984
Sudan	4 Aug 1963	9 Sep 1963
Swaziland[2]		26 Jul 1971 *a*
Togo	18 Oct 1963	3 Jul 1964
Tunisia	4 Aug 1963	29 Oct 1964
Uganda	4 Aug 1963	16 Dec 1963
United Republic of Tanzania[3]	4 Aug 1963	27 Nov 1963
Zaire	4 Aug 1963	5 Jun 1964
Zambia[2]		1 Sep 1966 *a*
Zimbabwe[2]		5 Sep 1980 *a*

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 10* (E/3586, E/CN.14/168), p. 44.

[2] Article 64 (2) of the Agreement provides that a State may, after the Agreement has entered into force, become a member of the Bank by accession to the Agreement on such terms as the Board of Governors may determine; that the Government of such State shall deposit its instrument of accession on or before a date appointed by the Board, and that, upon the deposit, the State concerned shall become a member of the Bank on the appointed date.

Following are, in respect of each acceding State, the number and date of the pertinent resolution adopted by the Board of Governors of the Bank. In all cases, the terms for accession included the payment of the first instalment of its initial subscription to the Bank by the State concerned and, unless otherwise indicated, the appointed date corresponded to the date of deposit of the instrument of accession with the Secretary-General:

Participant	*Number of Resolution*	*Date of Resolution*
Angola	3-80	23 Jun 1980 (Appointed date: 23 June 1980)
Botswana	9-71	28 Jul 1971
Burundi	4-67	31 Dec 1967
Cape Verde	02-76	15 Apr 1976
Central African Republic	3-7	26 Aug 1970
Chad	2-68/ 3-68	25 Jun 1968/ 26 Aug 1968
Comoros	05-76	3 May 1976
Djibouti	01-78	1 May 1978
Equatorial Guinea	03-75	5 May 1975
Gabon	8-72	20 Jul 1972
Gambia	2-73	2 Jul 1973
Guinea-Bissau	02-75	5 May 1975
Lesotho	3-73	2 Jul 1973

[3] Effective 26 April 1964, Tanganyika and Zanzibar united to form the United Republic of Tanzania.

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya .	13–72	21	Jul	1972
Madagascar ...	06–76	3	May	1976
Malawi	2–66	19	Apr	1966
Mauritius	4–73	2	Jul	1973
Mozambique ..	07–76	3	May	1976
Sao Tome and Principe ...	01–76	28	Feb	1976
Seychelles	01–77	31	Mar	1977
Swaziland	6–71	26	Jul	1971
Zambia	6–66	15	Aug	1966
Zimbabwe* ...	04–80	23	Jun	1980

* Pursuant to the resolution of the Board of Governors (No. 04–80 of 23 June 1980), the Agreement is deemed to have taken effect retroactively for Zimbabwe as of 23 June 1980, upon completion of all the necessary conditions and receipt of its instrument of accession by the African Development Bank.

[3] The Agreement was originally signed and the instrument of ratification was deposited on behalf of Tanganyika. Following the formation of the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar under the name of the United Republic of Tanzania (see note 23 in chapter I.2), the Government of that country submitted a declaration to the African Development Bank to the effect that "it assumes the membership in the ADB both as regards Tanganyika and Zanzibar, and desires the Bank to give effect to this extension and to increase its subscription by one million units of account". The said declaration was considered by the Board of Governors of the African Development Bank at its first plenary session on 4 November 1964. In resolution No. 3 adopted on the same date, the Board of Governors, having expressed the desire of giving full effect to the extension of membership of the United Republic of Tanzania, decided, *inter alia*, that the subscription of that country to the capital stock of the ADB should be increased by one million units of account, half of it to consist of paid–up shares, and the other half of callable shares; and that the extension of membership of the United Republic of Tanzania should take effect upon the payment to the ADB of the first instalment of its initial subscription to the paid–up capital stock as provided in the resolution. The Board further took note that, upon the extension of its membership, the United Republic of Tanzania would have 1,255 votes.

2. (a) Amendments to the Agreement establishing the African Development Bank

Adopted by the Board of Governors of the African Development Bank in resolution 05–79 of 17 May 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 May 1982, in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 05–79 and paragraph 1 of article 60 of the unamended Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 7 May 1982, No. 7408.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1276, p. 501.
STATUS: Parties: 48.

Note: On 17 May 1979, the Board of Governors of the African Development Bank adopted three resolutions (05–79, 06–79 and 07–79) concerning non–regional membership in the Bank. Resolution 05–79 adopts amendments to the Agreement. Resolution 06–79 provides for the increase of the capital stock, and resolution 07–79 sets out general rules governing admission of non–regional countries to membership in the Bank.

Participants bound by the amendments by virtue of paragraph 4 of resolution 05–79 and paragraph 1 of article 60 of the unamended Agreement	*Acceptance of the amendments*
Angola	7 Jan 1981
Benin	6 Sep 1980
Botswana	13 Dec 1979
Burkina Faso	23 Aug 1980
Burundi	11 Jan 1980
Cameroon	12 Mar 1980
Cape Verde	22 Dec 1980
Central African Republic	15 Jan 1981
Chad	7 Sep 1981
Comoros	30 Nov 1979
Congo	18 Aug 1980
Côte d'Ivoire	27 Feb 1980
Djibouti	29 Jun 1979
Egypt	27 Jun 1979
Equatorial Guinea	14 Nov 1979
Ethiopia	21 Apr 1980
Gabon	9 Aug 1980
Gambia	25 Feb 1980
Ghana	13 Dec 1979
Guinea	16 May 1980
Guinea–Bissau	15 Dec 1980
Kenya	25 Jul 1979
Lesotho	20 Nov 1979
Liberia	30 Sep 1980
Madagascar	18 Dec 1981
Malawi	23 Aug 1979
Mali	16 Jul 1979
Mauritania	5 Jan 1981
Mauritius	27 Sep 1979
Morocco	24 Nov 1980
Mozambique	27 Dec 1979
Niger	9 Dec 1980
Nigeria	6 May 1982
Rwanda	2 Feb 1980
Sao Tome and Principe	19 Nov 1979
Senegal	10 Jul 1979
Seychelles	14 Dec 1979
Sierra Leone	26 Oct 1979
Somalia	22 Dec 1980
Sudan	10 Dec 1980
Swaziland	11 Jan 1980
Togo	18 Jan 1980
Tunisia	27 Jun 1979
Uganda	29 May 1980
United Republic of Tanzania	20 Aug 1980
Zaire	6 Sep 1980
Zambia	3 Apr 1980
Zimbabwe	24 Oct 1980

2. (b) Agreement establishing the African Development Bank done at Khartoum on 4 August 1963, as amended by resolution 05-79 adopted by the Board of Governors on 17 May 1979

Concluded at Lusaka on 7 May 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 May 1982, in accordance with paragraph 4 of resolution 05–79.
REGISTRATION: 7 May 1982, No. 21052.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1276, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 75.

Note: The original of the Agreement was established by the Secretary–General of the United Nations on 2 June 1982.

Participant	*Participation in the Agreement as amended under paragraph 4 of resolution 05–79 and paragraph 1 of article 60 of the unamended Agreement*	*Signature by non–regional members under Section 3 (c) (i) of resolution 07–79*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*
Angola	7 May 1982		
Argentina[1]		6 Jun 1985	6 Jun 1985 *A*
Austria[1]		23 Jul 1982	10 Mar 1983
Belgium[1]		15 Feb 1983	15 Feb 1983
Benin	7 May 1982		
Botswana	7 May 1982		
Brazil[1]		8 Dec 1982	14 Jul 1983
Burkina Faso	7 May 1982		
Burundi	7 May 1982		
Cameroon	7 May 1982		
Canada[1]		23 Dec 1982	23 Dec 1982 *A*
Cape Verde	7 May 1982		
Central African Republic	7 May 1982		
Chad	7 May 1982		
China[1]		9 May 1985	9 May 1985 *A*
Comoros	7 May 1982		
Congo	7 May 1982		
Côte d'Ivoire	7 May 1982		
Denmark[1]		7 Sep 1982	7 Sep 1982
Djibouti	7 May 1982		
Egypt	7 May 1982		
Equatorial Guinea	7 May 1982		
Ethiopia	7 May 1982		
Finland[1]		7 Sep 1982	7 Sep 1982 *A*
France[1]		1 Jul 1982	1 Jul 1982
Gabon	7 May 1982		
Gambia	7 May 1982		
Germany[1, 2, 3]		16 Feb 1983	16 Feb 1983 *A*
Ghana	7 May 1982		
Guinea	7 May 1982		
Guinea–Bissau	7 May 1982		
India[1]		25 Oct 1983	6 Dec 1983 *a*
Italy[1]		26 Nov 1982	26 Nov 1982 *A*
Japan[1]		3 Feb 1983	3 Feb 1983 *A*
Kenya	7 May 1982		
Kuwait[1]		9 Nov 1982	9 Nov 1982 *A*
Lesotho	7 May 1982		
Liberia	7 May 1982		
Madagascar	7 May 1982		
Malawi	7 May 1982		
Mali	7 May 1982		

Participant	*Participation in the Agreement as amended under paragraph 4 of resolution 05–79 and paragraph 1 of article 60 of the unamended Agreement*	*Signature by non-regional members under Section 3 (c) (i) of resolution 07–79*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*
Mauritania	7 May 1982		
Mauritius	7 May 1982		
Morocco	7 May 1982		
Mozambique	7 May 1982		
Namibia			10 Apr 1994 *a*
Netherlands[1,4]		28 Jan 1983	28 Jan 1983 *A*
Niger	7 May 1982		
Nigeria	7 May 1982		
Norway[1]		7 Sep 1982	7 Sep 1982 *A*
Portugal[1]		8 Dec 1983	15 Dec 1983 *a*
Republic of Korea[1]		27 Sep 1982	27 Sep 1982 *A*
Rwanda	7 May 1982		
Sao Tome and Principe	7 May 1982		
Saudi Arabia[1]		15 Dec 1983	15 Dec 1983 *a*
Senegal	7 May 1982		
Seychelles	7 May 1982		
Sierra Leone	7 May 1982		
Somalia	7 May 1982		
South Africa[8]			13 Dec 1995 *a*
Spain[1]		13 Feb 1984	13 Feb 1984 *A*
Sudan	7 May 1982		
Swaziland	7 May 1982		
Sweden[1]		7 Sep 1982	7 Sep 1982 *A*
Switzerland[1]		14 Sep 1982	14 Sep 1982 *A*
Togo	7 May 1982		
Tunisia	7 May 1982		
Uganda	7 May 1982		
United Kingdom[1]		23 Dec 1982	27 Apr 1983 *A*
United Republic of Tanzania	7 May 1982		
United States of America[1]		31 Jan 1983	31 Jan 1983 *A*
Yugoslavia[1]		15 Sep 1982	15 Sep 1982
Zaire	7 May 1982		
Zambia	7 May 1982		
Zimbabwe	7 May 1982		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

CANADA

Reservation:

"In so accepting the said Agreement, the Government of Canada, pursuant to paragraph 3 of article 64, hereby retains for itself the right to tax the salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to Canadian citizens, nationals and residents."

DENMARK

Declaration:

"According to the main rule of article 17, paragraph 1 (d), in the Agreement establishing the African Development Bank, the proceeds of any financing undertaken by the Bank shall be used only for procurement in Member Countries of goods and services produced in Member Countries.

"The declared shipping policy of the Danish Government is based on the principle of free circulation of shipping in international trade in free and fair competition. In accordance with this policy, transactions and transfers in connection with maritime transport should not be hampered by provisions giving preferencial treatment to one country or group of countries, the aim always being that normal commercial considerations should determine the method and flag of shipment. The Government of Denmark trusts that article 17, paragraph 1 (d), will not be applied contrary to this principle."

GERMANY[2,5]

Reservations made upon acceptance

1. The Federal Republic of Germany retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to German citizens, nationals or residents.

2. In the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany the immunities conferred by articles 53 and 56 of the Agreement shall not apply in relation to a civil action arising out of an accident caused by a motor vehicle belonging to the Bank or operated on its behalf, or to a traffic offence committed by the driver of such a vehicle.

3. According to the exchange of notes between the African Development Bank and the Federal Republic of Germany executed at Abidjan on 24 January 1983,

(a) The Bank shall not claim exemption from direct taxation, customs duties or taxes having equivalent effect on goods imported or exported for other than its official use;

(b) The Bank shall not claim exemption from taxes and duties which are no more than charges for services rendered, and

(c) The Bank shall sell articles imported under an exemption pursuant to article 57 paragraph 1 of the Agreement in the territory of a member granting the exemption only on the terms agreed with that member.

INDIA

Declaration:

"[The] Government of India retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the African Development Bank to the citizens, nationals or residents of India."

ITALY

Declaration:

The Government of Italy declares, in accordance with article 64 (3) of the Agreement Establishing the African Development Bank (Khartoum, 4 August 1963), amended by Resolution 05-09, that it retains for itself and its constitutional subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid to citizens and residents.

JAPAN

Declaration:

"The Government of Japan, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of article 64 of the Agreement, retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its nationals or residents."

KUWAIT[6]

Understanding:

"It is understood that ratification of the Agreement . . . does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the right to take into account, for the purpose of assessing the amount of income tax due on income from other sources, the salaries and emoluments paid to the professional staff of the African Development Bank and exempt from taxation under article 57 of the Agreement. The exemption shall not be deemed applicable to the pensions paid by the Bank."

NORWAY

Declaration:

According to article 17, paragraph 1 (d) of the Agreement establishing the African Development Bank, the proceeds of any loan, investment or other financing undertaken in the ordinary operations of the Bank shall be used only for procurement in member countries of goods and services produced in member countries, except for special cases.

The declared shipping policy of the Norwegian Government is based on the principle of free circulation of shipping in international trade in free and fair competition. In accordance with this policy, transactions and transfers in connection with maritime transport should not be hampered by provisions giving preferential treatment to one country or a group of countries, the aim always being that normal commercial consideration should determine the method and flag of shipment. The Government of Norway trusts that article 17, paragraph 1 (d) will not be applied contrary to this principle.

Upon signature and acceptance:

Declaration:

The Government of Norway retains, in accordance with article 64.3 of the said Agreement, the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to Norwegian citizens, nationals or residents.

SWEDEN

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed uon ratification:

With reference to article 64.3 of the Agreement Establishing the African Development Bank, Sweden hereby declares that it retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to citizens, nationals or residents of Sweden.

Declaration:

According to the main rule of article 17, paragraph 1 (d) in the Agreement establishing the African Development Bank, the proceeds of any loan, investment or other financing undertaken by the Bank shall be used only for procurement in member countries of goods and services produced in member countries.

The shipping policy of the Swedish Government is based on the principle of free circulation of shipping in international trade in free and fair competition. The Swedish Government trusts that article 17, paragraph 1 (d) will not be applied contrary to this principle. Similarly, it is part of the assistance policy of the Swedish Government that multilateral development assistance should be based on the principle of free international competitive bidding. The Swedish Government expresses the hope that it will be possible to reach agreement on such modification of article 17, 1 (d) that it does not conflict with this principle.

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

In accordance with article 64 (3) of the Agreement, Switzerland retains for itself the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its nationals, residents of Switzerland.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[7]

Declarations and reservations:

"1. As Bank telegrams and telephone calls are not defined as Government telegrams and telephone calls in Annex 2 to the International Telecommunications Conventions signed at Montreux on 12 November 1965 and at Málaga-Torremolinos on 25 October 1973 and are therefore not entitled by the Convention to the privileges thereby conferred on Government telegrams and telephone calls, the Government of the United Kingdom, having

regard to their obligations under the International Telecommunications Conventions, declare that the privileges conferred by Article 55 of the Agreement shall be correspondingly restricted in the United Kingdom but, subject thereto, shall be not less favourable than the United Kingdom affords to international financial institutions of which it is a member.

"2. In accordance with the provisions of article 64 (3) of the Agreement, the United Kingdom declares that it retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its citizens, nationals and permanent residents. The United Kingdom will not accord to consultants the privileges and immunities mentioned in article 56 unless they are experts performing missions for the Bank.

"3. In accordance with its current practice in regard to international organisations, the United Kingdom will, pursuant to the terms of article 57 (1) of the Agreement, accord to the Bank the following taxation privileges:

"a) Within the scope of its official activities, the Bank and its property and income will be exempt from all direct taxes, including income tax, capital gains tax and corporation tax. The Bank will also be exempt from municipal rates levied on its premises with the exception of the proportion which, as in the case of diplomatic missions, represents payments for specific services rendered.

"b) The Bank will be accorded a refund of car tax and value added tax paid on the purchase of new motor cars of United Kingdom manufacture, and value added tax paid on the supply of goods or services of substantial value, necessary for the official activities of the Bank.

"c) Goods the import and export of which by the Bank is necessary for the exercise of its official activities shall be exempt from all duties of customs and excise and other such charges except payments for services. The Bank will be accorded a refund of the duty and value added tax paid on the importation of hydrocarbon oils purchased by the Bank and necessary for the exercise of its official activities.

"d) Exemption in respect of taxes or duties under the preceding sub-paragraphs will be accorded subject to compliance with conditions agreed with Her Majesty's Government. Goods which have been acquired or imported under the above provisions may not be sold, given away or otherwise disposed of in the United Kingdom except in accordance with conditions agreed with Her Majesty's Government.

"4. In the territory of the United Kingdom the immunity conferred by article 52 (1) and article 56 (i) shall not apply in relation to a civil action by a third party for damage arising out of an accident caused by a motor vehicle belonging to or operated on behalf of the Bank or a person covered by article 56, as the case may be, or in relation to a traffic offence committed by the driver of such a vehicle.

"5. Her Majesty's Government are not at the moment able to implement Article 57 (3) (ii) of the Agreement as this requires an amendment to existing legislation. Her Majesty's Government hope however that they will be in a position to implement it in the near future."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"The United States of America retains for itself and for all political subdivisions of the United States of America the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the African Development Bank to United States citizens or nationals."

NOTES:

[1] Date of admission as member of the Bank in accordance with the relevant declaration by the President of the Bank provided for in section 3 (c) of resolution 07–79 adopted by the Board of Governors of the Bank on 17 May 1979:

Canada	30	Dec	1982
Denmark	30	Dec	1982
Finland	30	Dec	1982
France	30	Dec	1982
Kuwait	30	Dec	1982
Norway	30	Dec	1982
Republic of Korea	30	Dec	1982
Sweden	30	Dec	1982
Switzerland	30	Dec	1982
Yugoslavia	30	Dec	1982
Italy	31	Dec	1982
Netherlands	28	Jan	1983
Japan	3	Feb	1983
United States of Amerıa	8	Feb	1983
Germany*	18	Feb	1983
Belgium	15	Mar	1983
Austria	30	Mar	1983
United Kingdom	29	Apr	1983
Brazil	14	Jul	1983
India	6	Dec	1983
Saudi Arabia	15	Dec	1983
Portugal	15	Dec	1983
Spain	20	Mar	1984
China	10	May	1985
Argentina	2	Jul	1985

* See also note 2 below.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] With a declaration to the effect that the Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date when it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] The Bank notified the Depositary that reservations Nos. 2 and 3, not contemplated in the Agreement, had been accepted by the Bank.

[6] With this regard, the Secretary General received from the Government of Israel, on 27 June 1984 the following communication:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument by Kuwait contains a declaration of political character in respect of Israel. In the view of the government of the State of Israel this Convention is not the place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of the State of Kuwait under general international law or under specific Convention.

"The Government of the State of Israel will, in regard to the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of the State of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[7] The Bank notified the Depositary that those reservations above that are not contemplated in the Agreement, had been accepted by the Bank.

[8] By resolution B/B6/95/11 of 6 December 1996, the Board of Governors of the Bank, in application of article 64 (2) of the Agreement, had established the conditions for accession by South Africa while appointing 13 December 1995 as the date on which South Africa upon deposit of its instrument of accession and making its initial payment would become a member of the Bank. See also note 2 in chapter X.2.

3. Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States

Done at New York on 8 July 1965

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 June 1967, in accordance with article 20.
REGISTRATION: 9 June 1967, No. 8641.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 597, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 35.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Transit Trade of Land-locked Countries, which had been convened pursuant to the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations taken at its 1328th plenary meeting on 10 February 1965. The Conference met at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 7 June to 8 July 1965.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (s)*
Afghanistan	8 Jul 1965	
Argentina	29 Dec 1965	
Australia		2 May 1972 *a*
Belarus	28 Dec 1965	11 Jul 1972
Belgium	30 Dec 1965	21 Apr 1970
Bolivia	29 Dec 1965	
Brazil	4 Aug 1965	
Burkina Faso		23 Mar 1987 *a*
Burundi		1 May 1968 *a*
Cameroon	10 Aug 1965	
Central African Republic	30 Dec 1965	9 Aug 1989
Chad		2 Mar 1967 *a*
Chile	20 Dec 1965	25 Oct 1972
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *s*
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark		26 Mar 1969 *a*
Finland		22 Jan 1971 *a*
Germany[2]	20 Dec 1965	
Holy See	30 Dec 1965	
Hungary	30 Dec 1965	20 Sep 1967
Italy	31 Dec 1965	
Lao People's Democratic Republic[4]	8 Jul 1965	29 Dec 1967
Lesotho		28 May 1969 *a*
Luxembourg	28 Dec 1965	
Malawi		12 Dec 1966 *a*
Mali		11 Oct 1967 *a*
Mongolia		26 Jul 1966 *a*
Nepal	9 Jul 1965	22 Aug 1966
Netherlands	30 Dec 1965	30 Nov 1971
Niger		3 Jun 1966 *a*
Nigeria		16 May 1966 *a*
Norway		17 Sep 1968 *a*
Paraguay	23 Dec 1965	
Russian Federation	28 Dec 1965	21 Jul 1972
Rwanda	23 Jul 1965	13 Aug 1968
San Marino	23 Jul 1965	12 Jun 1968
Senegal		5 Aug 1985 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Sudan	11 Aug 1965	
Swaziland		26 May 1969 *a*
Sweden		16 Jun 1971 *a*
Switzerland	10 Dec 1965	
Turkey		25 Mar 1969 *a*
Uganda	21 Dec 1965	
Ukraine	31 Dec 1965	21 Jul 1972
United States of America	30 Dec 1965	29 Oct 1968
Yugoslavia	8 Jul 1965	10 May 1967
Zambia	23 Dec 1965	2 Dec 1966

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

Declaration and reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 17, 19, 22 and 23 of the Convention, under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters that affect the interests of all States, and it should therefore be open for participation by all States. According to the principle of sovereign equality, no States have the right to exclude other States from participation in a Convention of this type.

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 of the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States, under which members of the arbitration commission may be appointed by the President of the International Court of Justice, and declares that, in each individual case, the consent of the contending States is necessary for the appointment of members of the arbitration commission by the President of the International Court of Justice.

BELGIUM

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. With regard to the application of article 3 of the Convention, the Belgian Government considers that the exemption relates exclusively to duties or taxes on imports or exports, and not to taxes on transactions, such as the Belgian tax on transport and auxiliary services, which also apply to internal trade.

2. Belgium can apply article 4, paragraph 1, only in so far as State-owned means of transport and handling equipment are concerned.

Upon signature (the reservation referred to below was not made upon ratification):

3. The Belgian Government intends, upon depositing its instrument of ratification of the Convention, to make a reserva-

tion concerning the rights and obligations of Belgium arising from its adherence to certain international treaties relating to economic matters or trade.

BOLIVIA

Upon signature:

I have been instructed by my Government to place on record the Bolivian view, which is already to be found in the records of the Conference, that Bolivia is not a land-locked State but a nation which is deprived by temporary circumstances of access to the sea across its own coast and that unrestricted and unconditional freedom of transit must be recognized in international law as an inherent right of enclosed territories and countries for reasons of justice and because of the need to facilitate such transit as a contribution to general progress on a basis of equality.

Bolivia will on no occasion fail to maintain these views, which are inherent in national sovereignty, and, by signing the Convention, will give evidence of its willingness to co-operate with the United Nations and the developing countries without a sea-coast.

CHILE

Reservation with respect to article 16 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

In any dispute with American countries over the interpretation or implementation of this Convention, Chile shall proceed in accordance with whatever inter-American instruments concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes may be binding both on Chile and on the other American country.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

GERMANY

"In respect of article 2, paragraph 1, article 5 and article 7:

"The Federal Republic of Germany starts from the assumption that normal frontier controls which, in accordance with international agreements and with existing national legislation, are carried through in an adequate and non-discriminatory manner, meet the requirements of article 2, paragraph 1, article 5 and article 7.

"In respect of article 2, paragraph 2:

"The Federal Republic of Germany understands this provision to imply that, as long as agreements according to article 2, paragraph 2, have not been concluded, the national regulations of the transit state will apply.

"In respect of article 4, paragraph 1 and article 6, paragraph 1:

"The Federal Republic of Germany is not in a position to assume obligations as provided for in article 4, paragraph 1 and in article 6, paragraph 1. Considering transport conditions in the Federal Republic of Germany, however, it may be taken for granted that sufficient means of transport as well as handling equipment and storage facilities will be available for traffic in transit. Should difficulties arise nevertheless, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would be prepared to seek remedies.

"In respect of article 4, paragraph 2 and article 6, paragraph 2:

"The Federal Republic of Germany is not in a position to assume obligations as contained in article 4, paragraph 2 and article 6, paragraph 2.The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is, however, prepared, within the scope of its possibilities, to use its influence as regards tariffs and charges so as to facilitate traffic in transit as much as possible."

HUNGARY[3]

The Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that articles 17, 19, 22 and 23 of the Convention, which debar a number of States the right to become parties to the Convention, are of a discriminatory nature. The Convention is a general multilateral international treaty, and therefore, as follows from the principles of international law, every State shall have the right to become a party to it.

ITALY

The Permanent Representative of Italy wishes to notify the Secretary-General that the Italian Government intends to enter specific reservations to the Convention on depositing its instrument of ratification.

LUXEMBOURG

The Government of Luxembourg envisages the possibility, on depositing the instrument of ratification of the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States, of entering a reservation relating to its membership in regional economic unions or common markets.

MONGOLIA[4]

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic deems it essential to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of the provisions of articles 17, 19, 22 and 23 of the Convention, under which a number of States are excluded from participation in this Convention. The Convention deals with matters of interest to all States and should therefore be open for participation by all States.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration and reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 17, 19, 22 and 23 of the Convention under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters that affect the interests of all States, and it should therefore be open for participation by all States. According to the principle of sovereign equality, no States have the right to exclude other States from participation in a Convention of this type.

The Government of the Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 of the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States, under which members of the arbitration commission may be appointed by the President of the International Court of Justice, and declares that, in each individual case, the consent of the contending States is necessary for the appointment of members of the arbitration commission by the President of the International Court of Justice.

SLOVAKIA[1]

SUDAN

"The Government of the Republic of the Sudan will not consider itself bound by the third sentence of article 2, paragraph 1, of the Convention in respect of the passage across its territory of goods destined to or coming from South Africa or Portugal or goods the ownership of which could be claimed by South Africa or Portugal. The reservation is made in accordance with the spirit of Security Council resolution S/5773, in which the Security Council condemned the *apartheid* Policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa, resolution A/AC.109/124 in which the Special Committee condemned the colonial policy of

Portugal and its persistent refusal to carry out the resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Special Committee, and resolution CM/Res.6 (1) of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity. The reservations will remain in force pending the ending of the prevailing situation in South Africa and the Portuguese colonies.

"Nor will the Republic of the Sudan, as a member of the Arab League, consider itself bound by the same provision in respect of the passage across its territory of goods destined for or coming from Israel."

UKRAINE

Declaration and reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of articles 17, 19, 22 and 23 of the Convention, under which a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention. The Convention deals with matters that affect the interests of all States, and it should therefore be open for participation by all States. According to the principle of sovereign equality, no States have the right to exclude other States from participation in a Convention of this type.

The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 of the Convention on Transit Trade of Land-locked States, under which members of the arbitration commission may be appointed by the President of the International Court of Justice, and declares that, in each individual case, the consent of the contending States is necessary for the appointment of members of the arbitration commission by the President of the International Court of Justice.

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 10 December 1965 and 8 August 1967, respectively, with reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 597, p. 111. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article 16 made upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 605, p. 399.

[4] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article 16 made upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 593, p. 137.

4. Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank

Done at Manila on 4 December 1965

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 August 1966, in accordance with article 65.
REGISTRATION: 22 August 1966, No. 8303.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 571, p. 123 (including the procès-verbal of rectification established on 2 November 1967), and vol. 608, p. 380 (procès-verbal of rectification).
STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 48.[1]

Note: The Agreement was adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Asian Development Bank, which had been convened pursuant to resolution 62 (XXI)[2] of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, and which met at Manila from 2 to 4 December 1965.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), participation (P) under articles 3 (2)*[3] *and (3)*[1]
Afghanistan	4 Dec 1965	22 Aug 1966
Australia	4 Dec 1965	19 Sep 1966
Austria	31 Jan 1966	29 Sep 1966
Bangladesh[3]		14 Mar 1973 *P*
Belgium	31 Jan 1966	16 Aug 1966
Bhutan[3]		15 Apr 1982 *P*
Cambodia	4 Dec 1965	30 Sep 1966
Canada	4 Dec 1965	22 Aug 1966
China[3]		10 Mar 1986 *P*
Cook Islands[1]		10 Apr 1976 *P*
Denmark	28 Jan 1966	16 Aug 1966
Fiji[1]		2 Apr 1970 *P*
Finland	28 Jan 1966	22 Aug 1966
France[3]		27 Jul 1970 *P*
Germany[4]	4 Dec 1965	30 Aug 1966
Hong Kong[1]		27 Mar 1969 *P*
India	4 Dec 1965	20 Jul 1966
Indonesia[3]		24 Nov 1966 *P*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Dec 1965	
Italy	31 Jan 1966	30 Sep 1966
Japan	4 Dec 1965	16 Aug 1966
Kiribati[1]		28 May 1974 *P*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	4 Dec 1965	30 Aug 1966
Malaysia	4 Dec 1965	16 Aug 1966
Maldives[3]		14 Feb 1978 *P*
Myanmar[3]		26 Apr 1973 *P*
Nepal	4 Dec 1965	21 Jun 1966 *A*
Netherlands[6]	4 Dec 1965	29 Aug 1966
New Zealand	4 Dec 1965	29 Sep 1966
Norway	28 Jan 1966	14 Jul 1966
Pakistan	4 Dec 1965	12 May 1966
Papua New Guinea[1]		8 Apr 1971 *P*
Philippines	4 Dec 1965	5 Jul 1966
Republic of China[5]	4 Dec 1965	22 Sep 1966
Republic of Korea	4 Dec 1965	16 Aug 1966
Samoa	4 Dec 1965	23 Jun 1966
Singapore	28 Jan 1966	21 Sep 1966
Solomon Islands[1]		30 Apr 1973 *P*
Spain[3]		14 Feb 1986 *P*
Sri Lanka	4 Dec 1965	29 Sep 1966
Sweden	31 Jan 1966	29 Sep 1966
Switzerland[3]		31 Dec 1967 *P*
Thailand	4 Dec 1965	16 Aug 1966
Tonga[3]		29 Mar 1972 *P*
United Kingdom	4 Dec 1965	26 Sep 1966
United States of America	4 Dec 1965	16 Aug 1966 *A*
Uzbekistan		31 Aug 1995 *P*
Vanuatu[3]		15 Apr 1982 *P*
Viet Nam[7]	28 Jan 1966	22 Sep 1966

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance or participation.)

AUSTRALIA[8]

"The Australian Government further declares in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 56 of the said Agreement that it retains the right to levy taxation in respect of salary and emoluments paid by the Bank for services rendered in Australia to a Director, alternate, officer or employee of the Bank, including an expert performing a mission for the Bank, being a resident of Australia within the meaning of the Australian legislation relating to income tax unless the person is not a citizen of Australia and came to Australia solely for the purpose of performing duties of the office in the Bank held by him.

[In connection with the above declaration the Government of Australia further specified that "although paragraph 2 of article 56 refers to 'citizens or nationals' and not to residents, it is understood that the persons intended to be covered by the word 'resident' in the declaration include, in addition to citizens, persons already living in Australia at the time of recruitment as potential Australian citizens who, in fact, under Australian law have duties of a similar character to citizens. They may, therefore, be considered as within the category of persons envisaged by the words 'citizens or nationals'.]

"The Australian Government is unable to accord to the Bank, in respect of any mailbags which the Bank might wish to despatch through postal channels in Australia, the reduced rates which the Australian Government accords, on the basis of reciprocity, to certain other Governments in respect of mailbags despatched through postal channels by their diplomatic missions in Australia.

"The Australian Government is, insofar as the article applies to priorities, rates and taxes on telecommunications, unable fully to comply with article 54 of the Agreement which requires that the Bank in respect of its official communications shall be accorded by each member treatment not less favourable than that

accorded to the official communications of any other member, until such time as all other Governments have decided to co-operate in granting this treatment to international organizations. This reservation shall not affect the right of the Bank to lodge press telegrams at prescribed press rates to the press and radio in Australia.

"The Australian Government understands that nothing in the said Agreement affects the application of any Australian law relating to quarantine."

CANADA

"Canada retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax Canadian citizens resident or ordinarily resident in Canada."

DENMARK

"According to article 14, paragraph ix, in the Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, 'the proceeds of any loan, investment or other financing undertaken in the ordinary operations of the Bank or with Special Funds established by the Bank pursuant to paragraph 1 (i) of article 19, shall be used only for procurement in member countries of goods and services produced in member countries. . .'.

"The declared shipping policy of the Danish Government is based on the principle of free circulation of shipping in international trade in free and fair competition. In accordance with this policy transactions and transfers in connexion with maritime transport should not be hampered by provisions giving preferential treatment to one country or a group of countries, the aim always being that normal commercial consideration should determine the method and flag of shipment. The Government of Denmark trusts that article 14, paragraph ix, will not be applied contrary to this principle."

FRANCE

Pursuant to article 56 (2) of the said Agreement, the French Government retains for itself the right to levy taxes, as provided by French law, on salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to French nationals.

GERMANY[4]

"1. The Federal Republic of Germany makes use of the reservation provided for in article 56, paragraph 2, of the Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank and retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Asian Development Bank to Germans within the meaning of Article 116 of the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany who have their domicile or ordinary residence in the area of application of the said Basic Law, including Land Berlin;

"2. The Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank shall also apply to Land Berlin as from the day on which the Convention will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

INDIA

"The Government of India declares that India retains for herself and her political subdivision the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Asian Development Bank to citizens or nationals of India."

ITALY

"The Italian Government, pursuant to article 56, paragraph 2, of the Agreement, retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to Italian citizens employed in offices of the Bank that might be set up in Italy or performing any activities in Italy on behalf of the Bank.

"On the occasion of the deposit of the instrument of ratification, the Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations, on the instructions of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, has made the following observations:

"The Italian Government considers that paragraph 1 of article 56 is to be construed in the light of current practice concerning exemption of international organizations from taxation. According to such practice, relief from taxation is granted to international organizations only in respect of articles acquired in pursuance of the official activities of an organization and, in the case of internal indirect taxes, only for substantial purchases where it is reasonably practicable to allow such relief.

"The Italian Government considers that the provision of article 50, paragraph 1, concerning immunity from jurisdiction is to be construed within the limits in which such immunity is provided by international law.

"[The Permanent Representative also has] the honour to inform your Excellency that it is the intention of the Italian Government to seek from the Asian Development Bank an understanding to the effect that the special procedure to be provided for pursuant to paragraph 2 of article 50 of the by-laws and regulations of the Bank or in contracts entered into with the Bank should not be of prejudice to the jurisdiction of Italian Courts with respect to any claims put forward by private parties."

JAPAN

"Japan retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its nationals."

MALAYSIA

"The Government of Malaysia declares that it retains for itself the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid."

NETHERLANDS

This ratification is subject to the reservation provided for in article 56, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

NEW ZEALAND

"Pursuant to paragraph 2 (ii) of article 24 of the Agreement, the Government of New Zealand hereby declares that it desires the use of the portion of its subscription paid pursuant to paragraph 2 (*b*) of article 6 of the Agreement to be wholly restricted to payments for goods or services produced in its territory."

NORWAY

"According to article 14, paragraph ix, in the Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, 'the proceeds of any loan, investment or other financing undertaken in the ordinary operations of the Bank or with Special Funds established by the Bank pursuant to paragraph 1 (i) of article 19, shall be used only for procurement in member countries of goods and services produced in member countries. . .'.

"The declared shipping policy of the Norwegian Government is based on the principle of free circulation of shipping in international trade in free and fair competition. In accordance with this policy transactions and transfers in connection with maritime transport should not be hampered by provisions giving preferential treatment to one country or a group of countries, the aim always being that normal commercial consideration should determine the method and flag of shipment. The Government of Norway trusts that article 14, paragraph ix, will not be applied contrary to this principle."

PHILIPPINES

"The Government of the Philippines declares that it retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to citizens or nationals of the Philippines."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"The Republic of Korea retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its nationals."

SINGAPORE

"Singapore retains for itself the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Asian Development Bank to citizens and nationals of Singapore."

SRI LANKA

"In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 56 of the Asian Development Bank Agreement, the Government of Ceylon retains for itself and its political subdivision the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to citizens or nationals of Ceylon resident or ordinarily resident in Ceylon."

SWEDEN

"According to the main rule of article 14, paragraph ix, in the Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, the proceeds of any loan, investment or other financing undertaken by the Bank shall be used only for procurement in member countries of goods.

"The shipping policy of the Swedish Government is based on the principle of free circulation of shipping in international trade in free and fair competition. The Swedish Government trusts that article 14, paragraph ix, will not be applied contrary to this principle. Similarly, it is part of the assistance policy of the Swedish Government that multilateral development assistance should be based on the principle of free international competitive bidding. The Swedish Government expresses the hope that it will be possible to reach agreement on such modification of article 14, paragraph ix, that it does not conflict with this principle."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"In accordance with paragraph 2 of article 56, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they retain the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Asian Development Bank to citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies."

In a letter transmitting the instrument of ratification, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, has made the following observations:

"Article 54 of the Agreement has the effect of affording Government telecommunication privileges to the Asian Development Bank. The list of persons and authorities entitled to such privileges in Annex 3 to the International Telecommunications Convention signed at Geneva on the 21st of December, 1959, does not include international organizations other than the United Nations. There is thus a clear conflict between article 54 and the Telecommunications Convention, to which the United Kingdom (and no doubt other members of the Asian Development Bank) is a party. The United Kingdom wishes to propose that this conflict be considered at an early meeting of the Board of Governors.

"Paragraph 1 of article 56 of the Agreement might perhaps be construed as allowing the Asian Development Bank complete exemption from all customs duties and taxes on goods without any qualification. It is current practice to accord relief from taxation on goods to international organizations only in respect of articles acquired in pursuance of the official activities of an organization, and, in the case of internal indirect taxes, only for substantial purchases where it is reasonably practicable to allow such relief. The Government of the United Kingdom consider that paragraph 1 of article 56 is to be construed in the light of current practice.

"[The Permanent Representative also has] the honour to inform you that it is the intention of the Government of the United Kingdom to seek from the Asian Development Bank:

"(*a*) An understanding that it will insure any motor vehicle belonging to, or operated on behalf of, the Bank against third party claims for damage arising from an accident caused by such a vehicle in the United Kingdom and that the immunity of the Bank from legal process under paragraph 1 of article 50 will not be asserted in the case of any civil action in the United Kingdom by a third party for damage arising from an accident caused by such a vehicle;

"(*b*) An understanding that no immunity under article 55 will be asserted in respect of any motor traffic offence committed by a member of the personnel of the Bank or in respect of damage caused by a motor vehicle belonging to, or driven by, him."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States of America retains for itself and for all political subdivisions of the United States of America the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Asian Development Bank to any citizen or national of the United States of America."

NOTES:

[1] Pursuant to the procedure provided for in article 3 (3) of the Agreement, various non-autonomous territories became members of the Bank, as indicated hereinafter:

Territory	*Participant presenting the application for admission*	*Date of the resolution by the Council of Governors*	*Date on which the resolution took effect*
Hong Kong	United Kingdom	26 Mar 1969	27 Mar 1969
Fiji*	United Kingdom	24 Mar 1970	2 Apr 1970

Territory	*Participant presenting the application for admission*	*Date of the resolution by the Council of Governors*	*Date on which the resolution took effect*
Papua New Guinea*	Australia	12 Mar 1971	8 Apr 1971
British Solomon Islands Protectorate*	United Kingdom	12 Apr 1973	30 Apr 1973
Gilbert* and Ellice Islands**	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1974	28 May 1974
Cook Islands	New Zealand	8 Apr 1976	20 Apr 1976

* These territories have since become independent and have informed the Bank that "they had assumed full responsibility for the conduct of their international relations and that they assumed full responsibility for all obligations that may be incurred by them by reason of admission to membership in the Bank".

** On 1 October 1975, the Ellice Islands (which subsequently became the State of "Tuvalu") separated from the Gilbert Islands which alone remained a member of the Bank and subsequently, on 12 July 1979, became the independent State of "Kiribati".

[2] *Official Records of Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, 39th Session, Supplement No. 2* (E/4005–E/CN.11/705), p. 167.

[3] Article 3 (2) of the Agreement provides that countries eligible for membership under paragraph 1 of article 3 which do not become members in accordance with article 64 may be admitted, under such terms and conditions as the Bank may determine, to membership in the Bank upon the affirmative vote of two–thirds of the total number of Governors, representing not less than three–fourths of the total voting power of the members. Conditions include the acceptance of the Agreement through the deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Bank. The date of participation corresponds to the fulfilment of all requirements.

[4] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] Upon the admission of the People's Republic of China on 10 March 1986, the Republic of China, representing the Island of Taiwan, was re–designated as "Taipei, China" and continues its membership under that designation.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[7] The formalities were effected by the Republic of South Viet–Nam. The Government of Viet–Nam assumed the responsibilities and obligations of South Viet–Nam in respect of the Bank following unification of the Democratic Republic of Viet–Nam and the Republic of South Viet–Nam.

[8] In a notification received on 12 May 1976, the Government of Australia informed the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of the declaration made upon ratification under article 24 (2) (ii) of the said Agreement. For the text of the declaration so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 572, p. 368.

5. Articles of Association for the Establishment of an Economic Community of West Africa

Done at Accra on 4 May 1967

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 May 1967, in accordance with article 7 (2).
REGISTRATION: 4 May 1967, No. 8623.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 595, p. 287.
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Note: Adopted by the West African Sub-regional Conference on Economic Co-operation, held at Accra from 27 April to 4 May 1967.

The Articles of Association for the Establishment of an Economic Community of West Africa done at Accra on 4 May 1967 were concluded "pending the formal establishment of the Community" (preamble). Thereafter, two additional agreements were concluded: (1) the Treaty establishing the Community of West Africa, concluded at Abidjan on 17 April 1973 between the Ivory Coast, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Upper Volta (came into force on 1 January 1974 and deposited with the Government of Upper Volta); and (2) the Treaty of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), concluded at Lagos on 28 May 1975 between Benin, the Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo and Upper Volta (came into force on 20 June 1975 and deposited with the Government of Nigeria).

Participant	*Definitive signature*	*Participant*	*Definitive signature*
Benin	4 May 1967	Mauritania	4 May 1967
Burkina Faso	4 May 1967	Niger	4 May 1967
Gambia	21 Nov 1967	Nigeria	4 May 1967
Ghana	4 May 1967	Senegal	4 May 1967
Liberia	4 May 1967	Sierra Leone	4 May 1967
Mali	4 May 1967	Togo	4 May 1967

6. Agreement Establishing the Caribbean Development Bank, with Protocol to Provide for Procedure for Amendment of Article 36 of the Agreement

Done at Kingston, Jamaica, on 18 October 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 January 1970, in accordance with article 64.
REGISTRATION: 26 January 1970, No. 10232.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 712, p. 217; vol. 1021, p. 437 (Addendum) [amendment to article 29 (1) (a)] and vol. 1401, p. 265 (amendments to articles 25, 33, 34, 35 and 57).
STATUS: Signatories: 18. Parties: 25.

Note: The Agreement and Protocol were adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Caribbean Development Bank which met at Kingston, Jamaica, on 18 October 1969. The Conference was convened for that purpose by the Acting Secretary-General of the Commonwealth Caribbean Regional Secretariat in accordance with the decision of the Commonwealth Caribbean Conference of Finance Ministers taken at its meeting held at Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, on 22 July 1969. Both instruments were opened for signature by the Plenipotentiary Conference at Kingston on 18 October 1969. The Conference also adopted the Final Act, approved the memorandum of understanding relating to the allocation of the Bank's resources to multinational projects, which had been adopted by the Conference of Finance Ministers at Port of Spain, and adopted the resolution on the duties of the Trustee designated under article 7, paragraph (8), of the Agreement. The texts of the said memorandum and resolution are appended to the Final Act as annexes A and B.

The Protocol, to provide for procedure for amendment of article 36 of the Agreement, became void, when the amendment proposed under the said procedure at the Inaugural Meeting of the Board of Governors of the Caribbean Development Bank, held at Nassau, Bahamas, on 31 January 1970, had failed to obtain the required majority.

By Resolution No. 9/76 adopted on 20 August 1976, the Board of Governors of the Bank has amended article 29 (1) (a) of the Agreement (number of Directors) with effect from 2 September 1976.

Subsequently, by Resolution No. 3/85 of 15 May 1985, the Board of Governors of the Bank adopted amendments to articles 25, 33, 34, 35 and 57 of the Agreement with effect from 24 June 1985.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Anguilla[2]		4 May 1982 *a*	Guyana	18 Oct 1969	22 Jan 1970
Antigua	18 Oct 1969	30 Jan 1970	Italy[5]		26 Oct 1988 *a*
Bahamas	18 Oct 1969	28 Jan 1970	Jamaica	18 Oct 1969	9 Jan 1970
Barbados	18 Oct 1969	16 Jan 1970	Mexico		7 May 1982 *a*
Belize	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970	Montserrat	18 Oct 1969	28 Jan 1970
British Virgin Islands	18 Oct 1969	30 Jan 1970	Saint Kitts and Nevis[2]	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970
Canada	18 Oct 1969	22 Jan 1970	Saint Lucia	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970
Cayman Islands	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970	Saint Vincent	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970
Colombia		22 Nov 1974 *a*	Trinidad and Tobago	18 Oct 1969	20 Jan 1970
Dominica	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970	Turks and Caicos Islands	18 Oct 1969	5 Jan 1970
France		11 May 1984 *a*	United Kingdom	18 Oct 1969	23 Jan 1970
Germany[3, 4, 5]		25 May 1989 *a*	Venezuela		25 Apr 1973 *a*
Grenada	18 Oct 1969	26 Jan 1970			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

ANTIGUA, BAHAMAS, BRITISH HONDURAS[6], BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS, CAYMAN ISLANDS, DOMINICA, GRENADA, MONTSERRAT, ST. CHRISTOPHER-NEVIS-ANGUILLA, ST. LUCIA, ST. VINCENT, TURKS AND CAICOS ISLANDS

The instruments of ratification by the Governments of the above-mentioned Associated States or territories, all contain a declaration made in accordance with the first provision of the second part of paragraph 3 of article 63 of the Agreement to the effect that the privilege conferred by article 53 shall be restricted in its territory to treatment not less favourable than the Government concerned accords to international financial institutions of which it is a member.

FRANCE[7]

Declaration:

In acceding to the Agreement, the French Republic recalls that the Departments of Guyana, Martinique and Guadeloupe are integral parts of the French territory and that, as a result, it is a state of the Caribbean region.

GERMANY[3]

1. The Federal Republic of Germany proceeds on the understanding that the Caribbean Development Bank will, in accordance with article 57 of the Agreement, waive immunity from jurisdiction and execution in the event of a civil action for damage arising out of an accident caused by a motor vehicle belonging to the Bank or operated on its behalf or driven by a governor, director, alternate, official or employee of, or expert performing a mission for, the Bank;

2. Privileges in accordance with article 54 (b) as regards travel facilities will be granted to the degree that they are extended to World Bank officials in the Federal Republic of Germany;

3. The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right for itself and its territorial entities to tax the salaries and other emoluments paid by the Carribbean Development Bank to Germans within the meaning of article 116 of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany domiciled or resident in the area of application of the Basic Law;

4. The provision of article 55 (2) regarding exemption from taxes which merely represent charges for public utility services will be extended to include all charges for services levied by public authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany;

5. The Federal Republic of Germany proceeds on the understanding that the Bank will not claim exemption from taxation in accordance with article 55 (3).

ITALY

Reservation:

In accordance with article 55, paragraph 5, of the Agreement, the Italian Government reserves for itself and its political subdivisions the right to exclude from the tax exemption for remuneration employees who are Italian nationals and aliens who are permanently resident in Italy.

Declaration:

The Italian Government hereby declares that the immunities provided for by the Agreement shall be conditional on the requirements of maintaining public order and national security.

(With regard to the above-mentioned declaration, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Italy the following clarification which has been duly acknowledged by the Bank:

"This declaration does not exclude the immunities provided for in the Agreement establishing the Caribbean Development Bank. It is only intended as a safeguard instrument in respect of Bank representatives, recognizing the Italian Government's authority and power to take exceptional measures in case of extraordinary circumstances regarding public order and national security. In those circumstances, the Government of Italy would give treatment to the Bank's representatives no less favourable than what is accorded by Italy to representatives of any other Member of the Bank as contemplated by article 54 (B) and (C) of the agreement establishing the Bank. Therefore, this declaration is not a reservation. The possibility that this declaration will ever have practical relevance is indeed very remote. In fact, it will be applicable only when extraordinary events occur during the stay in Italy of representatives of the Bank who are not citizens or nationals of Italy."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[8, 9]

"(*a*) In the United Kingdom the immunity conferred by paragraph 1 of article 49 and subparagraph (*a*) of article 54 of the Agreement shall not apply in relation to a civil action arising out of an accident caused by a motor vehicle belonging to the Bank or operated on its behalf or to a traffic offence committed by the driver of such a vehicle.

"(*b*) As Bank telegrams and telephone calls are not defined as Government telegrams and telephone calls in Annex 2 to the International Telecommunication Convention (Montreux, 1965) and are therefore not entitled by the Convention to the privileges thereby conferred on Government telegrams and telephone calls, the Government of the United Kingdom, having regard to their obligations under the International Telecommunication Convention, declare that the privileges conferred by article 53 of the Agreement shall be correspondingly restricted in the United Kingdom, but, subject thereto, shall be not less favourable than the United Kingdom affords to international financial institutions of which it is a member.

"(*c*) The exemption referred to in paragraph 6(*b*) of article 55 of the Agreement shall not extend to any bearer instrument issued by the Bank in the United Kingdom or issued elsewhere by the Bank and transferred in the United Kingdom."

NOTES:

[1] See article 3 and 62 of the Agreement in the annex to this publication: *Final Clauses* (ST/LEG/SER.D/1.Annex), page X-15.

[2] Anguilla ceased to apply the Agreement as part of St. Christopher-Nevis-Anguilla on 19 December 1980 and became a member in its own right on 4 May 1982.

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a note accompanying the instrument, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

[5] These participants deposited their instruments of accession prior to the date appointed by the Board of Governors for their admittance to membership in the Bank, which took place, on that appointed date, in accordance with article 63 (2), as indicated hereinafter:

Participant	*Date of admission*
Italy	2 November 1988
Germany*	27 October 1989

* See also note 3 above.

[6] In its instrument of ratification, the Government of British Honduras further declared that the Agreement was ratified subject "... to the condition that the Government of British Honduras undertakes that legislation to give effect to the immunities and privileges to be conferred on the Bank in British Honduras by virtue of the Agreement will be passed on or before February 21st, 1970." Regarding this part of the declaration see note 8 below.

[7] On 16 May 1984, the Secretary-General received from the Government of France the following interpretative note:

> The declaration accompanying the instrument of accession cannot be interpreted as a reservation to the conditions set forth in Resolutions 5/82 and 5/83 of the Board of Governors for the admission of France to membership in the Bank.

[8] Paragraph (*d*) of the United Kingdom declaration and the declaration by the Government of British Honduras quoted in note 6 above, not being provided for in paragraph 3 of article 63 of the Agreement, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General that all signatories to the Agreement had been consulted in connection therewith and, in particular, that "the signatories to the Agreement were requested to notify any objection on their part to these declarations and no objection has been notified by any signatory." With reference to these declarations, the Secretary-General, in his report of 27 January 1970 to the Board of Governors of the Caribbean Development Bank on the status of the Agreement, stated that, inasmuch as the said declarations were not provided in the Agreement, but having taken note of the information given in their respect by the Government of the United Kingdom, he had received the instruments of ratification of the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of British Honduras provisionally in deposit, without prejudice to and pending the decision of the competent organ of the Caribbean Development Bank as to the acceptability of the declarations concerned.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 30 January 1970, the Government of British Honduras notified him of the withdrawal of the pertinent part of its declaration. In so far as concerns paragraph (*d*) of the declaration of the United Kingdom, the Acting Secretary of the Caribbean Development Bank informed the Secretary-General that the Board of Governors of the Bank, at the inaugural meeting held on 31 January 1970, had decided to accept the conditions accompanying the United Kingdom ratification and had requested him to notify the Secretary-General of its decision. As a result of these actions, the Secretary-General considered the instruments of ratification by the Government of British Honduras and the Government of the United Kingdom as definitively deposited and informed all Governments concerned and the Bank accordingly.

[9] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 February 1972, the Government of the United Kingdom notified him of its decision to withdraw paragraph *d* of its declaration, the necessary legislation having been enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom and having come into operation on 5 February 1972. For the text of the declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 712, p. 326.

7. Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods

Concluded at New York on 14 June 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1988, in accordance with article 44 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1988, No. 26119.
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.63/15, and depositary notification C.N.260.1975.TREATIES–6 of 30 September 1975 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic French text).
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 20.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Prescription (limitation) in the International Sale of Goods, which convened at the Headquarters of the United Nations, at New York, from 20 May to 14 June 1974. The Conference was convened in accordance with Resolution 3104 (XXVIII)[1] of the General Assembly adopted on 12 December 1973. The Convention was opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 14 June 1974, (closing date for signature: 31 December 1975).

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) or participation under article XI of the Protocol of 11 April 1980 (P)*
Argentina		9 Oct 1981 *a*
Belarus	14 Jun 1974	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Brazil	14 Jun 1974	
Bulgaria	24 Feb 1975	
Costa Rica	30 Aug 1974	
Cuba		2 Nov 1994 *P*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Dominican Republic		23 Dec 1977 *a*
Egypt		6 Dec 1982 *P*
Ghana	5 Dec 1974	7 Oct 1975
Guinea		23 Jan 1991 *a*
Hungary	14 Jun 1974	16 Jun 1983
Mexico		21 Jan 1988 *a*
Mongolia	14 Jun 1974	
Nicaragua	13 May 1975	
Norway	11 Dec 1975	20 Mar 1980
Poland	14 Jun 1974	19 May 1995
Romania		23 Apr 1992 *a*
Russian Federation	14 Jun 1974	
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		2 Aug 1995 *P*
Uganda		12 Feb 1992 *a*
Ukraine	14 Jun 1974	13 Sep 1993
United States of America		5 May 1994 *a*
Yugoslavia		27 Nov 1978 *a*
Zambia		6 Jun 1986 *P*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, succession or participation.)

NORWAY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"In accordance with article 34 the Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares that the Convention shall not govern contracts of sale where the seller and the buyer both have their relevant places of business within the territories of the Nordic States (i.e. Norway, Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Sweden)."

Notes:

1 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 30* (A/9030), p. 143.

2 The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 14 June 1974 and 31 August 1989, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

3 Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 August 1975 and 26 May 1977, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

7. *(a)* Protocol amending the Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods

Concluded at Vienna on 11 April 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1988, in accordance with article IX (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1988, No. 26120.
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.97/18.
STATUS: Parties: 13.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, held at Vienna from 10 March to 11 April 1980. The Conference was convened by the General Assembly of the United Nations, in accordance with its resolution 33/93[1] of 16 December 1978 adopted on the basis of chapter II of the report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its eleventh session (1978).

The Protocol is open for accession by all States, at any time, at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant[2]	*Accession, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession, succession (d)*
Argentina	19 Jul 1983	Romania	23 Apr 1992
Czech Republic[3]	30 Sep 1993 *d*	Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 *d*
Egypt	6 Dec 1982	Slovenia	2 Aug 1995
Guinea	23 Jan 1991	Uganda	12 Feb 1992
Hungary	16 Jun 1983	United States of America	5 May 1994
Mexico	21 Jan 1988	Zambia	6 Jun 1986
Poland	19 May 1995		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession or succession.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article XII, the United States will not be bound by article I of the Protocol."

NOTES:

1 *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 45* (A/3345), p. 217.

2 The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 31 August 1989. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

3 Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 5 March 1990 with the following reservation:

Pursuant to article XII [of the Protocol], the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that it shall not consider itself bound by the provision of its article I.

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

7. *(b)* Convention on the Limitation Period in the International Sale of Goods, concluded at New York on 14 June 1974, as amended by the Protocol of 11 April 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1988, in accordance with article 44 (1) of the Convention and article IX (1) of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1988, No. 26121.
TEXT: See United Nations publications Sales Nos. E.74.V.8, p. 101 (Convention) and E.81.IV.3, p. 191 (amending Protocol), UNCITRAL Document ref. V.90–81217 (English, French and Spanish only) and depositary notifications C.N.11.1989.TREATIES–1 of 17 April 1989 (revised text prepared by the Secretary–General, of the Convention, as amended by the Protocol of 11 April 1980); C.N.106.1991.TREATIES–2 of 29 February 1992 (procès–verbal of rectification of English, French, Russian and Spanish texts established by the Secretary–General); C.N.161.1992.TREATIES–4 of 1 July 1992 (procès–verbal of rectification of Spanish text established by the Secretary–General); and C.N.470.1992.TREATIES–5 of 2 April 1993 (procès–verbal adopting the Arabic authentic text of the Convention, as amended).
STATUS: Parties: 14.

Note: The text of the Convention, as amended, has been established by the Secretary–General, as provided for by article XIV of the Protocol.

Participant[1]	*Accession, succession (d) or participation by virtue of accession to the Protocol of 11 April 1980 (P)*
Argentina	19 Jul 1983
Cuba	2 Nov 1994
Czech Republic[2]	30 Sep 1993 *d*
Egypt	6 Dec 1982
Guinea	23 Jan 1991
Hungary	16 Jun 1983
Mexico	21 Jan 1988
Poland	19 May 1995 *P*
Romania	23 Apr 1992 *P*
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia	2 Aug 1995 *P*
Uganda	12 Feb 1992 *P*
United States of America	5 May 1994 *P*
Zambia	6 Jun 1986

Notes:

[1] The German Democratic Republic was a participant by virtue of its accession on 31 August 1989 to the Protocol of 11 April 1980. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] Czechoslovakia was a participant to the Convention and the Protocol by virtue of its accession to the Protocol on 5 March 1990. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

8. Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development

Concluded at Rome on 13 June 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 November 1977, in accordance with article 13, section 3 (a).
REGISTRATION: 30 November 1977, No. 16041.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1059, p. 191 (including procès-verbal of rectification of the French text of annex 1); vol. 1141, p. 462 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Arabic authentic text); depositary notifications C.N.31.1987.TREATIES-1 of 20 April 1987 [amendment to section 8 (a) of article 6]; and C.N.322.1987.TREATIES-4 of 29 January 1988 (corrigendum of the Spanish text of the amendment).
STATUS: Signatories: 80. Parties: 157.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 13 June 1976 by the United Nations Conference on the Establishment of an International Fund for Agricultural Development, which met at the Headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the World Food Council in Rome, Italy, from 10 to 13 June 1976. In accordance with section 1 (a) of its article 13, the Agreement was opened for signature by the States concerned on 20 December 1976 at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. At its Tenth session held in Rome, the Governing Council of the Fund, by its Resolution 44/X of 11 December 1986 adopted, in accordance with article 12 of the Agreement, an amendment to section 8 (a) of article 6 of the Agreement, which amendment entered into force on 11 March 1987, in accordance with article 12 (a) (ii).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Amount of the initial contribution as specified in the instrument in accordance with article 4 (2) (a) and (b) (showing in parentheses the category of the contributor)*		
				Amount	
Afghanistan		13 Dec 1978 *a*			(III)
Albania		3 Nov 1992 *a*			
Algeria	20 Jul 1977	26 May 1978 *AA*	US dollar	10,000,000	(II)
Angola		24 Apr 1985 *a*			(III)
Antigua and Barbuda		21 Jan 1986 *a*			(III)
Argentina	14 Apr 1977	11 Sep 1978			(III)
Armenia		23 Mar 1993 *a*			(III)
Australia	30 Mar 1977	21 Oct 1977	Australian dollar	8,000,000	(I)
Austria	1 Apr 1977	12 Dec 1977	US dollar	4,800,000	(I)
Azerbaijan		11 Apr 1994 *a*			(III)
Bangladesh	17 Mar 1977	9 May 1977			(III)
Barbados		13 Dec 1978 *a*	US dollar	1,000	(III)
Belgium	16 Mar 1977	9 Dec 1977	Belgian franc	500,000,000	(I)
			US dollar	1,000,000	
Belize		15 Dec 1982 *a*			(III)
Benin		28 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Bhutan		13 Dec 1978 *a*			(III)
Bolivia	27 Jul 1977	30 Dec 1977			(III)
Bosnia and Herzegovina		18 Mar 1994 *a*			(III)
Botswana		21 Jul 1977 *a*			(III)
Brazil	13 Apr 1977	2 Nov 1978			(III)
Burkina Faso		14 Dec 1977 *a*	US dollar	10,000	(III)
Burundi		13 Dec 1978 *a*			(III)
Cambodia		25 Aug 1992 *a*			(III)
Cameroon		20 Jun 1977 *a*			(III)
Canada	10 Feb 1977	28 Nov 1977	Canadian dollar	33,000,000	(I)
Cape Verde		12 Oct 1977 *a*			(III)
Central African Republic		11 Dec 1978 *a*	CFA franc	1,000,000	(III)
Chad	13 Oct 1977	3 Nov 1977			(III)
Chile	19 Jan 1977	2 Jun 1978			(III)
China		15 Jan 1980 *a*			(III)
Colombia		16 Jul 1979 *a*			(III)

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Amount of the initial contribution as specified in the instrument in accordance with article 4 (2) (a) and (b) (showing in parentheses the category of the contributor)*		
				Amount	
Comoros		13 Dec 1977 *a*	CFA franc	10,000,000	(III)
Congo	30 Jun 1977	27 Jul 1978			(III)
Cook Islands		25 Mar 1993 *a*			(III)
Costa Rica	20 Dec 1977	16 Nov 1978			(III)
Côte d'Ivoire		19 Jan 1982 *a*			(III)
Cuba	23 Sep 1977	15 Nov 1977			(III)
Cyprus		20 Dec 1977 *a*	US dollar	10,000	(III)
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		23 Feb 1987 *a*			(III)
Denmark	11 Jan 1977	28 Jun 1977	US dollar	7,500,000	(I)
Djibouti		14 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Dominica		29 Jan 1980 *a*			(III)
Dominican Republic		29 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Ecuador	1 Apr 1977	19 Jul 1977			(III)
Egypt	18 Feb 1977	11 Oct 1977			(III)
El Salvador	21 Mar 1977	31 Oct 1977	Colón	100,000	(III)
Equatorial Guinea		29 Jul 1981 *a*			(III)
Eritrea		31 Mar 1994 *a*			(III)
Ethiopia	20 Jul 1977	7 Sep 1977			(III)
Fiji		28 Mar 1978 *a*	US dollar	5,000	(III)
Finland	24 Feb 1977	30 Nov 1977	Finnish mark	12,000,000	(I)
France	21 Jan 1977	12 Dec 1977 *AA*	French franc	127,500,000	(I)
Gabon		5 Jun 1978 *a*	US dollar	500,000	(II)
Gambia		13 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Georgia		1 Feb 1995 *a*	US dollar	10,000	(III)
Germany[1, 2]	29 Mar 1977	14 Oct 1977	US dollar	55,000,000	(I)
Ghana	19 Oct 1977	5 Dec 1977	US dollar	100,000	(III)
Greece[3]	1 Jul 1977	30 Nov 1978	US dollar	150,000	(I)
Grenada		25 Jul 1980 *a*			(III)
Guatemala		30 Nov 1978 *a*			(III)
Guinea[4]	3 May 1977	12 Jul 1977	Syli	25,000,000	(III)
Guinea–Bissau		25 Jan 1978 *a*			(III)
Guyana		13 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Haiti		19 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Honduras	5 Jul 1977	13 Dec 1977			(III)
India	21 Jan 1977	28 Mar 1977			(III)
Indonesia	18 Feb 1977	27 Sep 1977	US dollar	1,250,000	(II)
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 Apr 1977	12 Dec 1977	US dollar	124,750,000	(II)
Iraq	23 Nov 1977	13 Dec 1977	US dollar	20,000,000	(II)
Ireland	28 Apr 1977	14 Oct 1977	Pound sterling	570,000	(I)
Israel	28 Apr 1977	10 Jan 1978			(III)
Italy	26 Jan 1977	10 Dec 1977	US dollar	25,000,000	(I)
Jamaica	24 Mar 1977	13 Apr 1977			(III)
Japan	11 Feb 1977	25 Oct 1977 *A*	Yen [Equivalent: 55,000,000 (US)]		(I)
Jordan		15 Feb 1979 *a*			(III)
Kenya	30 Mar 1977	10 Nov 1977			(III)
Kuwait	4 Mar 1977	29 Jul 1977	US dollar	36,000,000	(II)

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Amount of the initial contribution as specified in the instrument in accordance with article 4 (2) (a) and (b) (showing in parentheses the category of the contributor)*		
				Amount	
Kyrgyzstan		10 Sep 1993 *a*			(III)
Lao People's Democratic Republic		13 Dec 1978 *a*			(III)
Lebanon		20 Jun 1978 *a*			(III)
Lesotho		13 Dec 1977 *a*			(III)
Liberia		11 Apr 1978 *a*			(III)
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		15 Apr 1977 *a*	US dollar	20,000,000	(II)
Luxembourg[5]	18 Feb 1977	9 Dec 1977	Belgian franc		(I)
Madagascar		12 Jan 1979 *a*			(III)
Malawi		13 Dec 1977 *a*	US dollar	5,000	(III)
Malaysia		23 Jan 1990 *a*			(III)
Maldives		15 Jan 1980 *a*			(III)
Mali	30 Jun 1977	30 Sep 1977			(III)
Malta	24 Feb 1977	23 Sep 1977			(III)
Mauritania		26 Jun 1979 *a*			(III)
Mauritius		29 Jan 1979 *a*			(III)
Mexico	2 Aug 1977	31 Oct 1977			(III)
Mongolia		9 Feb 1994 *a*			(III)
Morocco	22 Dec 1976	16 Dec 1977			(III)
Mozambique		16 Oct 1978 *a*	Escudo	1,200,000	(III)
Myanmar		23 Jan 1990 *a*			(III)
Namibia		16 Oct 1992 *a*			
Nepal		5 May 1978 *a*			(III)
Netherlands[6]	4 Feb 1977	29 Jul 1977 *A*	Dutch guilder	100,000,000	(I)
			US dollar	3,000,000	
New Zealand	10 Oct 1977	10 Oct 1977	New Zealand dollar	2,000,000	(I)
Nicaragua	18 May 1977	28 Oct 1977			(III)
Niger		13 Dec 1977 *a*	CFA	15,000,000	(III)
Nigeria	6 May 1977	25 Oct 1977	US dollar	26,000,000	(II)
Norway	20 Jan 1977	8 Jul 1977	Norwegian krone	130,000,000	(I)
Oman	13 Dec 1977	19 Apr 1983 *a*			(III)
Pakistan[7]	28 Jan 1977	9 Mar 1977	US dollar	1,000,000	(III)
Panama	8 Mar 1977	13 Apr 1977			(III)
Papua New Guinea	4 Jan 1978	11 May 1978	US dollar	20,000	(III)
Paraguay		23 Mar 1979 *a*			(III)
Peru	20 Sep 1977	6 Dec 1977			(III)
Philippines	5 Jan 1977	4 Apr 1977	US dollar	250,000	(III)
Portugal[3]	30 Sep 1977	30 Nov 1978			(I)
Qatar		13 Dec 1977 *a*	US dollar	9,000,000	(II)
Republic of Korea	2 Mar 1977	26 Jan 1978			(III)
Romania	22 Mar 1977	25 Nov 1977			(III)
Rwanda	10 May 1977	29 Nov 1977			(III)
Saint Kitts and Nevis		21 Jan 1986 *a*	US dollar	1,000	(III)
Saint Lucia		9 Oct 1980 *a*			(III)
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		8 Mar 1990 *a*			(III)
Samoa		13 Dec 1977 *a*	US dollar	10,000	(III)
Sao Tome and Principe		22 Apr 1978 *a*			(III)

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Amount of the initial contribution as specified in the instrument in accordance with article 4 (2) (a) and (b) (showing in parentheses the category of the contributor)*		
				Amount	
Saudi Arabia	5 Jul 1977	15 Jul 1977	US dollar	105,500,000	(II)
Senegal	19 Jul 1977	13 Dec 1977			(III)
Seychelles		13 Dec 1978 *a*	US dollar	5,000	(III)
Sierra Leone	15 Feb 1977	14 Oct 1977			(III)
Solomon Islands		13 Mar 1981 *a*			(III)
Somalia	26 Jan 1977	8 Sep 1977			(III)
Spain	22 Jun 1977	27 Nov 1978	US dollar	2,000,000	(I)
Sri Lanka	15 Feb 1977	23 Mar 1977			(III)
Sudan	21 Mar 1977	12 Dec 1977			(III)
Suriname		15 Feb 1983 *a*			(III)
Swaziland	18 Nov 1977	18 Nov 1977			(III)
Sweden	12 Jan 1977	17 Jun 1977	Swedish krona	115,000,000	(I)
Switzerland	24 Jan 1977	21 Oct 1977	Swiss franc	22,000,000	(I)
Syrian Arab Republic	8 Sep 1977	29 Nov 1978			(III)
Tajikistan		26 Jan 1994 *a*			(III)
Thailand	19 Apr 1977	30 Nov 1977			(III)
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		26 Jan 1994 *a*			(III)
Togo		26 Apr 1979 *a*	CFA	3,000,000	(III)
Tonga		12 Apr 1982 *a*			(III)
Trinidad and Tobago		24 Mar 1988 *a*			(III)
Tunisia	27 Jan 1977	23 Aug 1977			(III)
Turkey	17 Nov 1977	14 Dec 1977			(III)
Uganda	6 Jul 1977	31 Aug 1977			(III)
United Arab Emirates	5 Oct 1977	28 Dec 1977 *A*	US dollar	16,500,000	(II)
United Kingdom	7 Jan 1977	9 Sep 1977	Pound sterling	18,000,000	(I)
United Republic of Tanzania	18 Jul 1977	25 Nov 1977			(III)
United States of America	22 Dec 1976	4 Oct 1977	US dollar	200,000,000	(I)
Uruguay	5 Apr 1977	16 Dec 1977			(III)
Venezuela	4 Jan 1977	13 Oct 1977	US dollar	66,000,000	(II)
Viet Nam		13 Dec 1977 *a*	Dong	500,000	(III)
Yemen[8]		6 Feb 1979 *a*	US dollar	50,000	(III)
Yugoslavia[9]	10 Feb 1977	12 Dec 1977	US dollar	300,000	(III)
Zaire	23 May 1977	12 Oct 1977			(III)
Zambia		16 Dec 1977 *a*	Kwacha	50,000	(III)
Zimbabwe		22 Jan 1981 *a*			(III)

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that, although the Agreement deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, the provisions of article 3, section 1, are discriminatory in nature since they deprive a number of States of the right to sign and accede to the Agreement, contrary to the principle of universality.

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba wishes to make an express reservation to article 11, section 2, of the Agreement, since it feels that any disputes arising between States, or between

States and the Fund, concerning the interpretation or application of the Agreement should be resolved through direct negotiations by diplomatic means.

EGYPT[10]

FRANCE

In depositing its instrument of approval, the Government of the French Republic declares, in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of article 13, that it will not accept, in so far as it is concerned, the application of the procedure provided for in section 2 of article 11 whereby a party may request the President of the International Court of Justice to appoint an arbitrator.

GUATEMALA

The *de facto* relations which may arise between Guatemala and Belize as a result of the latter's accession to the Agreement should not in any way be construed as a recognition on the part of Guatemala of the sovereignty and independence of that territory, which were unilaterally declared by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

IRAQ

"Entry into the [. . .] Agreement by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations with it."

KUWAIT

"It is understood that the ratification by the State of Kuwait of the Agreement Establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, signed by the State of Kuwait on 4 March, 1977, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."

ROMANIA

Upon signature (confirmed upon ratification):

The interpretation and application of the provisions of the Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, including those relating to voting procedures, and all activities of IFAD must take place on a democratic basis, in accordance with the purpose for which the Fund was established, namely, to assist the developing countries in their efforts to develop their agriculture.

Upon ratification:

Reservation

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, pursuant to the provisions of article 13, section 4, of the Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), concluded at Rome on 13 June 1976, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11, section 2, of the Agreement.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that disputes between the Fund and a State which has ceased to be a member, or between the Fund and one of the members upon the termination of the Fund's operations, can be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

SAUDI ARABIA

Upon signature:

The participation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in the Agreement shall in no way imply recognition of Israel and shall not lead to entry into dealings with Israel under this Agreement.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[11]

"It is understood that the ratification of this Agreement by the Syrian Arab Republic does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Syrian Arab Republic. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Syrian Arab Republic and Israel."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland [notifies the Secretary-General] in accordance with article 10, section 2 (b) (ii) of the Agreement, that the standard clauses of the Convention on the privileges and immunities of the specialized agencies shall apply to the Fund in the United Kingdom, subject to the following modifications:

"1. The following shall be substituted for section 4:

'(1) The Fund shall have immunity from jurisdiction and execution except:

(a) to the extent that it shall, by a decision of the Executive Board, have waived such immunity in a particular case. However, the Fund shall be deemed to have waived such immunity if, upon receiving a request for waiver submitted either by the person or body before which the proceedings are pending, or by another party to the proceedings, it has not given notice within two months after receipt of the request that it does not waive immunity;

(b) in respect of a civil action by a third party in respect of loss, injury or damage arising from an accident caused by a vehicle belonging to, or operated on behalf of, the Fund or in respect of an offence involving such a vehicle;

(c) in the event of the attachment, pursuant to a decision of a judicial authority, of the salary and emoluments owed by the Fund to a member of its staff;

(d) in respect of the enforcement of an arbitration award made under article 11 of the Agreement establishing the Fund.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this section no action shall be brought against the Fund by a Member or person acting for or deriving claims from a Member.'

"2. The immunity conferred by section 5 upon the property and assets of the Fund shall be subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 (c) above.

"3. The following shall be substituted for section 11:

'Official communications of the Fund shall be accorded by the Government of the United Kingdom treatment not less favourable than that which it accords to the official communications of other international financial institutions of which it is a Member, taking into account its international obligations in respect of telecommunications.'

"4. The following shall be substituted for sections 13–15, 17–21, and 25–30:

'(1) All representatives of Members (other than representatives of the Government of the United Kingdom), the President and all other staff of the Fund:

(a) shall be immune from legal process in respect of acts performed by them in the exercise of their functions, except in the case of loss, injury or damage caused by a vehicle belonging to or driven by them or an offence involving such a vehicle;

(b) shall be accorded no less favourable immunities from immigration restrictions, alien registration requirements and national service obligations, and no less favourable treatment as regards exchange regulations, than are accorded by the Government of the United Kingdom to the representatives to, and officials and employees of comparable rank of any other international financial institution of which it is a Member; and

(c) shall be granted no less favourable treatment in respect of travelling facilities than is accorded by the Government of the United Kingdom to representatives to, and officials and employees of comparable rank of, any other international financial institution of which it is a member.

(2) (a) No tax shall be levied on or in respect of salaries and emoluments paid by the Fund to the President and other members of the staff of the Fund unless they are citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies or resident in the United Kingdom.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) shall not apply to annuities and pensions paid by the Fund to its former President or other members of its staff.'"

VENEZUELA

Since the procedure established for the settlement of disputes arising in connexion with the application or interpretation of this Agreement is incompatible with Venezulean legislation, Venezuela expresses a specific reservation concerning article 11, section 2.

NOTES:

[1] See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this connection, the Secretary–General received on 12 January 1978 from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the following communication:

In reference to the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany to the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not object to the application of the Agreement to Berlin (West) within the limits and to the extent of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 which states that Berlin (West) is not an integral part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not governed by it.

Subsequently, the Secretary–General received on 11 July 1978, from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America the following communication:

"The Governments of the United States of America, of France, and of the United Kingdom wish to point out that the Soviet note referred to above contains an incomplete, and therefore, misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. The provision of the Quadripartite Agreement to which reference is made states that the 'ties between the Western Sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany will be maintained and developed, taking into account that these sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it'."

See also note 1 above.

[3] By resolutions 53/XII and 65/XIV, the Governing Council of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, at its Twelfth and Fourteenth Sessions, held from 24 to 26 January and 7 to 8 June 1989, and from 29 to 30 May 1991, decided, in accordance with section 3 (b) of article 3 of the Agreement, to reclassify Greece and Portugal from Category III to Category I, with effect from 24 January 1989 and 29 May 1991, respectively.

[4] The amount payable in three instalments.

[5] In its instrument of ratification the Government of Luxembourg specified that its initial contribution would consist in the equivalent 320,000 Special Drawing Rights (SDR) in Belgian francs.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and as from 1 January 1986 to Aruba. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] One half of the amount payable in Pakistan rupees and one half payable in convertible currency.

[8] Of the amount, 10,000 United States dollars freely convertible. The Yemen Arab Republic acceded to the Fund on 6 February 1979 (its membership having been approved by the Governing Council on 13 December 1977). See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[9] The amount to be paid in dinars.

[10] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration relating to Israel. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of the said declaration see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1059, p. 319.

[11] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 24 January 1979, the Government of Israel declared the following:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon it under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity."

9. Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization

Concluded at Vienna on 8 April 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 June 1985, in accordance with article 25 (2) (b).
REGISTRATION: 21 June 1985, No. 23432.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1401, p. 3
STATUS: Signatories: 135. Parties: 167.[1]

Note: The Constitution was adopted at Vienna on 8 April 1979 at the seventh plenary meeting of the United Nations Conference on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency at its second session held at Vienna from 19 March to 8 April 1979.

In accordance with its article 24 (1), it was open for signature at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria at Vienna from 8 April 1979 until 7 October 1979, by all States referred to in sub-paragraph (a) of article 3 and after that date at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until its entry into force.

Pursuant to article 25, the Constitution entered into force when at least eighty States having deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval had notified the Secretary-General that they had agreed, after consultation among themselves, that the Constitution should enter into force. For those States, the Constitution entered into force on that date (21 June 1985).

For States having deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval before that date, but not participating in the said notification, the Constitution entered into force on such later date on which they notified the Secretary-General that the Constitution should enter into force for them. For States having deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession subsequent to the entry into force of the Constitution, it entered into force on the date of the said deposit.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Notification under article 25*
Afghanistan	13 Feb 1980	9 Sep 1981	10 Jun 1985
Albania		19 Apr 1988 *a*	
Algeria	22 Oct 1979	6 Nov 1980	10 Jun 1985
Angola	3 Sep 1982	9 Aug 1985	
Antigua and Barbuda	8 Sep 1982		
Argentina	8 Apr 1979	6 Mar 1981	10 Jun 1985
Armenia		12 May 1992 *a*	
Australia[1]		[1 Jan 1992 *a*]	
Austria	3 Oct 1979	14 May 1981	10 Jun 1985
Azerbaijan		23 Nov 1993 *a*	
Bahamas		13 Nov 1986 *a*	
Bahrain		4 Apr 1986 *a*	
Bangladesh	2 Jan 1980	5 Nov 1980	28 Jun 1985
Barbados	30 May 1980	30 May 1980	10 Jun 1985
Belarus	10 Dec 1980	17 Jun 1985	17 Jun 1985
Belgium	5 Oct 1979	18 Nov 1981	10 Jun 1985
Belize		27 Feb 1986 *a*	
Benin	4 Dec 1979	3 Mar 1983	8 Aug 1985
Bhutan	15 Sep 1983	25 Oct 1983	23 Aug 1985
Bolivia	25 Jan 1980	9 Jan 1981	10 Jun 1985
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Oct 1992 *a*	
Botswana		21 Jun 1985 *a*	
Brazil	8 Apr 1979	10 Dec 1980	10 Jun 1985
Bulgaria	6 Jan 1981	5 Jun 1985	5 Jun 1985
Burkina Faso	16 Nov 1979	9 Jul 1982	16 Jul 1985
Burundi	25 Jan 1980	9 Aug 1982	9 Aug 1985
Cambodia		18 Sep 1995 *a*	
Cameroon	8 Jul 1980	18 Aug 1981	20 Jun 1985
Canada[1]	[31 Aug 1982]	[20 Sep 1983]	[10 Jun 1985]
Cape Verde	28 Jan 1983	27 Nov 1984	10 Jun 1985
Central African Republic	8 Jan 1982	8 Jan 1982	9 Jan 1986
Chad	14 Apr 1982	22 Aug 1991	
Chile	8 Apr 1979	12 Nov 1981	7 Jun 1985

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Notification under article 25*
China	6 Sep 1979	14 Feb 1980 *AA*	17 Jun 1985
Colombia	8 Apr 1979	25 Nov 1981	30 Jul 1985
Comoros	18 May 1981	10 May 1985	9 Jan 1986
Congo	18 Dec 1979	16 May 1983	12 Jul 1985
Costa Rica	5 Jan 1984	26 Oct 1987	
Côte d'Ivoire	21 Feb 1980	4 Nov 1981	21 Jun 1985
Croatia		2 Jun 1992 *a*	
Cuba	2 Oct 1979	16 Mar 1981	10 Jun 1985
Cyprus	17 Mar 1981	28 Apr 1983	10 Jun 1985
Czech Republic[2]		22 Jan 1993 *a*	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	10 Aug 1981	14 Sep 1981 *AA*	24 Jun 1985
Denmark	5 Oct 1979	27 May 1981	10 Jun 1985
Djibouti	29 Oct 1981	20 Aug 1991	
Dominica	8 Jun 1982	8 Jun 1982	27 Nov 1985
Dominican Republic	8 May 1981	29 Mar 1983	20 Jun 1985
Ecuador	8 Apr 1979	15 Apr 1982	10 Jun 1985
Egypt	8 Apr 1979	9 Jan 1981	10 Jun 1985
El Salvador	8 Apr 1979	29 Jan 1988	
Equatorial Guinea	3 Oct 1983	4 May 1984	20 Jan 1986
Eritrea		20 Jun 1995 *a*	
Ethiopia	18 Feb 1981	23 Feb 1981	21 Jun 1985
Fiji	21 Dec 1981	21 Dec 1981	30 Dec 1985
Finland	28 Sep 1979	5 Jun 1981	10 Jun 1985
France	5 Oct 1979	30 Mar 1982	10 Jun 1985
Gabon	8 Jan 1980	1 Feb 1982	6 Aug 1985
Gambia		12 Jun 1986 *a*	
Georgia		30 Oct 1992 *a*	
Germany[3,4]	5 Oct 1979	13 Jul 1983	10 Jun 1985
Ghana	8 Apr 1979	8 Feb 1982	30 Jul 1985
Greece	5 Oct 1979	10 Jun 1983	10 Jun 1985
Grenada		16 Jan 1986 *a*	
Guatemala	13 May 1981	8 Jul 1983	14 Jun 1985
Guinea	29 Nov 1979	23 Jun 1980	11 Jun 1985
Guinea–Bissau	1 May 1980	17 Mar 1983	14 Jun 1985
Guyana	17 Jul 1984	17 Jul 1984	19 Jul 1985
Haiti	28 Jan 1981	9 Jul 1982	5 Aug 1985
Honduras	5 Feb 1980	3 Mar 1983	13 Jun 1985
Hungary	26 Jan 1981	15 Aug 1983	2 Jul 1985
India	16 Nov 1979	21 Jan 1980	17 Jun 1985
Indonesia	28 Sep 1979	10 Nov 1980	10 Jun 1985
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	12 Nov 1980	9 Aug 1985	
Iraq	26 Feb 1980	23 Jan 1981	27 Jun 1985
Ireland	5 Oct 1979	17 Jul 1984	10 Jun 1985
Israel	1 Nov 1982	25 Nov 1983	24 Apr 1985
Italy	5 Oct 1979	25 Mar 1985	10 Jun 1985
Jamaica	1 Nov 1982	10 Dec 1982	21 Jun 1985
Japan	18 Jan 1980	3 Jun 1980 *A*	10 Jun 1985
Jordan	29 Jun 1981	30 Aug 1982	28 Oct 1985
Kenya	28 Oct 1981	13 Nov 1981	10 Jun 1985

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Notification under article 25*
Kuwait	7 Jan 1981	7 Apr 1982	30 Jul 1985
Kyrgyzstan		8 Apr 1993 *a*	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5 Mar 1980	3 Jun 1980	3 Sep 1985
Lebanon	8 Apr 1979	2 Aug 1983	6 Aug 1985
Lesotho	18 Jun 1981	8 Jun 1981	10 Jun 1985
Liberia	30 Jan 1980	0 May 1990	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	8 Apr 1979	9 Jan 1981	8 Aug 1985
Lithuania		7 Oct 1991 *a*	
Luxembourg	5 Oct 1979	9 Sep 1983	10 Jun 1985
Madagascar	13 Dec 1979	8 Jan 1980	10 Jun 1985
Malawi	12 Feb 1980	0 May 1980	19 Jul 1985
Malaysia	10 Apr 1980	8 Jul 1980	10 Jun 1985
Maldives		0 May 1988 *a*	
Mali	23 May 1980	4 Jul 1981	17 Jul 1985
Malta	2 Oct 1981	4 Nov 1982	10 Jun 1985
Mauritania	4 Mar 1981	9 Jun 1981	9 Aug 1985
Mauritius	16 Sep 1981	9 Dec 1981	10 Jun 1985
Mexico	12 Nov 1979	1 Jan 1980	10 Jun 1985
Mongolia	22 Dec 1980	3 Jun 1985 *A*	10 Jun 1985
Morocco	25 Jul 1980	0 Jul 1985	
Mozambique	10 Nov 1982	4 Dec 1983	13 Nov 1985
Myanmar		2 Apr 1990 *a*	
Namibia		1 Feb 1986 *a*	
Nepal	11 Aug 1983	6 Dec 1983	8 Aug 1985
Netherlands[5]	5 Oct 1979	0 Oct 1980 *A*	10 Jun 1985
New Zealand[6]	30 May 1985	9 Jul 1985	
Nicaragua	16 Jan 1980	8 Mar 1980	1 Jul 1985
Niger	9 Apr 1979	2 Aug 1980	20 May 1985
Nigeria	8 Apr 1979	9 Dec 1980	10 Jun 1985
Norway	28 Sep 1979	3 Feb 1981	10 Jun 1985
Oman	6 Jul 1981	6 Jul 1981	10 Jun 1985
Pakistan	8 Apr 1979	9 Oct 1979	10 Jun 1985
Panama	17 Aug 1979	3 Jul 1980	19 Jun 1985
Papua New Guinea	29 Mar 1985	0 Sep 1986	
Paraguay	7 Oct 1980	2 Dec 1981	18 Jul 1985
Peru	8 Apr 1979	3 Sep 1982	10 Jun 1985
Philippines	12 Oct 1979	7 Jan 1980	10 Jun 1985
Poland	22 Jan 1981	5 Mar 1985	14 Jun 1985
Portugal	10 Sep 1979	21 May 1984	10 Jun 1985
Qatar		9 Dec 1985 *a*	
Republic of Korea	7 Oct 1980	30 Dec 1980	14 Jun 1985
Republic of Moldova		1 Jun 1993 *a*	
Romania	8 Apr 1979	28 Nov 1980	10 Jun 1985
Russian Federation	8 Dec 1980	22 May 1985	22 May 1985
Rwanda	28 Aug 1979	18 Jan 1983	10 Jun 1985
Saint Kitts and Nevis		11 Dec 1985 *a*	
Saint Lucia	8 May 1980	11 Aug 1982	19 Nov 1985
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		30 Mar 1987 *a*	
Sao Tome and Principe	29 Nov 1983	22 Feb 1985	14 Apr 1986

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Notification under article 25*
Saudi Arabia		21 Jun 1985 *a*	
Senegal	8 Apr 1979	24 Oct 1983	13 Jun 1985
Seychelles	21 Apr 1982	21 Apr 1982	19 Aug 1985
Sierra Leone	29 Aug 1979	7 Mar 1983	15 Aug 1985
Slovakia[2]		20 Jan 1993 *a*	
Slovenia		11 Jun 1992 *a*	
Somalia	21 Mar 1980	20 Nov 1981	15 Nov 1985
Spain	21 Jan 1980	21 Sep 1981	10 Jun 1985
Sri Lanka	31 Oct 1979	25 Sep 1981	10 Jun 1985
Sudan	27 Jun 1979	30 Sep 1981	28 Jun 1985
Suriname	19 Sep 1980	8 Oct 1981	24 Dec 1985
Swaziland	14 Jan 1980	19 Aug 1981	3 Apr 1986
Sweden	28 Sep 1979	28 Jul 1980	10 Jun 1985
Switzerland	19 Sep 1979	10 Feb 1981	10 Jun 1985
Syrian Arab Republic	1 Feb 1980	6 Dec 1982	12 Jun 1985
Tajikistan		9 Jun 1993 *a*	
Thailand	8 Apr 1979	29 Jan 1981	10 Jun 1985
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		27 May 1993 *a*	
Togo	20 Dec 1979	18 Sep 1981	25 Jun 1985
Tonga		13 Aug 1986 *a*	
Trinidad and Tobago	14 Apr 1980	2 May 1980	15 Jul 1985
Tunisia	8 Apr 1979	2 Feb 1981	13 Jun 1985
Turkey	8 Apr 1979	5 May 1982	10 Jun 1985
Turkmenistan		16 Feb 1995 *a*	
Uganda	8 Apr 1979	23 Mar 1983	5 Dec 1985
Ukraine	12 Dec 1980	10 Jun 1985	10 Jun 1985
United Arab Emirates	4 Dec 1981	4 Dec 1981	1 Aug 1985
United Kingdom	5 Oct 1979	7 Jul 1983	10 Jun 1985
United Republic of Tanzania	12 May 1980	3 Oct 1980	10 Jun 1985
United States of America[1]	[17 Jan 1980]	[2 Sep 1983]	[10 Jun 1985]
Uruguay	5 May 1980	24 Dec 1980	10 Jun 1985
Uzbekistan		26 Apr 1994 *a*	
Vanuatu		17 Aug 1987 *a*	
Venezuela	5 Oct 1979	28 Jan 1983	10 Jun 1985
Viet Nam	16 Jun 1981	6 May 1983 *AA*	19 Jul 1985
Yemen[7]	8 Apr 1979	29 Jan 1982	29 Jul 1985
Yugoslavia	8 Apr 1979	8 Feb 1980	10 Jun 1985
Zaire	21 Jan 1980	9 Jul 1982	8 Jul 1985
Zambia	5 Oct 1979	15 May 1981	10 Jun 1985
Zimbabwe		21 Jun 1985 *a*	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

AUSTRALIA[1]

12 April 1982

"In accordance with section 43 of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, UNIDO will be accorded the same privileges and immunities as are accorded by Australia to other specialised agencies.

"Until the Constitution enters into force the Government of Australia will continue to accord to UNIDO the privileges and immunities in accordance with the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 13 February 1946."

BELARUS[8]

Declarations:

In ratifying the Constitution of UNIDO, the Byelorussian SSR assumes that the agreements on the condition for the establishment of UNIDO as specialized agency that were confirmed in General Assembly resolution 39/231 of 18 December 1984 will be fully and strictly observed, including the agreement on the equitable geographical distribution of posts and, in particular, the allocation of one of the posts of Deputy Director-General to the socialist countries. Fulfilment of those conditions will make it possible to ensure the universal character of UNIDO's activities in the interests of all its member countries.

The determination of the members of UNIDO, as expressed in the Organization's Constitution, to contribute to international peace and security and to the prosperity of all nations should be reflected in its decisions and its practical activities, since only under conditions of peace, and only when real disarmament measures are implemented, can significant additional resources be released for the needs of economic and social development, including the industrialization of the developing countries.

In [the Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic's] view, UNIDO activities aimed at promoting industrial development in the developing countries and at those countries' attainment of economic independence must be based on the progressive provisions and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the establishment of a New International Economic Order and the Lima and New Delhi Declarations on international industrial development co-operation. Those goals can be achieved only by means of a fundamental restructuring of the existing unjust international economic relations, the conduct of progressive social and economic reforms, the strengthening of the State sector of the economy and the implementation of national plans and programmes for social and economic development.

UNIDO must oppose the policies of those States that are striving not only to maintain but also to increase the neo-colonialist exploitation of the developing countries, must combat the acts of economic aggression, diktat, blackmail and interference in the internal affairs of States that are perpetrated by the forces of imperialism, and must promote the establishment of effective control over the activities of transnational corporations with a view to restricting their negative influence on the economies of developing countries and on international economic relations and development as a whole.

The Byelorussian SSR bases its position on the need to apply consistently in practice the provision of the UNIDO Constitution that relates to the purposes for which the regular and operational budgets of the Organization may be utilized, and on the need not to permit the expenditure of resources for programmes and projects, including "advisory services", that could serve for the penetration of foreign private capital into the economies of the developing countries. In order to ensure the effective and economical use of the resources of the regular budget, the level of that budget must be established on a stable basis.

At the United Nations Conference on the establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency, the delegations of the socialist countries announced on 7 April 1979 their opposition in principle to the use of funds from the Organization's regular budget for the provision of technical assistance.

In connection with the provision of the UNIDO Constitution on the allocation of 6 per cent of the regular budget to technical assistance, the Byelorussian SSR states that the corresponding portion of its convertible currency contribution to the UNIDO budget will be credited to a separate account in the Foreign Trade Bank of the USSR. The Republic will make use of those funds to participate in the provision through UNIDO of technical assistance to interested countries.

The Byelorussian SSR firmly expects that its position of principle on the activities of UNIDO, as contained in this statement and as expressed in the course of the consultations on the establishment of UNIDO as a specialized agency, will be duly taken into account and acted upon.

The nature and extent of our co-operation with UNIDO will depend on the implementation of the agreements reached, on the nature and direction of the practical activities of UNIDO and on that Organization's real observance of the basic United Nations decisions relating to international economic development and the restructuring of international economic relations on an equitable and democratic basis.

BULGARIA[8]

Declaration :

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria ratifies the Constitution of UNIDO proceeding from the consensus confirmed in General Assembly resolution 39/231 concerning the conditions for the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency of the United Nations. [The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria] attaches particular importance to the consensus on equitable geographical representation in the Secretariat post allocation, including the employment of one Deputy Director-General from the group of socialist countries. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is of the opinion that the strict and complete observance of this consensus would furnish the conditions for respecting the interests of all members of UNIDO on the basis of the principle of universality.

"The activities of UNIDO on behalf of the industrial development of the developing countries should be aimed at promoting international co-operation in the field of industrial development and should be based on the principles and norms of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on establishing the New International Economic Order, the Lima and New Delhi Declarations on international co-operation in this field. The activities of UNIDO should pursue as a lasting goal the attainment of economic independence for the developing countries.

"The Bulgarian Government is of the view that in order to achieve the [said] goals, international economic relations, including those in the industrial field, should be based on their radical restructuring through strengthening the state-owned and cooperative sectors of the economy and the creation of diversified industry in the developing countries which serves their national objectives as well as their plans for economic and social development.

"The maintenance of international peace and security are a prerequisite for the accelerated industrial development of the developing countries and for fostering international co-operation. Through its decisions and practical activities, UNIDO should actively contribute to strengthening of world peace and security, to the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of disarmament, as well as to the creation of condition for the re-channelling of non-productive expenditures for the purposes of economic development and international co-operation in the industrial field.

"UNIDO should vigourously oppose the use of economic measures and sanctions as a means of exerting political and economic pressures against sovereign States and should resist the attempts of the imperialist forces to preserve and expand their exploitation of the developing countries. For this purpose, of particular importance is the active co-operation of UNIDO in

establishing an effective control over the activities of transnational corporations for limiting the negative consequences of their activities for the overall socio-economic development of the developing countries.

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria is of the opinion that UNIDO should not allow the spending of resources under programmes and projects which might be used to facilitate the penetration by foreign private capital of the developing countries to the detriment of their national interests.

"It is the view of the People's Republic of Bulgaria that the resources of UNIDO's regular budget should be expended in a rational and economic fashion, whereas the amount of the regular budget should be maintained at the predetermined level.

"[The Permanent Representative of Bulgaria avails himself] of this opportunity to reaffirm the position of [his] Government, as expressed on 7 April 1979 in the statement made by the delegations of the socialist countries at the United Nations conference on conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency, with regard to the question of using the resources of UNIDO's regular budget for providing technical assistance.

"As in the past, the People's Republic of Bulgaria will continue to give active support to the efforts of the developing countries for their industrialization, as well as to the activities of UNIDO in this field, aimed at the restructuring of international economic relations and international industrial co-operation on a just and democratic basis.

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria hopes that in its practical work UNIDO would strive after realizing the foregoing considerations, as well as the considerations voiced by [its] Government during the consultations on the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency."

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

ISRAEL

Declaration:

"The Government of the State of Israel, in accordance with article 21 [2] (b) of the said Constitution, will not apply the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations to the United Nations Industrial Development Organization."

ITALY

Declaration:

The Italian Government will apply the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations of 13 February 1946, in accordance with article 21, paragraph 2 (b), of the Constitution.

The Italian Government reserves the right to take into account the tax-free emoluments paid by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) to its officials who are nationals or permanent residents of Italy for the purpose of calculating the amount of tax to be levied on income from other sources.

KUWAIT[9]

Understanding:

It is understood that the ratification of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, signed in New York by the State of Kuwait on 7 January 1981, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Declarations included in the notification under article 25:

. . . The Lao People's Democratic Republic believes that UNIDO activities aimed at promoting industrial development in the developing countries and at those countries' attainment of economic independence must be based on the progressive provisions and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the Lima and New Delhi Declarations on international industrial development co-operation.

The Lao People's Democratic Republic believes that without the fundamental restructuring of the existing unjust international economic relations, without effecting progressive social and economic reforms, without the strengthening of the States sector of the Economy and without the co-ordination of national plans and programmes for social and economic development, those objectives can never be achieved.

Not only must UNIDO combat economic aggression diktat, blackmail and interference in the internal affairs of States by the forces of imperialism, but it must also oppose the policies of those States which are striving to maintain and increase the neo-colonialist exploitation of the developing countries.

It is therefore important that UNIDO contribute actively to the establishment of effective control of the activities of transnational corporations with a view to restricting their negative influence on the economies of developing countries and on international economic relations and development as a whole.

In the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the States Parties express their determination to contribute to international peace and security and to the prosperity of all peoples; that determination should be reflected in the Organization's decisions and in its practical activities.

MONGOLIA[8]

Declarations:

The Mongolian People's Republic has always attached and continues to attach great significance to the activities of the United Nations in the field of industrial development. For this reason, it supports the proposal to convert UNIDO into a specialized agency of the United Nations on the understanding that this step will enhance its capability for the promotion of industrial development and for the attainment and consolidation of the economic independence of the developing countries on the basis of the progressive provisions and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the Lima and New Delhi Declarations on international co-operation in the field of industrial development.

In supporting UNIDO as a specialized agency of the United Nations, the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that, for the full attainment of the purposes and the performance of the functions specified in the Constitution, UNIDO should actively promote a radical restructuring of the existing unjust international economic relations, the introduction of progressive social and economic transformations, the strengthening of the State sector of the economy and the implementation of national plans and programmes of social and economic development.

UNIDO must oppose any form of economic aggression, diktat, blackmail, interference in the internal affairs of States and neo-colonialist exploitation of the developing countries practiced by the forces of imperialism and in particular by the transnational corporations.

UNIDO is also called on to promote the solution of the key problems of today – the establishment and strengthening of international peace and security and the adoption of practical disarmament measures, which will release additional resources for the development of the developing countries.

In the light of the above considerations, the Mongolian People's Republic is prepared to support the activities of UNIDO and the development of co–operation between its member countries. It is confident that the fruitful co–operation between the Mongolian People's Republic and UNIDO which has already existed for many years will be further expanded.

NEW ZEALAND

Declarations:

The instrument of ratification indicates that in accordance with the special relationships which exist between New Zealand and the Cook Islands and between New Zealand and Niue, there have been consultations between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Cook Islands and between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Niue regarding the Constitution; that the Government of the Cook Islands, which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in the Cook Islands, has requested that the Constitution should extend to the Cook Islands; that the Government of Niue which as exclusive competence to implement treaties in Niue, has requested that the Constitution should extend to Niue. The said instrument specifies that accordingly the Constitution shall apply also to the Cook Islands and Niue.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[8]

In taking this action, the Soviet side assumes that the Agreements on the conditions for converting UNIDO into a specialized agency which were confirmed in General Assembly resolution 39/231, including the agreement on the equitable geographical distribution of posts and, in particular, the allocation of one of the posts of Deputy Director–General to the socialist countries, will be fully and strictly observed. This will ensure the universal character of the new Organization's activities in the interest of all countries members of UNIDO.

UNIDO activities aimed at promoting industrial development in the developing countries and at those countries' attainment of economic independence must be based on the progressive provisions and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the Lima and New Delhi Declarations on international industrial development co–operation.

The Soviet Union believes that those goals can be achieved only by means of a fundamental restructuring of the existing unjust international economic relations, the conduct of progressive social and economic reforms, the strengthening of the State sector of the economy and the implementation of national plans and programmes for social and economic development.

UNIDO must combat the acts of economic aggression, *diktat*, blackmail and interference in the internal affairs of States which are perpetrated by the forces of imperialism. It must oppose the policies of those States which are striving not only to maintain but also to increase the neo–colonialist exploitation of the developing countries.

Of particular significance is UNIDO's active promotion of the establishment of effective control of the activities of transnational corporations with a view to restricting their negative influence on the economies of developing countries and on international economic relations and development as a whole.

In the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Members of UNIDO express their determination to contribute to international peace and security and to the prosperity of all nations; that determination should be reflected in the Organization's decisions and in its practical activities. Only under conditions of peace, and only when real disarmament measures are implemented, can significant additional resources be released for the needs of economic and social development, including the industrialization of the developing countries. The importance and urgency of that task was reaffirmed in the Declaration entitled "Maintenance of peace and international economic co–operation" adopted at the high–level Economic conference of the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance held in June 1984.

The Soviet Union bases its position on the need to apply consistently in practice that provision of the Constitution of UNIDO with regard to the purposes for which the regular and operational budgets of the expenditure of resources for programmes and projects, including "advisory services", which could serve for the penetration of foreign private capital into the economies of the developing countries. In order to ensure the effective and economical use of the resources of the regular budget, the level of that budget must be established on a stable basis.

At the United Nations Conference on the Establishment of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization as a Specialized Agency, the delegations of the socialist countries announced, on 7 April 1979, their opposition in principle to the use of funds from the regular budget of UNIDO for the provision of technical assistance.

In connection with the provision of the Constitution of UNIDO on the allocation of six percent the Soviet Union states that the corresponding promotion of its convertible currency contribution to the UNIDO budget will be credited to a separate account in the Foreign Trade Bank of the USSR. The Soviet Union will make use of those funds to participate in the provision through UNIDO of technical assistance to interested countries.

The Soviet Union firmly expects that its positions of principle on the activities of UNIDO,as contained in this statement and as expressed in the course of the consultations on the conversion of UNIDO into a specialized agency, will be duly taken into account and acted upon. The nature and the extent of the Soviet Union's co–operation with UNIDO will depend on the implementation of the agreements reached, on the nature and direction of the practical activities of UNIDO and on that organization's real observation of the basis United Nations decisions relating to international economic relations on an equitable and democratic basis.

SLOVAKIA[2]

UKRAINE[8]

Declarations:

The Ukrainian SSR supports the purposes and principles of UNIDO's activities, as stated in the UNIDO Constitution, and believes that their implementation requires a fundamental restructuring of the existing unjust international economic relations, the establishment of a new international economic order on an equitable and democratic basis, the conduct of progressive social and economic reforms, the strengthening of the State sector of the economy and the carrying out of national plans and programmes for economic and social development.

UNIDO'S activities aimed at promoting industrial development in the developing countries and at those countries' attainment of economic independence must be based on the progressive provisions and principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the Declaration on the Establishment of a

New International Economic Order, and the Lima and New Delhi Declarations on international industrial development co-operation.

To these ends, UNIDO must actively and firmly oppose the attempts of imperialist forces to interfere in the internal affairs of States and must combat acts of economic aggression, diktat and blackmail. UNIDO should work against the policies of those States and economic circles which are endeavouring not only to continue but even to expand the neo-colonialist plundering of the developing countries. In this connection, UNIDO should take active steps to establish effective control over the activities of transnational corporations with a view to restricting their negative influence on the economic development of the developing countries and on international economic relations in general.

The Ukrainian SSR attaches primary importance to the need for implementing the provisions of the UNIDO Constitution which declare the determination of member countries to promote international peace and security and the prosperity of all peoples.

It is firmly convinced that a cessation of the arms race and a transition to real disarmament measures would make possible the release of significant additional resources to meet the needs of social and economic development, including the industrialization of the developing countries.

The Ukrainian SSR emphasizes that it is essential to comply strictly, in the practical activities of UNIDO, with the provisions of its Constitution concerning the purposes for which the regular and operational budgets of the Organization may be utilized. UNIDO should take steps to prevent the expenditure of resources on programmes and projects, including "advisory services", that could be used for the penetration of foreign private capital into the economies of the developing countries. Fixing the levels of the regular budget on a stable basis will enable the Organization to make sure that the budget is more effectively and rationally used.

With regard to the expenditure of UNIDO regular budget resources for technical assistance, the Ukrainian SSR's position of principle has been stated in the joint declaration issued by the delegations of the socialist countries on 7 April 1979 at the United Nations Conference on the Establishment of UNIDO as a Specialized Agency. In connection with the provision in annex II of the UNIDO Constitution that 6 per cent of the regular budget of the Organization should be allocated to technical assistance, the Ukrainian SSR declares that the corresponding portion of its convertible currency contribution to the UNIDO budget will be credited to a separate account at the Foreign Trade Bank of the USSR. The Ukrainian SSR will make use of that portion of its contribution to participate in the provision through UNIDO of technical assistance to interested countries.

The Ukrainian SSR advocates keeping the new Organization's activities universal in character in the interests of all its member countries. The realization of this very important principle would help to ensure the full implementation of General Assembly resolution 39/231 of 18 December 1984, which confirms the agreement on the conditions for the establishment of UNIDO as a specialized agency, including the agreement on the equitable geographical distribution of posts and, in particular, the allocation of one of the posts of Deputy Director-General to the socialist countries.

The Ukrainian SSR wishes to express its conviction that the considerations with regard to the activities of the new Organization put forward in this statement and expressed in the course of the consultations on the establishment of UNIDO as a specialized agency will be duly taken into account and reflected in UNIDO's practical activities.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declarations:

"(1) As used in article 1 of the Constitution, the phrase 'new international economic order' –

"(A) is an evolving concept with no fixed meaning;

"(B) reflects the continuing goal of members of the United Nations to find new or more effective ways of handling international economic relations and is subject to interpretation by all such members; and

"(C) is not legally defined by the Constitution or by any resolution of the sixth or seventh special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations or by the Lima Declaration and Plan of Action of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

"(2) the entry into force of the Constitution with respect to the United States of America does not abrogate or rescind any reservation made by the United States of America to any resolution, declaration, or plan of action referred to in the Constitution."

Declaration included in the notification under article 25:

"In connection with the notification, [concerning *inter alia* declarations made by Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] the United States wishes to draw the attention of the Secretary-General to the understandings set forth in its instrument of ratification of the new UNIDO Constitution, deposited with the Secretary-General on September 2, 1983.

"Article 25, paragraph 1, of the Constitution provides for its entry into force when at least eighty States that had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval notify the Depositary that they have agreed, after consultation among themselves, that the Convention shall enter into force." The Permanent Missions of several States, including the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, have inserted in their article 25 notices or otherwise indicated their individual views as to how the Organization's goals should be achieved, characterizations of the results of the consultations, and statements as to how those States intend to apply certain articles of the Constitution. The United States considers that such unilateral statements cannot vary the legal rights or obligations of the Parties to the functioning of the Organization or in any way prejudge the decisions to be adopted by UNIDO."

NOTES:

[1] On 24 December 1987, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Australia, an instrument of denunciation of the Constitution. The denunciation took effect on 31 December 1988, in accordance with article 6 (2) of the Constitution. It is recalled that the Government of Australia had signed and ratified the Constitution on 3 March 1980 and 12 July 1982, respectively. In regard to the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, it is recalled that the instrument of ratification was received by the Secretary-General on 20 November 1981. By a note verbale dated 12 July 1982, received on the same day, the Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations in response to a request of clarifications concerning the declarations accompanying the instrument of ratification, informed the Secretary-General as follows:

"The Australian Government considers that Australia is a Party to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies and confirms the Secretary-General's understanding that the statements made by the Government of Australia, [made in relation to the ratification by Australia to the Constitution], do not purport to constitute reservations in respect of any provisions of the UNIDO Constitution."

On the basis of those assurances and due account being taken of the provisions of article 22 of UNIDO regarding the interpretation or application of the said Constitution, the Secretary–General concluded that the statements made by Australia in relation to the instrument received on 20 November 1981 were in nature of interpretative statements and, accordingly, proceeded to the deposit of the said instrument as at 12 July 1982 . With regard to the position of the Government of Australia in respect to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the specialized Agencies, it should be reminded that, in accordance with the practice described in the Secretary–General's report entitled "Depositary practice with regard to reservations" (A/5687, part II, par. 22–75), in the absence of agreement on the said reservations, the instrument of accession by Australia to the said Convention received on 20 November 1962, was not then accepted for deposit. It is also recalled that the Government of Australia had also deposited a notification under article 25 thereof on 10 June 1985.

Subsequently, the Secretary–General received instruments of denunciation of the Constitution from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter :

Participant:	*Date of notification:*	*Date of effect:*
Canada	3 Dec 1992	31 Dec 1993
United States of America	4 Dec 1995	31 Dec 1996

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Constitution on 26 November 1980 and 29 May 1985, respectively, with declarations. For the text of the declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1401, p. 149. See also note 8 below and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Constitution on 28 May 1981, ratified it and deposited its notification under article 25 on 24 May 1985, with declarations. For the text of the declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1401, p. 152. See also note 13 in chapter I.2 and note 8 below.

[4] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Constitution shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

Subsequently, on 2 December 1985, the Secretary–General received from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the following declaration:

> The Soviet side does not object to the application of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization to Berlin (West) in such measure and to such and extent as is permissible from the stand-point of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, according to which Berlin (West) continues not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not governed by it.

In this regard, on 29 October 1986, the Secretary–General received from the Government of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America the following communication:

> "The statement by the Soviet Union contains an incomplete and consequently misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement. The relevant passage of that agreement provides that the ties between the western sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany will be maintained and developed, taking into account that these sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it."
>
> See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[6] The ratification is applicable also to the Cook Island and Niue.

[7] The Yemen Arab Republic had signed and ratified the Constitution, and deposited its notification under article 25 on 19 July 1979, 20 October 1983 and 14 August 1985, respectively. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[8] The Secretary–General received on 28 April 1986, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration with regard to the said declarations:

> "The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wishes to note that article 27 of the Constitution of UNIDO provides that reservations to the Constitution are not permitted. The Government wishes to confirm that nothing in [these declarations] affects the rights and obligations of the Parties to the Constitution or the provisions of the Constitution that regulate the functioning of the Organization."

Subsequently, the Secretary–General received from the Governments of France (on 1 May 1986), Italy (on 12 May 1986), the Federal Republic of Germany (on 29 May 1986) and Spain (3 October 1986) declarations identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one made by the United Kingdom. (See also declaration by the United States of America.)

[9] The Secretary–General received on 28 June 1982 from the Government of Israel the following objection with regard to the above–mentioned understanding:

> "The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument deposited by the Government of Kuwait contains a statement of a political character in respect of Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, this Constitution is not the proper framework for such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of Kuwait under general international law or under particular conventions.
>
> "The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

10. United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods

Concluded at Vienna on 11 April 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1988, in accordance with article 99 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1988, No. 25567.
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.97/18[1].
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 45.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, held at Vienna from 10 March to 11 April 1980. The Conference was convened by the General Assembly of the United Nations, in accordance with its resolution 33/93[2] of 16 December 1978, adopted on the basis of chapter II of the report of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law on the work of its eleventh session (1978).

The Convention was opened for signature at the concluding meeting of the Conference on 11 April 1980 and remained open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 30 September 1981.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina		19 Jul 1983 *a*
Australia		17 Mar 1988 *a*
Austria	11 Apr 1980	29 Dec 1987
Belarus		9 Oct 1989 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		9 Jul 1990 *a*
Canada		23 Apr 1991 *a*
Chile	11 Apr 1980	7 Feb 1990
China	30 Sep 1981	11 Dec 1986 *AA*
Cuba		2 Nov 1994 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark	26 May 1981	14 Feb 1989
Ecuador		27 Jan 1992 *a*
Egypt		6 Dec 1982 *a*
Estonia		20 Sep 1993 *a*
Finland	26 May 1981	15 Dec 1987
France	27 Aug 1981	6 Aug 1982 *AA*
Georgia		16 Aug 1994 *a*
Germany[4, 5, 6]	26 May 1981	21 Dec 1989
Ghana	11 Apr 1980	
Guinea		23 Jan 1991 *a*
Hungary	11 Apr 1980	16 Jun 1983
Iraq		5 Mar 1990 *a*
Italy	30 Sep 1981	11 Dec 1986
Lesotho	18 Jun 1981	18 Jun 1981
Lithuania		18 Jan 1995 *a*
Mexico		29 Dec 1987 *a*
Netherlands[6, 7]	29 May 1981	13 Dec 1990 *A*
New Zealand[8]		22 Sep 1994 *a*
Norway	26 May 1981	20 Jul 1988
Poland	28 Sep 1981	19 May 1995
Republic of Moldova		13 Oct 1994 *a*
Romania		22 May 1991 *a*
Russian Federation		16 Aug 1990 *a*
Singapore	11 Apr 1980	16 Feb 1995
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		7 Jan 1994 *d*
Spain		24 Jul 1990 *a*
Sweden	26 May 1981	15 Dec 1987
Switzerland		21 Feb 1990 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		19 Oct 1982 *a*
Uganda		12 Feb 1992 *a*
Ukraine		3 Jan 1990 *a*
United States of America	31 Aug 1981	11 Dec 1986
Venezuela	28 Sep 1981	
Yugoslavia	11 Apr 1980	27 Mar 1985
Zambia		6 Jun 1986 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

In accordance with articles 96 and 12 of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, any provisions of article 11, article 29 or Part II of the Convention that allows a contract of sale or its modification or termination by agreement or any offer, acceptance or other indication of intention to be made in any form other than in writing does not apply where any party has his place of business in the Argentine Republic.

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"The Convention shall apply to all Australian States and mainland territories and to all external territories except the territories of Christmas Island, the Cocos (Keeling) Islands and the Ashmore and Cartier Islands."

BELARUS

Declaration:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, in accordance with articles 12 and 96 of the Convention declares that any provision of article 11, article 29 or Part II of this Convention that allows a contract of sale or its modification or termination by agreement or any offer, acceptance or other indication of intention to be made in any form other than in writing does not apply where any party has his place of business in the Byelorussian SSR.

CANADA[9]

Declarations:

"The Government of Canada declares, in accordance with article 93 of the Convention, that the Convention will extend to Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick,

Newfounland, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island and the Northwest Territories."

9 April 1992

"The Convention shall also extend to Quebec and Saskatchewan."

29 June 1992

"The Convention applies also to the Territory of the Yukon."

CHILE

Declaration:

The State of Chile declares, in accordance with articles 12 and 96 of the Convention, that any provision of articles 11, article 29 or Part II of the Convention that allows a contract of sale or its modification or termination by mutual agreement or any offer, acceptance or other indication of intention to be made in any other form than in writing, does not apply where any party has its place of business in Chile.

CHINA

Declaration:

The People's Republic of China does not consider itself to be bound by subparagraph (b) of paragraph 1 of article 1 and article 11 as well as the provisions in the Convention relating to the content of article 11.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

DENMARK

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Denmark will not be bound by Part II of the Convention.

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

"...

"2) under paragraph 1 of article 93 that the Convention shall not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland,

"3) under paragraph 1 cf. paragraph 3 of article 94 that the Convention shall not apply to contracts of sale where one of the parties has his place of business in Denmark, Finland, Norway or Sweden and the other party has his place of business in another of the said states,

"4) under paragraph 2 of article 94 that the Convention is not to apply to contracts of sale where one of the parties has his place of business in Denmark, Finland, Norway or Sweden and the other party has his place of business in Iceland."

ESTONIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with articles 12 and 96 of [the said Convention] any provision of article 11, article 29 or Part II of the Convention that allows a contract of sale or its modification or termination by agreement or any offer, acceptance or other indication of intention to be made in any form other that in writing does not apply where any party has his place of business in the Republic of Estonia."

FINLAND

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Finland will not be bound by Part II of the Convention.

Upon ratification:

"With reference to Article 94, in respect of Sweden in accordance with paragraph (1) and otherwise in accordance with paragraph (2) the Convention will not apply to contracts of sale where the parties have their places of business in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Iceland or Norway."

GERMANY [4]

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany holds the view that Parties to the Convention that have made a declaration under article 95 of the Convention are not considered Contracting States within the meaning of subparagraph (a) (b) of article 1 of the Convention. Accordingly, there is no obligation to apply – and the Federal Republic of Germany assumes no obligation to apply – this provision when the rules of private international law lead to the application of the law of a Party that has made a declaration to the effect that it will not be bound by subparagraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the Convention. Subject to this observation the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany makes no declaration under article 95 of the Convention.

HUNGARY

Declaration:

"[The Hungarian People's Republic] considers the General Conditions of Delivery of Goods between Organizations of the Member Countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance/GCD CMEA, 1968/1975, version of 1979/ to be subject to the provisions of article 90 of the Convention;

"[The Hungarian People's Republic] states, in accordance with articles 12 and 96 of the Convention, that any provision of article 11, article 29 or Part II of the Convention that allows a contract of sale or its modification or termination by agreement or any offer, acceptance or other indication of intention to be made in any form other than in writing, does not apply where any party has his place of business in the Hungarian People's Republic."

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with articles 96 and 12 of the said Convention, the Republic of Lithuania declares that any provisions of article 11, article 29 or Part II of the Convention that allows a contract of sale or its modification or termination by agreement or any offer, acceptance or other indication of intention to be made in any form other than in written does not apply where any party has his place of business in the Republic of Lithuania."

NORWAY

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Finland.]*

Upon ratification:

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Finland.]*

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belarus.]*

SINGAPORE

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 95 of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Singapore will not be bound by sub-paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the Convention and will apply the Convention to the Contracts of Sale of Goods only between those parties whose places of business are in different States when the States are Contracting States."

SLOVAKIA[3]

SWEDEN

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Finland.]*

Upon ratification:

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Finland.]*

UKRAINE

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belarus.]*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Pursuant to article 95 the United States will not be bound by subparagraph (1) (b) of Article 1".

NOTES:

[1] The English text of the Convention has been published by the Government of the United States of America in the publication "Federal Register" of Monday 2 March 1987, volume 52, No. 40, pages 6262 to 6280 together with various comments and information by the Department of State.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 45* (A/33/45), p. 217.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 1 September 1981 and 5 March 1990, respectively, with the following reservation:

Pursuant to article 95, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that it shall not consider itself bound by the provision of article 1, paragraph 1, item b), of the Convention.

See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 August 1981 and 23 February 1989, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

[6] [The Federal Republic of Germany denounced, on 1 January 1990,] [The Netherlands denounced, on 1 January 1991,] the Convention relating to a uniform law on the international Sale of Goods and the Convention relating to uniform on law the formation of contracts for the international sale of goods, both done at the Hague on 1 July 1964. These denunciations shall take effect 12 months later, and the present Convention will therefore enter into force for [the Federal Republic of Germany on 1 January 1991,] [the Netherlands,] in accordance with paragraph 2 and 6 of article 99. See also note 4 above.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe and Aruba.

[8] With a declaration of non-application to the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau.

[9] On 31 July 1992, the Government of Canada notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the following declaration made, upon accession, in accordance with article 95:

"The Government of Canada also declares, in accordance with article 95 of the Convention, that, with respect to British Columbia, it will not be bound by article 1.1 b) of the Convention."

11. Charter of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre

Adopted by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific on 1 April 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1983, in accordance with article XVIII (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1983, No. 22028.
TEXT: Resolution 225 (XXXVIII)[1] of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 18.

Note: The Charter was adopted on 1 April 1982 by resolution 225 (XXXVIII) of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, following decisions taken by the Commission in its resolutions 191 (XXXV) of 14 March 1979, 206 (XXXVI) of 27 March 1980 and 215 (XXXVII) of of 19 March 1981. The Charter, under article XVI (2), was open for signature by the Members and Associated Members of the Commission at the Headquarters of the Commission in Bangkok from 1 September 1982 to 30 April 1983 and remains open thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Australia		11 Oct 1983 *s*
Bangladesh		9 Sep 1982 *s*
Brunei Darussalam		14 Feb 1985 *s*
China		18 Feb 1983 *s*
Cook Islands		29 Mar 1983 *s*
Fiji		4 Sep 1986 *a*
India		25 Apr 1983 *s*
Indonesia		7 Jan 1983 *s*
Japan		9 Sep 1982 *s*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	9 Sep 1982	
Macau[2]		3 Jun 1993 *a*
Malaysia		9 Sep 1982 *s*
Maldives		25 Apr 1983 *s*
Nepal		25 Apr 1983 *s*
New Zealand	9 Sep 1982	
Pakistan		9 Sep 1982 *s*
Philippines		15 Dec 1982 *s*
Republic of Korea		9 Sep 1982 *s*
Sri Lanka	9 Sep 1982	
Thailand		27 Jun 1983 *s*
Viet Nam		9 Sep 1982 *s*

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Supplement No. 10* (E/198/20) and (E/ESCAP/287).

[2] As an associate member. The instrument was accompanied by the following declaration by the Government of Portugal, made in accordance with article XVII of the Statutes, according to which:

"... The Government of the Portuguese Republic confirms that Macao, as an associate member of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, is authorized to be a party to the Charter of the Asian and Pcific Development Centre and to assume the rights and obligations contained herein."... Moreover, it is recalled that "in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed in Beijing on April 13, 1987, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau from December 20 1999, while the Government of the Portuguese Republic remains also responsible for the external relations of Macau until December 19, 1999."

On 3 June 1993, and in relation to the deposit of the said instrument, the Secretary–General received from the Government of China, the following communication:

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao as of 20 December 1999. Macao, as a part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, will thereupon become a special administrative region of the People's Republic of China and its foreign affairs will be the responsibility of the People's Republic of China.

The People's Republic of China is a member of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre.

The Government of the People's Republic of China hereby declares that as of 20 December 1999, the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China may continue to stay in the Asian and Pacific Development Centre as an associate member in the name of "Macao, China" as it still meets the essential requirements for such a membership.

12. United Nations Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1988

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 89 (1).]
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/43/165.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 2.

Note: The draft Convention was prepared by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. The Convention was adopted by resolution 43/165[1] of 9 December 1988 at the forty-third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was open for signature by all States at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, until 30 June 1990, in accordance with article 86 (1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Canada	7 Dec 1989		Russian Federation ...	30 Jun 1990	
Guinea		23 Jan 1991 *a*	United States of America	29 Jun 1990	
Mexico		11 Sep 1992 *a*			

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-Third Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/43/49), p. 280.

13. United Nations Convention on the Liability of Operators of Transport Terminals in International Trade

Concluded at Vienna on 19 April 1991

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 22 (1).]
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF/152/13.
STATUS: Signatories: 5.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Liability of Operators of Transport Terminals in International Trade on 19 April 1991 at Vienna. In accordance with article 18(1), it was open for signature at the concluding meeting of the Conference and will remain open for signature by all States at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, until 30 April 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
France	15 Oct 1991	
Mexico	19 Apr 1991	
Philippines	19 Apr 1991	
Spain	19 Apr 1991	
United States of America	30 Apr 1992	

14. Agreement to Establish the South Centre

Opened for signature at Geneva on 1 September 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 July 1995, in accordance with article XV (1).
REGISTRATION: 30 July 1995.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.295.1994.TREATIES–2 of 28 September 1994.
STATUS: Signatories: 40. Parties: 15.

Note: The Agreement was open for signature at the South Centre in Geneva, from 1 September to 27 September 1994 by all developing countries members of the Group of 77 and China, in accordance with article XIII. Thereafter, it was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 30 September to 15 December 1994.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), definitive signature (s)*
Algeria	30 Sep 1994	
Angola	30 Sep 1994	
Benin	30 Sep 1994	
Bolivia	30 Sep 1994	
Brazil	15 Dec 1994	
Burundi	30 Sep 1994	
Cambodia	30 Sep 1994	
Cape Verde	30 Sep 1994	
China		4 May 1995 *a*
Colombia	30 Sep 1994	
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Nov 1994	
Cuba	30 Sep 1994	17 Nov 1995
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	6 Dec 1994	31 May 1995 *AA*
Egypt	30 Sep 1994	
Ghana	17 Oct 1994	
Guyana		16 Sep 1994 *s*
Honduras	30 Sep 1994	
India	30 Sep 1994	13 Dec 1994
Indonesia	30 Sep 1994	17 Feb 1995
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Sep 1994	
Jamaica	23 Nov 1994	
Jordan	30 Sep 1994	29 Dec 1995
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Sep 1994	
Malawi	30 Sep 1994	
Malaysia	1 Dec 1994	15 Jun 1995
Mali	30 Sep 1994	
Micronesia (Federated States of)	30 Sep 1994	
Morocco	19 Oct 1994	
Mozambique	30 Sep 1994	
Namibia	30 Sep 1994	
Nigeria	30 Sep 1994	
Pakistan		12 May 1995 *a*
Panama	30 Sep 1994	
Philippines	13 Oct 1994	
Seychelles		30 Sep 1994 *s*
Sierra Leone	4 Oct 1994	
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	
Sri Lanka	30 Sep 1994	16 Mar 1995
Sudan	30 Sep 1994	
Suriname	30 Sep 1994	
Uganda	30 Sep 1994	12 May 1995
United Republic of Tanzania	30 Sep 1994	27 Sep 1995
Viet Nam	25 Nov 1994	2 Jun 1995 *A*
Yugoslavia	8 Dec 1994	
Zimbabwe		30 Sep 1994 *s*

15. United Nations Convention on Independent Guarantees and Stand-by Letters of Credit

Adopted by the General Assembly on 11 December 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 28(1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/50/640.
STATUS: Signatories: .

Note: The draft Convention was prepared by the Working Group on International Contract Practices and submitted to the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law. The Commission decided at its twenty–eighth session (2–28 May 1995) to submit the draft Convention to the General Assembly for its consideration. Subsequently, the Convention was adopted by the General Assembly at its fiftieth session by resolution No. 48[1]. The Convention is open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 11 December 1997.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*

Notes:

[1] A/RES/50/48.

CHAPTER XI. TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS[1]

A. CUSTOMS MATTERS

1. AGREEMENT PROVIDING FOR THE PROVISIONAL APPLICATION OF THE DRAFT INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS CONVENTIONS ON TOURING, ON COMMERCIAL ROAD VEHICLES AND ON THE INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS BY ROAD

Signed at Geneva on 16 June 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1950, in accordance with article III.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1950, No. 696.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 45, p. 149.
TERMINATION: The Agreement, the Additional Protocol of 16 June 1949 (see chapter XI.A–2) and the Additional Protocol of 28 November 1952 (see chapter XI.A–4) were terminated, in accordance with articles III and IV of the Agreement, as follows: on 1 January 1965 in respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods by Road, and on 1 January 1966 in respect of the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring and on Commercial Road Vehicles. (The Additional Protocol of 11 March 1950 (see chapter XI.A–3) was abrogated by the Additional Protocol of 28 November 1952, in accordance with article V of the latter Protocol.)

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria[3,4]		[27 Dec 1949 *s*]	Netherlands[4,7]		[16 Jun 1949 *s*]
Belgo–Luxembourg Economic Union	16 Jun 1949		Norway[4]		[16 Jun 1949 *s*]
Denmark[4]		[29 Dec 1949 *s*]	Poland[4,8]		[7 Jan 1959 *a*]
France[4]		[16 Jun 1949 *s*]	Sweden[4,9]		[15 Sep 1950 *a*]
Italy[3]	[16 Jun 1949]	[26 Jan 1954]	Switzerland[4,5]		[16 Jun 1949 *s*]
Liechtenstein[4,5]			Turkey[4,10]		[16 Jan 1957 *a*]
Malaysia[6]		29 Jun 1959 *d*	United Kingdom[4,11]		[16 Jun 1949 *s*]
			Yugoslavia[4]		[10 Jul 1958 *a*]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	17 Mar 1950	In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring only, Gibraltar, Malta, Mauritius, Nyasaland, Sarawak and the Somaliland Protectorate
	28 Jul 1950	In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring only, Cyprus, St. Helena, Seychelles, Fiji and the Colony of Aden
	18 Oct 1950	In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring only, North Borneo, Singapore, Federation of Malaya, Leeward Islands, "Colonies of the Windward Islands", Trinidad, British Guiana, British Honduras, and Sierra Leone
		In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Commercial Road Vehicles, Singapore and Sierra Leone
	7 Sep 1951	In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring only, Brunei, Gambia, Jamaica, Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar
		In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Commercial Road Vehicles, Brunei, Gambia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika
	6 Feb 1952	In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring only, Northern Rhodesia
		In respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Commercial Road Vehicles, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia

Denunciations

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Date of effect*	*Draft Conventions concerned*
Austria	25 Apr 1961	1 Jan 1962	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles
	15 Oct 1963	1 Jan 1965	International Transport of Goods by Road
Denmark[12]	15 Sep 1961	1 Jan 1962	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles International Transport of Goods by Road
France	16 May 1960	1 Jan 1961	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles International Transport of Goods by Road
Italy[13]	20 Feb 1964	1 Jan 1965	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles International Transport of Goods by Road
Liechtenstein[5]	7 Jul 1960	1 Jan 1961	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles International Transport of Goods by Road
Netherlands[14]	15 Sep 1960	1 Jan 1961	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles International Transport of Goods by Road
Norway	2 Mar 1960	1 Jan 1961	International Transport of Goods by Road
	3 Feb 1965	1 Jan 1966	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles
Poland	20 Oct 1961	1 Jan 1963	International Transport of Goods by Road
Sweden	25 Feb 1959	1 Jan 1960	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles
	30 Sep 1965		International Transport of Goods by Road
Switzerland[5]	7 Jul 1960	1 Jan 1961	Touring Commercial Road Vehicles International Transport of Goods by Road
Turkey	10 Aug 1964	1 Jan 1965	Touring
United Kingdom	30 Sep 1958	1 Jan 1959	Touring
	30 Jul 1959	1 Jan 1960	Commercial Road Vehicles
Yugoslavia	8 Dec 1960	1 Jan 1962	Touring International Transport of Goods by Road
	29 Jan 1964	1 Jan 1965	Commercial Road Vehicles

NOTES:

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, all treaties listed in this chapter were drawn up within the framework of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed the Agreement on 28 December 1949 with a declaration to the effect that the signature applies only to the Draft International Conventions on Commercial Road Vehicles and on International Transport of Goods by Road and with the reservation that the date of entry into force of the latter Draft Convention "will be determined later, according to the results of the meeting of the Customs Experts of the European Economic Commission which will be held in Geneva on 20 February 1950". See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] With the declaration that the signature applies only to the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring and on Commercial Road Vehicles. In a notification received by the Secretary-General on 22 May 1950, the Government of Austria declared that the signature affixed on its behalf on 27 December 1949 also applies to the Draft International Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods by Road.

[4] See under *Denunciations*.

[5] In a notification received on 6 December 1949, the Government of Switzerland, referring to article II of the Agreement, declared that, as the Principality of Liechtenstein forms part of the Customs territory of the Confederation, the provisions of the Draft Conventions will also apply to it.

[6] Only in respect of the Draft Customs Convention on Touring.

[7] In a communication received on 10 April 1952, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that the reservation as to ratification, made on its behalf upon signature, is to be considered as withdrawn.

[8] Only in respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods by Road.

[9] In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of Sweden indicated that it desired to apply the provisions of the Agreement as from 1 July 1950.

[10] Only in respect of the Draft International Customs Convention on Touring.

[11] Only in respect of the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring and on Commercial Road Vehicles.

[12] In its notice of denunciation, the Government of Denmark made the following statement: "However, the Government of Denmark regards its denunciation as limited only to those Parties to the three Draft Conventions, who have adhered to and ratified—or in future may adhere to and ratify—the Customs Convention of May 18, 1956 on the Temporary Importation for Private Use of Aircraft and Pleasure Boats, the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles done at Geneva on May 18, 1956, and the Customs Convention of January 15, 1959, on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets".

[13] In its notice of denunciation, the Government of Italy made the following statement: However, the Government of Italy regards its denunciation as limited only to those Parties to the three Draft Conventions, who have adhered to and ratified—or in future may adhere to and ratify—the Customs Convention of May 18, 1956 on the Temporary Importation for Private Use of Aircraft and Pleasure Boats, the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles done at Geneva on May 18, 1956, and the Customs Convention of January 15, 1959, on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets.

[14] In its notice of denunciation, the Government of the Netherlands made the following statement: "However, as to the Draft Customs Convention on International Transport of Goods by Road annexed to the Agreement of 16 June 1949, the Netherlands Government will consider itself no longer bound in its relations with only those Parties to the Draft Convention, for whom the Customs Convention of 15 January 1959 has come into force, as from the date on which the 1959 Convention enters into force between those Parties and the Kingdom of the Netherlands".

2. Additional Protocol to the Agreement providing for the provisional application of the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring, on Commercial Road Vehicles and on the International Transport of Goods by Road

Signed at Geneva on 16 June 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1950.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1950, No. 696.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 45, p. 158.
TERMINATION: See under the Agreement of 16 June 1949, chapter XI.A–1.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Accession*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Accession*
Austria	27 Dec 1949		Netherlands	16 Jun 1949	
Belgo–Luxembourg Economic Union	16 Jun 1949		Norway	16 Jun 1949	
Denmark	29 Dec 1949		Switzerland	16 Jun 1949	
France	16 Jun 1949		Turkey		16 Jan 1957
Italy	16 Jun 1949		United Kingdom	16 Jun 1949	

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol on 28 December 1949. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

3. Additional Protocol to the Agreement providing for the provisional application of the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring, on Commercial Road Vehicles and on the International Transport of Goods by Road, relating to the international transport of goods by container under the TIR Carnet Régime

Signed at Geneva on 11 March 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 March 1950.
REGISTRATION: 7 June 1950, No. 696.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 65, p. 319.
TERMINATION: See under the Agreement of 16 June 1949, chapter XI.A–1.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Belgo–Luxemburg Economic Union	11 Mar 1950		Italy	11 Mar 1950	26 Jan 1954
Denmark		7 Jul 1950 *s*	Netherlands		11 Mar 1950 *s*
France		11 Mar 1950 *s*	Sweden		7 Dec 1950 *a*
			Switzerland		11 Mar 1950 *s*

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed the Protocol on 6 September 1950. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

4. Additional Protocol amending certain provisions of the Agreement providing for the provisional application of the Draft International Customs Conventions on Touring, on Commercial Road Vehicles and on the International Transport of Goods by Road

Done at Geneva on 28 November 1952

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 July 1955, in accordance with article VI. From the time of its entry into force, this Protocol, in accordance with its article VII, became an integral part of the Agreement of 16 June 1949.
REGISTRATION: 7 July 1955, No. 696.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 212, p. 296.
TERMINATION See under the Agreement of 16 June 1949, chapter XI.A–1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification*
Austria		3 Jun 1954 *s*	Italy	28 Nov 1952	7 Jul 1955
Belgo–Luxembourg Economic Union	5 Dec 1952		Netherlands		28 Nov 1952 *s*
Denmark		28 Nov 1952 *s*	Norway		10 Feb 1954 *s*
France		28 Nov 1952 *s*	Sweden		28 Nov 1952 *s*
			Switzerland		28 Nov 1952 *s*

5. International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material

Done at Geneva on 7 November 1952

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 November 1955, in accordance with article XI.
REGISTRATION: 20 November 1955, No. 3010.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 221, p. 255.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 63.[1]

Note: The Convention was drawn up by the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at its seventh session, held at Geneva in November 1952. The proposal for the conclusion of such a convention had been referred to the Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in resolution 347 (XII)[2] of 7 March 1951.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Australia		6 Jan 1956 *a*
Austria		8 Jun 1956 *a*
Belgium	30 Jun 1953	28 Aug 1957
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Canada		12 Jun 1974 *a*
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*
Cuba		26 Apr 1976 *a*
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[4]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		5 Oct 1955 *a*
Egypt		29 Sep 1955 *a*
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 *d*
Finland		27 May 1954 *a*
France		7 Feb 1964 *a*
Germany[5,6]	12 Jun 1953	2 Sep 1955
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	12 Jun 1953	10 Feb 1955
Guinea		8 May 1962 *a*
Haiti		12 Feb 1958 *a*
Hungary		3 Jun 1957 *a*
Iceland		28 Apr 1977 *a*
India		3 Aug 1954 *a*
Indonesia		21 Apr 1954 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		11 Jun 1970 *a*
Ireland		23 Apr 1959 *a*
Israel		8 Oct 1957 *a*
Italy		20 Feb 1958 *a*
Jamaica		11 Nov 1963 *d*
Japan		2 Aug 1955 *a*
Kenya		3 Sep 1965 *a*
Liechtenstein[1]		
Luxembourg		9 Sep 1957 *a*
Malaysia		21 Aug 1958 *d*
Malta		27 Jun 1968 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Netherlands		3 May 1955 *a*
New Zealand		19 Apr 1957 *a*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway		2 Nov 1954 *a*
Pakistan		12 Oct 1953 *a*
Poland		18 Feb 1960 *a*
Portugal		24 Sep 1956 *a*
Republic of Korea		12 Jun 1978 *a*
Romania		15 Nov 1968 *a*
Rwanda		1 Dec 1964 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		7 Jun 1966 *d*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
Spain		9 Sep 1954 *a*
Sri Lanka		28 Oct 1959 *a*
Sweden	30 Jun 1953	23 Feb 1955
Switzerland[1]		4 Dec 1954 *a*
Thailand		30 Nov 1994 *a*
Tonga		11 Nov 1977 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Turkey		8 Dec 1956 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	30 Jun 1953	21 Oct 1955
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
United States of America	28 May 1953	17 Sep 1957
Yugoslavia		29 May 1956 *a*
Zaire		31 May 1962 *d*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For reservations made upon notification of territorial application, see hereinafter.)

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the final clause of article VIII, paragraph 2, which authorizes the Parties to request the President of the International Court of Justice to nominate arbitrators for the settlement of disputes.

GERMANY[5]

"The Federal Republic of Germany cannot consider roasted coffee, coffee—and tea extracts as well as tobacco goods including cigarette paper as samples of negligible value. No privileges provided for in Article II of the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material can be granted with respect to the importation of the above-described products into the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany."

INDIA

"The concession of duty-free import would be available to only those catalogues, price lists and trade notices which are supplied free."

MALTA

"In the application of paragraph 5 of Article III of the Convention the period allowed by the Government of Malta for re-exportation of samples which qualify for exemption from import duties under that Article, should be three months which may be extended on sufficient cause being shown."

ROMANIA

(a) In acceding to the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, done at Geneva on 7 November 1952, in the interests of the development of international economic co-operation, the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that negotiation between the parties to a dispute, as provided for in article VIII (1) of the Convention, constitutes the means of settling such disputes in a spirit of co-operation between the States and of full respect for their interests.

(b) The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of article XIII of the above-mentioned Convention apply is not in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1960 in resolution 1514 (XV), which proclaims the need to put an end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations immediately and unconditionally.

SPAIN[7]

SRI LANKA[8]

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"Paragraph 6 of Article III cannot be implemented in Trinidad as the Customs and Excise Department is not self-accounting and refunds are made on Treasury vouchers."

UGANDA

"Uganda shall not be bound by article V of the Convention."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"In accordance with article XIV, Tanganyika [United Republic of Tanzania] reserves the right not to grant to advertising films temporary duty-free admission treatment."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	12 Jan 1956	Papua and the Trust Territory of New Guinea
Belgium	28 Aug 1957	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
Netherlands[9]	3 May 1955	Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand	19 Apr 1957	The Cook Islands (including Niue), the Tokelau Islands and the Trust Territory of Western Samoa
United Kingdom	21 Oct 1955	The Isle of Man
	5 Feb 1957	Aden, Barbados, British Guiana, British Honduras, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya (with reservation), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla, British Virgin Islands), Federation of Malaya, Malta (with reservations), Mauritius, North Borneo, Federation of Nigeria, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Tanganyika (with reservation), Trinidad and Tobago (with reservation), Uganda (with reservation), Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar, Tonga
United States of America	17 Sep 1957	All possessions of the United States except American Samoa, Guam, Kingman Reef, Johnston Island, Midway Islands, the Virgin Islands and Wake Island

Reservations made upon notification of Territorial Application

UNITED KINGDOM

Kenya

"Kenya shall not be bound by Article V of the Convention."

Malta

"(i) The period allowed by law for re-exportation of goods released on temporary importation is three months but this period may be extended on sufficient cause being shown. (ii) If the whole quantity of goods is not taken out of Malta the deposit made to cover duty shall be forfeited. (iii) Samples of high value will be controlled under temporary importation and under regulations to be made in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article III of the Convention."

Tanganyika

"Tanganyika shall not be bound by article V of the Convention."

Trinidad and Tobago

"Paragraph 6 of Article III cannot be implemented in Trinidad as the Customs and Excise Department is not self–accounting and refunds are made on Treasury vouchers."

Uganda

"Uganda shall not be bound by Article V of the Convention."

NOTES:

[1] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[2] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twelfth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/1987), p. 7.

[3] The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland had acceded to the Convention on 30 April 1956 in its capacity as a Contracting Party to the Agreement on Tariffs and Trade of 30 October 1947. See also note 26 in chapter V.2.

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 12 January 1956. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 15 December 1955, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "also applies to Land Berlin, as from the date of its entry into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of Romania made a declaration to the effect that it considers that the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is not competent to extend the application of this Convention to West Berlin because West Berlin does not constitute a part of the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 5 above:

[7] In a communication received on 17 June 1959, the Government of Spain notified the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of its reservation made upon accession. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 221, p. 282.

[8] In a communication received on 29 January 1963, the Government of Sri Lanka notified the Secretary–General of the withdrawal of its reservation made upon accession to the Convention. For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 349, p. 334.

[9] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

6. Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring

Done at New York on 4 June 1954

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 September 1957, in accordance with article 16.
REGISTRATION: 11 September 1957, No. 3992.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 276, p. 191; and vol. 596, p. 542 (amendment to article 2).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 32. Parties: 77.[2]

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Road Motor Vehicles and for Tourism, held at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, from 11 May to 4 June 1954. It also adopted the Additional Protocol to the said Convention, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, and the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles. The Conference was convened by the Secretary–General of the United Nations in accordance with resolution 468 F (XV)[3] adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on 15 April 1953. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 276, p. 191.

Participant[4]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Argentina	4 Jun 1954	19 Dec 1986
Australia		6 Jan 1967 *a*
Austria	4 Jun 1954	30 Mar 1956
Barbados		5 Mar 1971 *d*
Belgium	4 Jun 1954	21 Feb 1955
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria		7 Oct 1959 *a*
Cambodia	4 Jun 1954	29 Nov 1955
Canada		1 Jun 1955 *a*
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 *a*
Chile		15 Aug 1974 *a*
Costa Rica	20 Jul 1954	4 Sep 1963
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*
Cuba	4 Jun 1954	23 Oct 1963
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Denmark		13 Oct 1955 *a*
Dominican Republic	4 Jun 1954	
Ecuador	4 Jun 1954	30 Aug 1962
Egypt	4 Jun 1954	4 Apr 1957
El Salvador		18 Jun 1958 *a*
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 *d*
Finland		21 Jun 1962 *a*
France	4 Jun 1954	24 Apr 1959
Germany[5,6]	4 Jun 1954	16 Sep 1957
Ghana		16 Jun 1958 *a*
Greece[7]		15 Jan 1974 *a*
Guatemala	4 Jun 1954	
Haiti	4 Jun 1954	12 Feb 1958
Holy See	4 Jun 1954	
Honduras	15 Jun 1954	
Hungary		29 Oct 1963 *a*
India	30 Dec 1954	5 May 1958
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Apr 1968 *a*
Ireland		14 Aug 1967 *a*
Israel		1 Aug 1957 *a*
Italy	4 Jun 1954	12 Feb 1958
Jamaica		11 Nov 1963 *d*
Japan	2 Dec 1954	7 Sep 1955
Jordan		18 Dec 1957 *a*
Lebanon		16 Mar 1971 *a*
Liechtenstein[2]		
Luxembourg	6 Dec 1954	21 Nov 1956
Malaysia		7 May 1958 *d*
Mali		1 Aug 1973 *a*
Malta		3 Jan 1966 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	4 Jun 1954	13 Jun 1957
Monaco	4 Jun 1954	
Morocco		25 Sep 1957 *a*
Nepal		21 Sep 1960 *a*
Netherlands	4 Jun 1954	7 Mar 1958
New Zealand		17 Aug 1962 *a*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway		10 Oct 1961 *a*
Panama	4 Jun 1954	
Peru		16 Jan 1959 *a*
Philippines	4 Jun 1954	9 Feb 1960
Poland		16 Mar 1960 *a*
Portugal	4 Jun 1954	18 Sep 1958
Romania		26 Jan 1961 *a*
Russian Federation		17 Aug 1959 *a*
Rwanda		1 Dec 1964 *d*
Senegal		19 Apr 1972 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		22 Nov 1966 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Spain	4 Jun 1954	18 Aug 1958
Sri Lanka	4 Jun 1954	28 Nov 1955
Sweden	4 Jun 1954	11 Jun 1957
Switzerland[2]	4 Jun 1954	23 May 1956
Syrian Arab Republic[8]		26 Mar 1959
Tonga		11 Nov 1977 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		20 Jun 1974 *a*
Turkey		26 Apr 1983 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	4 Jun 1954	27 Feb 1956
United Republic of Tanzania		22 Jun 1964 *a*
United States of America	4 Jun 1954	25 Jul 1956
Uruguay	4 Jun 1954	8 Sep 1967
Yugoslavia		10 Jul 1958 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria reserves the right, notwithstanding article 1 of the said Convention, not to regard as tourists persons who, in the course of their visit, accept any paid employment.

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 21 of the said Convention concerning compulsory arbitration and declares that the agreement of all the parties in dispute is required for the submission of each individual dispute to arbitration.

BULGARIA[9]

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 21 of the Convention.

DENMARK

Notwithstanding the provisions of article 3 of this Convention, the Scandinavian countries shall be permitted to make special rules applicable to persons residing in those countries.

EGYPT

"The Delegation of Egypt reserves its Government's right to withhold the advantages provided for by the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring from any person who, while visiting Egypt as a tourist, takes up employment with or without pay."

FINLAND

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of article 3 the Government of Finland shall be permitted to make special rules applicable to persons residing in the Scandinavian countries;

"(ii) Taking into account the relevant provisions in the Finnish legislation the Government of Finland apply the rule in article 10, paragraph 2 so far as sub–paragraph *c* is concerned to tourists under 21 years of age."

GHANA

"(1) The exemption on arms and ammunition included in article 2 (3) of the Convention shall not be applicable to Ghana.

"(2) The authorization contained in article 4 *(b)* of the Convention, to export travel souvenirs of a total value not exceeding 100 USA dollars, without the formalities applying to Exchange Control and without payment of export duties shall not apply to Ghana."

GUATEMALA

"The Guatemalan Government reserves the right:

"(1) Not to consider as tourists persons who enter the country for business as provided in article 1.

"(2) Not to accept the provisions of article 19 in respect of territories in dispute which are under the *de facto* administration of another State."

HAITI

The Delegation of Haiti reserves its Government's right to withhold the advantages provided for by the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring from any person who, while visiting Haiti as a tourist, accepts any paid employment or engages in any other form of gainful occupation.

HUNGARY

"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 21 of the Convention."

POLAND[10]

1. The Government of the People's Republic of Poland reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 4 of the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring.

2. Notwithstanding article 21 of the Convention, a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the States parties to the dispute, whose consent is needed for the appointment of an arbitrator or arbitrators.

ROMANIA[11]

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 21, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention. The position of the Romanian People's Republic is that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[12]

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, considering that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring can be decided by arbitration, declares that a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

SENEGAL

1. The Government of the Republic of Senegal reserves the right to withhold the benefits of the provisions of the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring from any person who, while visiting Senegal as a tourist takes any employment paid or not;

2. The Government of the Republic of Senegal reserves the right:

a) Not to consider as tourists persons who enter the country for business as provided in article 1.

b) Not to accept the provisions of article 19 in respect of territories in dispute which are under the *de facto* administration of another State.

SWEDEN

"Notwithstanding the provisions of article 3 of the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, the Scandinavian countries shall be permitted to make special rules applicable to persons residing in those countries."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Reserving "the right of the Government to deny the privileges and facilities provided in the said Convention, to any tourist who takes up any job—paid or unpaid—during his stay in the country".

TUNISIA

A dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute.

UGANDA

"The Government of Uganda shall be bound by Article 2 provided that a tourist's stay in the East African Territories does not exceed six months, but shall not be bound by Article 2 in so far as it refers to portable gramophones with records, portable sound recording apparatus, portable wireless receiving sets, tents and other camping equipment, fishing outfits, non-powered bicycles, skis, tennis racquets and other similar articles if the period of stay in the Territories does not exceed six months, but undertakes to allow the temporary importation of these articles in accordance with the temporary importation permit procedure.

"The Government of Uganda shall not be bound by Article 3 but undertakes to grant reasonable concessions.

"The Government of Uganda shall not be bound by Article 4 and reserves the right to require that such goods shall be dealt with in accordance with the temporary importation permit procedure."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA[13]

"The Government of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar [Tanzania] shall not be bound by article 3 of the Convention, but undertakes to grant reasonable concessions in respect of the items referred to therein."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Belgium[14]	21 Feb 1955	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, with reservations
Netherlands	7 Mar 1958	Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand	21 May 1963	Cook Islands (including Niue)
Portugal	18 Sep 1958	Overseas Provinces
	30 Mar 1983	Macao
United Kingdom[15,16]	7 Aug 1957	North Borneo, Cyprus, Fiji, Jamaica, Federation of Malaya, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Tonga and Zanzibar; and Malta with reservation
	14 Jan 1958	Brunei, Antigua, Mauritius, Sarawak, Dominica, Bermuda, Gambia, Montserrat, Federation of Nigeria, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Gibraltar, Virgin Islands, St. Helena, Grenada, St. Vincent; and Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika with reservations
	16 Jun 1959	Barbados
	12 Sep 1960	British Honduras
	11 Nov 1960	Hong Kong
	9 Jan 1961	St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla
	15 Sep 1961	Trinidad and Tobago
	5 Feb 1962	British Guiana
United States of America	25 Jul 1956	Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

NOTES:

[1] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 9 August 1966, the Government of the Netherlands proposed an amendment to article 2, paragraph 3 of the Convention to the effect that the words "one portable television set" be inserted after the words "one portable wireless receiving set". The text of the proposed amendment was circulated by the Secretary-General to all contracting States on 6 September 1966. No objection having been expressed to the proposed amendment within the period of six months from the date of the circulation of its text by any of the contracting States, the amendment is deemed to have been accepted, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 23 of the Convention. Pursuant to paragraph 3 of the same article, the amendment entered into force for all contracting States three months after the expiration of the said period of six months, that is to say, on 6 June 1967.

[2] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[3] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifteenth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2419), p. 9.

[4] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 31 January 1956. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[5] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that this Convention, the additional Protocol thereto and the Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles also apply to *Land Berlin*.

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 3 in chapter III.3. See also note 5 above.

[7] In a notification received on 4 April 1974, the Government of Greece stated that it accepted the decisions, recommendations and declarations contained in the Final Act of the Conference.

[8] Notification by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

[9] The Governments of Italy and Switzerland have notified the Secretary-General that they object to this reservation. The Government of the United States of America has notified the Secretary-General that it has no objection to this reservation, but "considers that it may, and hereby states that it will, apply the aforesaid reservation reciprocally with respect to Bulgaria".

Subsequently, in a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 21 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 348, p. 358.

[10] The Governments of Italy and Switzerland have notified the Secretary-General that they object to these reservations.

[11] The Governments of Switzerland and the Republic of Viet-Nam informed the Secretary-General that they object to this reservation. The Government of the United States of America informed the Secretary-General that it has no objection to this reservation but "considers that it may and hereby states that it will apply this reservation reciprocally with respect to Romania".

[12] The Governments of Italy and Switzerland have notified the Secretary-General that they object to this reservation. The Government of the United States of America has notified the Secretary-General that it has no objection to this reservation, but "considers that it may and hereby states that it will apply this reservation reciprocally with respect to the Soviet Union". The Government of Yugoslavia has informed the Secretary-General that it does not object to this reservation subject to the provisions of paragraph 7 of article 20 of the Convention.

[13] In a communication received on 2 August 1965, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General that, in accordance with paragraph 7 of article 20 and paragraph 7 of article 14, respectively, of the Convention and Additional Protocol, Portugal reserves the right of not extending to the United Republic of Tanzania the benefit of those provisions of the Convention and the Additional Protocol to which apply the reservations made upon accession by the United Republic of Tanzania.

[14] This Convention is applicable to the Territory of the Belgian Congo and to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi, subject to the following reservations:

(1) The temporary importation of firearms and their ammunition cannot be considered without a temporary importation document (article 2 of the Convention);

(2) The exemption in the case of wine, spirits, toilet water and perfume must continue to be limited to opened containers and subject, in the case of alcoholic beverages in particular, to the observance of the legal provisions in force (article 3 of the Convention);

(3) Worked ivory and objects of indigenous art must be excluded from the operation of the Convention (article 4).

The Government of Rwanda notified the Secretary-General of its succession to the Convention on 1 December 1964. Subsequently, in a communication received on 10 February 1965, the Government of Rwanda informed the Secretary-General that it did not intend to maintain any of the above-mentioned reservations.

[15] [As concerns Malta] "The definition of 'Personal effects' contained in paragraph 3 of article 2 of the Convention shall not include 'one portable wireless set'."

On 3 January 1966, the Government of Malta notified the Secretary-General of its succession to the Convention. In a communication received on 28 February 1966, the Government of Malta notified the Secretary-General that it did not intend to maintain the said reservation, which had been made on its behalf by the Government of the United Kingdom at the time of the notification of the extension of the Convention to Malta.

[16] "(i) The Governments of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika shall not be bound by article 2 of the Convention in so far as it refers to portable musical instruments, portable gramophones with records, portable sound-recording apparatus, non-powered bicycles and sporting firearms with cartridges, but undertake to allow the temporary importation of these articles in accordance with the temporary importation permit procedure.

"(ii) The Governments of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika shall not be bound by article 3 of the Convention but undertake to grant reasonable concessions in respect of the items referred to therein.

"(iii) The Governments of Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika shall not be bound by article 4 of the Convention and reserve the right to require a temporary importation permit in respect of the articles refered to therein."

For the reservations made on accession by the Governments of Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, see under *"Declarations and Reservations"* in this chapter.

7. Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material

Done at New York on 4 June 1954[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 June 1956, in accordance with article 10.
REGISTRATION: 11 September 1957, No. 3992.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 276, p. 191.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 71.[2]

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Argentina	4 Jun 1954	19 Dec 1986
Australia		6 Jan 1967 *a*
Austria	4 Jun 1954	30 Mar 1956
Barbados		5 Mar 1971 *d*
Belgium	4 Jun 1954	21 Feb 1955
Bulgaria		7 Oct 1959 *a*
Cambodia	4 Jun 1954	
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 *a*
Chile		15 Aug 1974 *a*
Costa Rica	20 Jul 1954	4 Sep 1963
Cuba	4 Jun 1954	29 Jun 1964
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Czech Republic[3]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		13 Oct 1955 *a*
Ecuador	4 Jun 1954	30 Aug 1962
Egypt	4 Jun 1954	4 Apr 1957
El Salvador		18 Jun 1958 *a*
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 *a*
Finland		21 Jun 1962 *a*
France	4 Jun 1954	24 Apr 1959
Germany[4,5]	4 Jun 1954	16 Sep 1957
Ghana		16 Jun 1958 *a*
Greece[6]		15 Jan 1974 *a*
Haiti	4 Jun 1954	12 Feb 1958
Holy See	4 Jun 1954	
Honduras	15 Jul 1954	
Hungary		29 Oct 1963 *a*
India		15 Feb 1957 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Apr 1968 *a*
Ireland		14 Aug 1967 *a*
Israel		1 Aug 1957 *a*
Italy	4 Jun 1954	12 Feb 1958
Jamaica		11 Nov 1963 *d*
Japan	2 Dec 1954	7 Sep 1955
Jordan		18 Dec 1957 *a*
Lebanon		16 Mar 1971 *a*
Liechtenstein[2]		
Luxembourg	6 Dec 1954	21 Nov 1956
Malaysia		7 May 1958 *d*
Mali		11 Jun 1974 *a*
Malta		29 Jul 1968 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	4 Jun 1954	13 Jun 1957
Monaco	4 Jun 1954	
Morocco		25 Sep 1957 *a*
Nepal		21 Sep 1960 *a*
Netherlands	4 Jun 1954	7 Mar 1958
New Zealand		17 Aug 1962 *a*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway		10 Oct 1961 *a*
Panama	4 Jun 1954	
Peru		16 Jan 1959 *a*
Philippines	4 Jun 1954	9 Feb 1960
Poland		16 Mar 1960 *a*
Portugal		18 Sep 1958 *a*
Romania		26 Jan 1961 *a*
Rwanda		1 Dec 1964 *d*
Senegal		19 Apr 1972 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		22 Nov 1966 *d*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Spain		5 Sep 1958 *a*
Sweden	4 Jun 1954	11 Jun 1957
Switzerland[2]	4 Jun 1954	23 May 1956
Syrian Arab Republic[7]		26 Mar 1959
Tonga		11 Nov 1977 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		20 Jun 1974 *a*
Turkey		26 Apr 1983 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
Russian Federation		17 Aug 1959 *a*
United Kingdom[8]	4 Jun 1954	27 Feb 1956
United Republic of Tanzania		22 Jun 1964 *a*
Uruguay	4 Jun 1954	
Yugoslavia		10 Jul 1958 *a*

Declarations and Reservations[9]

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 15 of the Protocol concerning compulsory arbitration and declares that the agreement of all the parties in dispute is required for the submission of each individual dispute to arbitration.

BULGARIA[10]

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 15 of the Protocol.

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

FIJI

"Fiji shall not be bound by Article 2 of the Additional Protocol in so far as it refers to unframed photographs and unframed photographic enlargements; but undertakes to allow the temporary duty and tax free admission of these articles under the provisions applicable to Article 3 of the Protocol."

HUNGARY

"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 15 of the Protocol."

MALTA

"Notwithstanding article 3 of the Additional Protocol the duty–free temporary importation into Malta of display material (e.g., showcases, stands and similar articles), sound recordings and flags, shall be subject to the making of a deposit with the Comptroller of Customs equivalent to the amount of duty payable on the goods allowed to be temporarily imported or to the giving of a security for such duty."

POLAND[9]

Notwithstanding article 15 of the Protocol a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the States parties to the dispute, whose consent is needed for the appointment of an arbitrator or arbitrators.

ROMANIA[11]

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the additional Protocol. The position of the Romanian People's Republic is that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Additional Protocol may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

SLOVAKIA[3]

TUNISIA

A dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute.

UGANDA

"Notwithstanding Articles 2, 3 and 4, the Government of Uganda reserves the right to require temporary importation permits in respect of any item specified therein which may be or become dutiable at any time."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, considering that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring can be decided by arbitration, declares that a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute and only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA[12]

"Notwithstanding articles 2, 3 and 4 of the Additional Protocol, the Government of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar [Tanzania] reserves the right to require temporary importation permits in respect of any item specified therein which may at any time be dutiable."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Belgium	21 Feb 1955	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda Urundi
Netherlands	7 Mar 1958	Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand	21 May 1963	Cook Islands (including Niue)
Portugal	18 Sep 1958	Overseas Provinces
	30 Mar 1983	Macao
United Kingdom[13]	7 Aug 1957	North Borneo, Cyprus, Jamaica, Federation of Malaya, Malta, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Tonga and Zanzibar
	14 Jan 1958	Brunei, Antigua, Mauritius, Sarawak, St. Vincent, Gambia, Montserrat, Federation of Nigeria, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Gibraltar, Virgin Islands, Grenada, St. Helena and Dominica; and Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika with reservations
	16 Jun 1959	Barbados
	12 Sep 1960	British Honduras
	11 Nov 1960	Hong Kong
	9 Jan 1961	St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla
	15 Sep 1961	Trinidad and Tobago
	5 Feb 1962	British Guiana

NOTES:

1 See note at the beginning of chapter XI.A–6.

2 Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

3 Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 8 March 1967, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 596, p. 544. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

4 See note 13 in chapter I.2.

5 See note 6 in chapter XI.A–6.

6 See note 7 in chapter XI.A–6.

7 Notification by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

8 In a notification received on 4 March 1959, the Government of the United Kingdom gave notice of the withdrawal of the reservation to article 2 and informed the Secretary–General that "the United Kingdom has been giving full effect to article 2 of the Additional Protocol since the 1 rst of January 1959 . . .". For the text of that reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 276, p. 204.

9 In a communication received on 16 September 1968, the Government of Japan notified the Secretary–General that, in accordance with paragraph 7 of article 14 of the Protocol, it "reserves the right of not extending to the States making reservations the benefit of the provisions to which such reservations apply".

10 The Governments of Italy and Switzerland have notified the Secretary–General that they object to this reservation.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession to article 15 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 348, p. 358.

11 The Government of Switzerland has notified the Secretary–General that is objects to this reservation.

12 In a communication received on 2 August 1965, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary–General that, in accordance with paragraph 7 of article 20 and paragraph 7 of article 14, respectively, of the Convention and Additional Protocol, Portugal reserves the right of not extending to the United Republic of Tanzania the benefit of those provisions of the Convention and the Additional Protocol to which apply the reservations made upon accession by the United Republic of Tanzania.

13 With the following reservation: "Notwithstanding articles 2, 3 and 4 of the Additional Protocol, the Governments of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika reserve the right to require temporary importation permits in respect of any item specified therein which may at any time be dutiable."

8. Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles

Done at New York on 4 June 1954[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 December 1957, in accordance with article 35.
REGISTRATION: 15 December 1957, No. 4101.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 282, p. 249 and depositary notifications C.N.162.1984.TREATIES-1 of 23 July 1984 (amendments to chapter VII) and C.N.315.1991.TREATIES-1 of 30 January 1992 and C.N.288.1992.TREATIES-2 of 20 November 1992 (amendments to English, French and Spanish authentic texts).[2]
STATUS: Signatories: 32. Parties: 72.[3]

Participant[4]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Argentina	4 Jun 1954	
Australia		6 Jan 1967 *a*
Austria	4 Jun 1954	30 Mar 1956
Barbados		5 Mar 1971 *d*
Belgium	4 Jun 1954	21 Feb 1955
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria		7 Oct 1959 *a*
Cambodia	4 Jun 1954	
Canada		1 Jun 1955 *a*
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 *a*
Chile		15 Aug 1974 *a*
Costa Rica	20 Jul 1954	4 Sep 1963
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*
Cuba	4 Jun 1954	20 Nov 1963
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Denmark		13 Oct 1955 *a*
Dominican Republic	4 Jun 1954	
Ecuador	4 Jun 1954	30 Aug 1962
Egypt	4 Jun 1954	4 Apr 1957
El Salvador		18 Jun 1958 *a*
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 *d*
Finland		21 Jun 1962 *a*
France	4 Jun 1954	24 Apr 1959
Germany[5,6]	4 Jun 1954	16 Sep 1957
Ghana		16 Jun 1958 *a*
Guatemala	4 Jun 1954	
Haiti	4 Jun 1954	12 Feb 1958
Holy See	4 Jun 1954	
Honduras	15 Jun 1954	
Hungary		4 May 1983 *a*
India	4 Jun 1954	5 May 1958
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Apr 1968 *a*
Ireland		14 Aug 1967 *a*
Israel		1 Aug 1957 *a*
Italy	4 Jun 1954	12 Feb 1958
Jamaica		11 Nov 1963 *d*
Japan	2 Dec 1954	8 Jun 1964
Jordan		18 Dec 1957 *a*
Liechtenstein[3]		
Luxembourg	6 Dec 1954	21 Nov 1956
Malaysia		7 May 1958 *d*
Mali		12 Jun 1974 *a*
Malta		3 Jan 1966 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	4 Jun 1954	13 Jun 1957
Monaco	4 Jun 1954	
Morocco		25 Sep 1957 *a*
Nepal		21 Sep 1960 *a*
Netherlands	4 Jun 1954	7 Mar 1958
New Zealand		17 Aug 1962 *a*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway		10 Oct 1961 *a*
Panama	4 Jun 1954	
Peru		16 Jan 1959 *a*
Philippines	4 Jun 1954	9 Feb 1960
Poland		16 Mar 1960 *a*
Portugal	4 Jun 1954	18 Sep 1958
Romania		26 Jan 1961 *a*
Russian Federation		17 Aug 1959 *a*
Rwanda		1 Dec 1964 *d*
Senegal		19 Apr 1972 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		15 Aug 1966 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Spain	4 Jun 1954	18 Aug 1958
Sri Lanka	4 Jun 1954	28 Nov 1955
Sweden	4 Jun 1954	11 Jun 1957
Switzerland[3]	4 Jun 1954	23 May 1956
Syrian Arab Republic[7]		26 Mar 1959
Tonga		11 Nov 1977 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		20 Jun 1974 *a*
Turkey		26 Apr 1983 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	4 Jun 1954	27 Feb 1956
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
United States of America	4 Jun 1954	25 Jul 1956
Uruguay	4 Jun 1954	
Yugoslavia		10 Jul 1958 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification. accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article 40 of the said Convention and declares that a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties.

BULGARIA[8]

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 40 of the Convention. At the same time it states that, if this reservation is rejected by more than two-thirds of the Parties to the Convention, it will consider that the Convention has not been ratified by the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of article 39.

EL SALVADOR

In connexion with article 4, El Salvador reserves its rights with respect to the temporary importation of component parts for the repair of motor vehicles in view of the fact that such component parts may be difficult to identify when taken out of the country; it therefore considers that payment of the taxes prescribed by the law should be made in such cases. The same reservation is made in connexion with other articles of the Convention which refer to component parts for repairs.

GUATEMALA

"The Guatemalan Government reserves its right:

"(1) To consider that the provisions of the Convention shall apply solely to natural persons and not to legal persons and bodies corporate as provided in chapter I, article 1;

"(2) To consider that article 4 shall not be applicable to Guatemala;

"(3) Not to accept the provisions of article 38 in respect of territories in dispute which are under the *de facto* administration of another State."

HUNGARY[9]

Declaration:

Article 38 of the Convention is at variance with the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 16 December 1960 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Reservation:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in paragraph 2 of article 40 of the Convention.

INDIA

With reference to article 1 (e):

"The Government of India reserves the right to exclude 'legal' persons from the categories of persons to whom concessions envisaged in this Convention are applicable."

With reference to article 2:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of article 2 of this Convention, the Government of India reserves the right to exclude from the benefits of this article persons normally resident outside India who, on the occasion of a temporary visit to India, take up paid employment or any other form of gainful occupation."

ISRAEL

"Article 4, paragraph 1

"The Government of Israel shall not be bound to admit without payment of import duties and import taxes the importation of component parts of there pair of vehicles temporarily imported; likewise, import prohibitions and restrictions in force at the time being in Israel may be applied to the importation of such component parts."

"Article 24, paragraphs 1 and 2

"In view of the fact that land frontiers with neighbouring States are closed at the present time and that, consequently, private road vehicles may not be re-exported except through an Israel port, the Government of Israel shall not be bound to accept as evidence of re-exportation of vehicles or component parts thereof, any of the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 24."

MEXICO

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Delegation of Mexico, in accordance with the declaration duly made when the matter was under discussion in Working Party I, reserves its rights with regard to article 4, which authorizes the temporary importation of component parts for the repair of motor vehicles. The Delegation cannot agree to this article because the procedure in question is contrary to the legislation of its country, and because such spare parts do not usually have the specifications which would permit of their identification on exit. In the Delegation's opinion, this procedure would be prejudicial to the country's fiscal interests, because in this way it would be possible to import new spare parts without payment of duty by re-exporting old parts belonging to a vehicle not the tourist's own. It has therefore been considered more appropriate that in such cases the proper duty should be paid.

"The same reservation is made with regard to other articles of this Convention which refer to component parts for making repairs."

POLAND[10]

Notwithstanding article 40 of the Convention, a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the States parties to the dispute, whose consent is needed for the appointment of an arbitrator or arbitrators.

ROMANIA[11]

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 40, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention. The position of the Romanian People's Republic is that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[8]

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, considering that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Customs Convention on the Temporary Import-

ation of Private Road Vehicles can be decided by arbitration, declares that a dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

SENEGAL

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of article 2 of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Senegal reserves to itself the right to exclude from the benefits of the said article persons normally resident outside Senegal who, on the occasion of a temporary visit to Senegal take up paid employment or any form of gainful occupation;

2. The Government of the Republic of Senegal reserves the right:

a) To consider that the provisions of the Convention shall apply solely to natural persons and not to legal persons and bodies corporate as provided in chapter 1, article 1;

b) To consider that article 4 shall not be applicable to its territory;

c) Not to accept the provisions of article 38 in respect of territories in dispute which are under the *de facto* administration of another State.

SRI LANKA

"Notwithstanding the provisions of article 2 of this Convention, the Government of Ceylon reserves to itself the right to exclude from the benefits of this article persons normally resident outside Ceylon who, on the occasion of a temporary visit to Ceylon, take up paid employment or any other form of gainful occupation."

TUNISIA

A dispute may be submitted to arbitration only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Belgium[12]	21 Feb 1955	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda–Urundi, with reservations
Netherlands[13]	7 Mar 1958	Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand	21 May 1963	Cook Islands (including Niue)
Portugal	18 Sep 1958	Overseas Provinces
United Kingdom[14]	7 Aug 1957	North Borneo, Cyprus, Fiji, Jamaica, Federation of Malaya, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Tonga and Zanzibar; and Malta (with reservation)
	14 Jan 1958	Brunei, Antigua, Mauritius, Sarawak, Kenya, Dominica, Gambia, Montserrat, Federation of Nigeria, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, St. Helena, Uganda, Gibraltar, Virgin Islands, Grenada, St. Vincent, Tanganyika
	16 Jun 1959	Barbados
	12 Sep 1960	British Honduras
	11 Nov 1960	Hong Kong
	9 Jan 1961	St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla
	15 Sep 1961	Trinidad and Tobago
	5 Feb 1962	British Guiana
United States of America	25 Jul 1956	Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

NOTES:

[1] See note at the beginning of chapter XI.A–6.

[2] The Secretary–General circulated on 6 April 1979 the text of an amendment proposed by Switzerland aiming at the addition of a new article 25 *bis* to chapter VII of the Convention. The said amendment was not accepted owing to objections notified to the Secretary–General on 2 October 1979 (India) and on 4 October 1979 (Belgium, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands).

Subsequently, the text of a new amendment by Switzerland (new article 25 *bis*) was circulated by the Secretary–General on 23 July 1984. No objections having been notified within a period of six months from the date of its circulation, the amendment entered into force on 23 April 1985 in accordance with article 42 (3) of the Convention.

However, the Secretary–General received in this regard, on 22 January 1985, from the Government of Austria the following declaration:

"Austria does not object to the substance of the amendment proposed by Switzerland which has been approved by the Austrian Federal Government on December 12, 1984. But as the Austrian constitutional procedures in the present case also require the ratification by the Federal President after approval by parliament, Austria is not yet in a position to apply the new regulations. Austria does, however, not wish to prevent the entry into force of the present amendment for the other contracting states.

Subsequently, on 7 June 1985, the Secretary–General was informed by the Government of Austria that "the said amendment had been approved by the Austrian Parliament and that it would therefore now be applied by Austria."

On 30 January 1992, the Secretary–General circulated, the text of the amendments to the English, French and Spanish authentic texts proposed by the Government of Italy. In this connexion, it is to be noted that the said amendments, as circulated by depositary notification C.N.315.1991.TREATIES–1 dated 30 January 1992, indeed entered into force on 30 October 1992, with the exception, however, of the proposed amendment to article 13, consisting in the addition of a fourth paragraph: an objection was formulated by Japan to the said proposed

amendment on 30 July 1992, i.e., within the period of six months from the date of the relevant depositary notification as follows:

"... The Government of Japan considers that the proposed provisions of article 13, paragraph 4, setting forth the exemption from taxation in case of loss or theft of an object in the case of a seizure, do not appear precise enough to ensure the prevention of its abuse. For this reason, the Government of Japan considers that the proposed amendments should not be adopted and therefore expresses its objection to them in accordance with article 42 (2) of the Convention."

Consequently, in accordance with article 42 (3), all amendments proposed by Italy entered into force for all Contracting Parties three months after the expiration of the period of six months following the date of circulation of the proposed amendment by the Secretary-General, i.e. on 30 October 1992, with the exception of the proposed fourth paragraph to article 13.

[3] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[4] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 31 January 1956. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[5] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] See note 6 in chapter XI.A-6.

[7] Notification by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

[8] The Governments of Italy and Switzerland notified the Secretary-General that they object to these reservations. The Government of the United States of America has notified the Secretary-General that it has no objection to [these] reservation[s], but "considers that it may, and hereby states that it will, apply the aforesaid reservation[s] reciprocally with respect to Bulgaria [on the other hand and] to the Soviet Union [on the other]".

Subsequently, in a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 40 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 348, p. 360.

[9] By 24 August 1983, the day following the expiry of the period of ninety days from the date of the said depositary notification, none of the States concerned had notified the Secretary-General as envisaged in article 39 (3) of the Convention, of an objection to the reservation. Consequently, in accordance with article 35 (2), the Convention entered into force for Hungary with effect from 2 August 1983.

[10] The Government of Switzerland has notified the Secretary-General that it objects to this reservation.

[11] The Government of Switzerland has notified the Secretary-General that it objects to this reservation. The Government of the United States of America has notified the Secretary-General that it has no objection to this reservation, but "considers that it may and hereby states that it will apply this reservation reciprocally with respect to Romania".

[12] With regard to the application to the Territory of the Belgian Congo and to the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi of the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, concluded at New York on 4 June 1954, the Belgian Government considers that in present circumstances the system of free international circulation of motor vehicles should not be extended to legal persons. Temporary admittance without payment should not be granted in respect of component parts imported for the repair of a vehicle covered by free circulation papers.

The latter restriction does not, of course, apply to component parts accompanying vehicles when they are listed in the counterfoil of the international circulation document.

By a communication received on 10 February 1965, the Government of Rwanda in relation to the succession, informed the Secretary-General that it did not intend to maintain any of the above-mentioned reservations.

[13] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[14] The reservation with respect to Malta reads as follows:

"Article 4 of the Convention shall not apply to Malta." On 3 January 1966, the Government of Malta notified the Secretary-General of its succession to the Convention. In a communication received on 28 February 1966, the Government of Malta notified the Secretary-General that it did not intend to maintain the said reservation, which had been made on its behalf by the Government of the United Kingdom at the time of the notification of the extension of the Convention to Malta.

9. Customs Convention on Containers

Done at Geneva on 18 May 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 August 1949, in accordance with article 13. [*Note:* Article 20(1) of the Customs Convention on Containers, 1972 (see chapter XI.A–15), provides that, upon its entry into force, it shall terminate and replace, in relations between the Parties to the latter Convention, the present Convention. The said Convention of 1972 came into force on 6 December 1975.]
REGISTRATION: 4 August 1959, No. 4834.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 338, p. 103.
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 44.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*	Jamaica		11 Nov 1963 *d*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*	Japan		14 May 1971 *a*
Australia		6 Jan 1967 *a*	Liechtenstein[4]		7 Jul 1960
Austria	18 May 1956	13 Nov 1957	Luxembourg	18 May 1956	25 Oct 1960
Belgium	18 May 1956	27 May 1960	Malawi		24 May 1969 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*	Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Bulgaria		18 Jan 1960 *a*	Netherlands	18 May 1956	27 Jul 1960
Cambodia		4 Aug 1959 *a*	Norway		22 Nov 1961 *a*
Cameroon		24 Sep 1963 *a*	Poland	18 May 1956	6 May 1959
Canada		8 Sep 1972 *a*	Portugal		1 May 1964 *a*
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*	Romania		1 Nov 1967 *a*
Cuba		4 Aug 1965 *a*	Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Denmark		3 Sep 1965 *a*	Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
Finland		15 Jun 1961 *a*	Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
France	18 May 1956	20 May 1959	Spain		21 Jan 1959 *a*
Germany[2,3]	18 May 1956	23 Oct 1961	Sweden	18 May 1956	11 Aug 1959
Greece		12 Sep 1961 *a*	Switzerland[4]	18 May 1956	7 Jul 1960
Hungary	18 May 1956	23 Jul 1957	Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Ireland		7 Jul 1967 *a*	United Kingdom	18 May 1956	23 May 1958
Israel		14 Nov 1967 *a*	United States of America		3 Dec 1968 *a*
Italy	18 May 1956	29 Mar 1962	Yugoslavia		9 Mar 1961 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 17 of the said Convention relating to compulsory arbitration.

BULGARIA[5]

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 17 of this Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

DENMARK[6]

"Pursuant to article 5 in the prevailing Danish Customs Act, the Danish customs area does not comprise Faroe Islands and Greenland. The acceptance of the Convention by Denmark, therefore, applies only to the Danish customs area as defined in the said article."

POLAND

The Government of the People's Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by article 17 of the Convention.

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 17, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention.

The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention can be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all the parties in dispute.

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of article 16 of the Convention apply is not in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1960 in resolution 1514 (XV), which proclaims the need to put an end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations immediately and unconditionally.

SLOVAKIA[1]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 16 of the Convention, the said Convention shall extend to the customs territory of the United States [which at the present time includes the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico]."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	3 Jan 1968	The Territories of Papua, Norfolk Island, Christmas Island, Cocos (Keeling) Islands and the Trust Territory of New Guinea
Netherlands[7]	27 Jul 1960	Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea
United Kingdom	23 May 1958	The Isle of Man, Jersey and the Bailiwick of Guernsey
	19 Oct 1959	Antigua, Barbados, Bermuda, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Brunei, Cyprus, Dominica, Falkland Islands, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Grenada, Jamaica, Mauritius, Monteserrat, North Borneo, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Sarawak, Sierra Leone, State of Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Zanzibar
	12 Dec 1974	Hong Kong

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 31 May 1962, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 429, p. 299. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 30 November 1961, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin, as from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above–mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary–General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary–General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 2 above.

[4] On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein, so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[5] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–general that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 17 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 348, p. 375.

[6] The Working Party on Customs Questions affecting Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe included the following statement in the report on its Twenty–second session, adopted on 3 September 1965 (document TRANS/304–TRANS/WP30/98, paragraph 52): "With regard to the accession of Denmark to the Convention [Customs Convention on Containers, done at Geneva on 18 May 1956], the Working Party noted that its intention in preparing the Convention, had always been to allow Denmark to become a party to that instrument only in respect of the Danish Customs zone, which, under the Danish Customs laws, did not include the Faroe Islands and Greenland, and that in its opinion the matter was covered by the principles set forth in article 16 of the Convention."

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

10. Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles

Done at Geneva on 18 May 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 April 1959, in accordance with article 34.
REGISTRATION: 8 April 1959, No. 4721.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 327, p. 123; vol. 1314, p. 277 (amendment); and depositary notification C.N.316.1991.TREATIES 1 of 30 January 1992 (amendments to English and French authentic texts).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 33.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		19 Dec 1977 *a*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Austria	18 May 1956	13 Nov 1957
Belgium	18 May 1956	18 Feb 1963
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		7 Oct 1959 *a*
Cambodia		8 Apr 1959 *a*
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*
Cuba		16 Sep 1965 *a*
Cyprus		2 Feb 1983 *d*
Denmark		8 Jan 1959 *a*
Finland		23 May 1967 *a*
France	18 May 1956	20 May 1959
Germany[2,3]	18 May 1956	23 Oct 1961
Greece		12 Sep 1961 *a*
Hungary	18 May 1956	23 Jul 1957
Ireland		26 Jul 1967 *a*
Italy	18 May 1956	29 Mar 1962
Liechtenstein[4]		7 Jul 1960
Luxembourg	18 May 1956	28 Jan 1964
Netherlands[5]	18 May 1956	27 Jul 1960
Norway		11 Jul 1966 *a*
Poland	18 May 1956	6 May 1959
Portugal		8 May 1967 *a*
Romania		7 Jan 1966 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		15 Aug 1966 *d*
Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
Spain		17 Nov 1958 *a*
Sweden	18 May 1956	16 Jan 1958
Switzerland[4]	18 May 1956	7 Jul 1960
United Kingdom	18 May 1956	30 Jul 1959
Yugoslavia		12 Jun 1961 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 38 of the said Convention relating to the compulsory arbitration of the International Court of Justice.

BULGARIA[6]

POLAND

The Government of the People's Republic of Poland does not consider itself bound by article 38 of the Convention.

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 38, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Convention, its position being that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention can be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all the Parties to the dispute.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	30 Jul 1959	The Isle of Man, Jersey and the Bailiwick of Guernsey
	6 Nov 1959	Gibraltar, Brunei, Somaliland, North Borneo, Seychelles and Singapore
	29 Apr 1960	Cyprus, Gambia
	12 Sep 1960	Sierra Leone
	21 Sep 1960	Hong Kong
	19 Jul 1962	Kenya, Uganda

NOTES:

[1] The Secretary–General circulated on 6 April 1979 the text of an amendment proposed by Switzerland aiming at the addition of a new article 25^{bis} to chapter VII of the Convention. The said amendment was not accepted owing to objections notified to the Secretary–General on 4 October 1979 (Belgium, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands).

Subsequently, a further proposed amendment by Switzerland to chapter VII of the Convention by the addition of a new article 25^{bis} was circulated by the Secretary–General on 26 August 1982. Within the period of six months following the date of its circulation, no Contracting Party expressed an objection to the proposed amendment and therefore, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 41 of the Convention it is deemed accepted.

On 30 January 1992, the Secretary–General circulated the text of the amendments to the English and French authentic texts proposed by the Government of Italy. Within a period of six months from the date of its circulation (i.e. 30 January 1992), none of the Contracting Parties to the Convention expressed an objection to the proposed amendment. Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of article 41 (2) and (3) of the Convention, the proposed amendment was deemed accepted and will entered into force for all Contracting Parties three months after the expiry of the said period of six months, i.e., on 30 October 1992.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a communication received by the Secretary–General on 30 November 1961, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin, as of the date of its entry into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above–mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary–General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis* to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary–General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990, it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

[4] On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[5] For the Kingdom of Europe.

[6] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 38 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 342, p. 362.

11. Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation for Private Use of Aircraft and Pleasure Boats

Done at Geneva on 18 May 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1959, in accordance with article 34.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1959, No. 4630.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 319, p. 21.
STATUS: Signatories: 11. Parties: 26.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria[1]		31 Oct 1963 *a*	Malta		3 May 1966 *d*
Austria	18 May 1956	13 Nov 1957	Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Belgium	18 May 1956	18 Feb 1963	Netherlands[5]	18 May 1956	27 Jul 1960
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*	Portugal		16 Feb 1965 *a*
Denmark		8 Jan 1959 *a*	Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *a*
Finland		30 Sep 1965 *a*	Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
France	18 May 1956	20 May 1959	Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Germany[2,3]	18 May 1956	23 Oct 1961	Spain[6]		2 Oct 1958 *a*
Hungary	18 May 1956	23 Jul 1957	Sweden	18 May 1956	16 Jan 1958
Italy	18 May 1956	29 Mar 1962	Switzerland[4]	18 May 1956	7 Jul 1960
Jamaica		11 Nov 1963 *d*	Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Liechtenstein[4]		7 Jul 1960	United Kingdom	18 May 1956	3 Oct 1958
Luxembourg	18 May 1956	13 Oct 1964	Yugoslavia		29 Jan 1960 *a*

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
France	14 Dec 1959	Overseas Territories (St. Pierre and Miquelon, French Somaliland, Comoro Archipelago, New Caledonia and Dependencies, French Polynesia)
France/United Kingdom	28 Dec 1959)	
	23 Dec 1959)	Condominium of the New Hebrides
United Kingdom[7]	3 Oct 1958	The Isle of Man, Jersey and the Bailiwick of Guernsey
	13 May 1959	Aden, British Guiana, Brunei, Gambia, Gibraltar, Kenya, Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat), North Borneo, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Tanganyika, Uganda, Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar, British Solomon Islands Protectorate; and Cyprus
	15 Sep 1959	Jamaica
	19 Oct 1959	Malta, Sierra Leone
	12 May 1960	Hong Kong and Falkland Islands
	12 Jan 1961	British Honduras
	10 Feb 1961	Mauritius
	8 May 1961	Trinidad and Tobago

NOTES:

[1] With a reservation that the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 38 of the Convention relating to compulsory arbitration.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 30 November 1961, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin, as of the date of its entry into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications, are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 2 above.

[4] On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will also apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein, so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[5] The signature was affixed for the Kingdom in Europe. The instrument of ratification provides that the Convention was ratified for the Kingdom in Europe, for Surinam, for the Netherlands Antilles and Netherlands New Guinea. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[6] The Government of Spain had deposited an instrument of accession on 29 July 1958. On 2 October 1958, the Government of Spain withdrew the said instrument and deposited a new instrument of accession containing a declaration, made under paragraph 1 of article 39 of the Convention, that Spain does not consider itself bound by article 38 of the Convention.

[7] Application to Cyprus with the following note:

"It will involve amendment to Customs and Tariff Law which will be made at earliest opportunity. Facilities as provided by the Convention will be granted by administrative action in respect of any importation that may be made between the date of extension of the Convention to Cyprus and the amendment of the law."

12. Customs Convention concerning Spare Parts used for repairing Europ Wagons

Done at Geneva on 15 January 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1961, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1961, No. 5503.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 383, p. 229.
PARTIES: Signatories: 8. Parties: 10.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Austria	20 Feb 1958	3 Mar 1959
Belgium	5 Feb 1958	10 Sep 1959
Denmark[1]		5 Feb 1958 *s*
France	7 Feb 1958	19 Aug 1959
Germany[2,3]	10 Feb 1958	21 Oct 1960
Italy	5 Feb 1958	8 Mar 1960
Liechtenstein[4]		7 Jul 1960
Luxembourg	12 Feb 1958	19 Feb 1969
Netherlands[5]	7 Feb 1958	7 May 1959
Switzerland[4]	20 Feb 1958	7 Jul 1960

NOTES:

[1] The signature by Denmark was affixed subject to ratification. In a communication received on 16 May 1958, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservation as to ratification.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin, as from the date on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

See also note 2 above.

[4] On depositing the instrument of ratification the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein, so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

13. Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention)

Done at Geneva on 15 January 1959

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 anuary 1960, in accordance with article 40. [*Note:* Article 56(1) of the TIR Convention of 1975 (see chapter XI.A–16) provides that the said Convention, upon its entry into force, shall terminate and replace, in relations between the Contracting Parties thereto, the present Convention. The said Convention of 1975 came into force on 20 March 1978.]

REGISTRATION: 7 January 1960, No. 4996.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 348, p. 13; vol. 481, p. 598 (amendment 1),[1] and vol. 566, p. 356 (Amendment 2).[1]

STATUS: Signatories: 9. Parties: 39.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		11 Oct 1971 *a*
Albania		1 Oct 1969 *a*
Austria	15 Feb 1959	3 Feb 1960
Belgium	4 Mar 1959	14 Mar 1962
Bulgaria		15 Apr 1959 *s*
Canada		26 Nov 1974 *a*
Cyprus		3 Jun 1977 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		15 Apr 1959 *s*
Finland		14 Jun 1960 *a*
France	14 Apr 1959	3 Jul 1959
Germany[3,4]	13 Apr 1959	23 Oct 1961
Greece		2 May 1961 *a*
Hungary		6 Dec 1961 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		25 May 1971 *a*
Ireland		7 Jul 1967 *a*
Israel		31 Oct 1969 *a*
Italy	15 Apr 1959	11 Jan 1963
Japan		14 May 1971 *a*
Jordan		8 Nov 1973 *a*
Kuwait		26 May 1977 *a*
Liechtenstein[5]		7 Jul 1960
Luxembourg	14 Apr 1959	3 Jul 1962
Malta		31 Jan 1978 *a*
Morocco		10 Oct 1975 *a*
Netherlands	9 Apr 1959	27 Jul 1960
Norway		2 Mar 1960 *a*
Poland		3 Oct 1961 *a*
Portugal		6 Jun 1966 *a*
Romania		9 Apr 1964 *a*
Russian Federation		20 Feb 1974 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain		12 May 1961 *a*
Sweden		14 Apr 1959 *s*
Switzerland[5]	12 Mar 1959	7 Jul 1960
Turkey		23 Feb 1966 *a*
United Kingdom[6]	13 Apr 1959	9 Oct 1959
United States of America		3 Dec 1968 *a*
Yugoslavia		23 Aug 1960 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

ALBANIA

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention which provide for compulsory arbitration to settle disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. It declares that the agreement of all the parties in dispute is required in each particular case for the submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

BULGARIA[7]

CZECH REPUBLIC[2]

GREECE[8]

HUNGARY

"[The Hungarian People's Republic] does not consider as obligatory paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 44 of the Convention."

MALTA

"The Government of the Republic of Malta, having already become a party to the 1975 TIR Convention, now becomes a party to the 1959 TIR Convention only in relation to those States Parties that have not themselves become a party to the 1975 Convention."

POLAND

[Poland] does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 44 of the Convention.

ROMANIA

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention with reference to the settlement by compulsory arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of one of the Contracting Parties.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the provisions of article 39 of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets,

which restrict the participation of certain States in the Convention, are contrary to the generally recognized principle of the sovereign equality of States.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it necessary to state that the provisions of article 43 of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets, to the effect that States may extend the Customs Convention to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outmoded and at variance with the United Nations General Assembly's Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by article 44, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets and states that the submission to arbitration of any dispute between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Customs Convention must be subject, in each specific case, to the agreement of all the Parties in dispute and that only persons designated by agreement between the Parties in dispute may act as arbitrators.

SLOVAKIA[2]

TURKEY[9]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 43 of the Convention, the said Convention shall extend to the customs territory of the United States [which at the present time includes the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico]."

NOTES:

[1] Annexes 3 and 6 to the Convention were modified by agreement between the competent administrations of all the Contracting Parties, in accordance with the procedure provided in article 47, paragraph 4 of the Convention. Amendment 1 (amendment to article 5 of annex 3) entered into force on 19 November 1963; for the text, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 481, p. 598. Amendment 2 (amendments to articles 2 and 5 of annex 3, and article 5 of annex 6) entered into force on 1 July 1966; for the text, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 566, p. 356. For the text of the Convention incorporating these amendments, see document E/ECE/332(E/ECE/TRANS/ 510)/Rev.1.

In a communication received on 12 June 1974, the Government of Austria requested, in accordance with article 46 (1) of the Convention, that a conference be convened for the purpose of reviewing the latter. That request was notified by the Secretary-General to all States concerned on 28 June 1974, and the required number of States have expressed their concurrence with the said request within the four-month period provided for by article 46 (1). This Convention resulted in a new Convention (chapter XI.A-16).

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 31 August 1961, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 406, p. 334. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with a reservation and a declaration, on 24 October 1975. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 985, p. 394. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 1 December 1961, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin as from the date of its entry into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 3 in chapter III.3.

In this regard, the following declaration was made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic upon accession:

As regards the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) the German Democratic Republic notes in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic of 3 September 1971 that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and may not be governed by it. Accordingly, the statement of the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that this Convention also applies to the "Land Berlin" is incompatible with the Quadripartite Agreement.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 3 above.

[5] On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein, so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[6] On depositing the instrument of ratification the Government of the United Kingdom declared that the Convention shall extend to the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.

[7] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon definitive signature with respect to article 44 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 348, p. 44.

[8] In a communication received on 16 August 1971, the Government of Greece notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation formulated on deposit of its instrument of accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 395, p. 276.

[9] In a communication received on 12 February 1974, the Government of Turkey notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservations that it had made in respect of chapter IV and articles 44 (2) and 44 (3) of the Convention. For the text of those reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 557, p. 278.

14. European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets Used in International Transport

Done at Geneva on 9 December 1960

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 June 1962, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 12 June 1962, No. 6200.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 429, p. 211.
STATUS: Signatories: 8. Parties: 29.[1]

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Australia		1 Oct 1969 *a*
Austria		7 Oct 1963 *a*
Belgium	21 Feb 1961	14 Mar 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		28 Feb 1961 *s*
Croatia		31 Aug 1994 *d*
Cuba		26 Sep 1963 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		14 Mar 1961 *s*
Finland		19 Aug 1966 *a*
France	8 Mar 1961	12 Mar 1962
Germany[3,4]	20 Dec 1960	29 Sep 1964
Hungary		26 Jul 1963 *a*
Italy	15 Mar 1961	5 Jan 1967
Liechtenstein[1]		
Luxembourg	6 Feb 1961	31 Jul 1962
Netherlands	13 Mar 1961	22 Oct 1962
Norway		27 Oct 1964 *a*
Poland		4 Sep 1969 *a*
Portugal		15 Jan 1968 *a*
Romania		15 May 1964 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
Spain		2 Feb 1973 *a*
Sweden		1 Mar 1961 *s*
Switzerland[1]	6 Mar 1961	24 Apr 1963
Turkey		10 Oct 1974 *a*
United Kingdom	7 Feb 1961	1 Oct 1962
Yugoslavia		19 Jun 1964 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservation were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

BULGARIA[5]

CUBA

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 11 of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

HUNGARY

POLAND

"The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 11 of the Convention."

ROMANIA

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention, with reference to the settlement by compulsory arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention at the request of one of the Parties in dispute.

SLOVAKIA[2]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[6]	22 Oct 1962	Netherlands Antilles
United Kingdom	1 Oct 1962	Aden Colony, Antigua, Bahama Islands, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Channel Islands, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Kenya, Montserrat, North Borneo, Sarawak, Uganda

NOTES:

[1] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein, so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 31 May 1962 with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 429, p. 212. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 15 March 1977 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1037, p. 417. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "shall also apply to Land Berlin, as from the date on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 3 in chapter III.3.

Upon accession, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made the following declaration:

> With regard to the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) the German Democratic Republic states that according to the Quadripartite Agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic of 3 September 1971 Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and may not be governed by it.
>
> Consequently, the statement of the Federal Republic of Germany according to which this Convention was also applicable to the "Land Berlin" is in contradiction with the Quadripartite Agreement.

Concerning the declaration by the German Democratic Republic, the Secretary-General received on 22 February 1978 the following declaration from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that the declaration by the German Democratic Republic of 15 March 1977 concerning its accession to the European Convention of 9 December 1960 on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport cannot by itself have the effect of establishing contractual relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 1 above.

[5] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon definitive signature to article 11 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 429, p. 226.

[6] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

15. Customs Convention on Containers, 1972

Concluded at Geneva on 2 December 1972

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 December 1975, in accordance with article 19.
REGISTRATION: 6 December 1975, No. 14449.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 988, p. 43 and depositary notifications C.N.358.1981.TREATIES–1 of 8 December 1981 (amendments to annexes 4 and 6); vol. 1407, p. 389 (amendments to annexes 1, 5, 6 and 7); C.N.269.1985.TREATIES–2 of 8 November 1985 (amendments to annex 6); C.N.323.1987.TREATIES–2 of 29 January 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original French and Spanish texts); C.N.276.1988.TREATIES–1 of 1 December 1988 (amendments to article 1, paragraph c and annex 6); and C.N.36.1994.TREATIES–1 of 10 March 1994 (amendments to the Convention and annexes 4 et 6)[1].
STATUS: Signatories: 15. Parties: 26.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations/IMCO Conference on Containers Traffic, held at Geneva from 13 November to 2 December 1972. The Conference was convened in pursuance of a decision taken by the Economic and Social Council on 22 May 1970[2] and Council resolutions 1568 (L)[3] and 1725 (LIII)[4]. The Conference adopted a Final Act containing, *inter alia*, the texts of eight resolutions (see doc. E/CONF.59/44). The Convention was open for signature until 15 January 1973 at the Office of the United Nations at Geneva and subsequently from 1 February 1973 until 31 December 1973 inclusive at the Headquarters of the United Nations at New York.

Participant[5]	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		14 Dec 1978 *a*	Morocco		14 Aug 1990 *a*
Australia		10 Nov 1975 *a*	New Zealand[8]		20 Dec 1974 *a*
Austria	22 May 1973	17 Jun 1977	Poland	20 Dec 1972	29 Apr 1982
Bulgaria	12 Jan 1973	22 Feb 1977	Republic of Korea	15 Jan 1973	19 Oct 1984
Belarus	22 Oct 1973	1 Sep 1976	Romania	11 Dec 1973	6 Mar 1975
Canada	5 Dec 1972	10 Dec 1975	Russian Federation	18 Oct 1973	23 Aug 1976
China		22 Jan 1986 *a*	Slovakia[6]		28 May 1993 *d*
Cuba		23 Nov 1984 *a*	Spain		16 Apr 1975 *a*
Czech Republic[6]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Switzerland[7]	5 Dec 1972	12 Oct 1976
Finland	26 Dec 1973	22 Feb 1983 *A*	Trinidad and Tobago		23 Mar 1990 *a*
Greece	11 Jan 1973		Turkey	15 Dec 1972	13 Jul 1994
Hungary	10 Jan 1973	12 Dec 1973	Ukraine	22 Oct 1973	1 Sep 1976
Indonesia		11 Oct 1989 *a*	United States of America	5 Dec 1972	12 Nov 1984
Liechtenstein[7]		12 Oct 1976			

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

Upon signature and upon ratification:

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the provisions of article 18 of the Customs Convention on Containers, 1972, which bar certain States from participation in it, are contrary to the universally recognized principle of the sovereign equality of States.

As to the provisions of article 25 regarding the settlement by arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of the Byelorussian SSR declares that the adoption of this provision should not be interpreted as changing the view of the Government of the Byelorussian SSR that a dispute may be referred to an arbitration tribunal for consideration only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

CUBA[9]

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that the provisions of article 18 of the Convention are of a discriminatory nature since they deprive certain States of the right to sign and accede to the Convention, contrary to the principle of universality.

With reference to the rules set forth in article 25 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that differences arising between Parties should be resolved through direct negotiations by diplomatic means.

CZECH REPUBLIC [6]

ROMANIA

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 18 of the Customs Convention on Containers, 1972, concluded at Geneva on 2 December 1972, are not in accordance with the principle that multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the world community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

SLOVAKIA[6]

SPAIN

Reservation to article 9:

Concerning containers granted temporary admission for the carriage of goods in internal traffic, . . . such admission will not be granted in Spain.

SWITZERLAND[7]

(a) Switzerland shall grant temporary admission to containers, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 6 of the Convention;

(b) The use of containers which have been admitted temporarily for internal traffic, as provided for in article 9 of the Convention shall be authorized subject to the two conditions laid down in annex 3 to the Convention.

TURKEY

Upon signature:

With reservations to paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 19.

Upon signature and upon ratification:

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the provisions of article 18 of the Customs Convention on Containers, 1972, which bar certain States from participation in it, are contrary to the universally recognized principle of the sovereign equality of States.

As to the provisions of article 25 regarding the settlement by arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of the USSR declares that the adoption of this provision should not be interpreted as changing the view of the Government of the USSR that a dispute may be referred to an arbitration tribunal for consideration only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

UKRAINE

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the provisions of article 18 of the Customs Convention on Containers, 1972, which bar certain States from participation in it, are contrary to the universally recognized principle of the sovereign equality of States.

As to the provisions of article 25 regarding the settlement by arbitration of disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of the Ukrainian SSR declares that the adoption of this provision should not be interpreted as changing the view of the Government of the Ukrainian SSR that a dispute may be referred to an arbitration tribunal for consideration only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to the Convention and annexes were adopted as follows:

Amendments to:	*Author of the proposal:*	*Date of circulation:*	*Date of entry into force:*
Annexes 4 and 6	Customs Cooperation Council	8 December 1981	8 March 1983
Annexes 1, 5, 6 and 7	Customs Cooperation Council	18 June 1984	18 September 1985
Annex 6	Customs Cooperation Council	8 November 1985	1 January 1988*
Article 1, par. 6, and Annex 6	Customs Cooperation Council	1 December 1988	1 March 1990
Annex 4 and 6	Customs Cooperation Council	10 March 1994**	10 June 1995

* For all the Contracting Parties, except the United States of America and Canada which had objected to the proposed amendments.

** Amendments were proposed by the Customs Co-operation Council to the Convention and annex 7 of the Convention on that same date. An objection thereto having been made by the Government of the United States of America and received by the Secretary-General on 9 March 1995, that is to say, before the expiry of the twelve-month period provided for in article 21 (4), the said amendments are deemed not to have been accepted.

[2] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Resumed Forty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 1A,* (E/4832/Add.1), p.15.

[3] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/5044), p. 3.

[4] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-third Session, Supplement No. 1,* (E/5209), p. 5.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with a declaration on 4 October 1974. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 988, p. 253. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Convention on 27 December 1973 and 4 September 1974, respectively, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 988, p. 250. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[7] With the declaration by which the ratification "shall also apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein for as long as the latter is bound to the Swiss Confederation by a customs union treaty."

[8] With the following declaration: "Accession to the Convention shall not extend to the Cook Islands, Niue and the Tokelau Islands".

[9] Upon a request from the Secretary-General for clarification as to whether the declaration to article 25 was deemed to modify the legal effects of that article, the Government of Cuba replied that the declaration did not constitute a reservation.

16. Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention)

Concluded at Geneva on 14 November 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 March 1978, in accordance with article 53 (1).
REGISTRATION: 20 March 1978, No. 16510.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. No. 1079, p. 89, vol. 1142, p.413 (amendments to annexes 2 and 6), depositary notifications C.N.199.1980.TREATIES-4 of 25 July 1980 (amendments to annexes 1 and 6); vol. 1252, p. 332; C.N.51.1982.TREATIES-2 of 15 March 1982; vol. 1365, p. 348; C.N.280.1984.TREATIES-5 of 21 November 1984 (amendments to annex 6); C.N.328.1985.TREATIES-4 of 3 February 1986 (amendments to annexes 1, 2 and 6); C.N.45.1987.TREATIES-1 of 31 March 1987 and C.N.99.1987.TREATIES-2 of 10 June 1987 (amendments to annexes 1, 6 and 7); C.N.341.1987.TREATIES-5 of 23 February 1988 (amendments to article 18 and to annexes 1 and 2) and C.N.41.1988.TREATIES-1 of 13 May 1988 (corrigendum to C.N.341.1987. TREATIES-5 of 23 February 1988); C.N.136.1987.TREATIES-4 of 12 August 1987 (corrigendum to C.N.328.1985.TREATIES-4 of 3 February 1986 and C.N.45.1987.TREATIES-1 of 31 March 1987); C.N.18.1989.TREATIES-1 of 30 March 1989 (amendments to annexes 2 and 7); C.N.352.1989.TREATIES-6 of 26 March 1990 (amendments to annexes 2, 6 and 7); C.N.313.1990. TREATIES-2 of 15 February 1991 (amendments to annex 6); C.N.465.1992.TREATIES-4 of 24 March 1993 (amendments to article 16 and annexes 6 and 8); C.N.47.1994.TREATIES-1 27 April 1994 (amendments to annexes 1, 2, 6 and 7); and C.N.14.1995.TREATIES-1 of 5 April 1995 (amendments to annexes 1, 4 and 6).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 17. Parties: 59.

Note: The Convention was adopted by a revising Conference convened in accordance with article 46 of the TIR Convention of 15 January 1959 (see chapter XI.A-13). In accordance with its article 52(2), it was opened for signature from 1 January 1976 until 31 December 1976 inclusive at the United Nations Office at Geneva.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		23 Sep 1982 *a*
Albania		4 Jan 1985 *a*
Algeria		28 Feb 1989 *a*
Armenia		8 Dec 1993 *a*
Austria	27 Apr 1976	13 May 1977
Belarus		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Belgium	22 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria		20 Oct 1977 *a*
Canada		21 Oct 1980 *a*
Chile		6 Oct 1982 *a*
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Cyprus		7 Aug 1981 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark[3]	21 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982
Estonia		21 Sep 1992 *a*
European Community	30 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982 *AA*
Finland	28 Dec 1976	27 Feb 1978
France		30 Dec 1976 *s*
Georgia		24 Mar 1994 *a*
Germany[4,5]	30 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982
Greece	30 Dec 1976	15 May 1980
Hungary	23 Nov 1976	9 Mar 1978
Indonesia		11 Oct 1989 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		16 Aug 1984 *a*
Ireland	30 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982
Israel		14 Feb 1984 *a*
Italy	28 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982
Jordan		24 Dec 1985 *a*
Kazakstan		17 Jul 1995 *a*
Kuwait		23 Nov 1983 *a*
Latvia		19 Apr 1993 *a*
Liechtenstein[6]		3 Feb 1978
Lithuania		26 Feb 1993 *a*
Luxembourg	23 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982
Malta		18 Feb 1977 *a*
Morocco	15 Oct 1976	31 Mar 1983
Netherlands[7]	28 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1982 *A*
Norway		11 Jan 1980 *a*
Poland		23 Dec 1980 *a*
Portugal		13 Feb 1979 *a*
Republic of Korea		29 Jan 1982 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 May 1993 *a*
Romania		14 Feb 1980 *a*
Russian Federation		8 Jun 1982 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		11 Aug 1982 *a*
Sweden		17 Dec 1976 *s*
Switzerland[6]	4 Aug 1976	3 Feb 1978
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[8]		2 Dec 1993 *d*
Tunisia	11 Jun 1976	13 Oct 1977
Turkey		12 Nov 1984 *a*
Ukraine[9]		11 Oct 1994 *d*
United Kingdom	22 Dec 1976	8 Oct 1982
United States of America		18 Sep 1981 *a*
Uruguay		24 Dec 1980 *a*
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Yugoslavia	28 Apr 1976	20 Sep 1977

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Pursuant to article 58 (1), [. . .] Afghanistan will not be bound by the provisions of article 57, paragraphs 2 to 6, of the Convention.

ALBANIA

The Council of Ministers of the Socialist People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by article 57, paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 6, of the Convention, which provide for recourse to compulsory arbitration for the interpretation and application of the Convention, and declares that in order for a dispute to be submitted to arbitration the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each case.

ALGERIA

Reservation:

Pursuant to article 58, the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 to 6 of article 57 concerning arbitration.

BULGARIA[10]

Declarations:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that article 52, paragraph 1, which restricts the participation by a certain number of States in the Convention, is in contradiction with the generally accepted principle of sovereign equality of States.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares also that the possibility envisaged in article 52, paragraph 3, for customs or economic unions to become Contracting Parties to the Convention, does not bind Bulgaria with any obligations whatsoever with respect to these unions.

CZECH REPUBLIC[2]

HUNGARY

Reservation:

"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions on compulsory arbitration contained in article 57 of the Convention."

Declaration:

"The Hungarian People's Republic draws attention to the fact that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 52 of the Convention are at variance with the fundamental principles of international law. It follows from the generally accepted principle of sovereign equality of States that the Convention should be open for adherence by all States without any discrimination and restriction."

KUWAIT[11]

Reservation:

Excluding the application of article 57 (2) to (6).

Understanding:

It is understood that the accession by the State of Kuwait to the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets concluded at Geneva on 14 November 1975 does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

POLAND

Reservation:

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of article 57, paragraphs 2 to 6, of the Convention.

Declaration:

The Polish People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 52, paragraph 3, of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), concluded at Geneva on 14 November 1975, under which customs or economic unions may become Contracting Parties to that Convention, does not in any way alter the position of the Government of the Polish People's Republic with regard to the international organizations in question.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania brings to knowledge that according to the provisions of paragraph 1, article 58 of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), concluded at Geneva, on November 14, 1975, it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraphs 2-6 of article 57 of this Convention.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the differences between two or more contracting parties on the interpretation or implementation of the Convention, which had not been settled by negotiations or in any other way, could be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all parties in dispute, in each individual case.

Declaration:

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 52, paragraph 1 of the Convention do not concur with the principles according to which the international multilateral treaties, whose object and aim interest the international community in its entirety, should be opened to the universal participation.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

(a) *Declaration in respect of article 52, paragraph 1:*

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the provision of article 52, paragraph 1, of the 1975 Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), which restricts the participation of certain States in the Convention, is contrary to the generally recognized principle of the sovereign equality of States;

(b) *Declaration in respect of article 52, paragraph 3:*

The participation of customs or economic unions in the 1975 Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention) does not change the Soviet Union's position regarding different international organizations;

(c) *Reservation in respect of article 57, paragraphs 2 to 6:*

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article57, paragraphs 2 to 6, of the 1975 Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR carnets (TIR Convention), which provide for the submission of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention to a court of arbitration at the request of one of the Parties in dispute, and declares that the agreement of all the Parties in dispute is required in each particular case for the submission of the dispute to a court of arbitration.

SLOVAKIA[2]

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon definitive signature, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM, DENMARK, FRANCE, GERMANY[4], IRELAND, ITALY, LUXEMBOURG, THE NETHERLANDS AND THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND AND THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

In respect of the declaration made by Bulgaria:

16 August 1978

...On behalf of the Member States of the European Economic Community and of the Community itself, of the reaction on the Community side to this statement by the People's Republic of Bulgaria. It should be recalled that the conference which took place in Geneva, from 8 to 14 November 1975 under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe for the purpose of revising the TIR Convention decided that customs or economic unions might become contracting parties to the Convention at the same time as all their Member States or at any time after all their Member States had become contracting parties to the Convention.

In accordance with this provision as contained in article 52 (3) of the Convention the European Economic Community, which participated in the above-mentioned conference, signed the Convention on 30 December 1976.

It shall also be recalled that the TIR Convention prohibits any reservation on the Convention, with the exception of reservations to the provisions contained in article 57 paragraphs (2) to (6) thereof on the compulsory settlement of disputes arising from the interpretation or application of the Convention. The statement made by Bulgaria concerning article 52 (3) has the appearance of a reservation to that provision, although such reservation is expressly prohibited by the Convention.

The Community and the Member States therefore consider that under no circumstances can this statement be invoked against them and they regard it as entirely void.

In respect of the declaration made by the German Democratic Republic:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Belgium, Denmark, France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the European Economic Community with respect of the declaration made by Bulgaria.]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	8 Oct 1982	Bailiwick of Guernesey, Bailiwick of Jersey, Gibraltar and Isle of Man

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to the Convention and annexes were adopted as follows:

Amendments to:	*Author of the proposal:*	*Date of circulation:*	*Date of entry into force:*
Annexes 2 and 6	Sweden	22 Dec 1978	1 Aug 1979
Annexes 1 and 6	Federal Republic of Germany	7 Jan 1980	1 Oct 1980
Annex 6	France	8 Dec 1980	1 Oct 1981
Annex 6	France	15 Mar 1982	1 Oct 1982
Annex 6	Czechoslovakia*	19 Dec 1983	1 Aug 1984
Annex 6	United Kingdom	21 Nov 1984	1 Aug 1985
Annex 1	European Economic Community	3 Feb 1986	1 Aug 1986
Annex 2	Sweden and Federal Republic of Germany	3 Feb 1986	1 Aug 1986
Annex 6	Federal Republic of Germany	3 Feb 1986	1 Aug 1986
Annexes 1, 6 and 7	Belgium, European Economic Community, Germany, Federal Republic of, and Sweden	31 Mar 1987	1 Aug 1987
Annex 2	Federal Republic of Germany	23 Feb 1988	1 Aug 1988
Article 18 and annex 1	Austria	23 Feb 1988	23 May 1989**
Annexes 2 and 7	Various Parties	30 Mar 1989	1 Aug 1989
Annexes 2, 6 and 7	Various Parties	26 Mar 1990	1 Aug 1990
Annex 6	Sweden	15 Feb 1991	1 Aug 1991
Annexes 2 and 7	Sweden	21 Jan 1992	1 Aug 1992
Annex 6	Sweden	24 Mar 1993	1 Aug 1993
Article 16	Sweden	24 Mar 1993	24 June 1994
Annex 8	Netherlands	24 Mar 1993	24 June 1994
Annexes 1 and 6	Netherlands	27 April 1994	1 Oct 1994
Annex 7	Germany	27 April 1994	1 Oct 1994
Annexes 2, 6 and 7	Sweden	27 April 1994	1 Oct 1994

Amendments to:	*Author of the proposal:*	*Date of circulation:*	*Date of entry into force:*
Annexes 1, 4 and 6***	Germany, Sweden and European Community	5 April 1995	1 Aug 1995

* See note 2 below.

** As for the entry into force of the amendment to Annex 1 (model of the TIR Carnet, Rules regarding the use of the TIR carnet, Rule 5), which was proposed as a consequence of the proposed amendment to article 18 of the Convention, the Administrative Committee decided, in accordance with article 60 (1) of the Convention that the said amendments should come into force on the same date as the amendment to article 18 of the Convention, i.e 23 May 1989.

***The Secretary–General received objections from the Czech Republic on 1 May 1995 and Romania on 28 April 1995 with respect to amendments to Annex 6. None of the Contracting Parties to the above Convention having expressed an objection by 1 May 1995 to the amendments to Annexes 1 and 4, and less than one–fifth of the Contracting Parties having informed the Secretary–General that they reject the amendments to annex 6 by 1 May 1995, the amendments in question, in accordance with the decision of the Administrative Committee, taken at its seventeenth session held in Geneva on 20 and 21 October 1994, entered into force on 1 August 1995.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 25 February 1981, with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1216, p. 327. See also note 1 above and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The ratification does not extend to the Faroe Islands. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 13 April 1987, from the Government of Denmark a communication declaring that the Convention will apply to the Faroe Islands as from 10 April 1987.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 21 July 1978 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1098, p. 368. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] With a declaration that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 4 above.

[6] On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein, so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[8] On 12 April 1994, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Greece the following communication:

"Succession of the Former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia to the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods Under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), concluded at Geneva on 14 November 1975, does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Hellenic Republic."

[9] The Government of Ukraine informed the Secretary–General that although, being a part of the USSR, Ukraine as one of the States Members of the United Nations since its inception, a number of provisions set forth in the Convention pertained solely to the competence of the Government of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the Government of Ukraine specified that, from the time of the Soviet Union's participation in the TIR Convention, its provisions were extended also to the territory of Ukraine because Ukraine was an inalienable part of the USSR and also Ukraine, as a former Soviet Republic, shared borders with other States, and the relevant customs agencies of the Soviet Union were located in its territory. In accordance with the Act proclaiming the succession of Ukraine of 12 September 1991 and the Act of 15 July 1994 proclaiming the participation of Ukraine in the Convention , Ukraine reaffirmed its participation in the TIR Convention as from 12 September 1991.

[10] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 57 (2) to (6). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1079, p. 296.

[11] On 9 January 1984, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel, the following communication:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument by Kuwait contains a declaration of political character in respect of Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel this Convention is not the place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of the State of Kuwait under general international law or under specific Conventions.

"The Government of the State of Israel will, in regard to the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of the State of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

17. International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods

Concluded at Geneva on 21 October 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 October 1985, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 15 October 1985, No. 23583.
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/55 and depositary notification C.N.81.1984.TREATIES-3 of 4 May 1984 (procès-verbal of rectification of French authentic text).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 33.

Note: The Convention was drawn up within the framework of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe and opened for signature at Geneva from 1 April 1983 to 31 March 1984.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), succession (d)*
Armenia		8 Dec 1993 *a*
Austria		22 Jul 1987 *a*
Belarus		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Belgium	31 Jan 1984	12 Jun 1987
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Croatia		20 May 1994 *d*
Cuba		15 Apr 1992 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
European Community	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Finland		8 Aug 1985 *a*
France	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Germany[3,4]	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Greece	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Hungary	21 Dec 1983	26 Jan 1984 *AA*
Ireland	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Italy	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Lesotho		30 Mar 1988 *a*
Liechtenstein[5]		21 Jan 1986
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Netherlands[6]	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987 *A*
Norway		10 Jul 1985 *a*
Portugal		10 Nov 1987 *a*
Russian Federation		28 Jan 1986 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
South Africa		24 Feb 1987 *a*
Spain		2 Jul 1984 *a*
Sweden		15 Jul 1985 *a*
Switzerland[5]	25 Jan 1984	21 Jan 1986
United Kingdom[7]	1 Feb 1984	12 Jun 1987
Yugoslavia	29 Mar 1984	2 Jul 1985

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or succession.)

CUBA

Reservation:

[The Government of Cuba declares that] it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraphs 2 to 7, and that any disputes that may arise among the parties must be resolved by means of negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

HUNGARY

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon approval:

"The Government of the Hungarian's People's Republic does not consider itself bound by Article 20, paragraphs 2 to 7, of this Convention."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

Regarding article 20, paragraphs 2 to 7:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by article 20, paragraphs 2 to 7, of the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods concerning the settlement of disputes;

Declaration:

Regarding article 16:

The participation in the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods of regional economic integration organizations constituted by sovereign States does not alter the position of the Soviet Union with regard to such international organizations.

SOUTH AFRICA

"South Africa does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraphs 2 to 7, of this Convention."

SWITZERLAND

The Government of Switzerland declared that it accepts resolution No. 230 adopted by the Inland Transport Committee on 4 February 1983, concerning Technical Assistance Measures for the Implementation of the Convention.

NOTES:

[1] The rectification was proposed by the Secretary-General on 19 January 1984. It was effected on 18 April in the absence of any objections.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 6 September 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 22 April 1987, with the following declaration:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraphs 2 to 7 of the Convention according to which a dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention not settled by negotiation shall be

subject to arbitration upon the request of one of the Contracting Parties party to the dispute.

In this connection the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in each case the consent of all contracting parties to the dispute is required to settle a dispute by arbitration.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

[5] On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention will apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, for the Netherlands Antilles and for Aruba.

[7] For the United Kingdom, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man, Gibraltar, Monserrat, Saint Helena and Saint Helena Dependencies.

18. Convention on Customs Treatment of Pool Containers Used in International Transport

Concluded at Geneva on 21 January 1994

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 16 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/106.
STATUS: Signatures: 7. Parties: 2.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 21 January 1994 at Geneva by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe. It was opened for signature from 15 April 1994 to 14 April 1995 inclusive, at the Office of the United Nations in Geneva, by Member States of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. Thereafter, it shall be open for accession, in accordance with its article 14 (4).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Denmark	11 Apr 1995		Sweden	13 Apr 1995	
European Community	11 Apr 1995	11 Apr 1995	Switzerland	15 Feb 1995	
Italy	11 Apr 1995		Uganda	7 Nov 1994	
Malta		12 Jul 1995 *a*	United Kingdom	13 Apr 1995	

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Reservation :

"Pursuant to articles 6 and 7 of the Convention, community legislation requires, in certain circumstances, production of customs documents and the furnishings of a form of security for component parts for repair and for accessories and equipment of containers. These circumstances are:

–cases of serious risk of failure to comply with the obligation to re–export and

–cases where payment of the customs debt likely to arise is not entirely certain."

MALTA

Reservation :

"Malta wishes to enter the reservations as mentioned in article 15 of the Convention and pertaining to paragraph 2 of articles 6 and 7."

B. ROAD TRAFFIC

1. CONVENTION ON ROAD TRAFFIC

Signed at Geneva on 19 September 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 March 1952, in accordance with article 29. [*Note:* Article 48 of the Convention on Road Traffic, 1968 (see chapter XI.B-19), provides that the latter Convention, upon its entry into force, shall terminate and replace, in relations between the Contracting Parties thereto, the present Convention. The said Convention of 1968 came into force on 21 May 1977.]
REGISTRATION: 26 March 1952, No. 1671.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 125, p. 3.[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 20. Parties: 90.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport held at Geneva from 23 August to 19 September 1949. It was convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to resolution 147 B (VII)[2] of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, adopted on 28 August 1948. The Conference also prepared and opened for signature the Protocol concerning countries or territories at present occupied and the Protocol on Road Signs and Signals and reached certain other decisions which are recorded in the Final Act of the Conference. For the text of the said Final Act, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 125, p. 3.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Albania		1 Oct 1969 *a*
Algeria		16 May 1963 *a*
Argentina		25 Nov 1960 *a*
Australia		7 Dec 1954 *a*
Austria	19 Sep 1949	2 Nov 1955
Bangladesh		6 Dec 1978 *a*
Barbados		5 Mar 1971 *d*
Belgium	19 Sep 1949	23 Apr 1954
Benin		5 Dec 1961 *d*
Botswana		3 Jan 1967 *a*
Bulgaria		13 Feb 1963 *a*
Cambodia		14 Mar 1956 *a*
Canada		23 Dec 1965 *a*
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile		10 Aug 1960 *a*
China[4]		
Congo		15 May 1962 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		8 Dec 1961 *d*
Cuba		1 Oct 1952 *a*
Cyprus		6 Jul 1962 *d*
Czech Republic[5]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark	19 Sep 1949	3 Feb 1956
Dominican Republic	19 Sep 1949	15 Aug 1957
Ecuador		26 Sep 1962 *a*
Egypt	19 Sep 1949	28 May 1957
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 *d*
Finland		24 Sep 1958 *a*
France	19 Sep 1949	15 Sep 1950
Georgia		23 Jul 1993 *a*
Ghana		6 Jan 1959 *a*
Greece		1 Jul 1952 *a*
Guatemala		10 Jan 1962 *a*
Haiti		12 Feb 1958 *a*
Holy See		5 Oct 1953 *a*
Hungary		30 Jul 1962 *a*
Iceland		22 Jul 1983 *a*
India	19 Sep 1949	9 Mar 1962
Ireland		31 May 1962 *a*
Israel	19 Sep 1949	6 Jan 1955
Italy	19 Sep 1949	15 Dec 1952
Jamaica		9 Aug 1963 *d*
Japan		7 Aug 1964 *a*
Jordan		14 Jan 1960 *a*
Kyrgyzstan		22 Mar 1994 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		6 Mar 1959 *a*
Lebanon	19 Sep 1949	2 Aug 1963
Lesotho		27 Sep 1973 *a*
Luxembourg	19 Sep 1949	17 Oct 1952
Madagascar		27 Jun 1962 *d*
Malawi		17 Feb 1965 *d*
Malaysia		10 Sep 1958 *a*
Mali		19 Nov 1962 *d*
Malta		3 Jan 1966 *d*
Monaco		3 Aug 1951 *a*
Morocco		7 Nov 1956 *d*
Namibia		13 oct 1993 *d*
Netherlands	19 Sep 1949	19 Sep 1952
New Zealand		12 Feb 1958 *a*
Niger		25 Aug 1961 *d*
Norway	19 Sep 1949	11 Apr 1957
Papua New Guinea		12 Feb 1981 *a*
Paraguay		18 Oct 1965 *a*
Peru		9 Jul 1957 *a*
Philippines	19 Sep 1949	15 Sep 1952
Poland		29 Oct 1958 *a*
Portugal		28 Dec 1955 *a*
Republic of Korea[6]		14 Jun 1971 *a*
Romania		26 Jan 1961 *a*
Russian Federation		17 Aug 1959 *a*
Rwanda		5 Aug 1964 *d*
San Marino		19 Mar 1962 *a*
Senegal		13 Jul 1962 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		29 Nov 1972 *d*
Slovakia[5]		1 Feb 1993 *d*
South Africa	19 Sep 1949	9 Jul 1952
Spain		13 Feb 1958 *a*
Sri Lanka		26 Jul 1957 *a*
Sweden	19 Sep 1949	25 Feb 1952
Switzerland	19 Sep 1949	
Syrian Arab Republic		11 Dec 1953 *a*

Participant[3]	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Thailand		15 Aug 1962 *a*
Togo		27 Feb 1962 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		8 Jul 1964 *a*
Tunisia		8 Nov 1957 *a*
Turkey		17 Jan 1956 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	19 Sep 1949	8 Jul 1957
United States of America	19 Sep 1949	30 Aug 1950
Venezuela		11 May 1962 *a*
Yugoslavia	19 Sep 1949	8 Oct 1956
Zaire		6 Mar 1961 *d*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 33 of the Convention, which lays down that disputes between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice by application from one of the parties to the dispute. The Government of the People's Republic of Albania declares, as it has done hitherto, that in each separate case the agreement of all the parties to the dispute is required for the submission of any dispute for arbitration.

AUSTRALIA

"Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention, annexes 1 and 2."

AUSTRIA

15 October 1971

"Austria will not in future apply annex 1 to the Convention."

BARBADOS[7]

In the notification of succession, the Government of Barbados declared that it wished to maintain the declarations and reservations subject to which the Convention was extended to Barbados by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and which were the same as those made by that Government in its own instrument of ratification.

BOTSWANA

"Excluding annexes 1 and 2."

BULGARIA[8]

With reservations to the following provisions:

(a) .....

(b) Annex 1 to the Convention on Road Traffic, which provides that cycles fitted with an auxiliary internal combustion engine having a maximum cylinder capacity of 50 cm^3(3.05 cu.in.) shall not be considered as motor vehicles, provided that they retain all the normal characteristics of cycles with respect to their structure.

(c) Section II, paragraph (c) second sentence, of annex 6 to the Convention on Road Traffic, which stipulates: "However, motor cycles with an engine of a maximum cylinder capacity of 50 cm^3 (3.05 cu.in.) may be excluded from this obligation."

CHILE

Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention, annex 1 from the application of the Convention.

CYPRUS

Reservations:

"(1) In connexion with article 24 of the said Convention, the Government of Cyprus reserve the right not to permit a person to drive a vehicle, other than one brought into and only temporarily in Cyprus, if (i) the vehicle is used for the carriage of persons for hire or reward or for the carriage of goods and (ii) the driver of such vehicle would by the domestic legislation of Cyprus be required to have a special vocational licence.

"(2) In connexion with article 26 of the said Convention, cycles in international traffic admitted to Cyprus shall, from nightfall and during the night or whenever atmospheric conditions render it necessary, show only a white light to the front, and to show to the rear a red light or a red reflex reflector in accordance with the domestic legislation of Cyprus."

Declarations:

"(1) In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of Cyprus excludes annexes 1 and 2 from its application of the Convention.

"(2) In accordance with section IV *(b)* of annex 6 to the Convention, the Government of Cyprus will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle, it will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer and it will not permit articulated vehicles to be used for transport of passengers for hire or reward."

CZECH REPUBLIC [5]

DENMARK

Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annex 1 from its application of the Convention.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

[The Dominican Republic declares] excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention, annexes 1 and 2 from the application of the Convention and renewing the reservation concerning paragraph 2 of article 1 of the Convention already made in plenary meeting.

FIJI[7]

In its notification of succession, the Government of Fiji declared that it wished to maintain the declarations and reservations made on behalf of Fiji when the Convention was extended to Fiji by the Government of the United Kingdom on 16 December 1965.

FINLAND

Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention, annex 1.

With reference to annex 6, section IV *(b)*, the Government of Finland declare that they will permit only one trailer to be drawn

by a vehicle and that they will not permit an articulate vehicle to draw a trailer.

FRANCE

With reference to annex 6, section IV *(b)*, the French Government declares that it will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle and that it will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer.

GHANA

Reservations:

"(i) Cycles in international traffic admitted to Ghana shall from nightfall and during the night or whenever atmospheric conditions render it necessary show only a white light to the front and show to the rear a red light, a reflex reflector and a white surface with regard to article 26 of the Convention.

"(ii) In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, annexes 1 and 2 should be excluded."

GUATEMALA

Article 33 of the Convention shall apply without prejudice to the provisions of article 149, item 3, of the Constitution of the Republic.

26 September 1962

In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 and paragraph IV *(b)* of Annex 6 of the Convention, respectively, the Government of Guatemala:

1. Excludes annex 1 from its application of the Convention.

2. Will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle and will not permit articulated vehicles for the transport of passengers.

HUNGARY[8, 9]

ICELAND

Declaration:

"The Government of Iceland excludes, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1, of the Convention, annex 1 from the application of the Convention."

INDIA

"Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annexes 1 and 2 from its application of the Convention."

IRELAND

"1. Annexes 1 and 2 are excluded from Ireland's application of the Convention.

"2. In relation to annex 6, the number of trailers drawn by a mechanically propelled vehicle may not exceed that permitted under Irish legislation."

ISRAEL

"Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention, annex 1."

JAMAICA

"(a) In connexion with article 24 of the said Convention, the Government of Jamaica reserve the right not to permit a person to drive a vehicle, other than one brought into and only temporarily in Jamaica, if (i) the vehicle is used for the carriage of persons for hire or reward or for the carriage of goods and (ii) the driver of such vehicle would, by the domestic legislation of Jamaica, be required to have a special vocational licence.

"(b) In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the said Convention, annexes 1 and 2 shall be excluded from Jamaica's application of the Convention.

"(c) In accordance with the provisions of paragraph *(b)* of section IV of annex 6 to the said Convention, the Jamaica Government will permit only one trailer to be drawn by a vehicle, will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer and will not permit articulated vehicles to be used for the transport of passengers for hire or reward."

JAPAN

"Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annex 1 from its application of the Convention."

MALAWI

"Excluding annexes 1 and 2 from the application of the Convention."

MALAYSIA

"Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1, of this Convention, annexes 1 and 2."

MALTA

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of Malta excludes annex 1 from its application of the Convention."

MONACO

With reference to annex 6, section IV *(b)*, the Government of the Principality of Monaco indicates that it will permit only one trailer to be drawn by a vehicle and that it will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer.

NETHERLANDS

Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention, annex 2.

NEW ZEALAND

"Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1, of this Convention, annexes 1 and 2."

NORWAY

Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annex 1 from its application of the Convention.

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

"1) Excluding, in accordance with article 2 paragraph 1 of the Convention, annexes 1 and 2.

2) In connection with article 24 of the Convention, the Government of Papua New Guinea reserves the right not to permit a person to drive a vehicle, other than one brought into and only temporarily, in Papua New Guinea if:

(i) the vehicle is used for the carriage of persons for hire or reward, and

(ii) the driver of such vehicle would, by the domestic legislation of Papua New Guinea, be required to have a special vocational licence.

3) In accordance with section IV (b) of annex 6 of the Convention, the Government of Papua New Guinea will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle. It will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer and it will not permit articulated vehicles to be used for transport of passengers for hire or reward."

PHILIPPINES

"Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annex 1 from its application of the Convention."

PORTUGAL

In accordance with section IV *(b)* of annex 6, the Government of Portugal has indicated that it will only permit one trailer to be drawn by a vehicle and that it will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer, and that it will not permit articulated vehicles for the transport of passengers.

ROMANIA[8, 10]

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 33, under which any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision by application from any of the States concerned. The position of the Romanian People's Republic is that the agreement of all the parties in dispute is required in each case for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[8, 11]

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 33 of the Convention on Road Traffic, which lays down that disputes between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision by application from any of the States concerned, and declares that the agreement of all the States in dispute is required in each separate case for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

SAN MARINO

Excluding, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2, annex 1.

SENEGAL

Excluding, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 1 of the Convention, annex 1.

SIERRA LEONE

Reservations:

"(1) In connexion with article 24 of the said Convention, the Government of Sierra Leone reserve the right not to permit a person to drive a vehicle, other than one brought into and only temporarily in Sierra Leone if (i) the vehicle is used for the carriage of persons for hire or reward, and (ii) the driver of such vehicle would, by the domestic legislation of Sierra Leone, be required to have a special vocational licence.

"(2) In connexion with article 26 of the Convention, cycles in international traffic admitted to Sierra Leone shall, from nightfall and during the night or whenever atmospheric conditions render it necessary, show only a white light to the front and show to the rear a red light in accordance with the domestic legislation of the territory."

Declarations:

"(1) In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of Sierra Leone excludes annexes 1 and 2 from its application of the Convention.

"(2) In accordance with section IV *(b)* of annex 6 to the Convention, the Government of Sierra Leone will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle, it will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer and it will not permit articulated vehicles to be used for transport of passenger for hire or reward."

SINGAPORE

The Government of Singapore does not wish to maintain the reservation made by the Government of the United Kingdom at the time of notification of territorial application of the Convention to Singapore.

SLOVAKIA[5]

SOUTH AFRICA

"Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annexes 1 and 2 from its application of the Convention."

SWEDEN

"Subject to a declaration made in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention, excluding annex 1 from its application of the Convention."

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"Subject to the exclusion of annexes 1 and 2."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[12]

"Subject to the following reservations:

"(1) In connexion with article 24 of the said Convention, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reserve the right not to permit a person to drive a vehicle, other than one brought into and only temporarily in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, if (i) the vehicle is used for the carriage of persons for hire or reward or for the carriage of goods and (ii) the driver of such vehicle would, by the domestic legislation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, be required to have a special vocational licence.

"(2) In connexion with article 26 of the said Convention, cycles in international traffic admitted to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, shall, from nightfall and during the night or whenever atmospheric conditions render it necessary, show only a white light to the front, and show to the rear a red light and a red reflex reflector in accordance with the domestic legislation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

"(3) The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reserve the right, in applying the said Convention to any of the other territories for whose international relations they are responsible, to apply it subject to reservations similar to those set out above.

"Furthermore, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare:

"(1) That, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the said Convention, they exclude annexes 1 and 2 from their application of the Convention.

"(2) In accordance with section IV *(b)* of annex 6 to the said Convention, they will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle, that they will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer and that they will not permit articulated vehicles to be used for the transport of passengers for hire or reward."

VENEZUELA[8, 13]

Article 31:

Amendments to the Convention shall not enter into force with respect to the Republic of Venezuela until the relevant constitutional requirements have been complied with.

Article 33:

The Republic shall be bound by the terms of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. That is to say, no case

may be submitted to the International Court of Justice except by agreement between the Parties.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	3 May 1961	Papua and Trust Territory of New Guinea
Belgium	23 Apr 1954	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
France	29 Oct 1952	French Protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, all French Overseas Territories and Togoland and the Cameroons under French Mandate
	19 Jan 1953	Principality of Andorra
Japan[14]	12 Jun 1972	Okinawa
Netherlands[15]	14 Jan 1955	Surinam and the Netherlands New Guinea
	9 May 1957	The Netherlands Antilles
New Zealand	29 Nov 1961	Trust Territory of Western Samoa
Portugal	19 Jan 1956	All Overseas Provinces—excluding Macau
South Africa	9 Jul 1952	South West Africa
Spain	13 Feb 1958	African localities and provinces
United Kingdom[16, 17]	22 Jan 1958	The Isle of Man
	28 May 1958	Bailiwick of Guernsey and the States of Jersey
	27 Aug 1958	Aden Colony, British Guiana, Seychelles, Cyprus, Gibraltar, British Honduras and Uganda
	5 Mar 1959	Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad
	25 Mar 1959	Gambia
	13 May 1959	Mauritius and Singapore
	23 Nov 1959	Malta
	8 Feb 1960	Zanzibar
	25 Mar 1960	Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	22 Apr 1960	St. Vincent, North Borneo and Sierra Leone
	27 Sep 1960	Barbados
	12 Jan 1961	Hong Kong
	3 Aug 1961	Bahamas
	14 Jul 1965	Swaziland and Grenada
	16 Dec 1965	Fiji
United States of America	30 Aug 1950	All the territories for the international relations of which the United States of America is responsible

Declarations and Reservations made upon notification of territorial application
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

NETHERLANDS

Netherlands New Guinea

Excluding annexes 1 and 2.

Netherlands Antilles

Excluding annexes 1 and 2.

NEW ZEALAND

Trust Territory of Western Samoa

"Excluding annexes 1 and 2."

PORTUGAL[18]

Portuguese Overseas Provinces (excluding Macao)

Subject to the declaration made on accession by the Government of Portugal.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Isle of Man

The Convention is applied to the Isle of Man subject to declarations and reservations the terms of which are identical to those of the United Kingdom set out under Nos. 1 and 2 above.

Bailiwick of Guernsey

The *declarations* made by the Insular Authorities of the Bailiwick of Guernsey are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservations:

"(1) The provisions of the said Convention concerning motor vehicles shall not apply in the Island of Sark, in which Island the use of motor vehicles, except motor tractors for use for certain limited purposes, is prohibited.

"(2) In connexion with article 24 of the said Convention, the Insular Authorities of the Bailiwick of Guernsey reserve the right not to permit a person to drive a vehicle, other than one brought into and only temporarily in the Bailiwick if (i) the vehicle is used

for the carriage of persons for hire or reward and (ii) the driver of such vehicle would, by domestic legislation of the Bailiwick, be required to have a special vocational licence.

"(3) In connexion with article 26 of the said Convention, cycles in international traffic admitted to the Bailiwick of Guernsey shall, from nightfall and during the night or whenever atmospheric conditions render it necessary, show only a white light to the front and show to the rear a red reflex reflector, in accordance with the domestic legislation of the Bailiwick."

States of Jersey

The *declarations* made by the States of Jersey are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservations:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under Nos. 2 and 3.]*

Aden Colony, British Guiana, and Seychelles

The *declarations* made by the Governments of Aden Colony, British Guiana and Seychelles are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservations:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under Nos. 2 and 3.]*

Cyprus[19]

[With the same declarations and reservations as those made on behalf of the Governments of Aden Colony, British Guiana, and Seychelles; see above.]

Gibraltar

The *declarations* made by the Government of Gibraltar are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservation:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under No. 2.]*

British Honduras

Reservations:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under Nos. 2 and 3.]*

Uganda

Reservation:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under No. 2.]*

Jamaica[19]

Reservation:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under No. 2.]*

St. Lucia and Trinidad[19]

The *declarations* made by the Governments of St. Lucia and Trinidad are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservations:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under Nos. 2 and 3.]*

Mauritius

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of Mauritius excludes annex 2 from its application of the Convention.

Reservations:

"(1) In accordance with the provisions of paragraph *(b)* of section IV of annex 6, the Government of Mauritius will only permit that one trailer be drawn by a vehicle, will not permit an articulated vehicle to draw a trailer or that articulated vehicles shall be used for the transport of passengers for hire or reward.

"(2) The Government of Mauritius reserves the right not to apply the provisions of paragraph 1 of annex 8 of the said Convention whereby the minimum age for driving a motor vehicle under the conditions set out in article 24 of the Convention shall be eighteen years."

Singapore[19]

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of Singapore excludes annexes 1 and 2 from its application of the Convention."

Malta[19]

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of Malta excludes annex 1 from its application of the Convention."

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland[17]

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland exclude annexes 1 and 2 from their application of the Convention."

St. Vincent

The *declarations* made by the Government of St. Vincent are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservations:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under Nos. 2 and 3.]*

North Borneo

Reservations:

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for the Bailiwick of Guernsey, under No. 2.]*

Sierra Leone[19]

[Same, mutatis mutandis, *as those made for St. Vincent.]*

Barbados[19]

"The *declarations* and *reservations* relating to Barbados are the same as those made by the United Kingdom in its instrument of ratification."

Hong Kong

The *declarations* made by the Government of Hong Kong are identical to those made by the United Kingdom upon signature and on deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Reservations:

"(1) In connexion with article 26 of the said Convention, cycles in international traffic admitted to the territory shall, from nightfall and during the night or whenever atmospheric conditions render it necessary, show only a white light to the front, and show to the rear a red light and a red reflex reflector in accordance with the domestic legislation of Hong Kong.

"(2) In connexion with paragraph *(b)* of Section II of Annex 6–Lighting, Hong Kong legislation stipulates that every motor vehicle, other than a motor cycle with or without a sidecar, shall be equipped with direction indicators of one of the types described in that paragraph."

Bahamas

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 2 of the Convention, the Government of the Bahamas exclude annexes 1 and 2 from their application of the Convention."

Swaziland and Grenada

"Subject to the reservations contained in the United Kingdom instrument of ratification."

Fiji[19]

"Subject to the same reservations and declarations made in respect of the United Kingdom on ratification."

Distinguishing Sign of Vehicles in International Traffic
(Distinctive letters notified to the Secretary-General)

Albania	AL
Algeria	DZ
Andorra	AND
Argentina	RA
Australia	AUS
Austria	A
Bangladesh	BD
Barbados[20]	BDS
Belgium	B
Benin	DY
Botswana	RB
Brazil	BR
Bulgaria	BG
Cambodia	K
Canada	CDN
Central African Republic	RCA
Chile	RCH
China[4]	RC
Congo	RCB
Costa Rica	CR
Côte d'Ivoire	CI
Cyprus	CY
Denmark	DK
Faroe Islands	FR
Dominican Republic	DOM
Ecuador	EC
Egypt	ET
Fiji	FJI
Finland	SF
France (including French overseas territories)	F
Gambia[20]	WAG
Georgia	GE
Ghana	GH
Greece	GR
Guatemala	GCA
Haiti	RH
Holy See	V
Hungary	H
Iceland	IS
India	IND
Indonesia	RI
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	IR
Ireland	IRL
Israel	IL
Italy	I
Jamaica	JA
Japan	J
Jordan	HKJ
Kenya[20]	EAK
Kyrgyzstan	KS
Lao People's Democratic Republic	LAO
Lebanon	RL
Lesotho[20]	LS
Luxembourg	L
Madagascar	RM
Malawi	MW
Malaysia	MAL
Mali	RMM
Malta	M
Mauritius[20]	MS
Mexico	MEX
Monaco	MC
Morocco	MA
Myanmar	BUR
Namibia	NAM
Netherlands[15]	NL
Surinam	SME
Netherlands Antilles	NA
New Zealand	NZ
Nicaragua	NIC
Niger	NIG
Nigeria[20]	WAN
Norway	N
Pakistan	PAK
Papua New Guinea	PNG
Paraguay	PY
Peru	PE
Philippines	PI
Poland	PL
Portugal	P
Republic of Korea	ROK
Romania	R
Russian Federation	SU
Rwanda	RWA
Samoa[20]	WS
San Marino	RSM
Senegal	SN
Sierra Leone	WAL
Slovakia[5]	SK
Singapore	SGP
South Africa	ZA
Spain (including African localities and provinces)	E
Sri Lanka	CL
Swaziland[20]	SD
Sweden	S
Switzerland	CH
Syrian Arab Republic	SYR
Thailand	T
Togo	TG
Trinidad and Tobago	TT
Tunisia	TN
Turkey	TR
Uganda	EAU
United Kingdom	GB
Aden	ADN
Alderney	GBA
Bahamas	BS
British Honduras	BH
Brunei	BRU
Gibraltar	GBZ

Distinguishing Sign of Vehicles in International Traffic
(Distinctive letters notified to the Secretary–General)

Guernsey	GBG	Grenada	WG
Hong Kong	HK	St. Lucia	WL
Isle of Man	GBM	St. Vincent	WV
Jersey	GBJ	United States of America	USA
Seychelles	SY	Uruguay	U
Southern Rhodesia	RSR	Venezuela	YV
Tanganyika[20]	EAT	Yugoslavia	YU
Zanzibar[20]	EAZ	Zaire	CGO
Windward Islands		Zambia[20]	RNR

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to the Convention were proposed by the Governments of Austria (communicated by circular letter 8 October 1962) and France (communicated by circular letter of 11 March 1964). The proposed amendments were not put into effect since the conditions set forth in article 31 of the Convention were not met.

[2] *Resolutions adopted by the Economic and Social Council, during its seventh session* (E/1065), p. 8.

[3] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention on 2 November 1953 notifying VN as a distinguishing sign of vehicles in international traffic. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[4] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 27 June 1957. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1). With reference to the above-mentioned accession, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Yugoslavia on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. For the nature of these communications, see note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 28 December 1949 and 3 November 1950, respectively, choosing the letters "CS" as distinguishing sign and with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 125, p. 53. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

It should also be noted that, upon succession, the Government of Slovakia had selected the distinctive letters "SQ" in application of paragraph 3 of annex 4. Subsequently, on 14 April 1993, the Government of Slovakia notified the Secretary–General that it had replaced those letters by "SK".

[6] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the accession by the Republic of Korea, the Permanent Representatives of the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Mongolia and Romania stated that their Governments considered the said accession as null and void since the authorities of South Korea had no right or competence whatsoever to speak on behalf of Korea.

[7] See under *"Declarations and Reservations made upon notification of territorial application"* in this chapter.

[8] The Government of the United Kingdom has informed the Secretary-General that it is unable to accept [the reservation to article 33 of the Convention] because in its view it is not of the kind which intending parties to the Convention have the right to make.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 33. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 453, p. 354.

[9] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article 33 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 434, p. 288.

[10] The Government of the United States of America has informed the Secretary-General that it has no objection to this reservation, but "considers that it may and hereby states that it will apply this reservation reciprocally with respect to Romania".

[11] The Government of the United States of America has informed the Secretary-General that it has no objection to this reservation, but "considers that it may and hereby states that it will apply this reservation reciprocally with respect to the Soviet Union".

The Governments of Greece and of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that they do not consider themselves bound by the provisions to which the reservation is made, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

[12] At the 1949 United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport, the Conference placed on record that there would be no objection to a reservation by the United Kingdom in respect of article 26 of the Convention. In the letter transmitting the instrument of ratification of the Convention, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact that ". . . the reservation made in respect of article 26 of the Convention omits the phrase 'and a white surface' between the words 'a red reflex reflector' and the words 'in accordance with the domestic legislation of the United Kingdom,' which were included in the text of the reservation set out in sub-paragraph *(d)* of paragraph 7 of the Final Act of the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport, 1949. This omission is occasioned by the fact that the white surface requirement has since been repealed by United Kingdom legislation."

[13] The Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam had informed the Secretary-General that it objects to the reservation made to article 33 of the Convention. (See also note 9 in chapter III.3 on this subject.)

[14] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 June 1972, the Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations, upon instructions from his Government, made the following statement:

> "Japan has assumed as of May 15, 1972 full responsibility and authority for the exercise of all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over "Okinawa" in accordance with the Agreement between Japan and the United States of America concerning the Ryukyu Islands and the Daito Islands signed on June 17, 1971. Under the United States administration, all vehicles were required to keep to the right side of the road in Okinawa. Upon reversion of Okinawa to Japan, the Government of Japan began to take the measures, in conformity with Article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention on Road Traffic, necessary for shifting the side to which vehicles are required to keep in Okinawa from the right to the left so that there shall be uniformity with the rest of Japan. It is estimated that it will take at least three years before the changes may be smoothly carried out."

Subsequently, in a communication received on 21 August 1978, the Government of Japan informed the Secretary-General that "the said change was completed as of July 30, 1978, there being now the uniformity in Okinawa with the rest of Japan in conformity with article 9, paragraph 1 of the said Convention".

[15] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[16] In a communication received on 11 May 1971, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"At the time of the notification of the extension of this Convention to Jamaica in 1959, the Cayman Islands were a dependency of Jamaica, and the extension of the Convention to Jamaica therefore extended it automatically to the Cayman Islands.

"The Convention continued to apply and still applies to the Cayman Islands, which, when Jamaica became independent remained a territory for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible."

[17] See note 26 in chapter V.2.

[18] See under *"Declarations and Reservations"* in this chapter.

[19] For declarations and reservations made by these territories upon accession or notification of succession after attaining statehood, see under *"Declarations and Reservations"* in this chapter.

[20] Distinctive letters notified to the Secretary-General, prior to the independence of that country, by the Government responsible for its international relations.

2. Protocol concerning Countries or Territories at Present Occupied

Signed at Geneva on 19 September 1949[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 March 1952, at the same time as the Convention.
REGISTRATION: 26 March 1952, No. 1671.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 125, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 17. Parties: 19.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium	19 Sep 1949	23 Apr 1954	Luxembourg	19 Sep 1949	17 Oct 1952
Botswana		3 Jan 1967 *a*	Netherlands	19 Sep 1949	
Cambodia		14 Mar 1956 *a*	Norway	19 Sep 1949	
Chile		10 Aug 1960 *a*	Philippines	19 Sep 1949	
Cuba		1 Oct 1952 *a*	Portugal		28 Dec 1955 *a*
Denmark	19 Sep 1949		South Africa	19 Sep 1949	9 Jul 1952
Dominican Republic	19 Sep 1949	15 Aug 1957	Sweden	19 Sep 1949	
Egypt	19 Sep 1949	28 May 1957	Switzerland	19 Sep 1949	
France	19 Sep 1949	15 Sep 1950	Tunisia		8 Nov 1957 *a*
Guatemala		10 Jan 1962 *a*	Turkey		17 Jan 1956 *a*
Haiti		12 Feb 1958 *a*	Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
India	19 Sep 1949		United Kingdom	19 Sep 1949	8 Jul 1957
Italy	19 Sep 1949	15 Dec 1952	United States of America	19 Sep 1949	30 Aug 1950
Lebanon	19 Sep 1949				

NOTES:

[1] See note at the beginning of chapter XI.B-1.

3. Protocol on Road Signs and Signals

Signed at Geneva on 19 September 1949[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 December 1953, in accordance with article 58.
REGISTRATION: 20 December 1953, No. 1671.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 182, p. 229, and vol. 514, p. 254 (amendments to the Protocol[2]).
STATUS: Signatories: 15. Parties: 37.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	19 Sep 1949	2 Nov 1955
Belgium	19 Sep 1949	23 Apr 1954
Bulgaria		13 Feb 1963 *a*
Cambodia		14 Mar 1956 *a*
Cuba		1 Oct 1952 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark	19 Sep 1949	1 Jul 1959
Dominican Republic		15 Aug 1957 *a*
Ecuador		26 Sep 1962 *a*
Egypt	19 Sep 1949	28 May 1957
Finland		24 Sep 1958 *a*
France	19 Sep 1949	18 Aug 1954
Greece		1 Jul 1952 *a*
Haiti		12 Feb 1958 *a*
Holy See		1 Oct 1956 *a*
Hungary		30 Jul 1962 *a*
India	29 Dec 1949	
Israel	19 Sep 1949	
Italy	19 Sep 1949	15 Dec 1952
Kyrgyzstan		22 Mar 1994 *a*
Lebanon	19 Sep 1949	
Luxembourg	19 Sep 1949	17 Oct 1952
Monaco		25 Sep 1951 *a*
Netherlands	19 Sep 1949	19 Sep 1952
Niger		5 Mar 1968 *a*
Norway	19 Sep 1949	
Poland		29 Oct 1958 *a*
Portugal		15 Feb 1957 *a*
Romania		26 Jan 1961 *a*
Russian Federation		17 Aug 1959 *a*
Rwanda		5 Aug 1964 *d*
San Marino		19 Mar 1962 *a*
Senegal		13 Jul 1962 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain		13 Feb 1958 *a*
Sweden	19 Sep 1949	25 Feb 1952
Switzerland	19 Sep 1949	
Thailand		15 Aug 1962 *a*
Tunisia		8 Nov 1957 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom		16 May 1966 *a*
Yugoslavia	19 Sep 1949	8 Oct 1956

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA[4]

Subject to the reservation in respect of paragraph 1 of article 45 contained in paragraph 7 *(f)* of the Final Act of the Conference on Road and Motor Transport.

BULGARIA[5]

FINLAND

"With reference to article 15, paragraph 5 of this Protocol, the Government of Finland reserve the right to use the Saint Andrew's Cross at level-crossings with gates."

HUNGARY[6]

"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of paragraph 5, article 15 of the Protocol which stipulates that level-crossings with gates shall not be provided with a sign in the form of a Saint Andrew's cross."

NORWAY[8]

Subject to the reservation in respect of paragraph 5 of article 15 contained in paragraph 7 *(e)* of the Final Act of the Conference on Road and Motor Transport.

ROMANIA

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 62, under which any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Protocol may be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision by application from any of the States concerned. The position of the Romanian People's Republic is that the agreement of all the parties in dispute is required in each case for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[7]

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 62 of the Protocol on Road Signs and Signals, which lays down that disputes between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Protocol may be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision by application from any of the States concerned, and declares that the agreement of all the States in dispute is required in each separate case for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision.

SWEDEN[8]

Subject to the reservation in respect of paragraph 5 of article 15 contained in paragraph 7 *e)* of the Final Act of the Conference on Road and Motor Transport.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[9]	14 Jan 1955	Surinam and the Netherlands New Guinea
	9 May 1957	The Netherlands Antilles
Portugal	15 Feb 1957	Portuguese Overseas Provinces of Angola and Mozambique
Spain	13 Feb 1958	African localities and provinces

NOTES:

[1] See note at the beginning of chapter XI.B-1.

[2] Registration: 22 October 1964, No. 1671. The proposal for these amendments was communicated to the Secretary-General by the Government of France on 3 February 1964 pursuant to paragraph 1 of article 60 of the Protocol. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the same article, they entered into force on 22 October 1964 as regards all the Contracting Parties, with the exception that the Government of Portugal, having notified the Secretary-General of its objection to the amendment adding new paragraph 3^{bis} to article 35, is not bound by that amendment. For the text of the Protocol incorporating the said amendments, see *United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport, Final Act and Related Documents* (United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1967.VIII.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Protocol on 28 December 1949 and 3 November 1950, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The said reservation reads as follows:

"That the signs for the special identification of routes in Austria may be either rectangular or circular in shape."

[5] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 62. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 453, p. 354.

[6] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 62 of the Protocol made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 434, p. 290.

[7] The Government of Greece has informed the Secretary-General that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions to which the reservation is made, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

[8] The said reservation reads as follows:

"That the use of the Saint Andrew's Cross at level-crossings with gates shall be permitted in Sweden and Norway."

[9] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

4. European Agreement supplementing the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic and the 1949 Protocol on Road Signs and Signals

Signed at Geneva on 16 September 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 December 1953, in accordance with article 4.
REGISTRATION: 20 December 1953, No. 1671.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 182, p. 286 and vol. 1137, p. 484 (termination).
STATUS: Signatories: 4. Parties: 13.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Austria[1]	28 Jun 1951	2 Nov 1955
Belgium	16 Sep 1959	23 Apr 1954
France		16 Sep 1950 *s*
Greece		1 Jul 1952 *a*
Holy See		1 Oct 1956 *a*
Hungary[2]		30 Jul 1962 *a*
Italy		30 Mar 1957 *a*
Luxembourg	16 Sep 1950	17 Oct 1952
Netherlands[3]	16 Sep 1950	4 Dec 1952 *s*
Poland		29 Oct 1958 *a*
Spain		9 Jun 1960 *a*
United Kingdom		16 May 1966 *a*
Yugoslavia		16 Sep 1950 *s*

NOTES:

[1] In a communication received on 15 October 1971, the Government of Austria denounced, in accordance with article 3 of the Agreement, the addendum, in article 1 of that Agreement, to annex 1 of the 1949 Convention.

[2] With the declaration that "the Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 5 of the Agreement".

[3] In a communication received on 4 December 1952, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that the reservation as to ratification, made on its behalf upon signature of the Agreement, is to be considered as having been withdrawn. Consequently, the date of 4 December 1952 should be considered as the date of the definitive signature.

5. European Agreement on the Application of article 3 of Annex 7 of the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic Concerning the Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Permitted to Travel on Certain Roads of the Contracting Parties

Signed at Geneva on 16 September 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 April 1954, in accordance with article 5.
REGISTRATION: 23 April 1954, No. 1671.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 189, p. 366.
STATUS: Signatories: 2. Parties: 2.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification*
Belgium	16 Sep 1950	23 Apr 1954	Luxembourg	16 Sep 1950	17 Oct 1952
France[1]		[16 Sep 1950 *s*]			

NOTES:

1 Notice of denunciation of the Agreement was given by the Government of France on 26 May 1954.

6. European Agreement on the Application of article 23 of the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic concerning the Dimensions and Weights of Vehicles Permitted to Travel on Certain Roads of the Contracting Parties

Signed at Geneva on 16 September 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1952, in accordance with article 5.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1952, No. 1671.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 133, p. 368; vol. 251, p. 378 (addendum to the annex) and vol. 1137, p. 484 (termination).
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 6.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium	16 Sep 1950	23 Apr 1954	Luxembourg	16 Sep 1950	17 Oct 1952
France[1]		[16 Sep 1950 *s*]	Netherlands[2]	16 Sep 1950	4 Dec 1952 *s*
Greece		1 Jul 1952 *a*	Yugoslavia		16 Sep 1950 *s*
Italy		30 Mar 1957 *a*			

NOTES:

[1] In a communication received on 27 March 1961, the Government of France gave notice of the denunciation of the Agreement, which took effect on 27 September 1961.

[2] In a communication received on 4 December 1952, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that the reservation as to ratification, made on its behalf upon signature, is to be considered as having been withdrawn. Consequently, the date of 4 December 1952 should be considered as the date of the definitive signature.

7. Declaration on the Construction of Main International Traffic Arteries

Signed at Geneva on 16 September 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 September 1950, in accordance with paragraph 6.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1951, No. 1264.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 92, p. 91.[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 2. Parties: 26.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria		1 Oct 1951 *a*
Belgium	16 Sep 1950	23 Apr 1954
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria		8 May 1962 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		8 Jun 1966 *a*
Finland		9 Sep 1965 *a*
France		16 Sep 1950 *s*
Germany[3]		13 Nov 1957 *a*
Greece		1 Jul 1952 *a*
Hungary		5 Dec 1962 *a*
Ireland		20 May 1968 *a*
Italy		30 Mar 1957 *a*
Luxembourg		16 Sep 1950 *s*
Netherlands[4]	16 Sep 1950	4 Dec 1952 *s*
Norway		15 Dec 1953 *a*
Poland		26 Sep 1960 *a*
Portugal		1 Apr 1954 *a*
Romania		7 Apr 1965 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		25 Mar 1960 *a*
Sweden		31 Mar 1952 *a*
Turkey		10 Jun 1954 *a*
United Kingdom		16 Sep 1950 *s*
Yugoslavia		18 Nov 1960 *a*

NOTES:

[1] For additions and amendments to annexes I and II to the Declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 92, p. 122; vol. 108, p. 321; vol. 133, p. 365; vol. 184, p. 344; vol. 203, p. 336; vol. 451, p. 326; vol. 645, p. 348 and p. 350; vol. 651, p. 350, and vol. 764, p. 337 (corrigendum to vol. 645, p. 350).

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Declaration on 6 March 1973. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication received on 4 December 1952, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that the reservation as to ratification, made on its behalf upon signature, is to be considered as having been withdrawn. Consequently, the date of 4 December 1952 should be considered as the date of the definitive signature.

8. General Agreement on Economic Regulations for International Road Transport

(a) Additional Protocol

(b) Protocol of Signature

Concluded at Geneva on 17 March 1954

NOT YET IN FORCE: With the exception of the Additional Protocol[1] (see article 10 of the Agreement and the penultimate paragraph of the Protocol of Signature).
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/186 (E/ECE/TRANS/460), 22 March 1954.
STATUS: Signatories: 10. Parties: 4.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium	17 Mar 1954		Netherlands	17 Mar 1954	
Denmark	17 Mar 1954		Norway		17 Jan 1956 *a*
France		17 Mar 1954 *s*	Sweden	17 Mar 1954	
Greece	17 Mar 1954	11 Dec 1956	Switzerland	17 Mar 1954	
Italy	17 Mar 1954	18 Oct 1957	United Kingdom	17 Mar 1954	
Luxembourg	17 Mar 1954		Yugoslavia	17 Mar 1954	

(c) Protocol relating to the adoption of Annex C. 1 to the Set of Rules annexed to the General Agreement on Economic Regulations for International Road Transport

Concluded at Geneva on 1 July 1954

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see preamble).
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/186 (E/ECE/TRANS/460), Add.1, 21 September 1954.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium	1 Jul 1954		Luxembourg	1 Jul 1954	
France		1 Jul 1954 *s*	Netherlands	1 Jul 1954	

NOTE:

[1] Paragraph 3 of the Additional Protocol provides that it "shall enter into force on the date of its signature and shall be considered as an integral part of the General Agreement on the date of entry into force of the Agreement".

9. Agreement on Signs for Road Works, amending the European Agreement of 16 September 1950 Supplementing the 1949 Convention on Road Traffic and the 1949 Protocol on Road Signs and Signals[1]

Concluded at Geneva on 16 December 1955

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 2).
TEXT: Doc.E/ECE/223 (E/ECE/TRANS/481), 1956.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 12.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	16 Dec 1955		Luxembourg	16 Dec 1955	3 Jun 1957
Belgium	16 Dec 1955	28 May 1956	Netherlands[2]	16 Dec 1955	31 Jan 1958
France		16 Dec 1955 *s*	Poland		29 Oct 1958 *a*
Greece	16 Dec 1955		Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Holy See		1 Oct 1956 *a*	Spain		9 Jun 1960 *a*
Hungary		30 Jul 1962 *a*	United Kingdom		16 May 1966 *a*
Italy		12 Feb 1958 *a*	Yugoslavia	16 Dec 1955	19 Mar 1957

NOTES:

[1] For the Agreement of 16 September 1950, see chapter XI.B-4.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

10. Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic

Done at Geneva on 18 May 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 August 1959, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 18 August 1959, No. 4844.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 339, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 9. Parties: 22.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Australia		3 May 1961 *a*
Austria	18 May 1956	12 Nov 1958
Belgium	18 May 1956	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Cambodia		22 Sep 1959 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		9 Feb 1968 *a*
Finland		18 May 1956 *s*
France	18 May 1956	20 May 1959
Germany[2,3]		7 Jul 1961 *a*
Ghana		18 Aug 1959 *a*
Ireland		31 May 1962 *a*
Luxembourg	18 May 1956	28 May 1965
Malta		22 Nov 1966 *a*
Netherlands	18 May 1956	20 Apr 1959
Norway		9 Jul 1965 *a*
Poland	18 May 1956	4 Sep 1969
Republic of Moldova		26 May 1993 *a*
Romania		10 Jul 1967 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Sweden	18 May 1956	16 Jan 1958
United Kingdom	18 May 1956	15 Jan 1963
Yugoslavia	18 May 1956	8 Apr 1960

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

POLAND

"The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 10 of the Convention."

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 10, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention, its position being that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention cannot be submitted to arbitration without the consent of all the parties in dispute.

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania believes that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the regulations of article 9 of the Convention refer is not in harmony with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1960 in resolution 1514 (XV), in which the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations is proclaimed.

SLOVAKIA[1]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	3 May 1961	Papua and Trust Territory of New Guinea
Netherlands[4]	20 Apr 1959	Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea
United Kingdom	15 Jan 1963	Jersey, Guernsey, Alderney and the Isle of Man
	6 Jun 1963	Falkland Islands and Gilbraltar
	18 Jul 1963	Seychelles and Virgin Islands
	26 Jul 1963	St. Lucia and Montserrat
	8 Nov 1963	St. Vincent, Brunei, Zanzibar and British Guiana
	6 May 1964	Mauritius

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 2 July 1962, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 431, p. 316. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin as from the date on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3. See also note 2 above.

[4] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

11. Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR)

Done at Geneva on 19 May 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 July 1961, in accordance with article 43.
REGISTRATION: 2 July 1961, No. 5742.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 399, p. 189.
STATUS: Signatories: 10. Parties: 38.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	19 May 1956	18 Jul 1960
Belarus		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Belgium	19 May 1956	18 Sep 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria		20 Oct 1977 *a*
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		28 Jun 1965 *a*
Estonia		3 May 1993 *a*
Finland		27 Jun 1973 *a*
France	19 May 1956	20 May 1959
Germany[2, 3]	19 May 1956	7 Nov 1961
Greece		24 May 1977 *a*
Hungary		29 Apr 1970 *a*
Ireland		31 Jan 1991 *a*
Italy		3 Apr 1961 *a*
Kazakstan		17 Jul 1995 *a*
Latvia		14 Jan 1994 *a*
Lithuania		17 Mar 1993 *a*
Luxembourg	19 May 1956	20 Apr 1964
Morocco		23 Feb 1995 *a*
Netherlands[4]	19 May 1956	27 Sep 1960
Norway		1 Jul 1969 *a*
Poland	19 May 1956	13 Jun 1962
Portugal		22 Sep 1969 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 May 1993 *a*
Russian Federation		2 Sep 1983 *a*
Romania		23 Jan 1973 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		12 Feb 1974 *a*
Sweden	19 May 1956	2 Apr 1969
Switzerland	19 May 1956	27 Feb 1970
Tunisia		24 Jan 1994 *a*
Turkey		2 Aug 1995 *a*
United Kingdom		21 Jul 1967 *a*
Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Yugoslavia	19 May 1956	22 Oct 1958

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BULGARIA[5]

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

HUNGARY[6]

Declaration:

"1. The Hungarian People's Republic deems it necessary to call attention to the discriminative character of article 42 of the Convention by which a number of States are debarred from accession to the Convention. The matters regulated by the Convention concern the interests of all States, and therefore, in conformity with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, no State should be prevented from becoming a Party to such a Convention.

"2. The Hungarian People's Republic points out that the provisions of article 46 of the Convention are contrary to the principle of international law recording the self-determination of peoples as well as to United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

IRELAND

Declaration:

"Accession does not imply acceptance of the term 'Republic of' used in the first paragraph [of the Protocol of Signature to the Convention]."

MOROCCO

Reservation:

Pursuant to article 48 of the said Convention, the Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 47 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiation or other means may, at the request of anyone of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred for settlement to the International Court of Justice.

The Kingdom of Morocco declares that in order for a dispute between two or more Parties to be referred to the International Court of Justice, it is necessary to have the consent of all States Parties to the dispute in each individual case.

POLAND

The Government of the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 47 of the Convention.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, pursuant to article 48 of the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), done at Geneva on 19 May 1956, that it does not consider itself as bound by article 47 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation or other

means may, at the request of any one of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

Declaration:

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of article 42, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention are not in keeping with the principle that multilateral international treaties must be open for participation by all States for which the aim and purpose of such treaties are of concern.

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the maintenance of the dependent status of certain territories to which reference is made in article 46 of the Convention is not in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the documents adopted by the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, unanimously adopted in 1970 by the General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV), which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of article 46 of the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road, 1956, to the effect that Contracting Parties may extend the Convention to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outmoded and at variance with Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly [resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960].

Reservation:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 47 of the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road, 1956, to the effect that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute, and states that the referral of such a dispute to the International Court of Justice must be subject to the agreement of all the parties to the dispute in each specific case.

SLOVAKIA[1]

TURKEY

Reservation:

"The Republic of Turkey does not consider itself bound by article 47 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation or other means may, at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred to the International Court of Justice."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom[7]	31 Oct 1968	Gibraltar
	12 Nov 1969	Isle of Man
	3 Mar 1972	Bailiwick of Guernsey

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 4 September 1974, with a reservation. Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 47 made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 948, p. 525. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention, with a reservation, on 27 December 1973. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 78. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 7 November 1961, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention "will also apply to Land Berlin, as from the date on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications were received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The communications in question are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Upon accession to the Convention, on 27 December 1973, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made on the same subject a declaration identical in essence to that reproduced in the fourth paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3.

The latter declaration gave rise to communications from the Governments of the following States: France, United Kingdom and United States of America (received on 17 June 1974), Federal Republic of Germany (received on 15 July 1974). The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Upon accession to the Convention on 2 September 1983, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made a declaration to the effect that it reaffirms that the extension by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany of the Convention to *"Land Berlin"* is illegal.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3, as follows:

Participant	*Date of the communication:*
France, United Kingdom, United States of America	26 Jul 1984
Federal Republic of Germany	27 Aug 1984

Participant	*Date of the communication:*
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ...	2 Dec 1985
France, United Kingdom, United States of America	6 Oct 1986
Federal Republic of Germany	15 Jan 1987

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 47. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1057, p. 328.

[6] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 47 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 725, p. 375.

[7] The Government of Spain declared in its instrument of accession to the Convention that Spain did not consider itself bound by the United Kingdom communication notifying the extension of the Convention to Gibraltar, since it would not apply the Convention to Gibraltar by reason of the fact that article X of the Treaty of Utrecht signed on 13 July 1713 did not grant Gibraltar communication by land with Spain. In a subsequent communication, received on 12 February 1974, the Government of Spain stated that in making the above-quoted declaration its intention was not to formulate a reservation that might be covered by article 48 (3) of the Convention, but to place on record the fact that Spain did not consider itself bound by the communication from the Government of the United Kingdom, a communication which had no legal force whatever inasmuch as it was contrary to article X of the Treaty of Utrecht.

Subsequently, on 11 September 1974, a communication was received from the Government of the United Kingdom to the effect that that Government did not accept the statements made by the Government of Spain in its instrument of accession and in the letter received by the Secretary-General on 12 February 1974, concerning the effect of article X of the Treaty of Utrecht and the legal force of the notification by the Government of the United Kingdom of the extension of the Convention to Gibraltar.

11. *(a)* Protocol to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR)

Concluded at Geneva on 5 July 1978

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 December 1980, in accordance with article 4 (1).
REGISTRATION: 28 December 1980, No. 19487.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1208, p. 427.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 24.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirty-eighth (special) session held at Geneva on 5 July 1978. The Protocol is open for signature at Geneva from 1 September 1978 to 31 August 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Austria		19 Feb 1981 *a*	Lithuania		17 Mar 1993 *a*
Belgium		6 Jun 1983 *a*	Luxembourg	30 Mar 1979	1 Aug 1980
Denmark	23 Aug 1979	20 May 1980	Netherlands[3]		28 Jan 1986 *a*
Estonia		17 Dec 1993 *a*	Norway		31 Aug 1984 *a*
Finland	17 Aug 1979	15 May 1980	Portugal		22 Aug 1989 *a*
France		14 Apr 1982 *a*	Romania	28 Aug 1979	4 May 1981
Germany[1, 2]	1 Nov 1978	29 Sep 1980	Spain		11 Oct 1982 *a*
Greece		16 May 1985 *a*	Sweden		30 Apr 1985 *a*
Hungary		18 Jun 1990 *a*	Switzerland		10 Oct 1983 *a*
Ireland		31 Jan 1991 *a*	Tunisia		24 Jan 1994 *a*
Italy		17 Sep 1982 *a*	Turkey		2 Aug 1995 *a*
Latvia		14 Jan 1994 *a*	United Kingdom[4]	25 Sep 1978	5 Oct 1979

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic, referring to article 9 of the Protocol, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 8, which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

ROMANIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, pursuant to article 9 of the Protocol to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), done at Geneva on 19 May 1956, that it does not consider itself bound by article 8 of the Protocol, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the Protocol which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other means may, at the request of any one of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Socialist Republic of Romania further declares that the provisions of article 3, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Protocol are not in keeping with the principle that multilateral international treaties must be open for participation by all States for which the aim and purpose of such treaties are of concern.

The Socialist Republic of Romania likewise declares that the maintenance of the dependent status of certain territories, to which reference is made in article 7 of the Protocol, is not in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations unanimously adopted in 1970 by the General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV), which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

With reference to new paragraphs 7 and 9 of article 23 of the CMR, which have been added in accordance with article 2 of the Protocol, the Swiss Federal Council declares that Switzerland calculates the value of its national currency in terms of the Special Drawing Right (SDR) in the following manner:

Each day, the Swiss National Bank (BNS) communicates to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) the average rate for the United States Dollar on the Zurich currency market. The exchange value of an SDR in Swiss Francs is obtained using that exchange rate for the dollar and the exchange rate of the SDR against the Dollar, as calculated by IMF. On the basis of those values, BNS calculates an average rate for the SDR, which it publishes in its monthly bulletin.

TURKEY

Reservation:

"The Republic of Turkey does not consider itself bound by article 8 of the Additional Protocol, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation or other means may, at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred to the International Court of Justice."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	19 Apr 1982	Isle of Man
	9 Oct 1986	Bailiwick of Guernsey

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] With declaration to the effect that the said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 1 above and note 3 in chapter XI.B.11.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Gibraltar.

12. Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles Engaged in International Goods Transport

Done at Geneva on 14 December 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 August 1962, in accordance with article 5.
REGISTRATION: 29 August 1962, No. 6292.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 436, p. 115.
STATUS: Signatories: 5. Parties: 17.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	14 Dec 1956	7 Apr 1960
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Cuba		14 Feb 1966 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		9 Feb 1968 *a*
Finland		11 Jan 1967 *a*
Ghana		29 Aug 1962 *a*
Ireland		31 May 1962 *a*
Luxembourg	20 Feb 1957	28 May 1965
Morocco		29 Aug 1962 *a*
Netherlands[2]	15 May 1957	1 Aug 1986
Norway		17 May 1957 *s*
Poland	14 Dec 1956	4 Sep 1969
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Sweden	14 Dec 1956	16 Jan 1958
United Kingdom		6 Aug 1969 *a*
Yugoslavia		29 May 1959 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

CUBA

In accordance with article 10 of this Convention, the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself as bound by the provisions of article 9; instead, it will at all times be prepared to settle any dispute that may arise concerning the interpretation or application of one or more operative parts of this Convention by diplomatic negotiation with the dissenting party or parties.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

MOROCCO

If the point of departure and the destination of vehicles engaged in transport are both in Moroccan territory, those vehicles shall not enjoy the privileges granted under the said Convention. [See paragraph 2 of article 3 of the Convention.]

POLAND

"The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 9 of the Convention."

SLOVAKIA[1]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	24 Feb 1970	Isle of Man

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 2 July 1962, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 436, p. 116. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

13. Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles Engaged in International Passenger Transport

Done at Geneva on 14 December 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 August 1962, in accordance with article 5.
REGISTRATION: 29 August 1962, No. 6293.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 436, p. 131.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 17.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	14 Dec 1956	7 Apr 1960
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Cuba		16 Sep 1965 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		9 Feb 1968 *a*
Finland		11 Jan 1967 *a*
Ghana		29 Aug 1962 *a*
Ireland		31 May 1962 *a*
Luxembourg	20 Feb 1957	28 May 1965
Netherlands[2]	15 May 1957	1 Aug 1986
Norway		17 May 1957 *s*
Poland	14 Dec 1956	4 Sep 1969
Romania		19 Feb 1968 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Sweden	14 Dec 1956	16 Jan 1958
United Kingdom	17 May 1957	15 Jan 1963
Yugoslavia		29 May 1959 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

CUBA

In accordance with article 10 of this Convention, the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself as bound by the provisions of article 9; instead, it will at all times be prepared to settle any dispute that may arise concerning the interpretation or application of one or more operative parts of this Convention by diplomatic negotiation with the dissenting party or parties.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

POLAND

"The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions contained in paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 9 of the Convention."

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention. The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention can be submitted to arbitration only with the consent of all parties in dispute.

Declaration:

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of article 8 of the Convention apply is not in accordance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1960 in resolution 1514 (XV), which proclaims the need to put an end to colonialism in all its forms and manifestations immediately and unconditionally.

SLOVAKIA[1]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	15 Jan 1963	Jersey, Isle of Man
	6 Jun 1963	Gibraltar

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 2 July 1962, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 436, p. 132. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

14. European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR)

Done at Geneva on 30 September 1957

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 January 1968, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 29 January 1968, No. 8940.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 619, p. 77; vol. 641, p. 3 (French only); vol. 731, p. 3 (English only). For amendments to Annexes A and B, see vol. 774, p. 368; vol. 828, p. 518; vol. 883, p. 174; vol. 907, p. 158; vol. 921, p. 284; vol. 922, p. 282; vol. 926, p. 114; vol. 951, p. 433; vol. 982, p. 313; vol. 987, p. 435; vol. 1003, p. 249; vol. 1023, p. 462; vol. 1035, p. 330; vol. 1074, p. 352; vol. 1107, p. 269; vol. 1161, p. 461; vol. 1162, p. 437; vol. 1259, p. 407; vol. 1279, p. 307; vol. 1297, p. 406; vol. 1344, p. 231; and depositary notifications C.N.324.1984.TREATIES-2 of 20 February 1985; C.N.39.1987.TREATIES-1 of 4 May 1987; C.N.280.1987.TREATIES-3 of 10 December 1987; C.N.86.1989.TREATIES-1 of 22 May 1989; C.N.86.1982.TREATIES-2 of 5 April 1982 and C.N.160.1982.TREATIES-3 of 9 July 1982 (corrigenda to the English and French texts of annexes A and B); C.N.111.1991.TREATIES-1 of 29 July 1991 (amendments to appendix B.6 of annex B, as amended); C.N.209.1992.TREATIES-1 of 30 June 1992 (amendments to annexes A and B, as amended); and C.N.185.1994.TREATIES-2 of 30 June 1994 (amendments to annexes A and B, as amended).
STATUS: Signatories: 9. Parties: 30.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	13 Dec 1957	20 Sep 1973	Lithuania		7 Dec 1995 *a*
Belarus		5 Apr 1993 *a*	Luxembourg	13 Dec 1957	21 Jul 1970
Belgium	18 Oct 1957	25 Aug 1960	Netherlands[3]	13 Dec 1957	1 Nov 1963
Bulgaria		12 May 1995 *a*	Norway		5 Feb 1976 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	Poland		6 May 1975 *a*
Croatia		23 Nov 1992 *d*	Portugal		29 Dec 1967 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		2 June 1993 *d*	Romania		8 Jun 1994 *a*
Denmark		1 Jul 1981 *a*	Russian Federation		28 Apr 1994 *a*
Finland		28 Feb 1979 *a*	Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
France	13 Dec 1957	2 Feb 1960	Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Germany[2,3]	13 Dec 1957	1 Dec 1969	Spain		22 Nov 1972 *a*
Greece		27 May 1988 *a*	Sweden		1 Mar 1974 *a*
Hungary		19 Jul 1979 *a*	Switzerland	6 Nov 1957	20 Jun 1972
Italy	13 Dec 1957	3 Jun 1963	United Kingdom	1 Oct 1957	29 Jun 1968
Liechtenstein		12 Dec 1994 *a*	Yugoslavia		28 May 1971 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

HUNGARY

Reservation:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 11 of the Agreement concerning compulsory arbitration.

LITHUANIA

Statement:

"The distinguishing number assigned to Lithuania for the purpose of vehicle type approval in accordance with marginal 220 403 (1) of Annex B of ADR is 36."

SLOVAKIA[1]

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 17 July 1986, with the following reservation and declaration:

Reservation:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that within the meaning of article 12, para. 1, of the Agreement it does not feel bound by the provisions of article 11, paras. 2 and 3, of the Agreement."

Declaration:

"The provision of article 10 of the Agreement contravenes the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples that was adopted at the XVth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1960 and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic therefore regards the said provision as superseded."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 27 December 1973 with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 905, p. 86. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Agreement "shall also apply to Land Berlin with effect from the date on which it enters force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications have been received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of Bulgaria (on 13 May 1970) and Mongolia (on 22 June 1970). The communications in question are identical in

essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding declarations reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Furthermore, the Government of the German Democratic Republic, upon accession to the Agreement made on the same subject a declaration which is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to that reproduced in note 3 in chapter III.3. The latter declaration in turn gave rise to communications by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received on 17 June 1974 and 8 July 1975), the Federal Republic of Germany (received on 15 July 1974 and19 September 1975) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received on 12 September 1974 and 8 December 1975), which are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, the Government of Hungary, in a note accompanying its instrument of accession, made a declaration identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day [3 October 1990], it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect tot he notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

(*a*) Protocol amending article 14 (3) of the European Agreement of 30 September 1957 concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR)

Concluded at New York on 21 August 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 April 1985, in accordance with article 3 (1).
REGISTRATION: 19 April 1985, No. 8940.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.229.1975.TREATIES-8 of 18 September 1975.
STATUS: Parties: 20.

Note: The text of the Protocol was drawn up by the Group of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods at its special session held in Geneva on 20 January 1975.

Participant	*Acceptance, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Acceptance, succession (d)*
Austria	10 Aug 1976	Netherlands	8 Sep 1977
Belgium	8 Jun 1977	Norway	8 Feb 1977
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Sep 1993 *d*	Poland	14 Jun 1977
Denmark	19 Mar 1985	Portugal	20 Apr 1979
Finland	31 Aug 1979	Slovenia	6 Jul 1992 *d*
France	20 Dec 1977	Spain	5 Dec 1975
Germany[1,2]	4 Mar 1980	Sweden	23 Feb 1976
Hungary	26 Jan 1984	Switzerland	19 Feb 1976
Italy	23 Dec 1981	United Kingdom	13 Feb 1976
Luxembourg	23 Feb 1977	Yugoslavia	1 Oct 1976

NOTES:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol on 10 August 1976. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] With a declaration to the effect that the said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 1 above and note 3 in chapter XI.B.14.

(*b*) Protocol amending article 1 (a), article 14 (1) and article 14 (3) of the European Agreement of 30 September 1957 concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR)

Adopted at Geneva on 28 October 1993

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 6 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/WP.15/CD/6 of 1 December 1993.
STATUS: Signatures : 11. Parties: 15.

Note: The Protocol was adopted on 28 October 1993 at Geneva by the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the 1957 European Agreement concerning the International Transport of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR). In accordance with its article 4 (2), it was open for signature at the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe, in Geneva, from 28 October 1993 to 31 January 1994.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a)*
Austria		8 Aug 1995 *a*
Belgium	25 Jan 1994	
Bulgaria		12 May 1995 *a*
Czech Republic		4 Nov 1994 *a*
Denmark	28 Oct 1993	16 Nov 1995 *A*
Finland		26 Jan 1994 *s*
France	28 Oct 1993	
Germany	19 Jan 1994	
Greece	28 Oct 1993	
Hungary	26 Jan 1994	
Italy	17 Dec 1993	
Liechtenstein		12 Dec 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	28 Oct 1993	3 Oct 1995
Netherlands	28 Oct 1993	21 Nov 1994 *A*
Norway	28 Oct 1993	5 Dec 1995
Poland	31 Jan 1994	
Portugal		10 Jan 1994 *s*
Russian Federation		27 Apr 1995 *a*
Slovakia		26 Jan 1994 *s*
Spain		21 Dec 1994 *a*
Sweden		27 Sep 1995 *a*
United Kingdom		17 Jun 1994 *a*

15. European Agreement on Road Markings

Done at Geneva on 13 December 1957

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 August 1960, in accordance with article 10.
REGISTRATION: 10 August 1960, No. 5296.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 372, p. 159.
STATUS: Signatories: 9. Parties: 16.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Belgium	14 Jan 1958	28 Aug 1958
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		14 Mar 1963 *a*
Cyprus		30 Jul 1973 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
France		4 Feb 1958 *s*
Germany[2,3]	13 Dec 1957	3 Jan 1963
Ghana		10 Aug 1960 *a*
Hungary		30 Jul 1962 *a*
Italy	13 Feb 1958	
Luxembourg	13 Dec 1957	28 Jun 1961
Netherlands[4]	13 Dec 1957	
Portugal	13 Dec 1957	26 Mar 1959
Romania		20 Dec 1963 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain		3 Jan 1961 *a*
Switzerland	17 Feb 1958	
Turkey	28 Feb 1958	25 May 1961
United Kingdom	25 Feb 1958	
Yugoslavia		29 May 1959 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

Belgium does not consider itself bound by article 14 of the Agreement.

BULGARIA[5]

CZECH REPUBLIC[1]

HUNGARY[6]

ROMANIA

The Romanian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the stipulations of paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 14 of this Agreement.

SLOVAKIA[1]

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 12 May 1960, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 372, p. 160. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Agreement "will also apply to Land Berlin, as from the date on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and by the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 14 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 456, p. 500.

[6] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 14 (2) and (3) of the Agreement made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 434, p. 348.

16. Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions*

Done at Geneva on 20 March 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 June 1959, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 20 June 1959, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 335, p. 211; vol. 516, p. 378 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic English and French texts of paragraph 8 of article 1 of the Agreement); vol. 609, p. 290 (amendment to article 1, paragraph 1), and vol. 1059, p. 404 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic French text of article 12, paragraph 2 established by the Secretary–General on 29 November 1977); and depositary notification C.N.351.1994.TREATIES–50 of 16 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP29/409 (amendments*).
STATUS: Signatories: 4. Parties: 29.

*As a result of the entry into force (on 16 October 1995) of the amendments adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its one–hundred–and–third session on 18 August 1994, the title "Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts, done at Geneva on 20 March 1958", was modified accordingly.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria		12 Mar 1971 *a*
Belarus		3 May 1995 *a*
Belgium		7 Jul 1959 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Croatia		17 Mar 1994 *d*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark[2]		21 Oct 1976 *a*
Estonia		2 Mar 1995 *a*
Finland		19 Jul 1976 *a*
France		26 Jun 1958 *s*
Germany[3,4]	19 Jun 1958	29 Nov 1965
Greece		6 Oct 1992 *a*
Hungary	30 Jun 1958	3 May 1960
Italy	28 Mar 1958	25 Feb 1963
Luxembourg		13 Oct 1971 *a*
Netherlands	30 Mar 1958	30 Jun 1960
Norway		3 Feb 1975 *a*
Poland		12 Jan 1979 *a*
Portugal		29 Jan 1980 *a*
Romania		23 Dec 1976 *a*
Russian Federation		19 Dec 1986 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
Spain		11 Aug 1961 *a*
Sweden[5]		21 Apr 1959 *a*
Switzerland		29 Jun 1973 *a*
Turkey		29 Dec 1995 *a*
United Kingdom		15 Jan 1963 *a*
Yugoslavia		14 Feb 1962 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

"The accession of the Republic of Austria covers only the Agreement itself. The Republic of Austria is therefore not bound by any of the Regulations annexed to the Agreement."

BELGIUM

(a) In accordance with article 1, paragraph 6, Belgium declares that it does not consider itself bound by any of the Regulations annexed to the Agreement;
(b) In accordance with article 11, paragraph 1, Belgium declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 10 of the Agreement.

ESTONIA

Reservation:
"[The Government of Estonia] does not consider itself bound by article 10 of the Agreement."

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

HUNGARY

"The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic hereby ratifies the Agreement with the reservation that it does not recognize article 10 of the Agreement as binding upon it."

ITALY

Italy does not consider itself bound by article 10 of the Agreement.

POLAND

Reservation:
The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 10 of the said Agreement.
Declaration:
In accordance with paragraph 6 of article 1 of the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle

Equipment and Parts, done at Geneva on 20 March 1958, the Polish People's Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by any of the Regulations annexed to the above-mentioned Agreement.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, under paragraph 1 of article 11 of the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts, done at Geneva on 20 March 1958, that it does not consider itself bound by article 10 of the Agreement.

Declaration:

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the dependent status of certain territories to which reference is made in article 9 of the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval of Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts, done at Geneva on 20 March 1958, is not in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the documents adopted by the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, unanimously adopted in 1970 by the General Assembly in its resolution 2625 (XXV), which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 10 of the Agreement concerning the adoption of uniform conditions of approval and reciprocal recognition of approval for motor vehicle equipment and parts, of 20 March 1958, and state that, in order for any dispute between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Agreement to be submitted to arbitration, the consent of all the countries involved in the dispute shall be required in each individual case and that only persons appointed by the parties in dispute with their common consent may act as arbitrators.

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to state that the provisions of article 9 of the Agreement concerning the adoption of uniform conditions of approval and reciprocal recognition of approval for motor vehicle equipment and parts, of 20 March 1958, which envisage the possibility of the Contracting Parties extending it to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outmoded and at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960).

SLOVAKIA[1]

SPAIN

Subject to reservations provided for in article 11 of the Agreement.

TURKEY

Reservation:

"Turkey does not consider itself bound by any of the regulations annexed to this Agreement."

Regulations annexed to the Agreement of 20 March 1958 concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts

Regulation No. 1: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor vehicle headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam and/or a driving beam and equipped with filament lamps of category R_2

Regulation No. 2: Uniform provisions concerning approval of incandescent electric lamps for headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam or a driving beam or both

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium, France and Sweden

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 August 1960, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.

REGISTRATION: 8 August 1960, No. 4789.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 372, p. 370; vol. 462, p. 354 (amendments proposed by France); vol. 552, p. 370 (consolidated text of Regulations Nos. 1 and 2, incorporating all amendments, including those proposed by the Netherlands); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.1/Rev.1/Amend.1 and vol. 1106, p. 344 (amendments series 02, Regulation No. 2 only); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.1/Rev.1/Amend.2 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02, Regulation No. 2 only); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.1/Rev.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 to Regulation No. 1 and amendments series 03 to Regulation No. 2); depositary notifications C.N.27.1988.TREATIES–10 of 18 March 1988 (procès-verbal concerning modifications to Regulations Nos. 1 and 2, as revised); C.N.280.1989.TREATIES–47 of 14 December 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/237 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01, Regulation No. 1 only); C.N.71.1992.TREATIES–4 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/305 and 306 (supplement 2 to amendments series 01, Regulation No. 1 only); C.N.170.1992.TREATIES–2 of 2 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/332 (supplement 3 to amendments series 01, Regulation No. 1 only); C.N.264.1993.TREATIES–27 of 14 September 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/366 (supplement 4 to amendments series 01, Regulation No. 1 only); C.N.319.1994.TREATIES–40 of 30 November 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification concerning modifications); C.N.350.1994.TREATIES–49 of 16 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/410 (supplement 5 to amendments series 01); and C.N.211.1995.TREATIES–40 of 7 August 1995 (procès-verbal concerning modifications – Regulation No. 1 only).

STATUS: Parties: 25 (Regulation No. 1). Parties: 24 (Regulation No. 2).

Contracting Parties applying Regulations Nos. 1 and 2

Participant	*Effective date of application: Regulation No. 1*	*Effective date of application: Regulation No. 2*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	30 Apr 1972
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	2 July 1995
Belgium	8 Aug 1960	8 Aug 1960
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	8 Oct 1991
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	1 Jan 1993
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	20 Dec 1976
Finland	17 Sep 1976	17 Sep 1976
France	8 Aug 1960	8 Aug 1960
Germany[3]	2 May 1966	2 May 1966
Greece	3 Dec 1995	3 Dec 1995
Hungary	9 May 1965	8 Aug 1960
Italy	26 Jul 1963	26 Jul 1963
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987	4 Oct 1987
Netherlands (For the Kingdom in Europe)	9 Mar 1962	9 Mar 1962
Norway	21 Feb 1988	21 Feb 1988
Poland	1 Aug 1983	1 Aug 1983
Romania	21 Feb 1977	21 Feb 1977
Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987	17 Feb 1987
Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993	1 Jan 1993
Slovenia	25 Jun 1991	25 Jun 1991
Spain	10 Oct 1961	10 Oct 1961
Sweden	8 Aug 1960	8 Aug 1960
Switzerland	2 Feb 1996	
United Kingdom	30 Jun 1963	30 Jun 1963
Yugoslavia	15 Apr 1962	15 Apr 1962

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
—	France	28 Apr 1963
—	Netherlands	30 Jan 1966
02 (Regulation No. 2 only) (supplement 1)	Netherlands	26 Sep 1978
	Netherlands	29 Aug 1982
01 (Regulation No. 1 only)	Netherlands	18 Mar 1986
03 (Regulation No. 2 only)	Netherlands	9 Mar 1986
01 (Regulation No. 1 only) (supplement 1)	Netherlands	14 May 1990
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	2 Dec 1992
(supplement 4)	Netherlands	14 Feb 1994
(supplement 5)	Netherlands	16 Jun 1995

Regulation No. 3: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of retro-reflecting devices for power-driven vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1963, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1963, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, p. 376; vol. 557, p. 274 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic text); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS.505/Add.2/Rev.1 (Revised text incorporating amendments series 01); vol. 1401, p. 254 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS.505/Add.2/Rev.1/Amend.1 (amendments series 02); depositary notifications C.N.275.1990.TREATIES–43 of 4 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/254 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.266.1993.TREATIES–28 of 15 September 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/367 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); and C.N.245.1995.TREATIES–64 of 15 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/446 (supplement 3 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 3

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands (with respect to its European territory)	11 Mar 1966
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	20 Sep 1969	Poland	1 Aug 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	1 Nov 1963	Spain	26 Feb 1966
Germany[3]	28 Jan 1966	Sweden	30 Aug 1966
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	9 May 1965	United Kingdom	1 Nov 1963
Italy	21 Jun 1964	Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1969
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Germany[3]	20 Mar 1982
02	Netherlands	1 Jul 1985
(supplement 1)	Sweden	4 May 1991
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	15 Feb 1994
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	15 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 4: Uniform provisions for the approval of devices for the illumination of rear registration plates of motor vehicles (except motor cycles) and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 April 1964, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 April 1964, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 493, p. 308, and vol. 932, p. 118 (supplement 1 to the original); depositary notifications C.N.182.1988.TREATIES–42 of 30 September 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/207 (supplement 2 to the original); C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/277 (supplement 3 to the original); C.N.42.1992.TREATIES–1 of 30 March 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/290 (supplement 4 to the original); and C.N.244.1995.TREATIES–63 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/447 (supplement 5 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 4

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands	10 Jan 1971
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	15 Apr 1964	Poland	1 Aug 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	14 May 1977	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	6 Jul 1964	Spain	26 Feb 1966
Germany[3]	28 Jan 1966	Sweden	6 Jul 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	9 May 1965	United Kingdom	25 Sep 1967
Italy	15 Apr 1964	Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1969
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	France	6 May 1974
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	28 Feb 1989
Supplement 3 to the original	Netherlands	5 May 1991
Supplement 4 to the original	Netherlands	30 Aug 1992
Supplement 5 to the original	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 5: Uniform provisions for the approval of motor vehicle "sealed beam" headlamps (SB) emitting a European asymmetrical passing beam or a driving beam or both

Proposed by the Governments of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 September 1967, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 30 September 1967, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 606, p. 324; doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.4/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.205.1987.TREATIES–37 of 6 October 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/139 (amendments series 02); C.N.222.1989.TREATIES–33 of 29 September 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/236 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.71.1992.TREATIES–4 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/306 and 309 (supplement 2 to amendment series 02); and C.N.208.1995.TREATIES–37 of 4 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 5

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands (For its territory in Europe)	30 Sep 1967
Belgium	19 Mar 1972	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Spain	20 Oct 1969
Germany[3]	30 Sep 1967	Sweden	30 Sep 1967
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	30 Sep 1967
Italy	8 Feb 1969	Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1969
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Netherlands	29 Aug 1982
02	Netherlands	6 Mar 1988
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	28 Feb 1990
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992

****

Regulation No. 6: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of direction indicators for motor vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 October 1967, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 October 1967, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 607, p. 282; depositary notifications C.N.245.1986.TREATIES-36 of 27 January 1987 (amendments series 01); C.N.117.1987.TREATIES–22 of 24 July 1987 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.5/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 and modifications); C.N.207.1988.TREATIES–50 of 25 October 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/219 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.223.1989.TREATIES–34 of 29 September 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/239 (supplement 2 to amendments series 01); C.N.38.1990.TREATIES–3 of 10 April 1990 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/271 (supplement 3 to amendments series 01); C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès–verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.173.1992,TREATIES–7 of 2 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/291 (supplement 4 to amendments series 01); C.N.207.1992.TREATIES–24 of 13 August 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/315 (supplement 5 to amendments series 01); and C.N.243.1995.TREATIES–62 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/448 (supplement 6 to amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 6

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands (For its territory in Europe)	15 Oct 1967
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	15 Oct 1967	Poland	1 Aug 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	18 Nov 1979	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	14 May 1977	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	15 Oct 1967	Spain	20 Feb 1971
Germany[3]	15 Oct 1967	Sweden	6 Jul 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	15 Oct 1967
Italy	12 Apr 1968	Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1969
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Italy	27 Jun 1987
(supplement 1)	Italy	25 Mar 1989
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	28 Feb 1990
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	5 May 1991
(supplement 4)	Netherlands	2 Dec 1992
(supplement 5)	Netherlands	13 Jan 1993
(supplement 6)	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 7: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of front and rear position (side) lamps, stop–lamps and end–outline marker lamps for motor vehicles (except motor cycles) and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 October 1967, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 October 1967, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 607, p. 308, and vol. 754, p. 344 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic text), doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.6/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.301.1986.TREATIES–47 of 2 February 1987 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.6/Rev.1/Amend.1 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.181.1988.TREATIES–41 of 7 November 1988 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.323.1988.TREATIES–68 of 24 February 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/204 (supplement 2 to amendments series 01); C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/273 (supplement 3 to amendments series 01); and C.N.69.1992.TREATIES–3 of 24 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/292 (supplement 4 to amendments series 01); C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès–verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.219.1992.TREATIES–29 of 4 September 1992 (procès–verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.214.1993.TREATIES–18 of 26 August 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/368 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); C.N.206.1995.TREATIES–35 of 4 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.242.1995.TREATIES–61 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/449 (supplement 3 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 7

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands (For its territory in Europe)	15 Oct 1967
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	15 Oct 1967	Poland	1 Aug 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	14 May 1977	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	15 Oct 1967	Spain	20 Feb 1971
Germany[3]	15 Oct 1967	Sweden	6 Jul 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	15 Oct 1967
Italy	12 Apr 1968	Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1969
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Netherlands	15 Aug 1985
(supplement 1)	Belgium	2 Jul 1987
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	24 Jul 1989
02	Netherlands	5 May 1991
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	24 Sep 1992
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	26 Jan 1994
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 8: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor vehicle headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam or a driving beam or both and equipped with halogen lamps (H_1, H_2, H_3, HB_3, HB_4 and/or HB_7 lamps)

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 November 1967, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 November 1967, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 609, p. 292; vol. 764, p. 388 (amendments series 01), vol. 932, p. 118 (amendments series 02); vol. 1078, p. 358 (amendments series 03); depositary notifications C.N.330.1985.TREATIES-42 of 6 February 1986 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/125/Rev.1 (amendments series 04); C.N.322.1988.TREATIES-67 of 24 February 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/205 (supplement 1 to amendments series 04); C.N.136.1990.TREATIES-15 of 28 June 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/255 (supplement 2 to amendments series 04); C.N.71.1992.TREATIES-4 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES-33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/306 and 307 (supplement 3 to amendment series 04); C.N.208.1992.TREATIES-25 of 13 August 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/333 (supplement 4 to amendment series 04); C.N.199.1993.TREATIES-17 of 9 September 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/374 (supplement 5 to amendments series 04); C.N.318.1994.TREATIES-39 of 30 November 1994 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.210.1995.TREATIES-39 of 4 August 1995 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 22.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 8

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands	
Belgium	15 Nov 1967	(For its territory in Europe)	15 Nov 1967
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	15 Nov 1967	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	15 Nov 1967	Spain	15 Nov 1967
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	Sweden	15 Nov 1967
Italy	26 Mar 1976	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985	United Kingdom	30 Mar 1969
		Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1969

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	25 Jan 1971
02	France	6 May 1974
03	France	12 Mar 1978
04	Netherlands	6 Jul 1986
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	24 Jul 1989
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	28 Nov 1990
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992
(supplement 4)	Netherlands	13 Jan 1993
(supplement 5)	Netherlands	9 Feb 1994

****

Regulation No. 9: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of three–wheeled vehicles with regard to noise

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1969, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1969, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 659, p. 342; vol. 917, p. 303 (amendments series 01 only) and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.8/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); Amend.1 and vol. 1181, p. 323 (amendments series 02); Amend.2 (amendments series 03), and Amend.3 and vol. 1363, p. 256 (amendments series 04); and depositary notification C.N.245.1993.TREATIES–26 of 26 August 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/355 (amendments series 05).
STATUS: Parties: 14.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 9

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983
Belgium	11 Oct 1976	Poland	1 Aug 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	Spain	20 Feb 1971
Italy	1 Mar 1969	Yugoslavia	1 Mar 1969

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Italy	17 Feb 1974
02	Czech Republic	1 Jun 1980
03	Belgium[6]	1 Oct 1982
04	Italy	23 Jul 1984
05	Italy	26 Jan 1994

****

Regulation No. 10: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to radio interference suppression

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1969, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1969, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 667, p. 316, and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.9/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 23.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 10

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	22 Jan 1974
Belgium	7 Mar 1976	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	24 Mar 1978	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	19 Aug 1977	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Apr 1969	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	24 May 1970	Spain	20 Feb 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	5 Sep 1971
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	1 Apr 1969
Italy	27 Dec 1975	Yugoslavia	23 Apr 1973
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Germany[3]	19 Mar 1978

****

Regulation No. 11: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to door latches and door retention components

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and France

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1969, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1969, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 673, p. 354; vol. 932, p. 118 (amendments series 01); vol. 1218, p. 347 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.10/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 02); vol. 1276, p. 498 (rectification of English and French texts); depositary notification C.N.287.1985. TREATIES–33 of 20 November 1985 and doc. TRANS/SCI/WP29/133 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 23.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 11

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands (For its territory in Europe)	1 Jun 1969
Belgium	1 Jun 1969	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Jun 1969	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	24 May 1970	Spain	28 Dec 1975
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	6 Jul 1971
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	1 Jun 1969
Italy	17 Sep 1975	Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1983
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Belgium	6 May 1974
02	United Kingdom	15 Mar 1981
(supplement 1)	Italy	20 Apr 1986

****

Regulation No. 12: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the protection of the driver against the steering mechanism in the event of impact

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1969, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1969, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 680, p. 338; vol. 951, p. 400 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01), doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Add.11/Rev.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 02); depositary notifications C.N.290.1986.TREATIES–40 of 2 February 1987 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); C.N.37.1988.TREATIES–14 of 28 April 1988 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); C.N.471.1992.TREATIES–58 of 24 March 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP/344 (amendments series 03): and C.N.212.1995.TREATIES–41 of 7 August 1995 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 20.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 12

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	19 Mar 1972	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
France	1 Jul 1969	Spain	13 May 1991
Germany[3]	16 Sep 1972	Sweden	26 Dec 1969
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	17 Sep 1975	United Kingdom	1 Jul 1969
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983		
Netherlands (For its territory in Europe)	1 Jul 1969		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	20 Oct 1974
02	France	14 Nov 1982
03	Italy	24 Aug 1993

****

Regulation No. 13: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles of categories M, N and O with regard to braking

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1970, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1970, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 730, p. 342; vol. 887, p. 52 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); vol. 943, p. 350 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 to 04); vol. 1380, p. 309 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.12/Rev.2/Amend.2 and Corr.1 (amendments series 05); vol. 1392, p. 557 (Addendum); depositary notifications C.N.235.1986.TREATIES–34 of 1 November 1986 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.12/Rev.2/Amend.3 (supplement 1 to amendments series 05); C.N.57.1987.TREATIES–12 of 5 May 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/172 (supplement 2 to amendments series 05); C.N.334.1987. TREATIES–63 of 29 February 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/197 (supplement 3 to amendments series 05); C.N.127.1990.TREATIES–13 of 22 June 1990 and C.N.213.1990.TREATIES–31 of 24 September 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/264 and Corr.1 (amendments series 06 and corrigendum); C.N.80.1992.TREATIES–5 of 15 June 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.563 (supplement 1 to amendments series 06); C.N.467.1992.TREATIES–56 of 24 March 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/345 (supplement 2 to amendments series 06); C.N.22.1994.TREATIES–4 of 18 April 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/378 and Corr.1 (amendments series 07); and C.N.277.1994.TREATIES–26 of 26 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP.29/397 (amendments series 08).
STATUS: Parties: 23.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 13

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	1 Jun 1970
Belgium	11 Oct 1976	Norway	24 May 1993
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	5 Jun 1981
Denmark	2 Apr 1994	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	21 Jul 1980	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	29 Nov 1980	Spain	6 Feb 1989
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	30 Nov 1979
Italy	1 Jun 1970	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Italy	29 Aug 1973
02	Netherlands	11 Jul 1974
03	Netherlands	4 Jan 1979
04	Belgium	11 Aug 1981
05	United Kingdom	26 Nov 1984
(Addendum)	United Kingdom	20 Mar 1985
(supplement 1)	United Kingdom	1 Apr 1987
(supplement 2)	Italy	5 Oct 1987
(supplement 3)	Italy	29 Jul 1988
06	United Kingdom	22 Nov 1990
(supplement 1)	United Kingdom	15 Nov 1992
(supplement 2)	United Kingdom	24 Aug 1993
07	United Kingdom	18 Sep 1994
08	United Kingdom	26 Mar 1995

****

Regulation No. 14: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to safety–belt anchorages on passenger cars

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1970, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1970, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 723, p. 302; vol. 778, p. 372 (amendments proposed by France); vol. 1006, p. 411 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev. 1/Add. 13/Rev. 1, Corr. 1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); Corr. 2 and 3; vol. 1143, p. 284 (rectifications); vol. 1380, p. 296 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.13/Rev.1/Amend.1/Corr.1 (amendments series 02); vol. 1392, p. 558 (addendum to amendments series 02); depositary notifications C.N.141.1991.TREATIES–20 of 29 August 1991 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/281 and Add.1 (amendments series 03); C.N.232.1992.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications to amendments series 02 and 03); and C.N.383.1993. TREATIES–35 of 19 November 1993 (procès–verbal of rectification concerning certain modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 24.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 14

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	1 Apr 1970
Belgium	11 Dec 1970	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	3 Jun 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	31 Aug 1979
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Apr 1970	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	27 Mar 1973	Spain	20 Jul 1973
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	11 Mar 1978
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	Switzerland	2 Jul 1982
Italy	15 Jun 1976	United Kingdom	8 Nov 1977
Luxembourg	1 May 1983	Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1983

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
—	France	21 May 1971
01	Netherlands	28 Apr 1976
02	Italy	22 Nov 1984
Addendum	Italy	20 Mar 1985
03	United Kingdom	29 Jan 1992

****

Regulation No. 15: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles equipped with a positive–ignition engine or with a compression–ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine – method of measuring the power of positive–ignition engines – method of measuring the fuel consumption of vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1970, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1970, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 740, p. 364; vol. 955, p. 446 (amendments series 01); vol. 1037, p. 403 (amendments series 02) and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.14/Rev.3, and vol. 1078, p. 351 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 to 04) and Corr.1 (English only); vol. 1358, p. 295 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.14/ Rev.3/Amend.1 (supplement to amendments series 04); and depositary notification C.N.196.1988. TREATIES–49 of 21 October 1988 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 4.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 15

Participant[7]	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria[7]	[10 Dec 1979]	Netherlands[7]	[29 May 1971]
Belgium[7]	[11 Dec 1970]	Norway[7]	[4 Apr 1975]
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	1 May 1977
Denmark[7]	[7 Feb 1984]	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland[7]	[19 Aug 1977]	Slovenia[7]	[25 Jun 1991]
France[7]	[1 Aug 1970]	Spain[7]	[1 Aug 1970]
Germany[3,7]	[16 Sep 1972]	Switzerland[7]	[28 Aug 1973]
Hungary[7]	[18 Oct 1976]	United Kingdom[7]	[17 Jul 1972]
Italy[7]	[14 Apr 1973]	Yugoslavia	27 Aug 1976
Luxembourg[7]	[1 Oct 1983]		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	11 Dec 1974
02	United Kingdom[8]	1 Mar 1977
03	France	6 Mar 1978
04	France	20 Oct 1981
(supplement)	France	1 Jun 1984

****

Regulation No. 16: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of safety-belts and restraint systems for adult occupants of power-driven vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1970, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1970, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 756, p. 232; vol. 820, p. 420 (amendments series 01); vol. 893, p. 330 (amendments series 02 only) and doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.15/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 and 02); vol. 1153, p. 435 and doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.15/Rev.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 03), and Corr.1 (rectification to paragraphs 7.7.1.1 of the English and French texts); depositary notifications C.N.159.1985.TREATIES-19 of 22 July 1985 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/132, Corr.1 and 2 (amendments series 04); C.N.314.1987.TREATIES-61 of 15 January 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/198 (supplement 1 to amendments series 04); C.N.43.1988.TREATIES-15 of 8 April 1988 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); C.N.213.1988.TREATIES-55 of 26 October 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/221 (supplement 2 to amendments series 04); C.N.105.1989. TREATIES-19 of 20 June 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/240 (supplement 3 to amendments series 04); C.N.221.1990.TREATIES-33 of 9 November 1990 (modifications); C.N.83.1992. TREATIES-6 of 4 May 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/285 (supplement 4 to amendments series 04); C.N.466.1992.TREATIES-55 of 16 March 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/348 (supplement 5 to amendments series 04); C.N.196.1993.TREATIES-15 of 26 August 1993 (procès-verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.215.1993.TREATIES-19 of 29 August 1993 (procès-verbal concerning certain modifications); and C.N.119.1995.TREATIES-25 of 18 May 1995 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP.29/429 (supplement 6 to amendments series 04).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 16

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	23 Nov 1980	Netherlands	1 Dec 1970
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	1 Dec 1970	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	31 Aug 1979
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1986
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	1 Dec 1970	Spain	6 May 1973
Germany[3]	14 May 1973	Sweden	12 Oct 1980
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Jul 1982
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	United Kingdom	1 Apr 1980
Italy	15 Jun 1976	Yugoslavia	27 Aug 1976
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Belgium, France and Netherlands[9]	18 Apr 1972
02	Netherlands	3 Oct 1973
03	France	9 Dec 1979
04	Italy	22 Dec 1985
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	15 Jun 1988
(supplement 2)	Italy	26 Mar 1989
(supplement 3)	Italy	20 Nov 1989
(supplement 4)	Italy	4 Oct 1992
(supplement 5)	Italy	16 Aug 1993
(supplement 6)	Italy	18 Oct 1995

****

Regulation No. 17: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to seats, their anchorages and any head restraints

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1970, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1970, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 756, p. 286; vol. 891, p. 178 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.16/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); vol. 1216, p. 302 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.16/Rev.1/Amend.1 (amendment series 02); and Rev.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 03); depositary notifications C.N.264.1987.TREATIES–48 of 14 December 1987 (procès-verbal of modifications of English and French texts); C.N.190.1989.TREATIES–29 of 28 August 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/229 and Amend.1 (amendments series 04); C.N.232.1992.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications – French only); and C.N.241.1993.TREATIES–23 of 26 August 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/357 (supplement 1 to amendments series 04).
STATUS: Parties: 24.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 17

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	1 Dec 1970
Belgium	23 Mar 1976	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	3 Jun 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	31 Aug 1979
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Dec 1970	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	27 Mar 1975	Spain	7 Jun 1977
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	6 Jul 1971
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	17 Sep 1975	United Kingdom	12 Feb 1972
Luxembourg	1 May 1983	Yugoslavia	27 Aug 1976

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	11 Sep 1973
02	United Kingdom	9 Mar 1981
03	Belgium	1 May 1986
04	Italy	28 Jan 1990
(supplement 1)	Italy	26 Jan 1994

****

Regulation No. 18: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of power-driven vehicles with regard to their protection against unauthorized use

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and France

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1971, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1971, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 768, p. 300 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.17/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); and depositary notification C.N.40.1986.TREATIES–10 of 2 May 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of the English and French texts).
STATUS: Parties: 22.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 18

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983
Belgium	1 Mar 1971	Netherlands	1 Mar 1971
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Mar 1971	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	27 Mar 1973	Spain	27 Jul 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	15 Aug 1974
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	3 Apr 1972
Italy	17 Sep 1975	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Czechoslovakia[1]	24 Nov 1980

****

Regulation No. 19: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor vehicle front fog lamps

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1971, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1971, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 768, p. 314, and vol. 926, p. 99 (amendments series 01); and depositary notifications C.N.281.1987.TREATIES–50 of 8 December 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/187 (amendments series 02); C.N.183.1988.TREATIES–43 of 30 September 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/187/Corr.1 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.224.1989.TREATIES–35 of 29 September 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/235 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); C.N.137.1990.TREATIES–16 of 28 June 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/256 (supplement 3 to amendments series 02); C.N.71.1992.TREATIES–4 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/304 and 306 (supplement 4 to amendments series 02); C.N.349.1994.TREATIES–48 of 16 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/411 (supplement 5 to amendments series 02); and C.N.209.1995.TREATIES–38 of 4 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 19

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands	1 Mar 1971
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	4 Apr 1975
Belgium	1 Mar 1971	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	13 Sep 1971	Spain	7 Apr 1974
Germany[3]	27 Mar 1973	Sweden	28 May 1972
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	30 Nov 1971
Italy	4 Jul 1971	Yugoslavia	27 Aug 1976
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
—	Spain[10]	7 Apr 1974
01	Netherlands	18 Dec 1974
02	Netherlands	8 May 1988
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	28 Feb 1989
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	28 Feb 1990
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	28 Nov 1990
(supplement 4)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992
(supplement 5)	Netherlands	16 Jun 1995

****

Regulation No. 20: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor vehicle headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam or a driving beam or both and equipped with halogen filament lamps (H_4 lamps)

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 May 1971, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 May 1971, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 774, p. 174; vol. 1019, p. 374, and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.19/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01), and Amend.1 (amendments series 02); depositary notifications C.N.225.1989.TREATIES–36 of 29 September 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/234 (supplement 1 to series 02); C.N.71.1992. TREATIES–4 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/308 and 306 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); C.N.169.1992.TREATIES–5 of 2 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/334 (supplement 3 to amendments series 02); C.N.272.1993.TREATIES–29 of 5 October 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/370 (supplement 4 to amendments series 02); C.N.119.1994.TREATIES–12 of 27 June 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/391 (supplement 5 to amendments series 02); C.N.317.1994.TREATIES–38 of 30 November 1994 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.207.1995.TREATIES–36 of 4 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 23.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 20

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 Apr 1972	Netherlands	1 May 1971
Belgium	1 May 1971	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	1 May 1971	Spain	19 Nov 1973
Germany[3]	16 Sep 1972	Sweden	1 May 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	30 Nov 1971
Italy	4 Jul 1971	Yugoslavia	27 Aug 1976
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Sweden	15 Aug 1976
02	Netherlands	3 Jul 1986
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	28 Feb 1990
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	2 Dec 1992
(supplement 4)	Netherlands	5 Mar 1994
(supplement 5)	Netherlands	27 Nov 1994

****

Regulation No. 21: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to their interior fittings

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and France

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1971, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1971, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 801, p. 394, and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.20/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.310.1985.TREATIES–40 of 26 November 1985 and doc. TRANS/SCI/WP29/113 (amendments series 02); and C.N.142.1986.TREATIES–27 of 2 September 1986 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 21

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	1 Dec 1971	Netherlands	16 Jun 1981
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Dec 1971	Spain	12 Sep 1978
Germany[3]	13 Nov 1973	Sweden	1 Dec 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	United Kingdom	11 Feb 1973
Italy	17 Sep 1975	Yugoslavia	20 Jul 1991
Luxembourg	1 May 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	8 Oct 1980
02	Belgium	26 Apr 1986

****

Regulation No. 22: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of protective helmets and their visors for drivers and passengers of motor cycles and mopeds

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1972, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1972, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 826, p. 300; vol. 960, p. 256, and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.21/Rev.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 and 02); vol. 1324, p. 364 and depositary notifications C.N.212.1985.TREATIES–22 of 9 October 1985 (procès–verbal of rectification of English and French texts); C.N.143.1986.TREATIES–28 of 20 August 1986 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.335.1987.TREATIES–64 of 19 February 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/190 and Add.1 (amendments series 03); C.N.280.1990.TREATIES–45 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/257 (supplement 1 to amendments series 03); C.N.280.1994.TREATIES–28 of 20 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/398 (amendments series 04); and C.N.215.1995.TREATIES–44 of 7 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 19.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 22

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	28 Jul 1987	Luxembourg	1 May 1983
Belgium	1 Jun 1972	Netherlands	1 Jun 1972
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	16 May 1995	Spain	3 Dec 1976
Germany[3]	7 May 1984	Sweden	15 Jun 1973
Hungary	23 Nov 1979	Yugoslavia	15 Jan 1988
Italy	3 Jun 1977		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Belgium	7 Mar 1975
02	Belgium	24 Mar 1982
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	16 Jul 1983
03	Italy	19 Jul 1988
(supplement 1)	Germany[3]	5 May 1991
04	Italy	20 Mar 1995

****

Regulation No. 23: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of reversing lights for power–driven vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1971, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1971, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 801, p. 432; vol. 1038, p. 312 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.22/Amend.1 (amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.186.1988.TREATIES–44 of 30 September 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/208 (supplement 2 to the original); C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/278 (supplement 3 to the original); C.N.69.1992.TREATIES–3 of 24 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/293 (supplement 4 to the original); C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.241.1995.TREATIES–60 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/450 (supplement 5 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 23

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	23 Jul 1990	Netherlands	21 Jan 1973
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	1 Dec 1971	Poland	4 Mar 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	1 Jul 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	22 Mar 1977	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	14 May 1977	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	28 Oct 1972	Spain	1 Dec 1971
Germany[3]	13 Nov 1973	Sweden	1 Dec 1971
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	11 Feb 1973
Italy	5 May 1972	Yugoslavia[11]	24 Jul 1983
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Czechoslovakia[12]	22 Mar 1977
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	28 Feb 1989
Supplement 3 to the original	Netherlands	5 May 1991
Supplement 4 to the original	Netherlands	24 Sep 1992
Supplement 5 to the original	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 24: Uniform provisions concerning:

I. The approval of compression ignition (C.I.) engines with regard to the emission of visible pollutants
II. The approval of motor vehicles with regard to the installation of C.I. engines of an approved type
III. The approval of motor vehicles equipped with C.I. engines with regard to the emission of visible pollutants by the engine
IV. The measurement of power of C.I. engine

Proposed by the Governments of France and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 September 1972, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 September 1972, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 835, p. 226; vol. 891, p. 178 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.23/Amend.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); vol. 1157, p. 402 (amendments series 02); vol. 1349, p. 327 (supplement to amendments series 02) and docs. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.23/Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 and 02) and Amend. 1 and vol. 1349, p. 327 (supplement to amendments series 02) and Rev.2 (amendments series 03).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 24

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	20 May 1975
Belgium	11 Oct 1976	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	15 Sep 1972	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	13 Nov 1973	Spain	15 Sep 1972
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	13 Dec 1975
Italy	6 Apr 1974	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	11 Sep 1973
02	France	11 Feb 1980
(supplement)	France	15 Feb 1984
03	Italy	20 Apr 1986

****

Regulation No. 25: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of head restraints (headrests), whether or not incorporated in vehicle seats

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1972, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1972, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 814, p. 416 and doc. E/ECE/324–ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.24/Amend.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.311.1985.TREATIES–41 of 26 November 1985 and doc. TRANS/SCI/WP29/112 and Corr.1 (amendments series 02); C.N.244.1986.TREATIES–35 of 3 December 1986 and doc. E/ECE/324–ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.l/Add.24/Amend.3 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.106.1989.TREATIES–20 of 20 June 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/233 (amendments series 03); C.N.232.1992.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès-verbal concerning certain modifications); and C.N.243.1993.TREATIES–24 of 30 August 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/358 (supplement 1 to amendments series 03).
STATUS: Parties: 22.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 25

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 May 1984
Belgium	29 Jun 1979	Netherlands	1 Mar 1972
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Mar 1972	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	13 Nov 1973	Spain	18 Jun 1984
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	United Kingdom	11 Feb 1973
Italy	22 Sep 1978	Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1983

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Czechoslovakia[1]	11 Aug 1981
02	Belgium	26 Apr 1986
(supplement 1)	Italy	3 May 1987
03	Italy	20 Nov 1989
(supplement 1)	Italy	30 Jan 1994

****

Regulation No. 26: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to their external projections

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and France

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1972, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1972, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 829, p. 348; vol. 891, p. 178 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.25/Amend.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); and depositary notification C.N.92.1986.TREATIES–21 of 23 May 1986 (procès–verbal of rectification of English and French texts).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 26

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983
Belgium	1 Jul 1972	Netherlands	16 Jun 1981
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
France	1 Jul 1972	Spain	30 Sep 1983
Germany[3]	25 Oct 1975	Sweden	1 Jul 1972
Greece	3 Dec 1995	United Kingdom	11 Feb 1973
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	Yugoslavia	20 Jul 1991
Italy	17 Sep 1975		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	11 Sep 1973

****

Regulation No. 27: Uniform provisions for the approval of advance–warning triangles

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 September 1972, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 September 1972, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 835, p. 262; vol. 891, p. 178 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.26/Amend.1 and Amend.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01 and 02), and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.26/Amend.3 (revised text incorporating amendments series 03); and depositary notification C.N.232.1992.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 27

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	19 Nov 1978	Netherlands	15 Sep 1972
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	8 Jul 1973	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Romania	1 Jul 1977
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
France	15 Sep 1972	Spain	21 Oct 1974
Germany[3]	2 Feb 1988	Sweden	15 Sep 1972
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	6 Apr 1974	United Kingdom	13 Jan 1974
Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	11 Sep 1973
02	Spain	1 Jul 1977
03	Netherlands	3 Mar 1985

****

Regulation No. 28: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of audible warning devices and of motor vehicles with regard to their audible signals

Proposed by the Governments of France and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 January 1973, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 January 1973, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 854, p. 194, and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.27/Amend.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.172.1990.TREATIES–24 of 8 August 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/266 and Corr.1 (supplement 2 to the original – English only); and C.N.95.1992.TREATIES–10 of 16 June 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 28

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	30 May 1981	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	11 Oct 1976	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	5 Jul 1988	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	15 Jan 1973	Spain	15 Jan 1973
Germany[3]	25 Oct 1975	Sweden	8 Jun 1973
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	18 Oct 1976	United Kingdom	1 Jun 1975
Italy	26 Aug 1973	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Italy	7 Feb 1984
Supplement 2 to the original	Italy	8 Jan 1991

****

Regulation No. 29: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the protection of the occupants of the cab of a commercial vehicle

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 June 1974, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 June 1974, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 940, p. 343, and vol. 1050, p. 363 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.28/Amend.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 13.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 29

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	15 Jun 1974
Belgium	15 Jun 1974	Norway	24 May 1993
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Poland	3 Jun 1990
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	22 Oct 1988	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Netherlands	1 Aug 1977

****

Regulation No. 30: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of pneumatic tyres for motor vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1975, in accordance with article 1 (5) of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1975, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 963, p. 365 (amendments series 01); vol.1218, p. 360 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.29, and Amend.2 (revised text incorporating amendments series 02); depositary notifications C.N.56.1987.TREATIES–11 of 5 May 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.394 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/394/Corr.1 (French only – supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.138.1990.TREATIES–17 of 29 June 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/247 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); C.N.69.1992.TREATIES–3 of 24 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/298 (supplement 3 to amendments series 02); C.N.180.1993.TREATIES–10 of 23 August 1993 (procès–verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.384.1993.TREATIES–36 of 1 October 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/359 (supplement 4 to amendments series 02); and C.N.213.1994.TREATIES–20 of 8 August 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/399 (supplement 5 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 26.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 30

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	25 Dec 1979	Netherlands	1 Apr 1975
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	2 Apr 1978
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Poland	4 Mar 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Portugal	28 Mar 1980
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Denmark	24 Mar 1981	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	25 Sep 1977	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	22 May 1977	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	3 Jun 1977	Spain	3 Sep 1983
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	1 Apr 1975
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	Switzerland	1 Oct 1983
Italy	5 Apr 1977	United Kingdom	1 Apr 1975
Luxembourg	25 Sep 1977	Yugoslavia	17 Aug 1979

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	25 Sep 1977
02	United Kingdom	15 Mar 1981
(supplement 1)	United Kingdom	5 Oct 1987
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	29 Nov 1990
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	24 Sep 1992
(supplement 4)	United Kingdom	1 Mar 1994
(supplement 5)	Italy	8 Jan 1995

****

Regulation No. 31: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of halogen sealed-beam (HSB unit) motor vehicle headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam or a driving beam or both

Proposed by the Governments of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 May 1975, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 May 1975, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 966, p. 340 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.30; depositary notifications C.N.200.1982.TREATIES–25 of 7 September 1982 and vol. 1300, p. 368 (amendment series 01); C.N.229.1987.TREATIES–43 of 30 October 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/142 (amendments series 02); C.N.226.1989. TREATIES–37 of 29 September 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/238 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.71.1992. TREATIES–04 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/310 and 306 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); and C.N.184.1995.TREATIES–30 of 27 July 1995 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 9.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 31

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Denmark	20 Dec 1976	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Finland	17 Sep 1976	Sweden	1 May 1975
Hungary	23 Nov 1979	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Netherlands	6 Jul 1975	United Kingdom	1 May 1975
Norway	24 May 1993		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Netherlands	7 Feb 1983
02	Netherlands	30 Mar 1988
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	28 Feb 1990
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992

****

Regulation No. 32: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the behaviour of the structure of the impacted vehicle in a rear-end collision

Proposed by the Governments of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1975, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1975, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 973, p. 246, and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.31 and Corr.1. (English and Russian only) and Corr.2 (French only).
STATUS: Parties: 16.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 32

Participant[3]	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	5 Jun 1981
Denmark	18 Nov 1979	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	10 Sep 1978	Sweden	1 Jul 1975
Italy	1 Nov 1976	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985	United Kingdom	1 Jul 1975

****

Regulation No. 33: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the behaviour of the structure of the impacted vehicle in a head–on collision

Proposed by the Governments of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1975, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1975, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 973, p. 258 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.32 and Corr.1. (English only), Corr.2 (French only) and Corr. 3 (Russian only).
STATUS: Parties: 16.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 33

Participant[3]	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	5 Jun 1981
Denmark	18 Nov 1979	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	10 Sep 1978	Sweden	1 Jul 1975
Italy	1 Nov 1976	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985	United Kingdom	1 Jul 1975

****

Regulation No. 34: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the prevention of fire risks

Proposed by the Governments of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1975, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1975, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 973, p. 270 and vol. 1122, p. 358 (amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 15.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 34

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Denmark	18 Nov 1979	Romania	5 Jun 1981
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	10 Sep 1978	Sweden	1 Jul 1975
Germany[3]	25 Jun 1983	United Kingdom	1 Jul 1975
Italy	1 Nov 1976		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	18 Jan 1979

****

Regulation No. 35: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the arrangement of foot controls

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 November 1975, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 10 November 1975, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 986, p. 355 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.34.
STATUS: Parties: 18.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 35

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Belgium	10 Nov 1975	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	5 Jun 1981
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	24 Mar 1981	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	13 Feb 1978	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	10 Sep 1978	Spain	18 Jun 1984
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	United Kingdom	10 Nov 1975
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1983

****

Regulation No. 36: Uniform provisions concerning the construction of public service vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1976, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1976, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 997, p. 429 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/–505/Rev.1/Add.35; depositary notifications C.N.228.1981.TREATIES–32 of 8 September 1981 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/49/Rev.1 (amendments series 01); C.N.55.1986.TREATIES–19 of 7 April 1986 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/138 and Add.1 (amendments series 02); C.N.187.1992.TREATIES–9 of 14 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/289 (amendments series 03); and C.N.205.1995.TREATIES–34 of 4 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 11.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 36

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Romania	21 Feb 1977
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Mar 1976	Spain	16 Oct 1977
Hungary	23 Nov 1979	United Kingdom[13]	1 Mar 1976
Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	8 Feb 1982
02	United Kingdom	7 Sep 1986
03	Spain	14 Dec 1992

****

Regulation No. 37: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of filament lamps for use in approved lamp units of power-driven vehicles and of their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Germany[3] and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 February 1978, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 February 1978, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1073, p. 337; and vol. 1254, p. 464 (amendments series 01) and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.36 and Corr.1 and 2 (French only) and Rev.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 02 and 03); vol. 1358, p. 312 (amendments series 03); doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS.505/Rev.1/Add.36/Rev.1/Corr.1 (English only); depositary notifications C.N.41.1986.TREATIES–11 of 7 April 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of English and French texts); C.N.95.1986.TREATIES–22 of 23 May 1986 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/151 (supplement 1 to amendments series 03); C.N.81.1987.TREATIES–14 of 27 May 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/176 (supplement 2 to amendments series 03); C.N.230.1987. TREATIES–44 of 30 October 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/185 (supplement 3 to amendments series 03); C.N.188.1988.TREATIES–45 of 23 February 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/213 (supplement 4 to amendments series 03); C.N.326.1988.TREATIES–69 of 3 March 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/220 (supplement 5 to amendments series 03); C.N.139.1990. TREATIES–18 of 29 June 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/258 and Corr.1 (supplement 6 to amendments series 03); C.N.276.1990. TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/274 (supplement 7 to amendments series 03); C.N.46.1992.TREATIES–2 of 6 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/297 (supplement 8 to amendments series 03); C.N.180.1992.TREATIES–8 of 16 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/324 (supplement 9 to amendments series 03); C.N.195.1993.TREATIES–14 of 23 August 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification concerning certain modifications); C.N.252.1994.TREATIES–24 of 5 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/400 (supplement 10 to amendments series 03); C.N.344.1994.TREATIES–46 of 16 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/412 (supplement 11 to amendments series 03); and C.N.240.1995.TREATIES–59 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/460 (supplement 12 to amendments series 03).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 37

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	8 Jan 1982	Netherlands	1 Feb 1978
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	6 Oct 1978	Poland	1 Aug 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	31 Aug 1979
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	27 Feb 1987
Denmark	24 Mar 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	1 Feb 1978	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	3 Jul 1978	Spain	26 Jan 1980
Germany[3]	1 Feb 1978	Sweden	2 Nov 1980
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	23 Nov 1979	United Kingdom	2 Apr 1978
Italy	15 Aug 1978	Yugoslavia[11]	14 Jun 1983
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Italy	29 Oct 1981
02	Belgium	27 Oct 1983
03	Netherlands	1 Jun 1984
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	23 Oct 1986
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1987
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	30 Mar 1988
(supplement 4)	Netherlands	23 Jul 1989
(supplement 5)	Italy	3 Aug 1989
(supplement 6)	Netherlands	29 Nov 1990
(supplement 7)	Netherlands	5 May 1991
(supplement 8)	Netherlands	6 Sep 1992
(supplement 9)	Netherlands	16 Dec 1992
(supplement 10)	Netherlands	5 Mar 1995
(supplement 11)	Netherlands	16 Jun 1995
(supplement 12)	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

Regulation No. 38: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear fog lamps for power-driven vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of France and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1978, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1978, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1098, p. 295 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.37; depositary notifications C.N.177.1988.TREATIES–40 of 14 September 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/209 (supplement 1 to the original); C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/279 (supplement 2 to the original); C.N.69.1992.TREATIES–3 of 24 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/294 (supplement 3); C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.239.1995.TREATIES–58 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29.451 (supplement 4 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 38

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	20 Sep 1980	Netherlands	1 Aug 1978
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	29 Jun 1979	Poland	4 Mar 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	5 Jun 1981
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Denmark	1 Aug 1978	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	10 Aug 1982	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	1 Aug 1978	Spain	1 Aug 1978
Germany[3]	31 Dec 1978	Sweden	2 Nov 1980
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	23 Nov 1979	United Kingdom	3 Apr 1979
Italy	15 Jan 1979	Yugoslavia[11]	24 Jul 1983
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	14 Feb 1989
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	5 May 1991
Supplement 3 to the original	Netherlands	24 Sep 1992
Supplement 4 to the original	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 39: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the speedometer equipment including its installation

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 November 1978, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 20 November 1978, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1111, p. 431 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.38; and depositary notification C.N.333.1987.TREATIES–62 of 18 February 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/183 (supplement 1 to the original version).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 39

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 May 1984
Belgium	29 Jun 1979	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	31 Aug 1979
Denmark	18 Nov 1979	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	20 Nov 1978	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	13 Jun 1983	Sweden	20 Jan 1979
Greece	3 Dec 1995	United Kingdom	20 Nov 1978
Hungary	23 Nov 1979	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985
Italy	26 May 1979		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Czechoslovakia[1]	18 Jul 1988

****

Regulation No. 40: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor cycles equipped with a positive-ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 September 1979, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 September 1979, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1144, p. 308 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.39 and Corr.1, Corr.2 and Corr.2/Rev.1; depositary notifications C.N.305.1987.TREATIES–55 of 31 December 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/196 and Add.1 (amendments series 01); and C.N.75.1989.TREATIES–13 of 1 May 1989 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 19.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 40

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria[14]	[1 Sep 1985]	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Sep 1979	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	13 Jun 1983	Switzerland[15]	[10 Apr 1983]
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Italy	1 Sep 1979	Yugoslavia	2 Feb 1988
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	31 May 1988

****

Regulation No. 41: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor cycles with regard to noise

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1980, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1980, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1181, p. 303; and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.40/Amend.1 and vol. 1364, p. 371 (amendments series 01); and depositary notification C.N.381.1993.TREATIES–34 of 1 November 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/380 (amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 41

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	24 May 1993
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	5 Jul 1988	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	Spain	1 Jun 1980
Italy	1 Jun 1980	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Rectification	Italy	29 Oct 1981
01	Italy	24 Jul 1984
02	Germany	1 Apr 1994

****

Regulation No. 40: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor cycles equipped with a positive-ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 September 1979, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 September 1979, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1144, p. 308 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.39 and Corr.1, Corr.2 and Corr.2/Rev.1; depositary notifications C.N.305.1987.TREATIES–55 of 31 December 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/196 and Add.1 (amendments series 01); and C.N.75.1989.TREATIES–13 of 1 May 1989 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 19.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 40

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria[14]	[1 Sep 1985]	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Sep 1979	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	13 Jun 1983	Switzerland[15]	[10 Apr 1983]
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Italy	1 Sep 1979	Yugoslavia	2 Feb 1988
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	31 May 1988

****

Regulation No. 41: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor cycles with regard to noise

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1980, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1980, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1181, p. 303; and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.40/Amend.1 and vol. 1364, p. 371 (amendments series 01); and depositary notification C.N.381.1993.TREATIES–34 of 1 November 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/380 (amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 41

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	24 May 1993
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	5 Jul 1988	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	Spain	1 Jun 1980
Italy	1 Jun 1980	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Rectification	Italy	29 Oct 1981
01	Italy	24 Jul 1984
02	Germany	1 Apr 1994

****

Regulation No. 42: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to their front and rear protective devices (bumpers, etc.)

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1980, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1980, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1181, p. 314 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.41 and Corr.1.
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 42

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Denmark	24 Mar 1981	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Germany[3]	25 Jun 1983	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	Spain	1 Jun 1980
Italy	1 Jun 1980	Sweden	28 Oct 1980
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

****

Regulation No. 43: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of safety glazing and glazing materials

Proposed by the Governments of France and Germany[3]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 February 1981, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 February 1981, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1214, p. 295 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.42; depositary notifications C.N.78.1982.TREATIES–12 of 14 May 1982 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP.29/89; C.N.276.1985.TREATIES–29 of 4 November 1985 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/122, Corr.1 (French only), and Corr.2; and C.N.218.1986.TREATIES–32 of 31 October 1986 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/156 (supplement No. 3).
STATUS: Parties: 23.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 43

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	27 May 1984	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	24 May 1993
Belgium	8 Mar 1981	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Portugal	20 Aug 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland[16]	25 Sep 1981	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	15 Feb 1981	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	15 Feb 1981	Spain	1 Nov 1983
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	18 Aug 1981
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	15 Feb 1981
Italy	13 Nov 1981	Yugoslavia	22 Dec 1985
Luxembourg	1 May 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
—	Finland	14 Oct 1982
—	France	4 Apr 1986
Supplement No. 3	France	31 Mar 1987

****

Regulation No. 44: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of restraining devices for child occupants of power-driven vehicles ("child restraint system")

Proposed by the Governments of the Netherlands and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 February 1981, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 February 1981, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1213, p. 204 and doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.43; and Amend.1 (amendment series 01); depositary notifications C.N.398.1983.TREATIES-61 of 26 January 1984 (procès-verbal of rectification); C.N.275.1985.TREATIES-28 of 4 November 1985 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/134 (amendments series 02); C.N.95.1987.TREATIES-16 of 8 June 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/177 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02); C.N.191.1988.TREATIES-47 of 30 September 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/210 (supplement 2 to amendments series 02); C.N.140.1990. TREATIES-19 of 29 June 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/259 (supplement 3 to amendments series 02); C.N.232.1992.TREATIES-32 of 11 September 1992 (procès-verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.244.1993.TREATIES-25 of 26 August 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/360 (supplement 4 to amendments series 02); C.N.46.1995.TREATIES-14 of 12 April 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/401 (amendments series 03); and C.N.204.1995.TREATIES-33 of 7 August 1995 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 44

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	28 Jul 1987	Luxembourg	1 May 1984
Belgium	17 Nov 1982	Netherlands	1 Feb 1981
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Denmark	24 May 1981	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Jan 1992	Sweden	13 Jun 1981
Germany[3]	23 Mar 1984	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	United Kingdom	1 Feb 1981
Italy	29 Jan 1989		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Netherlands	17 Nov 1982
02	Netherlands	4 Apr 1986
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	8 Nov 1987
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	29 Feb 1989
(supplement 3)	Netherlands	29 Nov 1990
(supplement 4)	Italy	26 Jan 1994
03	United Kingdom	12 Sep 1995

****

Regulation No. 45: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of headlamp cleaners, and of power–driven vehicles with regard to headlamp cleaners

Proposed by the Government of Finland and Sweden

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1981, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1981, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1248, p. 376 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.44, depositary notifications CN.213.1985. TREATIES–23 of 10 October 1985 (procès–verbal of rectification of English and French texts); C.N.189. 1987. TREATIES–34 of 9 September 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/182 (amendments series 01); C.N.170.1990.TREATIES–22 of 30 July 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1WP29/260 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.291.1990.TREATIES–48 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/275 (supplement 2 to amendments series 01); C.N.78.1991. TREATIES–12 of 20 June 1991 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.351.1995.TREATIES–70 of 13 November 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 14.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 45

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Finland	1 Jul 1981	Norway	21 Feb 1988
France	6 Nov 1983	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	18 Oct 1985	Spain	30 Sep 1983
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	Sweden	1 Jul 1981
Italy	16 May 1982	United Kingdom	3 Feb 1986

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Finland	9 Feb 1988
(supplement 1)	Italy	30 Dec 1990
(supplement 2)	Italy	5 May 1991

****

Regulation No. 46: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear–view mirrors, and of motor vehicles with regard to the installation of rear–view mirrors

Proposed by the Government of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 September 1981, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 September 1981, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.45, and Amend.1 (supplement 1); United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1374, p. 434 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/163 and Amend.1 and 2 (amendments series 01); depositary notifications C.N.306.1987.TREATIES–56 of 30 December 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/188 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.132.1988.TREATIES–33 of 18 July 1988 (procès–verbal of rectification concerning modifications); C.N.232.1992.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès–verbal concerning modifications - French only); and C.N.42.1994.TREATIES–6 of 20 April 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/386 (supplement 3 to amendments series 01)[17].
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 46

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	23 Jul 1990	Netherlands	3 Dec 1987
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	24 May 1993
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Poland	3 Jun 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	10 Aug 1982	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
France	1 Sep 1981	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	20 Apr 1986	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Spain	24 Mar 1989
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	Sweden	24 Sep 1982
Italy	1 Sep 1981	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Luxembourg	1 Oct 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1[19]	Finland	21 Oct 1984
01	France	5 Oct 1987
(supplement 1)	France	30 May 1988
(supplement 3)[17]	Italy	20 Sep 1994

****

Regulation No. 47: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of mopeds equipped with a positive-ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine

Proposed by the Governments of Germany[3] and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1981, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1981, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1255, p. 158.
STATUS: Parties: 19.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 47

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
France	15 Jun 1982	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	1 Nov 1981	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	Switzerland[15]	10 Apr 1983
Italy	16 May 1982	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Luxembourg	4 Oct 1987	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985
Netherlands	1 Nov 1981		

****

Regulation No. 48: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices

Proposed by the Governments of the Germany[3] and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1982, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1982, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1259, p. 351; depositary notifications C.N.245.1986. TREATIES–36 of 27 January 1987 (supplement 1 to the original); C.N.171.1990.TREATIES–23 of 8 August 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/261 (supplement 2 to the original); C.N.217.1993.TREATIES–11 of 9 September 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/371 (amendments series 01); C.N.453.1993.TREATIES–52 of 9 February 1994 (procès–verbal concerning certain modifications); C.N.316.TREATIES–37 of 21 November 1994 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.180.1995.TREATIES–28 of 20 July 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/431 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.181.1995.TREATIES–29 of 20 July 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.214.1995.TREATIES–43 of 7 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.352.1995.TREATIES–71 of 13 November 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 20.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 48

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
France	17 Feb 1987	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	10 Jun 1983	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Spain	1 Jan 1982
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	22 Apr 1985
Italy[20]	27 Jun 1987	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Italy[20]	27 Jun 1987
Supplement 2 to the original	Italy	8 Jan 1991
01	Netherlands	9 Feb 1994
Supplement 1	Netherlands	20 Dec 1995

****

Regulation No. 49: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of compression ignition (C.I.) engines and vehicles equipped with C.I. engines with regard to the emission of pollutants by the engine

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and France

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 April 1982, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 April 1982, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1273, p. 294 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.48; depositary notifications C.N.27.1983.TREATIES–3 of 2 March 1983 (procès-verbal of rectification of English and French texts); C.N.279.1989.TREATIES–46 of 14 December 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/242 (amendments series 01); C.N.203.1992.TREATIES–22 of 30 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/340 (amendments series 02); C.N.232.1992.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); C.N.353.1995.TREATIES–72 of 13 November 1995 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.439.1995.TREATIES–87 of 18 December 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/473 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 20.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 49

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 May 1984
Belgium	16 Oct 1982	Netherlands	28 Oct 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	22 May 1989	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
France	15 Apr 1982	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	15 Dec 1985	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	6 Jul 1987
Italy	22 Mar 1985	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	14 May 1990
02	France	30 Dec 1992
Supplement 1	Italy	

****

Regulation No. 50: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of front position lamps, rear position lamps, stop lamps, direction indicators and rear–registration–plate illuminating devices for mopeds, motor cycles and vehicles treated as such

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1982, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1982, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.49; depositary notifications C.N.158.1985.TREATIES–18 of 22 July 1985 (procès–verbal of rectification of English and French texts); C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/269 (supplement 1 to the original); C.N.69.1992.TREATIES–3 of 24 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/295 (supplement 2); and C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 20.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 50

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	1 Jun 1982
Belgium	5 Jul 1983	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	17 Feb 1987	Spain	9 Jun 1992
Germany[3]	5 Oct 1986	Sweden	24 Sep 1982
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	1 Jun 1982	United Kingdom	15 Feb 1983
Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990	Yugoslavia	5 May 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	5 May 1991
Supplement 2	Netherlands	24 Sep 1992

****

Regulation No. 51: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor vehicles having at least four wheels with regard to their noise emissions

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 July 1982, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 July 1982, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1284, p. 316 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.50, and Amend.1 (revised text incorporating amendments series 01) and vol. 1374, p. 434 (amendments series 01 only); depositary notifications C.N.263.1987.TREATIES–47 of 27 November 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.337 and Amend.1 (amendments); C.N.91.1988.TREATIES–25 of 20 June 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification concerning modifications); C.N.38.1991. TREATIES–2 of 12 April 1991 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/276 and Corr.1 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.313.1994. TREATIES–34 of 18 November 1994 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/413 and Corr.1 (amendments series 02); and C.N.387.1995.TREATIES–78 of 5 December 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/464 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 21.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 51

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Belgium	15 Jul 1982	Norway	24 May 1993
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	5 Jul 1988	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
France	17 Feb 1987	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Spain	15 Jul 1982
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	16 Aug 1993
Italy	6 May 1983	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985
Luxembourg	1 May 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Italy	21 Oct 1984
—	Italy	27 Apr 1988
(supplement 1)	Italy	12 Sep 1991
02	Germany	18 Apr 1995
(supplement 1)	Germany	

****

Regulation No. 52: Uniform provisions concerning the construction of small capacity public service vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and Germany[3]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1982, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1982, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1293, p. 204 and doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.51; and depositary notification C.N.49.1995.TREATIES-15 of 12 April 1995 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/335 (amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 52

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Hungary	21 Mar 1993
Belgium	5 Jul 1983	Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
France	1 Nov 1982	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	1 Nov 1982	Spain	21 Jan 1994

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Belgium	12 Sep 1995

****

Regulation No. 53: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor cycles with regard to the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices

Proposed by the Governments of Germany[3] and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 February 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 February 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1299, p. 306 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.52; depositary notifications C.N.80.1990. TREATIES–10 of 14 May 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/262 (supplement 1 to the original version); and C.N.339.1994.TREATIES–44 of 16 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/414 (supplement 2 to the original version).
STATUS: Parties: 18.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 53

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	5 Jul 1983	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	8 Aug 1994	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	5 Oct 1986	Sweden	28 Dec 1983
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	United Kingdom	3 Sep 1995
Italy	1 Feb 1983	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Italy	14 Oct 1990
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	16 Jun 1995

****

Regulation No. 54: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of pneumatic tyres for commercial vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.53; depositary notifications C.N.223.1987. TREATIES–41 of 13 October 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/181 (supplement 1 to the original version); C.N.44.1988.TREATIES–16 of 28 April 1988 (procès–verbal of rectification concerning modifications); C.N.36.1989.TREATIES–8 of 3 April 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/225 (supplement 2 to the original version); C.N.7.1991.TREATIES–7 of 18 March 1991 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/286 (supplement 3 to the original); C.N.90.1992.TREATIES–8 of 15 June 1992 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.216.1992.TREATIES–27 of 14 August 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/316 (supplement 4 to the original); C.N.398.1993.TREATIES–37 of 10 January 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/361 (supplement 5 to the original); C.N.314.1994.TREATIES–35 of 18 November 1994 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/402 (supplement 6 to the original); and C.N.11.1995.TREATIES–8 of 15 March 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/415 (supplement 7 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 25.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 54

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	3 Sep 1983	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Belgium	5 Jul 1983	Portugal	11 Aug 1989
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Romania	5 Apr 1985
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
Finland	12 Jul 1987	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Mar 1983	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Germany[3]	19 May 1986	Spain	9 Aug 1987
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	7 Oct 1983
Hungary	26 Mar 1984	Switzerland	4 Oct 1988
Italy	6 Apr 1984	United Kingdom	15 Jul 1983
Luxembourg	1 May 1983	Yugoslavia	5 Jan 1985
Netherlands	1 Mar 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original		13 Mar 1988
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	3 Sep 1989
Supplement 3 to the original	Netherlands	18 Aug 1991
Supplement 4 to the original	France	14 Jan 1993
Supplement 5 to the original	United Kingdom	10 Jun 1994
Supplement 6 to the original	Italy	18 Apr 1995
Supplement 7 to the original	United Kingdom	15 Aug 1995

****

Regulation No. 55: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of mechanical coupling components of combinations of vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1301, p. 275 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.54; and depositary notification C.N.152.1993.TREATIES–5 of 12 July 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/317 (supplement 1 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 16.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 55

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Belgium	5 Jul 1983	Romania	3 Feb 1984
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	1 Mar 1983	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Netherlands	1 Mar 1983	Yugoslavia	28 Jan 1990

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Czechoslovakia[1]	12 Dec 1993

****

Regulation No. 56: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of headlamps for mopeds and vehicles treated as such

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 June 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 June 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1317, p. 286 and doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.55; depositary notifications C.N.28.1987.TREATIES-7 of 4 May 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/161 (supplement 1 to the original); C.N.78.1989.TREATIES-16 of 10 May 1989 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); C.N.95.1992.TREATIES-10 of 16 June 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.250.1994.TREATIES-22 of 10 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/403 (supplemnt 2 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 18.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 56

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	15 Jun 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Spain	8 May 1993
France	19 Oct 1986	Sweden	7 Oct 1983
Germany[3]	5 Oct 1986	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Italy	15 Jun 1983	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Czechoslovakia[1]	4 Oct 1987
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	10 Mar 1995

****

Regulation No. 57: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of headlamps for motor cycles and vehicles treated as such

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 June 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 June 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1317, p. 286and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.56; depositary notifications C.N.192.1988. TREATIES–48 of 30 September 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/199 (amendments series 01); C.N.71.1992.TREATIES–04 of 27 May 1992 and C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/306 and 311 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01); C.N.251.1994.TREATIES–23 of 10 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/404 and Corr.1 (supplement 2 to amendments series 01); and C.N.185.1995.TREATIES–31 of 27 July 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 57

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	15 Jun 1983
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Sweden	28 Dec 1983
France	19 Oct 1986	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Germany[3]	5 Oct 1986	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Yugoslavia	1 Apr 1985
Italy	15 Jun 1983		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	Netherlands	28 Feb 1989
(supplement 1)	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992
(supplement 2)	Netherlands	10 Mar 1995

****

Regulation No. 58: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of:

I. Rear underrun protective devices (RUPDs)

II. Vehicles with regard to the installation of a RUPD of an approved type

III. Vehicles with regard to their rear underrun protection (RUP)

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1351, p. 412; and depositary notification C.N.208.1988. TREATIES–51 of 25 October 1988 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/228 (amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 22.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 58

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Norway	24 May 1993
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	5 Apr 1985
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
France	1 Jul 1983	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	28 Dec 1983
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	1 Jul 1983	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994	Yugoslavia	15 Jan 1988

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	25 Mar 1989

****

Regulation No. 59: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of replacement silencing systems

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and France

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1983, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1983, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1333, p. 321; and depositary notifications C.N.193.1989.TREATIES–31 of 28 August 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.489 (supplement 1 to the original version); and C.N.191.1994.TREATIES–14 of 25 July 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/390 (supplement 2 to the original version).
STATUS: Parties: 15.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 59

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	1 Oct 1985
Belgium	1 Oct 1983	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Norway	24 May 1993
Finland	5 Jul 1988	Poland	13 Nov 1992
France	1 Oct 1983	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Greece	3 Dec 1995	United Kingdom	16 Aug 1993
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Yugoslavia	17 Jul 1993
Italy	6 Apr 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Italy	28 Jan 1990
Supplement 2 to the original	United Kingdom	25 Dec 1994

****

Regulation No. 60: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of two–wheeled motor cycles and mopeds with regard to driver–operated controls including the identification of controls, tell–tales and indicators

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1984, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1984, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1361, p. 324 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.59; and depositary notification C.N.347.1994.TREATIES–47 of 16 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP.29/301 (supplement 1 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 60

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Italy	1 Jul 1984
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	8 Aug 1994	Sweden	31 Aug 1984
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Germany	16 Jun 1995

****

Regulation No. 61: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of commercial vehicles with regard to their external projections forward of the cab's rear panel

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 July 1984, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 July 1984, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1363, p. 242 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.60.
STATUS: Parties: 14.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 61

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Italy	15 Jul 1984
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	21 Jun 1985
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	5 Apr 1985
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Russian Federation	17 Feb 1987
France	15 Jul 1984	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Sweden	29 Dec 1984
Hungary	6 Aug 1995	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

****

Regulation No. 62: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of power-driven vehicles with handlebars with regard to their protection against unauthorized use

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 September 1984, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 September 1984, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.61; and depositary notification C.N.165.1987. TREATIES-25 of 24 August 1987 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/175 (supplement 1 to the original version).
STATUS: Parties: 13.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 62

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Sep 1984	Sweden	29 Dec 1984
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Italy	1 Sep 1984		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1	Italy	24 Jan 1988

****

Regulation No. 63: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of mopeds with regard to noise

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 August 1985, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 August 1985, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.62.
STATUS: Parties: 16.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 63

Participant[3]	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Norway	24 May 1993
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Finland	5 Jul 1988	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
France	19 Oct 1986	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Italy	15 Aug 1985	Yugoslavia	15 Jan 1988

****

Regulation No. 64: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles equipped with temporary–use spare wheels/tyres

Proposed by the Governments of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1985, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1985, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1408, p. 274 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.63; and depositary notification C.N.38.1989. TREATIES–9 of 17 April 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/231 (supplement 1 to the original version).
STATUS: Parties: 14.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 64

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Netherlands	1 Oct 1985
Finland	12 Jul 1987	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	4 Mar 1995	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Spain	29 May 1992
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Sweden	28 Feb 1986
Italy	31 Mar 1986	United Kingdom	1 Oct 1985

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	17 Sep 1989

****

Regulation No. 65: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of special warning lights for motor vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 June 1986, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 June 1986, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1428, p. 335 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.64, Amend.1, and Amend.1/Corr.1; depositary notification C.N.468.1992.TREATIES–57 of 24 March 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/352 (supplement 1 to the original version).
STATUS: Parties: 14.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 65

Participant[3]	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	15 Jun 1986
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Norway	21 Feb 1988
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	15 Jun 1986	Spain	29 May 1992
Germany	3 Jul 1994	Sweden	11 Nov 1988
Hungary	14 Nov 1988	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	17 Sep 1991	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	24 Aug 1993

****

Regulation No. 66: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of large passenger vehicles with regard to the strength of their superstructure

Proposed by the Governments of Hungary and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1986, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1986, No. 4789.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1443, p. 314 et doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.65.
STATUS: Parties: 15.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 66

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Norway	24 May 1993
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Russian Federation[18]	1 Jan 1988
France	17 Dec 1994	Spain	6 Jun 1992
Germany[3]	16 Jul 1988	Sweden	21 Sep 1990
Hungary	1 Dec 1986	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994	United Kingdom	1 Dec 1986
Netherlands	2 May 1988		

****

Regulation No. 67: Uniform provisions regarding the approval of specific equipment of motor vehicles using liquefied petroleum gases in their propulsion system

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 June 1987, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 June 1987, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.66; and depositary notification C.N.197.1993.TREATIES–16 of 9 September 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/362 (supplement 1 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 67

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	1 Jun 1987
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Norway	24 May 1993
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Hungary	16 Nov 1992	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Italy	1 Jun 1987	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	9 Feb 1994

****

Regulation No. 68: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of power-driven vehicles with regard to the measurement of the maximum speed

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 May 1987, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 May 1987, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.67.
STATUS: Parties: 11.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 68

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Italy	1 May 1987
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Netherlands	2 May 1988
France	1 May 1987	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Germany[3]	17 Jun 1989	Yugoslavia	20 Jul 1991
Hungary	6 Jan 1991		

****

Regulation No. 69: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear marking plates for slow-moving vehicles (by construction) and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 May 1987, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 May 1987, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.68.
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 69

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	15 May 1987	Norway	24 May 1993
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Denmark	18 Sep 1987	Sweden	11 Nov 1988
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Germany	8 Oct 1993	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990
Netherlands	15 May 1987	Yugoslavia	18 Aug 1990

****

Regulation No. 70: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear marking plates for heavy and long vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 May 1987, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 May 1987, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.69.
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 70

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	15 May 1987	Netherlands	15 May 1987
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
Denmark	6 Aug 1990	Sweden	11 Nov 1988
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Germany	26 Sep 1993	United Kingdom	20 Mar 1990
Italy	21 Aug 1988	Yugoslavia	18 Aug 1990

****

Regulation No. 71: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of agricultural tractors with regard to the driver's field of vision

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1987, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1987, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.70.
STATUS: Parties: 11.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 71

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	2 May 1988
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Norway	24 May 1993
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Poland	6 Jun 1992
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	1 Aug 1987	Russian Federation	4 Jan 1992
Italy	1 Aug 1988		

****

Regulation No. 72: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor cycle headlamps emitting an asymmetrical passing beam and a driving beam and equipped with halogen lamps (HS_1 lamps)

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 February 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 February 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505–Rev.1/Add.71; depositary notifications C.N.77.1989. TREATIES–15 of 10 May 1989 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.71.1992. TREATIES–04 of 27 May 1992; C.N.247.1992.TREATIES–33 of 23 September 1992 (addendum) and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/306 and 312 (supplement 1 to the original); and C.N.186.1995.TREATIES–32 of 27 July 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 8.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 72

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Netherlands	15 Feb 1988
Germany	19 Apr 1994	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	15 Feb 1988	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	27 Oct 1992

****

Regulation No. 73: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of goods vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers with regard to their lateral protection

Proposed by the Governments of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.72.
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 73

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	1 Jan 1988
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Norway	24 May 1993
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	23 Jul 1988	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany[3]	20 Feb 1990	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Greece	3 Dec 1995	United Kingdom	1 Jan 1988
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	Yugoslavia	17 Jul 1993
Italy	3 Jul 1989		

****

Regulation No. 74: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of mopeds with regard to the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Finland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 June 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 June 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.73 and Amend.1; depositary notifications C.N.87.1992.TREATIES–7 of 17 June 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/270 and Corr.1 (supplement 1 to the original); and C.N.340.1994.TREATIES–45 of 9 January 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/416 (supplement 2 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 6.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 74

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Hungary	6 Jan 1991
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Netherlands	4 Jul 1992
Finland	15 Jun 1988	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Finland	17 Nov 1992
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	9 Jun 1995

****

Regulation No. 75: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of pneumatic tyres for motorcycles

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.74; and depositary notifications C.N.384.1993.TREATIES–36 of 1 October 1993 and docs. TRANS/SC1/WP29/363 and Corr.1 (supplement 1 to the original) and 372 and Corr.1 (French only) (supplement 2 to the original); C.N.60.1994.TREATIES–9 of 23 May 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/388 (supplement 3 to the original); C.N.248.1994.TREATIES–21 of 2 September 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/405* (supplement 4 to the original); and C.N.280.1995.TREATIES–66 of 26 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/465 (supplement 5 to the original)[21].
STATUS: Parties: 11.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 75

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Netherlands	27 Jan 1989
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Norway	24 May 1993
France	6 Jun 1992	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany	20 Aug 1991	United Kingdom	28 Nov 1989
Italy	1 Apr 1988		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	United Kingdom[21]	1 Mar 1994
Supplement 2 to the original	United Kingdom[21]	1 Mar 1994
Supplement 3 to the original	United Kingdom[21]	23 Oct 1994
Supplement 4 to the original	Italy	2 Feb 1995
Supplement 5 to the original	United Kingdom	26 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 76: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of headlamps for mopeds emitting a driving beam and a passing beam

Proposed by the Governments of Germany[3] and Sweden

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.75 and Corr.1; and depositary notification C.N.95.1992.TREATIES–10 of 16 June 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 8.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 76

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	4 Jul 1992
Finland	12 Sep 1988	Sweden	1 Jul 1988
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	6 Jan 1991	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

****

Regulation No. 77: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of parking lamps for power-driven vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 September 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 30 September 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.76 and Amend.1; depositary notifications C.N.276.1990.TREATIES–44 of 5 December 1990 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/272 (supplement 1 to the original); C.N.69.1992.TREATIES–3 of 24 April 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/296 (supplement 2 to the original); C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.238.1995.TREATIES–57 of 11 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/452 (supplement 3 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 77

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Italy	17 Sep 1991
Belgium	19 Dec 1989	Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Netherlands	30 Sep 1988
France	30 Sep 1988	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	6 Jan 1991	United Kingdom	27 Apr 1990

Amendments

Series	*Author of the proposition*	*Entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	5 May 1991
Supplement 2 to the original	Netherlands	24 Sep 1992
Supplement 3 to the original	Netherlands	11 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 78: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles of category L with regard to braking

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 October 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 October 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.77; depositary notifications C.N.128.1990.TREATIES–14 of 22 June 1990 and doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.77/Amend.1 (amendments series 01); C.N.115.1992.TREATIES–11 of 1 July 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); C.N.208.1994.TREATIES–16 of 8 August 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/381 and Corr.1 (amendments series 02); and C.N.278.1994.TREATIES–27 of 21 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/406 (supplement 1 to amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 17.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 78

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	19 Dec 1989	Netherlands	27 Jan 1989
Croatia	8 Oct 1991	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Slovenia	25 Jun 1991
France	15 Oct 1988	Spain	29 May 1992
Germany[3]	3 Oct 1990	Sweden	16 Aug 1993
Hungary	6 Jan 1991	Yugoslavia	22 Apr 1989
Italy	15 Oct 1988		

Amendments

Series	*Author of the proposition*	*Entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	22 Nov 1990
02	United Kingdom	8 Jan 1995
(supplement 1)	United Kingdom	21 Mar 1995

****

Regulation No. 79: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the steering equipment

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1988, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1988, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.404 and Amend.1 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.408; depositary notifications C.N.211.1989.TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1989 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/246 (amendments series 01); C.N.224.1990.TREATIES–34 of 9 November 1990 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.70.1994.TREATIES–11 of 5 July 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/320 (supplement 2 to the original)*; C.N.13.1995.TREATIES–10 of 14 March 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/417 and Corr.1 (supplement 1 to the origianl)*; and C.N.354.1995.TREATIES–73 of 13 November 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 17.

*[As indicated in the document of the Economic and Social Council (doc. TRANS/WP.29/343/Rev.3). The lack of numerical order in the sequence of supplements is due to circumstancespertaining to the establishment of the relevant documentation by the ECE.]

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 79

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Netherlands	4 Jul 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Norway	24 May 1993
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	1 Dec 1988	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany	9 Feb 1992	Sweden	16 Aug 1993
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	6 Jan 1991	United Kingdom	1 Dec 1988
Italy	3 Jul 1989		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	11 Feb 1990
Supplement 2 to the original*	France	5 Dec 1994
Supplement 1 to the original*	United Kingdom	14 Aug 1995

****

Regulation No. 80: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of seats of large passenger vehicles and of these vehicles with regard to the strength of the seats and their anchorages

Proposed by the Governments of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 February 1989, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 23 February 1989, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.79.
STATUS: Parties: 11.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 80

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Norway	24 May 1993
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	23 Feb 1989	Spain	27 Mar 1994
Germany[3]	20 Feb 1990	Sweden	21 Sep 1990
Hungary	6 Jan 1991	United Kingdom	23 Feb 1989
Luxembourg	21 Jan 1994		

****

Regulation No. 81: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of rear–view mirrors of two–wheeled power–driven vehicles with or without side car, with regard to the mounting of rear–view mirrors on handlebars

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1989, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1989, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324–E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.80.
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 81

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Hungary	6 Aug 1995
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Italy	1 Mar 1989
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Netherlands	4 Jul 1992
France	1 Mar 1989	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany	3 Apr 1994	Sweden	21 Sep 1990

****

Regulation No. 82: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of moped headlamps equipped with filament halogen lamps (HS_2)

Proposed by the Governments of the Netherlands and Sweden

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 17 March 1989, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 17 March 1989, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/324-E/ECE/TRANS/505/Rev.1/Add.81.
STATUS: Parties: 8.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 82

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	17 Mar 1989
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Sweden	17 Mar 1989
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	28 Aug 1990	United Kingdom	3 Sep 1995

****

Regulation No. 83: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the emission of pollutants according to engine fuel requirements

Proposed by the Governments of France, Germany[3] and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 November 1989, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 5 November 1989, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.486 and Corr.1; depositary notifications C.N.205.1992.TREATIES–23 of 30 July 1992 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/339 (amendments series 01); C.N.232.1992. TREATIES–32 of 11 September 1992 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); C.N.315.1994.TREATIES–36 of 21 Novembre 1994 (procès–verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.384.1994.TREATIES–51 of 2 February 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/419 (proposal of amendments series 02).
STATUS: Parties: 19.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 83

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Netherlands	5 Nov 1989
Belgium	7 Aug 1990	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
France	5 Nov 1989	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
Germany[3]	5 Nov 1989	Spain	23 Jul 1991
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Hungary	6 Jan 1991	United Kingdom	28 Nov 1989
Italy	18 Dec 1989	Yugoslavia	20 Jul 1991
Luxembourg	12 May 1991		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	France	30 Dec 1992
02	France	2 Jul 1995

****

Regulation No. 84: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of power-driven vehicles equipped with internal combustion engine with regard to the measurement of fuel consumption

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 July 1990, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 July 1990, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/251.
STATUS: Parties: 20[22].

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 84

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Austria	29 Dec 1990	Netherlands	4 Jul 1992
Belgium	17 May 1992	Norway	24 May 1993
Czech Republic[1,22]	1 Jan 1993	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	15 Jul 1990	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany	12 Jan 1992	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Spain	21 Jan 1995
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	15 Jul 1990	United Kingdom	4 May 1991
Luxembourg	25 Aug 1992	Yugoslavia	20 Jul 1991

****

Regulation No. 85: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of internal combustion engines intended for the propulsion of motor vehicles of categories M and N with regard to the measurement of the net power

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 September 1990, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 September 1990, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/252.
STATUS: Parties: 19.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 85

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	17 May 1992	Norway	24 May 1993
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Finland	12 Apr 1991	Romania	24 Sep 1994
France	15 Sep 1990	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Germany	15 Jun 1992	Slovenia	1 Oct 1994
Greece	3 Dec 1995	Spain	21 Jan 1995
Hungary	21 Mar 1993	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	15 Sep 1990	United Kingdom	4 May 1991
Luxembourg	8 Mar 1993	Yugoslavia	20 Jul 1991
Netherlands	4 Jul 1992		

****

Regulation No. 86: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of agricultural or forestry tractors with regard to the installation of lighting and light-signalling devices

Proposed by the Governments of Finland and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 August 1990, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 August 1990, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/R.284 and Amend.1; and depositary notification C.N.237.1995.TREATIES-56 of 15 September 1995 et doc. TRANS/WP.29/466 (supplement 1 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 10.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 86

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belarus	2 Jul 1995	Italy	3 Dec 1990
Belgium	21 Dec 1990	Netherlands	1 Aug 1990
Czech Republic[1]	1 Jan 1993	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Finland	1 Aug 1990	Slovakia[1]	1 Jan 1993
Hungary	6 Aug 1995	United Kingdom	3 Sep 1995

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	15 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 87: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of day-time running lamps for power-driven vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of France and Sweden

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1990, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1990, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/263; and depositary notifications C.N.115.1992.TREATIES-11 of 1 July 1992 (procès-verbal concerning modifications); and C.N.235.1995.TREATIES-54 of 15 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/453 (supplement 1 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 7.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 87

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Germany	29 Nov 1994	Poland	13 Nov 1992
Finland	1 Nov 1990	Sweden	1 Nov 1990
Netherlands	4 Jul 1992	United Kingdom	3 Sep 1995
Norway	24 May 1993		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	13 Feb 1996

••••••••••••••••••••

Regulation No. 88: Uniform provisions concerning the approval retroreflective tyres for two–wheeled vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 April 1991, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 10 April 1991, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/217 and Corr.1; and depositary notification C.N.190.1993.TREATIES-13 of 27 August 1993 (procès–verbal concerning certain modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 6.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 88

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Belgium	10 Apr 1991	Norway	24 May 1993
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Sweden	16 Aug 1993
Netherlands	10 Apr 1991	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 89: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of

I. Vehicles with regard to limitation of their maximum speed
II. Vehicles with regard to the installation of a speed limitation device (SLD) of an approved type
III. Speed limitation devices (SLD)

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1992, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1992, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/284.
STATUS: Parties: 10.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 89

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Italy	1 Oct 1992
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Netherlands	16 Aug 1993
France	26 Jan 1993	Romania	24 Sep 1994
Germany	3 Apr 1993	Slovakia	1 Sep 1995
Hungary	6 Aug 1995	United Kingdom	1 Oct 1992

****

Regulation No. 90: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of replacement brake lining assemblies for power–driven vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1992, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1992, No. 4789.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC1/WP291/321; and depositary notifications C.N.23.1994.TREATIES–5 of 18 April 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP291/382 (amendments series 01); and C.N.12.1995.TREATIES–9 of 14 March 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/420 (supplement 1 to amendments series 01).
STATUS: Parties: 10.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 90

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Hungary	6 Aug 1995
Finland	19 Apr 1994	Italy	1 Mar 1993
Denmark	2 Apr 1994	Luxembourg	11 Jun 1995
France	16 Aug 1993	Netherlands	1 Nov 1992
Germany	3 Jul 1994	United Kingdom	1 Nov 1992

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
01	United Kingdom	18 Sep 1994
(supplement 1)	United Kingdom	14 Aug 1995

****

Regulation No. 91: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of side-marker lamps for motor vehicles and their trailers

Proposed by the Governments of Czechoslovakia[1] and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 October 1993, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 October 1993, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notifications C.N.489.1992.TREATIES-60 of 11 May 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/337; and C.N.236.1995.TREATIES-55 of 15 September 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/454 (supplement 1 to the original).
STATUS: Parties: 11.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 91

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Czech Republic	26 May 1995	Netherlands	15 Oct 1993
Finland	3 Apr 1994	Slovakia	15 Oct 1993
France	13 Dec 1993	Sweden	15 Oct 1993
Germany	3 Jul 1994	Switzerland	2 Feb 1996
Italy	20 Nov 1993	United Kingdom	20 Feb 1994
Luxembourg	11 Jun 1995		

Amendments

Series	*Proposed by*	*Date of entry into force*
Supplement 1 to the original	Netherlands	15 Feb 1996

****

Regulation No. 92: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of replacement exhaust silencing systems (RESS) for motor cycles

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and Spain

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1993, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1993, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.188.1993.TREATIES–12 of 1 August 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/268.
STATUS: Parties: 4.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 92

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Luxembourg	11 Jun 1995
Italy	1 Nov 1993	Spain	1 Nov 1993

****

Regulation No. 93: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of:

I. Front underrun protective devices (FUPD's)
II. Vehicles with regard to the installation of an FUPD of an approved type
III. Vehicles with regard to their front underrun protection (FUP)

Proposed by the Governments of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 February 1994, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 27 February 1994, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.376.1993.TREATIES–33 of 15 October 1993 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/377.
STATUS: Parties: 5.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 93

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Netherlands	27 Feb 1994
Germany	22 Aug 1994	United Kingdom	27 Feb 1994
Italy	29 Jan 1996		

****

Regulation No. 94: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the protection of the occupants in the event of a frontal collision

Proposed by the Governments of France and Germany

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1995, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1995, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.294.1994.TREATIES–30 of 31 October 1994 and doc. TRANS/SC1/WP29/392.
STATUS: Parties: 4.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 94

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Finland	29 Dec 1995	Germany	1 Oct 1995
France	1 Oct 1995	United Kingdom	1 Oct 1995

****

Regulation No. 95: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the protection of the occupants in the event of a lateral collision

Proposed by the Governments of France and Italy

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 July 1995, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 6 July 1995, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notifications C.N.10.1995.TREATIES–7 of 15 March 1995 and doc. TRANS/SC.1/WP.29/396 and Corr.1; and C.N.213.1995.TREATIES–42 of 7 August 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 3.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 95

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
France	6 Jul 1995	United Kingdom	6 Jul 1995
Italy	6 Jul 1995		

****

Regulation No. 96: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of compression iginition (c.i) engines to be installed in agricultural and forestry tractors with regard to the emissions of pollutants by the engine

Proposed by the Governments of Italy and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 December 1995, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 December 1995, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notifications C.N.220.1995.TREATIES–45 of 10 July 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/395 and Corr.1; and C.N.355.1995.TREATIES–74 of 13 November 1995 (procès–verbal concerning modifications).
STATUS: Parties: 2.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 96

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Italy	15 Dec 1995	United Kingdom	15 Dec 1995

****

Regulation No. 97: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicle alarm systems (VAS) and of motor vehicles with regard to their alarm systems

Proposed by the Governments of Germany and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1996, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1996, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.234.1995.TREATIES–53 of 29 August 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/425 and Corr.1.
STATUS: Parties: 2.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 97

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Germany	1 Jan 1996	United Kingdom	1 Jan 1996

****

Regulation No. 98: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of motor vehicle headlamps equipped with gas-discharge light sources

Proposed by the Governments of Germany and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 April 1996, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 April 1996, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.385.1995.TREATIES-76 of 27 December 1995 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/432.
STATUS: Parties: 2.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 98

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Germany	15 Apr 1996	Netherlands	15 Apr 1996

Regulation No. 99: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of gas-discharge light sources for use in approved gas-discharge lamp units of power-driven vehicles

Proposed by the Governments of Germany and the Netherlands

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 April 1996, in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 1 of the Agreement.
REGISTRATION: 15 April 1996, No. 4789.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.386.1995.TREATIES-77 of 19 January 1996 and doc. TRANS/WP.29/433.
STATUS: Parties: 2.

Contracting Parties applying Regulation No. 99

Participant	*Effective date of application*	*Participant*	*Effective date of application*
Germany	15 Apr 1996	Netherlands	15 Apr 1996

****

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 12 May 1960, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 358, p. 366.

Czechoslovakia also applied the following regulations as from the dates indicated below:

Regulations	*Date of effect*
1 and 2	8 May 1961
3	16 February 1964
4, 6, 7 and 8	17 June 1969
5	15 April 1968
9	1 March 1969
10	15 July 1969
11, 12, 14, 15*, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20	14 April 1972
21 and 23**	30 July 1972
24, 25, and 26	9 December 1975
32 and 33	17 September 1976
30	26 September 1977
41	1 August 1980
37	11 November 1980
38	20 July 1981
39	29 December 1981
49	15 April 1982
43	12 September 1981
13, 34, 35, 40, 42, 46, 47 and 48	18 September 1982
44***	8 November 1982
51	4 January 1983
50, 54, 56 and 57	18 December 1983
60	1 July 1984
53	30 July 1984
63	15 August 1985
28, 45, 55, 58 and 61	3 November 1985
74	15 June 1988
75	1 April 1988
78	1 January 1990
83	10 August 1990
73 and 79	9 June 1991
67	25 August 1991
84 and 85	27 August 1991
36 and 52	10 February 1992
59, 62, 64, 71, 81 and 86	18 October 1992
91	15 October 1993

* See note 7 below.
** See note 12 below.
*** In application of article 12 (2).
See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] With a declaration that the Agreement does not apply to the Faeroe Islands.

[3] The German Democratic Republic acceded to the Convention with a reservation on 4 October 1974. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 950, p. 362.

The German Democratic Republic also applied the following Regulations as from the dates indicated hereinafter:

Regulations	*Date of effect*
1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 19, 20 and 23	3 January 1976
10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25 and 26	26 September 1977
27, 28, 35 and 37	23 June 1979
22, 24, 30, 38 and 39	18 May 1980
12, 13, 16, 32, 33, 34, 41 and 42	28 June 1981
48	1 January 1982
53	1 February 1983
40, 45, 47, 49, 50 and 51	6 May 1984
54, 57 and 58	9 November 1986
64	19 December 1986
43, 46, 60, 61, 62, 63 and 65	3 April 1988
76	1 July 1988
78	24 April 1989
83*	16 October 1990

* Parts B and C only

With regard to the above, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, in a communication received on 14 January 1991, informed the Secretary-General of the following:

- The following Regulations which have been applied by both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic shall continue to apply:
  Regulations Nos. 1 to 4, 6 to 8, 10 to 14, 16 to 28, 30, 34, 37 to 40, 42, 43, 45 to 50, 53, 54, 57 and 83;
- The following Regulations which have so far been applied only by the German Democratic Republic and not by the Federal Republic of Germany shall be applied by the Federal Republic of Germany as from 3 October 1990, the date when the German Democratic Republic acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany:
  Regulations Nos. 35, 41, 51, 58, 60 to 62, 64 76 and 78; and

– The following Regulations which were applied by the German Democratic Republic but not by the Federal Republic of Germany are not to be applied in the future:

Regulations Nos. 15, 32, 33, 63 and 65.

The notification further states that it ". . . does not constitute a general statement of position by the Federal Republic of Germany on the question of state succession in relation to treaties."

Moreover, it should be noted that Regulations Nos. 37, 43, 47, 52 and 83 were proposed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and that Regulations Nos. 48, 53 and 76 were proposed by the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Agreement "shall apply to Land Berlin as from the date on which the Agreement enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above–mentioned statement, the Secretary–General received communications from the Governments of Czechoslovakia (1 February 1966 and 13 September 1967), Hungary (10 February 1966), Poland (4 March 1966), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (12 April 1966 and 2 June 1967, and upon accession), the Byelorussian SSR (6 June 1966 and 10 November 1967), Albania (14 June 1966), France (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the United Kingdom (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the Federal Republic of Germany (25 November 1966, 21 August 1968 and 23 December 1987), the United States of America (21 August 1968), and France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (30 October 1987). The communications in question are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Upon accession to the Agreement on 4 October 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made on the same subject a declaration identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one reproduced in the fifth paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3.

In reference to the latter declaration, the Secretary–General received communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (8 July 1975) and from the Federal Republic of Germany (19 September 1975) identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding declarations cited in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary–General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 3 above.

[5] On 29 March 1990, the Secretary–General was informed by the Government of Sweden that as from 1 January 1991, the Swedish National Safety Office (TSV) will be authorized to propose new regulations as well as to approve new regulations and amendments of regulations when they exclusively relate to TSV regulations.

[6] 1 October 1982 is the date retained at the request of the Government of Belgium in order to synchronize the implementation of Regulation No. 9 as amended and that of the new Regulation No. 51.

[7] The following states notified, pursuant to the provisions of article 1 (7) of the Agreement, their intention to cease to apply regulation No. 15, with effect from the date indicated below:

State	*Date of effect of the cessation of application:*
Austria	25 May 1986
Belgium	1 Oct 1989
Czechoslovakia*	31 Dec 1991
Denmark	1 Oct 1989
Finland	1 Jan 1990
France	10 Oct 1989
Germany**	30 Sep 1989
Hungary	21 May 1992
Italy	1 Oct 1989
Luxembourg	1 Jul 1990
Netherlands	20 Jun 1989
Norway	1 Jan 1989
Slovenia	2 Aug 1995
Spain	15 Feb 1991
Switzerland***	1 Jan 1982
United Kingdom	1 Oct 1990

* See note 1 above.

** The notification contained the following declaration:

In the European Communities, the provisions of Directive 70/220/EEC on the approximation of the law of the Member States relating to measures to be taken against air pollution by gases from positive–ignition engines of motor vehicles, as amended by Directive 83/351/EEC, were in conformity with ECE Regulation No. 15/04. As a result of Directive 88/76/EEC, however, provisions on exhaust–gas behaviour and other requirements to be met by fuels that are more stringent than those set forth in ECE Regulation 15/04 have come into effect.

For reasons relating to environment policy, the Federal Republic of Germany can no longer approve motor vehicles meeting only the less stringent requirements of ECE Regulation No. 15/04 with regard to exhaust–gas behaviour.

The Federal Republic of Germany intends, together with France, to submit to the United Nations the draft of a new ECE regulation that both maintains a link with ECE Regulation No. 15/04 and contains the more stringent provisions of Directive 88/76/EEC. The goal of this course of action is to ensure a gradual transition.

See also note 3 above.

*** The notification contained the following declaration:

The Federal Council [of Switzerland] expresses the hope that progress made within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe as regards the regulation of the emission of gaseous pollutants will lead it to reapply the said Regulation No. 15 in the near future.

[8] The amendments (series 02) to Regulation No. 15 entered into force on 1 March 1977 (instead of 15 March 1977), in accordance with a proposal by the United Kingdom received on 22 October 1976 and circulated by the Secretary General on 8 November 1976.

[9] Amendments to Regulation No. 16 proposed by the Governments of Belgium, France and the Netherlands were circulated by the Secretary–General among the Contracting Parties to the Agreement on 18 February 1972. The proposed amendments having thus been communicated jointly by all Governments applying Regulation No. 16, it was not necessary to wait for the expiration of the three–month period provided for by article 12 (1) of the Agreement for the possible formulation of objections, and the amendments consequently entered into force on 18 April 1972, i.e., within a period of two months from their circulation in accordance with the other provisions of article 12 of the Agreement.

[10] Amendments to Regulation No. 19, proposed by the Government of Spain, were circulated by the Secretary–General among the Contracting Parties to the Agreement on 7 November 1973. The Government of Spain had made its acceptance of Regulation No. 19 subject to the acceptance of the aforesaid amendments.

[11] It results from the indications given by the Government of Yugoslavia that it has applied the regulations 23, 37 and 38 *de facto* as from 15 February 1982 and 21 May 1983, respectively, and the Secretary–General's understanding is that none of the other Contracting Parties concerned object thereto.

[12] Amendments to Regulation No. 23, proposed by the Government of Czechoslovakia, were circulated by the Secretary–General among the Contracting Parties to the Agreement on 28 March 1975. The amendments in question were not accepted, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany having objected thereto by a notification received on 26 June 1975.

Having been informed, in a communication received on 7 June 1976, of the withdrawal of that objection, the Secretary–General again circulated the text of the amendments proposed by the Government of Czechoslovakia among the Contracting Parties on 22 October 1976. The amendments then were accepted and entered into force on 22 March 1977.

[13] On 4 March 1976, the Secretary–General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a communication stating in part:

"... Public Service Vehicles approved under Regulation 36 which enter the United Kingdom will continue to have to comply with certain provisions of the 'Public Service Vehicle (conditions of Fitness, Equipment and Use) Regulations 1972' of the United Kingdom which regulate matters not covered by Regulation 36."

[14] On 30 July 1987, the Government of Austria notified the Secretary–General that it intends to cease to apply Regulation No. 40 as from 30 July 1988.

[15] The Government of Switzerland indicated its intention to apply the regulations 40 and 47 as from 1 April 1983.

Subsequently, in a notification received on 23 October 1986, the Government of Switzerland informed the Secretary–General it would no longer apply regulations No. 40 and 47 as from 30 September 1987 and 30 September 1988, respectively.

[16] With the following statement:

"A provision concerning new automobiles, which is in force in Finland since 1 January 1981, prohibits the mounting of tempered windshields on automobiles."

[17] At the time of publication, supplement 2 to the amendments series 01 was still under consideration.

[18] The said regulations would normally enter into force for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on 6 March 1988. However, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has indicated in its notification that it intends to apply the Regulations as from 1 January 1988.

[19] Previous 01 series of amendments becomes supplement 1 to the original version (see document TRANS/SC1/WP29/163/Amend.2).

[20] The notification of application of regulation 48 by Italy was accompanied by a proposal of amendment to supplement 1 of the said regulation and a statement to the effect that the Government of Italy's acceptance of regulation No. 48 was subject to the acceptance of the proposed amendments (which were circulated on 27 January 1987). Entry into force: 27 June 1987.

[21] The proposal by the Government of the United Kingdom was accompanied by the following communication:

"In accordance with the decision of the Working Party on the Construction of Vehicles at its 100th session (TRANS/SC.1/WP29/384, para 47), the Government of the United Kingdom wishes to propose that this Supplement 3, as well as Supplements 1 and 2 to this Regulation, be considered as applying from 25 June 1993."

In this connection and in view of the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 12 of the Agreement, the Secretary–General wishes to note that this application would thus presently take place strictly on a *de facto* basis.

[22] Termination of application as from 31 December 1996.

17. Agreement on Special Equipment for the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs and on the Use of such Equipment for the International Transport of some of those Foodstuffs

Concluded at Geneva on 15 January 1962[1]

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 8 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/456 (E/ECE/TRANS/526), 1962.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium	29 Jun 1962		Poland[3]	19 Jun 1962	
Bulgaria	19 Jan 1962		Spain		7 Jan 1964 *a*
France		13 Feb 1962 *s*	Switzerland	19 Jan 1962	
Germany[2]	10 Apr 1962		Yugoslavia		25 Sep 1963 *a*
Luxembourg	22 Jun 1962				

NOTES:

[1] Although listed in this chapter for reasons of convenience, this Agreement is not limited to transport by road.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] With a declaration that the Polish People's Republic is not bound by paragraph 2 and 3 of article 12 of the Agreement.

18. European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles Engaged in International Road Transport (AETR)

Concluded at Geneva on 19 January 1962

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 18 (4)].[1]
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE/457-E/ECE/TRANS/527.
STATUS: Signatories: 8.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Belgium	29 May 1962		Netherlands	12 Apr 1962	
France	13 Feb 1962		Poland[3]	17 May 1962	
Germany[2]	16 Mar 1962		Sweden	19 Jun 1962	
Luxembourg	1 Mar 1962		United Kingdom	31 Jan 1962	

NOTES:

[1] Instruments of ratification or accession *(a)* have been transmitted to the Secretary-General, pending their deposit in the manner provided in article 18, paragraph 4 of the Agreement, by the Governments of France, the Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe), Spain *(a)* and Yugoslavia *(a)*.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] With a declaration that the Polish People's Republic is not bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 22 of the Agreement.

19. Convention on Road Traffic

Concluded at Vienna on 8 November 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 May 1977, in accordance with article 47 (1).
REGISTRATION: 21 May 1977, No. 15705.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1042, p. 17; and depositary notification C.N.19.1992.TREATIES-1 of 3 March 1992 (amendments).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 37. Parties: 56.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on Road Traffic, held at Vienna from 7 October to 8 November 1968. It was convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to resolutions 1129 (XLI) and 1203 (XLII)[2] adopted by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on 27 July 1966 and 26 May 1967, respectively. The Conference also prepared and opened for signature the Convention on Road Signs and Signals (see chapter XI.B-20) and adopted the Final Act.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	8 Nov 1968	11 Aug 1981
Bahamas		14 May 1991 *a*
Bahrain		4 May 1973 *a*
Belarus	8 Nov 1968	18 Jun 1974
Belgium	8 Nov 1968	16 Nov 1988
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	8 Nov 1968	29 Oct 1980
Bulgaria	8 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Central African Republic		3 Feb 1988 *a*
Chile	8 Nov 1968	
China[3]		
Costa Rica	8 Nov 1968	
Côte d'Ivoire		24 Jul 1985 *a*
Croatia		23 Nov 1992 *d*
Cuba		30 Sep 1977 *a*
Czech Republic[4]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark[5]	8 Nov 1968	3 Nov 1986
Ecuador	8 Nov 1968	
Estonia		24 Aug 1992 *a*
Finland	16 Dec 1969	1 Apr 1985
France	8 Nov 1968	9 Dec 1971
Georgia		23 Jul 1993 *a*
Germany[6,7]	8 Nov 1968	3 Aug 1978
Ghana	22 Aug 1969	
Greece		18 Dec 1986 *a*
Guyana		31 Jan 1973 *a*
Holy See	8 Nov 1968	
Hungary	8 Nov 1968	16 Mar 1976
Indonesia	8 Nov 1968	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Nov 1968	21 May 1976
Israel	8 Nov 1968	11 May 1971
Italy	8 Nov 1968	
Kazakstan		4 Apr 1994 *a*
Kuwait		14 Mar 1980 *a*
Latvia		19 Oct 1992 *a*
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 *a*
Luxembourg	8 Nov 1968	25 Nov 1975
Mexico	8 Nov 1968	
Monaco		6 Jun 1978 *a*
Morocco		29 Dec 1982 *a*
Niger		11 Jul 1975 *a*
Norway	23 Dec 1969	1 Apr 1985
Pakistan		19 Mar 1986 *a*
Philippines	8 Nov 1968	27 Dec 1973
Poland	8 Nov 1968	23 Aug 1984
Portugal	8 Nov 1968	
Republic of Korea[8]	29 Dec 1969	
Republic of Moldova		26 May 1993 *a*
Romania	8 Nov 1968	9 Dec 1980
Russian Federation	8 Nov 1968	7 Jun 1974
San Marino	8 Nov 1968	20 Jul 1970
Senegal		16 Aug 1972 *a*
Seychelles		11 Apr 1977 *a*
Slovakia[4]		1 Feb 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
South Africa		1 Nov 1977 *a*
Spain	8 Nov 1968	
Sweden	8 Nov 1968	25 Jul 1985
Switzerland	8 Nov 1968	11 Dec 1991
Tajikistan		9 Mar 1994 *a*
Thailand	8 Nov 1968	
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[9]		18 Aug 1993 *d*
Turkmenistan		14 Jun 1993 *a*
Ukraine	8 Nov 1968	12 Jul 1974
United Kingdom	8 Nov 1968	
Uruguay		8 Apr 1981 *a*
Uzbekistan		17 Jan 1995 *a*
Venezuela	8 Nov 1968	
Yugoslavia	8 Nov 1968	1 Oct 1976
Zaire		25 Jul 1977 *a*
Zimbabwe		31 Jul 1981 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

Reservations and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 52 of the Convention on Road Traffic stating the disputes which relate to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred, at the request of any of the Parties, to the International Court of Justice.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of article 45 of the Convention on Road Traffic, under

which a number of States may not become parties to this Convention, are discriminatory in character, and it considers that the Convention on Road Traffic should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restrictions.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of article 46 of the Convention on Road Traffic are anachronistic and at variance with the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960).

BELGIUM[10]

16 May 1989

Reservations to article 10 (3) and 18 (3).

BRAZIL[11]

Reservations with respect to the following articles and annex:

- Article 20, paragraph 2 (a) and (b);
- Article 23, paragraph 2 (a);
- Article 40;
- Article 41, paragraph 1 (a), (b) and (c) (partial reservations);
- Annex 5, paragraph 5 (c); and
- Annex 5, paragraphs 28, 39 and 41 (partial reservations).

Declarations as regards the above-mentioned partial reservations:

(a) Brazil's partial reservation to chapter IV (Drivers of Motor Vehicles), article 41 (Validity of Driving Permits), paragraphs 1 (a), (b), and (c), refers to the fact that drivers issued permits in left-hand drive countries cannot drive in Brazil before taking a road test for right-hand driving.

(b) The partial reservation to Annex 5 (Technical Conditions Concerning Motor Vehicles and Trailers), chapter II (Lights and reflecting devices), paragraph 28, is against the triangular form of the reflex reflectors required for every trailer, inconvenient for Brazil since the triangular shape is used for emergency signal devices to alert drivers ahead on the road.

(c) In Annex 5, chapter II, paragraph 39, Brazil's reservation refers solely to the amber colour of the direction-indicators, since only red lights should be used at the rear of vehicles.

(d) The partial reservation made to Annex 5, paragraph 41, refers to the fact that in Brazil reversing lights fitted on motor vehicles shall emit only white light.

Declarations:

- Pursuant to the provisions of chapter IV, article 41, paragraph 2 (b), Brazil refuses to recognize the validity in its territory of driving permits held by persons under eighteen years of age.
- Pursuant to the provisions of chapter IV, article 41, paragraph (c), Brazil, referring to annexes 6 and 7 covering models of domestic driving permits, refuses to recognize the validity in its territory for the driving of motor vehicles or combinations or vehicles in Categories C, D, and E of driving permits held by persons under twenty-one years of age.

BULGARIA[12]

Declaration made upon signature:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that the provisions of article 45 of the Convention on Road Traffic, under which a number of States may not become parties to this Convention, are discriminatory in character, and it considers that the Convention on Road Traffic should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restrictions.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that the provisions of article 46 of the Convention on Road Traffic are anachronistic and at variance with the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Declaration made upon ratification:

In the People's Republic of Bulgaria mopeds are treated as motor cycles for the purposes of the application of the Convention on Road Traffic (art. 54, para. 2).

COTE D'IVOIRE

Reservations:

Pursuant to article 54, paragraph 1, [of the Convention] the Republic of the Ivory Coast does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 52, under which "Any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of this Convention and which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other means of settlement may be referred, at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned, to the International Court of Justice for decision".

CUBA

The Republic of Cuba declares that the provisions of article 45, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which deals with matters affecting the interests of all States, are of a discriminatory nature in that they preclude the right of a number of States to become signatories and parties to the Convention, contrary to the principle of sovereign equality of States.

The Republic of Cuba declares that the provisions of article 46 of the Convention, are not applicable as they are contrary to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1960, which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 52 of the Convention on Road Traffic regarding the referral to the International Court of Justice of any dispute with another Contracting Party.

The Republic of Cuba declares that it treats mopeds as motor cycles, in accordance with article 54 (2) of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

DENMARK

Reservations:

Article 18, paragraph 2 according to which road users coming from a path or graved track shall give way to vehicles on the road.

Article 33, paragraph 1 (d) according to which it shall be permissible to use parking light also when driving outside a built-up area.

Annex 5, 17 (c) according to which the total permissible weight of a trailer without a service brake may not exceed half the sum of the hauling vehicle's unladen weight and the driver's weight.

Declaration:

Article 54, paragraph 2: for the purposes of the Convention Denmark treats mopeds whose maximum design speed exceeds 30 km per hour as motor cycles.

ESTONIA

Reservation:

"Estonia does not consider itself bound by article 52 of the Convention."

FINLAND[13]

Reservations:

"1. *With respect to Article 11 paragraph 1 (a) (Overtaking):*

Finland reserves the right to provide in Finnish law that in Finland drivers of cycles and mopeds may always overtake other vehicles than cycles or mopeds from the right;

"2. *With respect to Article 18 paragraphs 2 and 3 (Obligation to give way):*

Finland reserves the right to provide in Finnish law that in Finland every driver emerging from a path or an earth-track on to a road other than a path or an earth-track or emerging on to a road from property boarding there on shall give way to all traffic travelling on that road. (Since the Convention provides that the right of way shall be given to "vehicles", while in Finnish Law such right of way is to be given to all traffic, including pedestrians.) In Finnish law the obligation to give way is of wider appreciation than that of the Convention;

"3. *With respect to Article 33 paragraph 1 (c) and 1 (d) (Use of driving or passing lights):*

Finland reserves the right to provide in Finnish law that in a motor-driven vehicle driving lights, passing lights or running lights must always be switched on when driving outside built-up areas. Driving or passing lights must be used in every vehicle when it is being driven in darkness or in dim light or when visibility is inadequate on account of weather or some other reason. Fog lights may only be used in fog or heavy rain or snowfall. In that case their use is allowed as a substitute for passing lights provided that position lights are simultaneously on."

30 May 1994

Reservation:

"Finland does not consider itself to be bound by the provision in Annex 3 paragraph 4 a) concerning the minimum dimensions of the axes of the ellipse of the distinguishing sign on other motor vehicles and their trailers."

GERMANY[6]

Reservations:

Ad article 18, paragraph 3

Article 18, paragraph 3, applies in the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with paragraph 15 of the annex to the European Agreement of 1 May1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic.

Ad article 23, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (c), No. (v)

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by article 23, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph (c), No. (v).

Ad article 31, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (d)

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by article 31, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (d).

Ad article 42, paragraph 1

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right of continuing to make entries of the kind mentioned in article 42, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (c) also in foreign domestic driving permits.

Ad annex 1, paragraph 1

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right in international transport

(a) of requiring of foreign lorries the same minimum engine performance as of German vehicles,

(b) of not admitting to traffic motor vehicles

– equipped with studded tyres,

– exceeding the maximum permissible weight and the maximum axle load permitted in the Federal Republic of Germany

or

not complying with the provisions on the placement on the vehicles of these figures,

– not equipped with a tachograph (control device) of the prescribed type.

Ad annex 5, paragraph 11

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the first half-sentence of paragraph 11 of annex 5.

Ad annex 5, paragraph 58

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 58 of annex 5.

Declarations:

With reference to the notification, made upon signature of the Convention on Road Traffic done at Vienna on 8 November 1968, according to which the distinguishing sign of the Federal Republic of Germany would be the letter "D", the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that the said notification was made for the whole area which through the ratification of the Convention by the Federal Republic of Germany fell within the purview of the said Convention.

Pursuant to the provisions of articles 3 (5) and 54 (2) of the Convention on Road Traffic, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shall treat mopeds as motor cycles for the purpose of the application of the Convention.

HUNGARY[14]

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. The wording of article 45, paragraph 1, of the Convention is at variance with the purposes and principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations. All States, without any restriction, should be given the possibility of participating in the Convention.

2. The provisions of article 46 of the Convention, as such, are anachronistic and are not in conformity with the principles of contemporary international law or the present state of international relations, and they are at variance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

Upon ratification:

The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic considers itself bound by article 18, paragraph 3, of the Convention subject to its tenor as defined in the European Agreement supplementary thereto.

INDONESIA

"Indonesia does not consider itself bound by article 52.

"In conformity with article 1, moped will be deemed as motor-cycle."

KUWAIT[15]

Interpretative statement:

"It is the understanding of the State of Kuwait that its accession to the said Convention does not imply recognition of Israel, or accepting any obligation towards it emanating from the provisions of the said Convention."

LITHUANIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Lithuania does not consider itself bound by article 52 of the Convention."

MONACO

In accordance with the provisions of article 54 (2) of the Convention, the Government of His Excellency the Prince of Monaco has decided, within the framework of its national regulations, to treat mopeds as motorcycles.

MOROCCO

Reservation:

Morocco does not consider itself bound by article 52 of the said Convention.

Declaration:

Morocco will treat mopeds as motor cycles.

NORWAY

Declaration:

"In accordance with their articles 46 (1) and 38 (1), respectively, the Convention on Road Traffic and the Convention on Road Signs and Signals shall for the present not become applicable to the territories of Svalbard and Jan Mayen."

Reservations:

"The Government of Norway shall not be bound by the provisions in Article 3, Article 8 (5), Article 18 (2), Article 18 (3) and Article 33 (1) (c) and (d)" [of the Convention on Road Traffic]."

POLAND

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

With the reservation, as provided for in article 54, paragraph 1 of the Convention, that it does not consider itself bound by article 52.

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 52 of this Convention.

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

"1. The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 45 of the Convention on Road Traffic and of article 37 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals are not in keeping with the principle according to which the international treaties whose object and purpose are of interest to the international community as a whole, should be opened to universal participation.

"2. The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that maintaining the state of dependence of some territories to which reference is made in article 46 of the Convention of Road Traffic, article 38 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention of Road Traffic and article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals are not in keeping with the United Nations Charter and with the documents adopted by the U.N. concerning the granting of independence to the colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on the principles of international law concerning the friendly relations and the co-operation between States according to the United Nations Charter, and which has unanimously been adopted by the United Nations General Assembly resolution No. 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970 and which solemnly proclaims the States' obligation to further the implementation of the principle of equal rights for the peoples and their right to dispose of themselves, in order to put a speedy end to colonialism."

Reservations:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 52 of the Convention according to which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of the Convention and which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other means may be referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the interested Contracting Parties.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision only with the consent of all Parties in dispute, for each case individually.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservation and declarations, mutatis mutandis, as those reproduced under "Belarus".]

SLOVAKIA[4]

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Republic of South Africa does not consider itself bound by article 52 of the aforesaid Convention".

SPAIN

In accordance with article 54, [. . .] Spain does not consider itself bound by article 52 and enters a reservation with respect to article 46.

SWEDEN

Reservations:

"(1) Instead of article 18, paragraph 3, of the Convention Sweden will apply the dispositions of paragraph 15 to the Annex of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic.

"(2) With respect to article 33, paragraph 1 (c) and (d), parking lights only may never be used when driving. Dipped head lights, position lights or other lights sufficient to enable the other road-users to notice the vehicle shall be used even when driving in daylight.

"With respect to article 52, Sweden opposes that disputes in which it is involved shall be referred to arbitration."

SWITZERLAND

Reservations:

Ad article 11, paragraph 1 (a)

Switzerland reserves the right to enact, in its domestic legislation, regulations specifying that cyclists and motorcyclists may still overtake a line of motor vehicles on the right.

Ad article 18, paragraph 3

Switzerland applies article 18, paragraph 3, in accordance with the version in number 15 of the annex to the European Agreement of 1 May 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic.

Declaration:

Switzerland recognizes in international traffic all registration certificates issued by the Contracting Parties according to chapter III of the Convention, when such certificates do not prohibit the admission of the vehicles to the territory of the State that issued the certificates.

Ad annex 1, paragraph 1

According to annex 1, paragraph 1, a Contracting Party may refuse to admit to its territory in international traffic only motor vehicles, trailers and combinations of vehicles whose overall weight or weight per axle or dimensions exceed the limits fixed by its domestic legislation. Switzerland therefore considers any application of this paragraph by Contracting Party to refuse admission in international traffic to motor vehicles, trailers and combinations of vehicles whose overall weight or weight per axle or dimensions do not exceed the limits fixed by its domestic legislation to be inconsistent with the principles of territoriality

and non-discrimination implicit in annex 1, paragraph 1; such cases, Switzerland reserves the right to take all appropriate measures to defend its interests.

THAILAND

"Thailand will not be bound by article 52 of this Convention.
"Thailand will consider mopeds as motor-cycles."

UKRAINE

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservation and declarations, mutatis mutandis, as those reproduced under "Belarus".]

URUGUAY

[Uruguay] will treat mopeds as motor cycles for the purposes of the application of the Convention.

ZAIRE

With reference to the pertinent provisions of the Convention Zaire shall not treat mopeds as motor cycles.

ZIMBABWE[16]

23 February 1982

"For the purpose of the application of the Convention, Zimbabwe will treat mopeds as motor cycles."

Distinguishing Sign of Vehicles in International Traffic [article 45 (4)]

(Distinctive letters notified to the Secretary-General)[17]

Austria	A	Luxembourg	L
Bahrain	BRN	Monaco	MC
Belarus	SU	Morocco	MA
Belgium	B	Niger	RN
Bosnia and Herzegovina	BIH	Norway	N
Brazil	BR	Pakistan	PK
Bulgaria	BG	Philippines	RP
Central African Republic	RCA	Romania	RO
Côte d'Ivoire	CI	Russian Federation[21]	RUS
Croatia	HR	San Marino	RSM
Czech Republic[4]	CZ	Senegal	SN
Denmark	DK	Seychelles	SY
Estonia[18]	EST	Slovakia[4]	SK
Finland[19]	FIN	Slovenia	SLO
France[20]	F	South Africa	ZA
Georgia	GE	Sweden	S
Germany[6]	D	Switzerland	CH
Greece	GR	Tajikistan	TJ
Guyana	GUY	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[9]	MK
Hungary	H	Turkmenistan[22]	TM
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	IR	Ukraine[23]	UA
Israel	IL	Uruguay	ROU
Kazakstan	KZ	Uzbekistan	UZ
Kuwait	KWT	Yugoslavia	YU
Latvia	LV	Zaire	ZRE
Lithuania	LT	Zimbabwe	ZW

NOTES:

[1] Amendments proposed by the Government of Poland were circulated by the Secretary-General on 3 March 1993. Less that one-third of the Contracting Parties having informed the Secretary-General that they rejected the said proposed amendments within the period of twelve months following the date of the depositary notification (3March 1993), the amendments were deemed to have been accepted. The Amendments entered into force on 3 September 1993 for all Contracting Parties except for the following States with respect to which only those amendments which these Parties have not rejected, will enter into force:

Denmark (26 February 1993):

"The Government of Denmark can accept the proposed amendments except for the following provisions which have to be rejected:

- Article 25, paragraph 2, according to which drivers emerging on to a motorway shall give way to vehicles travelling on it;
- Article 32, paragraph 4, concerning the use of fog lamps;
- Article 32, paragraph 7, concerning the use of driving lights;
- Annex 6, item 4, on numbering on driving permits and, consequently, article 43, paragraph 2, in so far as it refers to annex 6."

Finland (26 February 1993):

"Finland accepts the proposed amendments to the Convention on Road Traffic, but wishes to inform the Depositary and the Contracting Parties, that if the amendments are deemed accepted, Finland will make the following reservations pursuant to article 54, paragraph 5, of the Convention:

1. Finland does not consider itself to be bound by the proposed amendment to article 18, paragraph 7, of the Convention.
2. Finland does not consider itself to be bound by the proposed amendment to article 25, paragraph 2, of the Convention.
3. Finland does not consider itself to be bound by the first sentence of the proposed amendment to article 32, paragraph 6, of the Convention."

Germany (2 March 1993):

The Federal Republic of Germany is able to approve the proposed amendments of Poland with the following reservations:

1. Reservation concerning article 13, paragraph 2

The Federal Republic of Germany, in its national law, reserves the right not to set speed limits for certain categories of roads.

2. Reservation concerning article 19, sub-paragraph (d)

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the amendments to article 19, subparagraph (d), of the Convention.

(Subsequently, on 30 November 1993, the Government of Germany notified the Secretary-General that it was withdrawing the reservation No. 2.)

3. Reservation concerning article 23, paragraph 3, subparagraphs (b), (iv) and (c)

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the amendments to article 23, paragraph 3, subparagraphs (b), (iv) and (c), of the Convention.

4. Reservation concerning article 32, paragraphs 8, 10 (c) and 15

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by article 32, paragraphs 8 and 10 (c), of the Convention. With respect to article 32, paragraph 15, the Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to use for warning purposes a red light on the front of certain vehicles (for example, school buses).

5. Reservation concerning article 35, paragraph 1 (c) and (d)

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the amendments to article 35, paragraph 1 (c) and (d) of the Convention.

6. Reservation concerning article 41, paragraph 1 (a)

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, in its national law, not to require the possession of a driving permit for drivers of certain categories of vehicles.

7. Reservation concerning article 41, paragraph 4

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, in its national law, to indicate in some other way on the driving permit restrictions of the driving permit to certain vehicles of a particular category.

8. Reservation concerning annex 6 (Domestic driving permit), paragraph 4 of the Convention

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the numbering of the entries on the driving licence in annex 6 (Domestic driving permit), paragraph 4, of the Convention.

Norway (26 February 1993):

"(i) Norway rejects the proposed amendment to the Convention's article 25, paragraph 2, which states that priority should be given to vehicles entering highways, since Norway favours a continued application of the so-called 'zip-fastener'-principle, and that (ii) Norway accepts the other amendments proposed by Poland."

Sweden (3 March 1993):

"The Swedish Government wishes to inform the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the said Convention, of its rejection of the proposed amendment to article 25, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

[2] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-first Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/4264), p. 36, and *ibid., Forty-second Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/4393), p. 22.

[3] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 19 December 1969. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Albania and the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stating that their Governments did not recognize the said signature as valid since the only Government authorized to represent China and to assume obligations on its behalf was the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the United Nations Conference on Road Traffic 1968, and contributed to the formulation of, and signed the Convention on Road Traffic and the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, and that "any statements or reservations relating to these two Conventions that are incompatible or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said two Conventions."

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 8 November 1968 and 7 June 1978, respectively, choosing "CS" as a distinguishing sign of vehicles in international traffic [article 45(4)], with a reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification and a declaration made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1092, p. 407.

Subsequently, on 22 January 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation with respect to article 52 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification.

It should be noted that, upon succession, both the Government of Czechoslovakia and the Government of Slovakia had notified that the distinguishing signs chosen in application of article 45 (4), were "CZ" and "SQ", respectively. On 14 April 1993, the Government of Slovakia notified the Secretary-General that it had replaced its distinguishing sign "SQ" with the distinguishing sign "SK".

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of Denmark stated that "until further notice the [Convention] shall not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland".

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 11 October 1973 choosing DDR as a distinguishing sign of vehicles in international traffic [article 45 (4)] and with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1042, p. 355. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[7] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention will also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 6 above.

[8] With reference to the signature by the Republic of Korea, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Albania and the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Mongolia, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stating that their Governments considered the said signature as illegal, inasmuch as the authorities of South Korea could not act on behalf of Korea.

[9] On 20 May 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece the following objection in respect of the succession of the former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia to the Convention on Road Traffic:

> "The Greek Government objects to the accession of the [former Yugoslave Republic Macedonia] to the Convention on Road Traffic (Vienna, 8 November 1968) and consequently does not regard as valid the notification by which the former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia indicated the distinguishing sign "MK" it has selected for display on international traffic on vehicles registered by it.
>
> It should also be pointed out that the Government of Greece considers the distinguishing sign selected by the [former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia] incompatible with Security Council resolution S/RES/817 (1993) adopted on 7 April 1993, concerning the admission of that State to the United Nations, to the extent that it is contrary to the name [former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia], which must, in accordance with the above-mentioned resolution, be used for all purposes within the United Nations pending settlement of the difference that has arisen over the name of that State.
>
> Furthermore, the Greek Government would like to remind of the fact that accession of the former Yugoslave Republic of Macedonia to Convention on Road Traffic does not imply its recognition on behalf of the Greek Government."

[10] In application of article 54 (2) of the Convention, this declaration should have been made upon deposit of the instrument of ratification. The ratification was to have become effective on 16 November 1989, and in the absence of objection within a period of 90 days from the date (7 July 1989) when it was circulated by the Secretary-General, the notification was formally deposited as at 5 October 1989.

[11] In a communication received on 14 March 1985, the Government of Brazil notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the following declaration made upon ratification:

– "Pursuant to the provisions of article 54, paragraph 2, Brazil hereby declares that for the purposes of the application of this Convention, it treats mopeds as motor cycles (article 1 (n))."

The notification specifies that the withdrawal of the declaration is a consequence of a decision taken by the National Road Traffic Council of Brazil, to consider mopeds as now being in the same category as cycles (bicycles and tricycles), in conformity with article 1 (1) of the afore–mentioned Convention.

[12] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification with respect to article 52. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1120, p. 532.

[13] In a communication received on 20 August 1993, the Government of Finland transmitted the reservation to the Secretariat informing the Secretary–General that its instrument of ratification should have specified that its ratification was made subject to the said reservation, which had not been transmitted to the Secretary–General when the instrument was deposited. No objections on the part of one of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, were received within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (1 March 1994) and the said reservation was deemed accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the stipulated period of 90 days, that is to say on 30 May 1994.

[14] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 52 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1042, p. 357.

[15] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 June 1980, the Government of Israel declared the following:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Kuwait. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait under general international law or under particular conventions. Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[16] In application of article 54 (2) of the Convention, this declaration should have been made upon deposit of the instrument of accession. The accession was to have become effective on 31 July 1982, and in the absence of objection within a period of 90 days from the date (5 April 1982) when it was circulated by the Secretary-General, the notification was formally deposited as at 4 July 1982.

[17] See also list under the 1949 Convention (chapter XI.B-1).

[18] Formerly: "EW" until 31 December 1993.

[19] Formerly: "SF" until 31 December 1992.

[20] Also applicable to the overseas territories.

[21] Formerly: "SU" until 10 March 1993.

[22] Formerly: "TMN" until 14 June 1994.

[23] Formerly: "SU" until 20 January 1994.

20. Convention on Road Signs and Signals

Concluded at Vienna on 8 November 1968[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 June 1978, in accordance with article 39 (1).
REGISTRATION: 6 June 1978, No. 16743.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1091, p. 3; and depositary notification C.N.61.1994.TREATIES–1 of 31 May 1994 and doc. ECE/TRANS/90/Rev.2 (amendments).[2]
STATUS: Signatories: 36. Parties: 46.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	8 Nov 1968	11 Aug 1981
Bahrain		4 May 1973 *a*
Belarus	8 Nov 1968	18 Jun 1974
Belgium	8 Nov 1968	16 Nov 1988
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Brazil	8 Nov 1968	
Bulgaria	8 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Central African Republic		3 Feb 1988 *a*
Chile	8 Nov 1968	27 Dec 1974
China[3]		
Costa Rica	8 Nov 1968	
Côte d'Ivoire		24 Jul 1985 *a*
Croatia		2 Nov 1993 *d*
Cuba		30 Sep 1977 *a*
Czech Republic[4]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark[5]	8 Nov 1968	3 Nov 1986
Ecuador	8 Nov 1968	
Estonia		24 Aug 1992 *a*
Finland	16 Dec 1969	1 Apr 1985
France	8 Nov 1968	9 Dec 1971
Germany[6,7]	8 Nov 1968	3 Aug 1978
Ghana	22 Aug 1969	
Greece		18 Dec 1986 *a*
Holy See	8 Nov 1968	
Hungary	8 Nov 1968	16 Mar 1976
India		10 Mar 1980 *a*
Indonesia	8 Nov 1968	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Nov 1968	21 May 1976
Iraq		18 Dec 1988 *a*
Italy	8 Nov 1968	
Kazakstan		4 Apr 1994 *a*
Kuwait		13 May 1980 *a*
Latvia		19 Oct 1992 *a*
Lithuania		20 Nov 1991 *a*
Luxembourg	8 Nov 1968	25 Nov 1975
Mexico	8 Nov 1968	
Morocco		29 Dec 1982 *a*
Norway	23 Dec 1969	1 Apr 1985
Pakistan		14 Jan 1980 *a*
Philippines	8 Nov 1968	27 Dec 1973
Poland	8 Nov 1968	23 Aug 1984
Portugal	8 Nov 1968	
Republic of Korea[8]	29 Dec 1969	
Romania	8 Nov 1968	9 Dec 1980
Russian Federation	8 Nov 1968	7 Jun 1974
San Marino	8 Nov 1968	20 Jul 1970
Senegal		19 Apr 1972 *a*
Seychelles		11 Apr 1977 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain	8 Nov 1968	
Sweden	8 Nov 1968	25 Jul 1985
Switzerland	8 Nov 1968	11 Dec 1991
Tajikistan		9 Mar 1994 *a*
Thailand	8 Nov 1968	
Turkmenistan		14 Jun 1993 *a*
Ukraine	8 Nov 1968	12 Jul 1974
United Kingdom	8 Nov 1968	
Uzbekistan		17 Jan 1995 *a*
Venezuela	8 Nov 1968	
Yugoslavia	8 Nov 1968	6 Jun 1977
Zaire		25 Jul 1977 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

Reservations:

"1. Article 10 (6) of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals is applied with the exception that the sign B, 2[a] is announced in advance by the sign B, 1 supplemented by a rectangular panel bearing the symbol "STOP" and a figure indicating the distance to sign B, 2[a].

"2. Article 23 (1) (a) (i), article 23 (2) and article 23 (3) of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals are applied with the exception that the green light may also be flashing. The flashing of the green light signifies that the green phase will end immediately.

"3. Paragraph 6 (signs E, 19 and E, 20) of Annex 5, section F of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals is not applied."

BELARUS

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals stating that disputes which relate to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred, at the request of any of the Parties concerned, to the International Court of Justice for decision.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of article 37 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, under which a number of States may not become parties to the Convention, are discriminatory in character, and it considers that the Convention on Road Signs and Signals should

be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that the provisions of article 38 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals are anachronistic and at variance with the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960).

BELGIUM[9]

16 May 1989

Reservations to articles 10 (6) and 23 (7), and annex 5, section F, 6.

BULGARIA[10]

Declaration made upon signature:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that the provisions of article 37 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals, under which a number of States may not become parties to this Convention, as discriminatory in character, and it considers that the Convention on Road Signs and Signals should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination or restriction.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that the provisions of article 38 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals are anachronistic and at variance with the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

Reservation made upon ratification:

The inscription of words on informative signs (i) to (v) inclusive of article 5, paragraph 1 (c), shall be duplicated in the People's Republic of Bulgaria by a transliteration into Latin characters solely to indicate the terminal points of international routes passing through the People's Republic of Bulgaria and places of interest to international tourism.

Declaration made upon ratification:

In the People's Republic of Bulgaria mopeds are treated as motorcycles for the purposes of the application of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals [art. 46, para. 2 (b)].

COTE D'IVOIRE

Reservations:

Pursuant to article 46, paragraph 1, [of the Convention] the Republic of the Ivory Coast does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44, under which "Any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of this Convention and which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other means of settlement may be referred, at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned, to the International Court of Justice for decision".

CUBA

The Republic of Cuba considers that the provisions of article 37 of the Convention, although concerned with matters which affect the interests of all States, are discriminatory in nature since they deny a number of States the right to sign or become a party to the Convention and this is contrary to the principle of the sovereign equality of States.

The Republic of Cuba declares that the provisions of article 38 of the Convention are no longer applicable because they are contrary to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1960, which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44 of the Convention, under which the International Court of Justice is to have compulsory jurisdiction in any dispute which may arise regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention. With regard to the competence of the International Court of Justice, Cuba maintains that, in order for a dispute to be submitted for settlement by the Court, the consent of all the parties concerned in the dispute must be obtained in each individual case.

The Republic of Cuba declares that it treats mopeds as motor cycles, in accordance with article 46 (2.b) of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

DENMARK

Reservation to article 27, paragraph 3 "according to which 'give way' shall be indicated both by transverse marking and a plate."

ESTONIA

Reservation:

"Estonia does not consider itself bound by article 44 of the Convention."

FINLAND[11]

Reservations:

"1. *With respect to Article 10 paragraph 6 and Section B of Annex 2, paragraph 2 (a) (iii) (Advance warning signs indicating obligatory stop):*

Finland reserves the right to use as an advance warning sign indicating an obligatory stop the "GIVE WAY" sign, supplemented with an additional panel including an inscription "STOP" and indicating the distance to the obligatory stop;

"2. *With respect to Article 18 (Place identification signs):*

Finland reserves the right not to use signs E, 9^a or E, 9^b to indicate the beginning of a built-up area or signs E, 9^c or E, 9^d to indicate the end of such an area. Instead of them symbols are used. A sign corresponding to sign E, 9^b is used to indicate the name of a place, but it does not signify the same as sign E, 9^b;

.....

"4. *With respect to Section F of Annex 5, paragraph 6 (Signs notifying a bus or a tramway stop):*

Finland reserves the right to use signs indicating a bus or a tramway stop which differ in shape and colour from signs E, 19 and E, 20."

FRANCE

The French Government enters a reservation with regard to the application of article 10, paragraph 6, of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals in respect of metropolitan France and French overseas territories:

Decisions adopted under the Economic Commission for Europe provide for advance warning of sign B, 2a (Stop) by means of sign B, 1, supplemented by a rectangular panel bearing the "Stop" symbol and a figure indicating the distance to sign B, 2^a. This rule conflicts with the provisions of article 10 of the Convention.

GERMANY[2,6]

Reservations:

Ad article 10, paragraph 6

Article 10, paragraph 6, applies in the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with paragraph 9 of the annex to the

European Agreement of 1 May 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals.

Ad article 23, paragraph 7

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by article 23, paragraph 7, of this Convention.

Ad annex 5, section F, No. 6

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound regarding the design of signs E, 19 and E, 20.

GREECE

[The Government of Greece] declares that it has no intention of treating mopeds as motorcycles.

HUNGARY[12]

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. The wording of article 37, paragraph 1, of the Convention is at variance with the purposes and principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations. All States, without any restriction, should be given the possibility of participating in the Convention.

2. The provisions of article 38 of the Convention, as such, are anachronistic and are not in conformity with the principles of contemporary international law or the present state of international relations, and they are at variance with the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960.

Upon ratification:

[The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic] considers itself bound by the provisions of article 10, paragraph 6, of the Convention, relative to the [advance warning signs for sign B, 2], subject to its tenor as defined in the European Agreement supplementary thereto.

INDIA

"The Government of the Republic of India does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44 of the Convention.

"India shall treat mopeds as motor cycles."

INDONESIA

"Indonesia does not consider itself bound by article 44.

"In conformity with article 1 moped will be deemed as motorcycle."

IRAQ[13]

Ratification of this Convention by the Republic of Iraq shall under no circumstances signify recognition of or entry into any relations with Israel.

LITHUANIA

Reservation:

"The Republic of Lithuania does not consider itself bound by article 44 of the Convention."

LUXEMBOURG

With regard to the provisions of article 10, paragraph 6:

The advance warning sign for sign B, 2^a shall be sign B, 1, supplemented by a rectangular panel bearing the word "Stop" and a figure indicating the distance to sign B, 2^a.

With regard to the provisions of article 23, paragraph 7:

Red or yellow arrows shall be used on a black circular background.

MOROCCO

Reservation:

Morocco does not consider itself bound by the contents of article 44 thereof.

Declaration:

Morocco will treat mopeds as motor cycles.

NORWAY

[For the text of a declaration regarding the application of the Convention to the territories of Svalbard and Jan Mayen see chapter XI.B.19.]

"The Government of Norway shall not be bound by the provisions, in article 10 (6), annex 4 A (2) (a) (iii), annex 4 A (2) (a) (v) and annex 5 F (4) and (5) [of the Convention]."

POLAND

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

With the reservation, as provided for in article 46, paragraph 1 of the Convention, that Poland does not consider itself bound by article 44.

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 44 of this Convention.

Upon ratification:

Declaration and reservation:

[For the text see the declarations and the reservation made in respect of the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Vienna on 8 November 1968 (chapter XI.B-19).]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservation and declarations, mutatis mutandis, *as those reproduced under "Belarus".]*

SEYCHELLES

"In compliance with article 46 (2) of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals the Government of the Republic of Seychelles declares that [it] treats mopeds as motor cycles."

SLOVAKIA[4]

SPAIN

In accordance with article 46, . . . Spain does not consider itself bound by article 44 and enters a reservation with respect to article 38.

SWEDEN

Reservations:

"(1) Instead of article 10, paragraph 6 of the Convention Sweden will apply the dispositions of paragraph 9 of the annex of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals.

"(2) With respect to annex 5, section F, paragraph 4, of the Convention, the signs E, 15-shall have a green ground.

"(3) With respect to article 44 of the Convention, Sweden opposes that disputes in which it is involved shall be referred to arbitration."

SWITZERLAND

Reservations:

Ad article 18, paragraph 2 and annex 5, section C

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 18, paragraph 2 of annex 5, section C.

Ad article 29, paragraph 2, 2nd sentence

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 2, 2nd sentence.

Ad annex 4, section A, number 2, letter (d)

Switzerland reserves the right to enact, in its domestic legislation, regulations specifying that signs C, 13aa and C, 13ab shall not prohibit drivers from also overtaking motor vehicles whose speed is limited to 30 km/hr.

Ad annex 5, section F, numbers 4 and 5

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by the introductory provision that signals E, 15; E, 16; E, 17; and E, 18 shall have a blue ground.

Text of the reservations made by Switzerland, as adapted in view of the entry into force of the amendments proposed by Belgium on 31 mai 1994:

Ad article 13 bis, paragraph 2, and annex 1, section E, sous–section II, paragraphe 7

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13 *bis*, paragraph 2, and annex 1, section E, subsection II, paragraph 7.

Ad article 29, paragraph 2, 2nd sentence, article 26 bis, paragraph 1 and annex 2, chapter II, section G

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 2, 2nd sentence, article 26 bis, paragraph 1 and annex 2, chapter II, section G.

Ad Annex 1, section C, subsecton II, paragraph 4, letter (a)

Switzerland reserves the right to enact in its national legislation a regulation specifying that signs C, 13 aa and C, 13 ab shall not prohibit drivers from also overtaking motor vehicles whose maximum speed is limited to 30 km/h.

Ad article 10, paragraph 6, 2nd sentence

Switzerland reserves the right to provide in its national legislation, as an advance warning for sign B,2, for an identical sign with an additional panel (model H,1) as indicated in annex 1, section H.

THAILAND

Ad article 13 bis, paragraph 2, and annex

"Thailand will not be bound by article 44 of the Convention.

"Thailand will consider mopeds as motor-cycles."

UKRAINE

Reservation and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same reservation and declarations, mutatis mutandis, as those reproduced under "Belarus".]

ZAIRE

With reference to the pertinent provisions of the Convention Zaire shall not treat mopeds as motor cycles.

Designations under article 46 (2)[4]

Participant	*Model Danger Warning Sign*	*Model Stop Signal*
Austria	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Bahrain	A[a]	B, 2[b]
Belarus	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Bulgaria	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Central African Republic	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Chile	A[b]	B, 2[a]
Côte d'Ivoire	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Cuba	A[a]	B, 2[b]
Denmark	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Estonia	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Finland	A[a]	B, 2[a]
France	(see reservation)	(see reservation)
Germany[2,4]	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Greece	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Hungary	A[a]	B, 2[a]
India	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Kuwait	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Latvia	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Lithuania	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Luxembourg	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Morocco	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Norway	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Pakistan	A[a]	B, 2[b]
Philippines	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Poland	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Romania	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Russian Federation	A[a]	B, 2[a]
San Marino	A[a]	B, 2[b]
Senegal	A[a]	B, 2[b]
Seychelles	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Slovakia[4]	A	B, 2
Sweden	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Switzerland	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Turkmenistan	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Ukraine	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Uzbekistan	??	??
Yugoslavia	A[a]	B, 2[a]
Zaire	A[a]	B, 2[a]

NOTES:

[1] See note in title section of chapter XI.B-19.

[2] On 31 May 1994, the Secretary–General circulated amendments proposed by the Government of Belgium in accordance with article 41 (1) of the Convention.

In this regard, the Secretary–General received the following communications from Contracting Parties:

Austria (30 May 1995):

"... The Republic of Austria while *not* rejecting the amendments proposed by Belgium according to article 41 paragraph 2 (a) [of the Convention] declares the following *reservation*:

The Republic of Austria declares that Figures [paragraphs] 4 and 6 of Annex 1, section G, subsection V to the Convention on Road Signs and Signals shall not be applied."

Chile (26 June 1995):

[The Government of Chile] hereby informs the Secretary-General that the Government of Chile accepts these proposed amendments.

However, without prejudice to the foregoing, it wishes to make some comments intended to clarify the proposed text. Thus although it agrees to substitute the word "mass" for the word "weight" throughout the text, it believes that the States parties should be allowed a certain period of time in which to make the necessary adjustments.

In annex 1, entitled "Road signs" *(Signos camineros)*, the term *Señales viales* should be used whenever the signs referred to include those used on any transport route in the territory, not only on roads.

The proposed amendment to article 10, paragraph 6, should serve as an alternative to the Convention's current provisions, so that each Contracting Party may opt for the alternative that it finds more suitable.

The wording of article 13 *bis*, paragraph 2, should be changed to make it easier to understand.

The symbol mentioned in annex 1, section A, subsection II, paragraph 5, refers to swing bridges or drawbridges and not to suspension bridges; this should be rectified.

The symbol mentioned in annex 1, section A, subsection II, paragraph 25, refers to level-crossings with gates and not to bridges; this should be rectified.

Germany (31 May 1995):

The proposals contain a revision of the Convention, whereby the location of the provisions and the references between the provisions were changed. For reasons of clarity, also the already existing reservations and declarations are hereinafter adjusted and/or confirmed.

1 *Reservations*

1.1. *Reservation on Article 10 paragraph 6*

Article 10 paragraph 6 applies in the Federal Republic of Germany subject to paragraph 9 of the Annex to the European Agreement of 1 May 1971 supplementing this Convention.

1.2 *Reservation on Article 23 paragraph 7*

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by Article 23 paragraph 7.

1.3 *Reservation on Annex I section C subsection II N° 1: Prohibition and restriction of entry.*

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound as far as the design of sign C, 3[g] "No entry for any power-driven vehicle drawing a trailer" is concerned.

1.4 *Reservation on Annex I section D subsection II N° 10: Compulsory direction for vehicles carrying dangerous goods.*

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound as far as the design of signs D, 10[a], D, 10[b], D, 10[c] is concerned.

1.5 *Reservation on Annex I section E subsection II N° 13: Signs notifying a bus or tramway stop.*

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound as far as the design of signs E 15 "Bus Stop" and E 16 "Tramway Stop" is concerned.

1.6 *Reservation on Annex I section E subsection II N° 8: Signs having zonal validity.*

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to depict signs having zonal validity on a square panel.

1.7 *Reservation on Annex I section G subsection I N° 1: General characteristics and symbols.*

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to give a rectangular shape to informative signs, especially to those indicating the number and direction of lanes.

1.8 *Reservation on Annex I section G subsection V N° 7: Sign notifying advised itinerary for heavy vehicles.*

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound as far as the design of sign G, 18 "Advised itinerary for heavy vehicles" is concerned.

1.9 *Reservation on Annex I section H N° 7:*

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right to indicate a slippery road section also by means of a main panel (sign B, 1 with the symbol of additional panel H, 9).

Less than one-third of the Contracting Parties having informed the Secretary-General that they reject the said proposed amendments within the period of twelve months following the date of their circulation i.e. 31 May 1995, and in accordance with article 41 (2) (a) of the Convention, the proposed amendments are deemed to have been accepted.

The amendments entered into force six months after the expiry of the said period of twelve months, i.e. on 30 November 1995 for all Contracting Parties. Paragraphs 4 and 6 of Annex 1, section G, subsection V did not enter into force for Austria only.

[3] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 19 December 1969. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 8 November 1968 and 7 June 1978, respectively, choosing A[a] as a model danger warning sign and B, 2[a] as a model stop signal under article 46 (2), with reservations, one of which with regard to article 44 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification, was withdrawn on 22 January 1991. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1091, p. 348 and vol. 1092, p. 412. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a notification accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of Denmark stated that "until further notice the [Convention] shall not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland".

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 11 October 1973 choosing A[a] as a model danger warning sign and B, 2[a] as a model stop signal under article 46 (2), and with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1091, p. 377. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[7] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention will also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 6 above.

[8] See note 8 in chapter XI.B-19.

[9] See note 10 in chapter XI.B.19.

[10] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification with respect to article 44. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1120, p. 537.

[11] In a communication received on 5 September 1995, by virtue of the entry into force of the amendments proposed by Belgium on 31 mai 1994 (see also note 2 in this chapter) the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon ratification :

> "3. *With respect to Section F of Annex 5, preamble and paragraphs 4 and 5:* Finland reserves the right to use green colour as the ground of signs E, 15 to E, 18."

[12] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 44 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1091, p. 378.

[13] On 17 March 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following objection:

> "The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession of the Republic of Iraq to the [said] Convention contains a reservation in respect of Israel. In view of the Government of the State of Israel, such reservation which is explicitly of a political character is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Republic of Iraq under general international law or under particular Conventions.
>
> "The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Republic of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

21. European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles Engaged in International Road Transport (AETR)

Concluded at Geneva on 1 July 1970

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 January 1976, in accordance with article 16 (4).
REGISTRATION: 5 January 1976, No. 14533.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 143 and depositary notifications C.N.399.1981.TREATIES-1 of 2 February 1982 (amendments); C.N.88.1982.TREATIES-1 of 2 July 1982 (rectification of the English and French texts of the amendments); C.N.105.1991.TREATIES-1 of 24 July 1991 (amendments); and C.N.285.1993.TREATIES–3 of 30 August 1993 (amendments).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 13. Parties: 30.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria[2]	31 Jan 1971	11 Jun 1975
Belarus		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Belgium	15 Jan 1971	30 Dec 1977
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		12 may 1995 *a*
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Czech Republic[3]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		30 Dec 1977 *a*
Estonia		3 May 1993 *a*
France	20 Jan 1971	9 Jan 1978
Germany[4,5]	23 Dec 1970	9 Jul 1975
Greece		11 Jan 1974 *a*
Ireland		28 Aug 1979 *a*
Italy	29 Mar 1971	28 Dec 1978
Kazakstan		17 Jul 1995 *a*
Latvia		14 Jan 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	2 Feb 1971	30 Dec 1977
Netherlands	26 Mar 1971	30 Dec 1977
Norway	16 Mar 1971	28 Oct 1971
Poland	24 Mar 1971	14 Jul 1992
Portugal	30 Mar 1971	20 Sep 1973
Republic of Moldova		26 May 1993 *a*
Romania		8 Dec 1994 *a*
Russian Federation		31 Jul 1978 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Aug 1993 *d*
Spain		3 Jan 1973 *a*
Sweden	19 Jan 1971	24 Aug 1973
Switzerland	24 Mar 1971	
United Kingdom[6]	25 Mar 1971	4 Jan 1978
Yugoslavia		17 Dec 1974 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM[7]

Transport operations between member States of the European Economic Community shall be regarded as national transport operations within the meaning of the AETR in so far as such operations do not pass in transit through the territory of a third State which is a contracting party to the AETR.

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

Reservation:

Upon acceding to the Agreement the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares, in accordance with its article 21, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Agreement.

Declaration:

The Government of Czechoslovakia considers article 19 of the Agreement to be in contradiction to the generally recognized right of nations to self-determination.

DENMARK[7]

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

FRANCE[7]

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

GERMANY[4,7]

9 August 1979

[Same declaration, in essence, as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

IRELAND[7]

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

LUXEMBOURG[7]

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

NETHERLANDS[7]

Upon signature:

The Government of the Netherlands [will] ratify the Agreement only when the law of the European Economic Community conforms with the provisions of the latter.

Upon ratification:

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

POLAND[8]

Upon signature:

"The Polish People's Republic considers that the Agreement should be open for participation to all European countries without discrimination."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation with respect of article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles Engaged in International Road Transport (AETR), and states that, for the submission to arbitration of any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the

European Agreement (AETR), the agreement of all of the Parties in dispute shall be required in each individual case, and the arbitrators shall only be persons appointed by general agreement between the Parties in dispute.

Declaration with respect of article 19:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to declare that the provisions of article 19 of the European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles Engaged in International Road Transport (AETR), on the extension by States of the validity of the European Agreement (AETR) to the territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outdated and contradict the Declaration of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) dated 14 December 1960), which proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

SLOVAKIA[3]

SPAIN

(a) The Government of Spain avails itself of the first of the options provided for in article 5, paragraph 1 *(b)* (ii) of the Agreement whereby persons whose age is less than 21 years may be prohibited from driving in the territory vehicles of a permissible maximum weight exceeding 7.5 tons.

(b) The Government of Spain enters the reservation provided for in article 21, paragraph 1, of the Agreement and accordingly does not consider itself bound by article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Agreement.

(c) The Government of Spain selects variant *(a)* of the procedures set forth in paragraph 6 of the annex entitled "Individual Control Book".

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[6]

[Same declaration, in essence, as the one reproduced under "Belgium".]

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to articles 3, 6, 10, 11, 12 and 14 of the Agreement, proposed by the Government of the United Kingdom, were circulated by the Secretary-General on 2 February 1982 (with rectification on 2 July 1982).

In this regard, notifications made under article 23 (2) (b) of the Agreement were received from the Government of the Netherlands on 28 July 1982 and from the Government of Czechoslovakia on 30 July 1982.

In a communication, received on 28 January 1983, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General in accordance with article 23, its acceptance of the said amendments. No objection having been made on behalf of the Government of Czechoslovakia at the expiration of a period of nine months following the expiry of six months from the date of the depositary notification transmitting the proposed amendments, (2 February 1982), the amendments are deemed to have been accepted in accordance with article 23 (6) and entered into force on 3 August 1983, i.e. the end of a further period of three months.

Other amendments were proposed as follows

Proposed by	*Date of circulation*	*Date of entry into force*
Norway	24 July 1991	24 April 1992
Norway*	30 August 1993	28 February 1995

* In this regard, a notification made under article 23 (2) (b) of the Agreement was received from the Government of the Netherlands on 28 February 1994. Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 november 1994, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary–General, in accordance with article 23, its acceptance, for the Kingdom in Europe, of the amendments proposed by Norway.

[2] The Protocol of signature [annexed to the Agreement] was signed on 31 March 1971 on behalf of Austria.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 5 December 1975, with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 172. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 10 August 1976 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1019, p. 400. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] With a declaration that the Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 4 above.

[6] In a notification under article 19(1), dated on 25 March 1971, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General that the validity of the Agreement would extend to the Isle of Man.

[7] None of the States Parties having objected to these reservations by the end of six months after the respective dates of their circulation by the Secretary-General, they are deemed to have been accepted, in accordance with article 21 (2).

[8] Upon ratification, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary–General, under article 21(3) of the Agreement, that it does not maintain the reservation made upon signature of not applying article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Agreement.

22. Agreement on the International Carriage of Perishable Foodstuffs and on the Special Equipment to be used for such Carriage (ATP)[1]

Concluded at Geneva on 1 September 1970

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 November 1976, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 1.
REGISTRATION: 21 November 1976, No. 15121.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1028, p. 121; depositary notifications C.N.343.1980.TREATIES-8 of 4 December 1980, C.N.211.1982.TREATIES-6 of 30 September 1982 and C.N.292.1982. TREATIES-9 of 20 December 1982 (addendum), vol. 1347, p. 342, C.N.243.1985.TREATIES-4 of 18 October 1985, C.N.280.1985.TREATIES-5 of 11 November 1985; C.N.54.1986.TREATIES-2 of 7 April 1986 (corrigendum), C.N.286.1985. TREATIES-6 of 12 November 1985; C.N.155. 1986.TREATIES-5 of 26 August 1986 (addendum); C.N.199.1987.TREATIES-5 of 5 October 1987 and C.N.266.1987.TREATIES-6 of 14 December 1987 (addendum), C.N.59.1988.TREATIES-1 of 6 May 1988 (addendum); C.N.305.1980.TREATIES-6 of 10 November 1980; C.N.185.1984. TREATIES-4 of 21 August 1984 (amendments to annex 3); C.N.123.1989.TREATIES-2 of 27 June 1989 (amendments to annex 2); C.N.165.1989. TREATIES-3 of 14 August 1989, C.N.229.1989. TREATIES-4 of 29 September 1989; C.N.9.1990.TREATIES-1 of 12 March 1990 and C.N.319.1990.TREATIES-7 of 15 March 1990 (corrigendum); C.N.190.1991.TREATIES-2 of 18 October 1991 and C.N.85.1992.TREATIES–2 of 15 June 1992 (amendments to annex 1); C.N.450.1993.TREATIES–3 of 30 December 1993 (amendments to annex 1); C.N.397.1994. TREATIES–4 of 24 February 1995 (amendments to article 18 and annex 1); C.N.414.1994.TREATIES–6 of 13 February 1995 (amendments to annexes 2 and 3)[2]; and C.N.416.1994.TREATIES–7 of 22 February 1995 (amendments to annex 1).[3]
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 29.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	28 May 1971	1 Mar 1977
Belgium		1 Oct 1979 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		26 Jan 1978 *a*
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Czech Republic[4]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		22 Nov 1976 *a*
Finland		15 May 1980 *a*
France[5]		1 Mar 1971 *s*
Germany[6, 7]	4 Feb 1971	8 Oct 1974
Greece		1 Apr 1992 *a*
Hungary		4 Dec 1987 *a*
Ireland		22 Mar 1988 *a*
Italy	28 May 1971	30 Sep 1977
Kazakstan		17 Jul 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	25 May 1971	9 May 1978
Morocco		5 Mar 1981 *a*
Netherlands[8]	28 May 1971	30 Nov 1978
Norway		14 Jul 1979 *a*
Poland		5 May 1983 *a*
Portugal	28 May 1971	15 Aug 1988
Russian Federation		10 Sep 1971 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Aug 1993 *d*
Spain		24 Apr 1972 *a*
Sweden		13 Dec 1978 *a*
Switzerland	28 May 1971	
United Kingdom		5 Oct 1979 *a*
United States of America		20 Jan 1983 *a*
Yugoslavia		21 Nov 1975 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BULGARIA[9]

Declarations:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that article 9, which entitles only States members of the Economic Commission for Europe to become Parties to the Agreement, is discriminatory. The People's Republic of Bulgaria also declares that article 14, pursuant to which a State may declare that the Agreement will also be applicable to territories for the international relations of which that State is responsible, is contrary to the General Assembly's Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 14 December 1960.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

HUNGARY

"[The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic] does not consider itself bound by article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Agreement."

POLAND

Reservation:

"The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 15, paragraph 2 and 3, of the Agreement."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 15, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Agreement relating to the mandatory submission to

arbitration, at the request of one of the Parties, of any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Agreement.

Declarations:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics deems it necessary to state that the provisions of article 9 of the Agreement, which limit the circle of possible participants to this Agreement, are of a discriminatory character, and states that, in accordance with the principles of sovereign equality among States, the Agreement should be opened for participation by all European States without any discrimination or restriction;

The provisions of article 14 of the Agreement under which Contracting Parties may extend its applicability to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outmoded and contrary to the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960).

SLOVAKIA[4]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"The Agreement does not apply to carriage in the United States of America and its territories."

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon definitive signature, ratification, accession or succession.)

FRANCE

13 January 1984

[The French Government] considers that only European States can formulate the declaration provided for in article 10 with respect to carriage performed in territories situated outside Europe.

It therefore raises an objection to the declaration by the Government of the United States of America and, consequently, declares that it will not be bound by the ATP Agreement in its relations with the United States of America.

ITALY

19 January 1984

[Same objection as under France.]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

21 September 1984

"The United States considers that under the clear language of article 10 [of the Agreement], as confirmed by the negotiating history, any State party to the Agreement may file a declaration under that article. The United States therefore considers that the objections of Italy and France and the declarations that those nations will not be bound by the Agreement in their relations with the United States are unwarranted and regrettable. The United States reserves its rights with regard to this matter and proposes that the parties continue to attempt cooperatively to resolve the issue."

NOTES:

[1] Although listed in this chapter for reasons of convenience, this agreement is not limited to transport by road.

[2] In a communication dated 11 August 1995, the Government of Slovakia notified the Secretary-General, pursuant to article 18 (2)(b) of the Agreement, that although it intended to accept the proposal of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to annex 3, the conditions necessary for such acceptance were not yet fulfilled in respect of Slovakia. In view of this, and in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 2 and 5 of article 18, the proposed amendments will be deemed to have been accepted only if, before the expiry of a period of nine months following the expriy of the period of six months indicated in depositary notification C.N.414.1994.TREATIES-6 of 13 February 1995, i.e. before 14 May 1996, the Government of Slovakia has not notified an objection to the said proposed amendments (unless, of course, the Government of Slovakia notifies its acceptance before 14 May 1996, in which ase the amendments will be deemed accepted on the date of such acceptance).

[3] Other amendments to the Agreement were also proposed by various States as indicated hereinafter, but not accepted, one or more objections thereto having been notified to the Secretary-General:

Proposed by:	*Articles or Annexes:*	*Depositary notification reference:*
Denmark	Annex 3	C.N.154.1977.TREATIES-3 of 1 June 1977 and C.N.44.1978.TREATIES-2 of 28 March 1978.
	Annex 3	C.N.248.1981.TREATIES-5 of 29 September 1981, C.N.52.1982.TREATIES-2 of 15 March 1982 and C.N.116.1982.TREATIES-4 of 17 May 1982.
United Kingdom	Annexes 2 and 3	C.N.318.1983.TREATIES-4 of 20 October 1983 and C.N.78.1984.TREATIES-2 of 16 July 1984.
France	Annex 1	C.N.224.1984.TREATIES-5 of 25 September 1984 and C.N.79.1985.TREATIES-3 of 12 April 1985.
	Annex 1	C.N.66.1985.TREATIES-2 of 30 July 1985, C.N.14.1986.TREATIES-1 of 10 March 1986, and C.N.243.1986.TREATIES-6 of 4 December 1986.
Italy	Article 10 (1)	C.N.121.1988.TREATIES-3 of 30 June 1988 and C.N.211.1988.TREATIES-5 of 26 October 1988.
Germany	Annex 1*	C.N.85.1992.TREATIES-2 of 15 June 1992 and C.N.469.1992.TREATIES-5 of 31 December 1992.
	Annex 3	C.N.131.1994.TREATIES-1 of 15 June 1994 and C.N.401.1994.TREATIES-5 of 3 February 1995 (corrigendum) and C.N.337.1994.TREATIES-3 of 3 February 1995.

* The objection by Italy applies only to the amendments proposed by Germany to annex 1, appendix 2, paragraphs 6, 8, 10 and 18 of the Agreement.

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 13 April 1982, with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, 1272, p. 439. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The Agreement was first signed without reservation as to ratification by the French Plenipotentiary on 20 January 1971. The signature affixed on 1 March 1971 signifies the approval of the text of the Agreement as corrected in accordance with the decision taken by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirtieth session (1 to 4 February 1971).

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 14 April 1981 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1223, p. 419. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[7] Upon ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Agreement should also apply to Berlin (West) from the date upon which it would enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 6 above.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[9] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession to article 15 (2) and (3). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1066, p. 347.

23. European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968

Concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 June 1979, in accordance with article 4 (1).
REGISTRATION: 7 June 1979, No.17847.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137. p. 369; and depositary notification C.N.20.1992.TREATIES–1 of 28 February 1992 (proposal of amendments).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 24.

Note: The text of the Agreement was approved by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe on 1 May 1971, at its thirtieth session held at Geneva. In accordance with a decision of the Committee at its thirty-first session, held at Geneva from 1 to 4 February 1971, the period during which the Agreement was open for signature (originally from 1 May 1971 to 30 April 1972) was extended to 31 December 1972 (doc. E/ECE/TRANS/568, paragraph 132).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	15 Dec 1972	11 Aug 1981	Luxembourg	25 May 1971	25 Nov 1975
Belarus		17 Dec 1974 *a*	Monaco		6 Jun 1978 *a*
Belgium	28 Oct 1971	16 Nov 1988	Poland		23 Aug 1984 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	Romania	6 Oct 1972	9 Dec 1980
Bulgaria		28 Dec 1978 *a*	Russian Federation		27 Sep 1974 *a*
Croatia		23 Nov 1992 *d*	Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Denmark	2 May 1972	3 Nov 1986	Sweden	1 Feb 1972	25 Jul 1985
Finland	22 Dec 1972	1 Apr 1985	Switzerland	31 Oct 1972	11 Dec 1991
France	29 Dec 1972	16 Jan 1974	Ukraine		30 Dec 1974 *a*
Germany[3,4]	28 May 1971	3 Aug 1978	United Kingdom	27 Oct 1971	
Greece		18 Dec 1986 *a*	Yugoslavia		1 Oct 1976 *a*
Hungary	29 Dec 1972	16 Mar 1976			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

Reservation:

"Paragraph 18 of the Annex to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic (referring to article 23 of the Convention) is applied with the exception of the provision under paragraph 3 (a) (i), according to which any halting or parking of a vehicle on the road is prohibited within a distance of less than 5 m before a pedestrian crossing."

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to state that the provisions of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of 1968 and of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, under which States may extend the applicability of the Agreements to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are anachronistic and contrary to the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 9 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of 1968 or by article 9 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, under which disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Agreements shall be referred to arbitration if any of the Parties in dispute so requests.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

DENMARK

[Same reservations as those made by Denmark under chapter XI.B.19.]

Reservation:

Annex, item 18, re: article 23.3(a) according to which standing or parking shall be prohibited within 5 m. of an intersection.

FINLAND

Declaration:

"With respect to article 11, paragraph 3, Finland notified that the reservations Finland has made to article 11 paragraph 1 (a), article 18 paragraph 2 and article 33 paragraph 1 (c) and (d) of the Convention on Road Traffic shall also apply to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention."

FRANCE[5]

Moreover, with regard to article 23, paragraph 3 *(a)* (i) and 3 *(a)* (iii), France does not intend to specify metric distances in connexion with the prohibition of standing and parking mentioned in those provisions.

GERMANY[3]

Reservations:

Ad paragraph 3 of the annex

(Article 1, sub-paragraph *(n)*, of the Convention):

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 3 of the annex (article 1, sub-paragraph (n) of the Convention).

Ad paragraph 18 of the annex

(Article 23, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph *(a)*, new No. (iii) of the Convention):

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 18 of the annex (article 23, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph *(a)*, new No. (iii) of the Convention).

Ad paragraph 18 of the annex

(Article 23, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph *(b)*, new No. (iv) of the Convention):

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 18 of the annex (article 23, paragraph 3, sub-paragraph *(b)*, new No. (iv) of the Convention).

HUNGARY

Reservation:

The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the Agreement, in pursuance of article 11, paragraph 1, thereof.

Declarations:

The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 2 of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, opened for signature at Geneva on 1 May 1971, are at variance with the generally recognized principle of the sovereign equality of States and it considers that these international instruments should be open for participation by all interested States without any discrimination.

The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic further declares that the provisions . . . of article 3 of the European Agreement, supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968 opened for signature at Geneva on 1 May 1971, are at variance with the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960].

POLAND

Reservation:

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by article 9 of the Agreement.

ROMANIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

a. The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 1, of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, and with article 11, paragraph 1, of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, it does not consider itself bound by article 9 of the two Agreements, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of the Agreements and which is not settled by negotiation is to be referred to arbitration if any of the Parties so requests.

It is the position of the Socialist Republic of Romania that such disputes may be referred to arbitration only with the consent of all the Parties in dispute in each individual case.

Declaration made upon signature:

b. The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of article 2 of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, and article 2 of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, are not in keeping with the principle that multilateral international treaties whose aim and purpose affect the international community as a whole should be opened to universal participation.

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

c. The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania feels that the maintenance of a dependent status for certain territories to which reference is made by the provisions of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, is not in keeping with the Charter of the United Nations or with the documents adopted by the United Nations concerning the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, including the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which was unanimously adopted in General Assembly resolution 2625 (XXV) of 24 October 1970 and which solemnly proclaims the duty of States to promote realization of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in order to bring a speedy end to colonialism.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it necessary to state that the provisions of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of 1968 and of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, under which States may extend the applicability of the Agreements to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are anachronistic and contrary to the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which solemnly proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

Reservation:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of 1968 or of article 9 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968 under which disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Agreements shall be referred to arbitration if any of the Parties in dispute so requests.

SLOVAKIA[2]

SWEDEN

"The reservations of Sweden to the Convention on Road Traffic also apply to this Agreement."

Reservation concerning article 9:

"Sweden opposes that disputes in which it is involved shall be referred to arbitration."

SWITZERLAND

[See under chapter XI.B.19.]

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers it necessary to state that the provisions of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of 1968 and of article 3 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, under which States may extend the applicability of the Agreements to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are anachronistic and contrary to the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Traffic of 1968 or of article 9 of the European Agreement supplementing the Vienna Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, under which disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Agreements shall be referred to arbitration if any of the Parties in dispute so requests.

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to the Agreement, proposed by the Government of Poland, were circulated by the Secretary-General on 28 February 1992. In this regard, a notification made under article 6 (1) (a) was received from the Government of Ukraine on 5 August 1992. Entry into force on 28 August 1993 for all Contracting Parties, except for the following Parties, with respect to which only those amendments which these Parties have not rejected, will enter into force:

Denmark (26 February 1993):

"The Government of Denmark can accept the proposed amendments except what regards article 11, paragraph 11 (a) of item 10, which has to be rejected."

Finland (26 February 1993):

"Finland accepts the proposed amendments to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic, but wishes to inform the Depositary and the Contracting Parties, that if the amendments are deemed accepted, Finland will make the following reservations pursuant to article 11, paragraph 2, of the Agreement."

1. Finland does not consider itself to be bound by the first sentence of subparagraph (a) of the proposed amendment to paragraph 10 of the Annex to the European Agreement (*ad* article 11 of the Convention.)

2. Finland does not consider itself to be bound by subparagraph (f) of the proposed new paragraph 20^{bis} of the Annex to the European Agreement (*ad* article 27^{bis} of the Convention).

Germany (26 February 1993):

The Federal Republic of Germany can accept the amendments proposed by Poland to the European Agreement of 1 May 1971 supplementing the Convention of 8 November 1968 on Road Traffic with the following reservations:

1. The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound, as to certain vehicle categories, by paragraph 10 of the annex to article 11 of the Convention (overtaking and movement of traffic in lines).

2. The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 18 (b) of the annex to article 23 of the Convention (standing and parking) to the extent that the paragraph in question requires the document to bear the holder's name.

3. The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound, in respect of motorways and similar roads, by paragraph 19 (b) of the annex to article 25 additional paragraph to be inserted immediately after paragraph 3."

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 7 June 1978, with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 18 August 1975 with a reservation and declarations. For the text of the reservation and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 417. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Agreement will also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

[5] In a communication received on 30 October 1980, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General that it withdrew its reservation with regard to article 20, paragraph 5 of the Agreement. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416.

24. European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968

Concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 August 1979, in accordance with article 4 (1).
REGISTRATION: 3 August 1979, No. 17935.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1142, p. 225; and depositary notification C.N.62.1994.TREATIES-1 of 27 May 1994 and doc. E/ECE/TRANS/92/Rev.2 (amendments)[1].
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 23.

Note: The text of the Agreement was approved by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe on 1 May 1971, at its thirtieth session held at Geneva. In accordance with a decision of the Committee at its thirty-first session, held at Geneva from 1 to 4 February 1971, the period during which the Agreement was open for signature (originally from 1 May 1971 to 30 April 1972) was extended to 31 December 1972 (doc. E/ECE/TRANS/568, paragraph 132).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	15 Dec 1972	11 Aug 1981	Hungary	29 Dec 1972	16 Mar 1976
Belarus		17 Dec 1974 *a*	Lithuania		31 Jan 1992 *a*
Belgium	28 Oct 1971	16 Nov 1988	Luxembourg	25 May 1971	25 Nov 1975
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*	Poland		23 Aug 1984 *a*
Bulgaria		28 Dec 1978 *a*	Romania	6 Oct 1971	9 Dec 1980
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Russian Federation		27 Sep 1974 *a*
Denmark	2 May 1972	3 Nov 1986	Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Estonia		30 Nov 1993 *a*	Sweden	1 Feb 1972	25 Jul 1985
Finland	22 Dec 1972	1 Apr 1985	Switzerland	31 Oct 1972	11 Dec 1991
France	29 Dec 1972	16 Jan 1974	Ukraine		30 Dec 1974 *a*
Germany[3,4]	28 May 1971	3 Aug 1978	United Kingdom	27 Oct 1971	
Greece		18 Dec 1986 *a*	Yugoslavia		6 Jun 1977 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

Declaration and reservation:

[For the text see the declaration and reservation made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

DENMARK

[Same reservations as those under chapter XI.B.20.]

ESTONIA

Reservation:

"Estonia does not consider itself bound by article 9 of the Agreement."

FINLAND

Declaration:

"1) *With respect to Annex, paragraph 17 (amendment to Section B of Annex I, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Convention:*

"Signs indicating dangerous descent and steep ascent), Finland reserves the right to use sign A, 2^{c} of the Convention to indicate a dangerous descent, instead of sign A, 2^{a}. Similarly sign A, 3^{c} of the Convention is used to indicate a steep ascent instead of sign A, 3^{a};

"2) With respect to Article 11, paragraph 3, Finland notifies that the reservations Finland has made to Article 18, preamble and paragraphs 4 and 5 of Section F of Annex 5 and paragraph 6 of Section F of Annex 5 of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals shall also apply to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention."

Reservation:

"With respect to Annex, paragraph 22 (amendment to the Note and Section A of Annex 4 of the Convention):

Prohibition signs, Finland reserves the right to use an oblique red bar in signs corresponding to signs C, 3^{a}-C, 3^{k} of the Convention."

5 September 1995

Modification of the text of the reservation made by Finland, as adapted in view of the entry into force of the amendments proposed by Belgium on 31 mai 1994 to the 1968 Convention on Road Signs and signals:

"The reservation made by Finland [made upon ratification] also applies to signs C, 3^{g} to C, 3^{h} and C, 3^{m} to C, 3^{n} to the Annex."

FRANCE

With regard to article 23, paragraph $3^{bis}(b)$, of the Agreement on Road Signs and Signals, France intends to retain the possibility of using lights placed on the side opposite to the direction of traffic, so as to be in a position to convey meanings different from those conveyed by the lights placed on the side appropriate to the direction of traffic.

GERMANY[3]

Reservations:

Ad paragraph 3 of the annex

(Article 1, sub-paragraph (l) of the Convention):

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 3 of the annex (article 1, sub-paragraph (l) of the Convention).

Ad paragraph 15 of the annex

Article 33, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph *(a)*, No. (i) of the Convention):

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by paragraph 15 of the annex (article 33, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph *(a)* No. (i) of the Convention).

HUNGARY

[Same reservation and declarations, mutatis mutandis, *as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]*

POLAND

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]*

Declaration:

The Polish People's Republic will use symbol A, 2^c (dangerous descent) instead of symbol A, 2^a, and symbol A, 3^c (steep ascent) instead of symbol A,3a provided for in item 17 of the annex to the aforesaid Agreement in accordance with the provisions of Annex 1, Section B, paragraphs 2 and 3, of the Convention on Road Signs and Signals.

ROMANIA

Reservation and declarations:

[For the text see the reservation and declarations made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration and reservation:

[For the text see the declaration and reservation made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]

SLOVAKIA[2]

SWEDEN

"With respect to paragraph 22 of the annex, signs C, 3^a to C, 3^k shall incorporate an oblique bar."

"The reservations of Sweden to the Convention on Road Signs and Signals also apply to this Agreement."

With regard to article 9:

"Sweden opposes that disputes in which it is involved shall be referred to arbitration."

SWITZERLAND[1]

Reservations:

Annex, number 9 (article 10, paragraph 6, of the Convention):

Switzerland reserves the right to provide in its national legislation, as an advance warning sign for sign B 2^a, for an identical sign with an additional panel (model H, 1) as indicated in annex 1, section H.

Annex, numbers 9 bis and 22 (article 13 bis and annex 1, section E, subsection II, paragraph 7, of the Convention)

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of numbers 9^{bis} and 22 of the annex.

Annex, paragraph 12 (article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention)

Switzerland reserves the right to provide in its national legislation for the use of the three-colour system for light signals for pedestrians, in accordance with article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

UKRAINE

Declaration and reservation:

[For the text see the declaration and reservation made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]

NOTES:

[1] The Secretary-General received the following communications from the Contracting Parties as indicated hereinafter:

Germany (26 May 1995):

The Federal Republic of Germany agrees to the proposals subject to the following reservation:

Reservation on Annex I, section C, subsection II, No. 1 to the Convention

The Federal Republic reserves the right to define the meaning of sign C., 3n "No entry for vehicles carrying more than a certain quantity of substances liable to cause water pollution" as follows:

"No entry for vehicles with a water endangering cargo."

Switzerland (23 May 1995):

[The Government of Switzerland] has no objection to the amendments proposed by Belgium. The reservations entered previously [with regard to the Agreement] are hereby abrogated and replaced by the following: *(see under "Reservations and Declarations" in this chapter).*

Those reservations to the Agreement made upon ratification and which were abrogated read as follows:

Ad number 9 of the annex (article 10, paragraph 6, of the Convention)

Switzerland reserves the right to make provision in its domestic legislation, to give advance warning of sign B,2^a, for an identical sign supplemented by a panel conforming to model 1, reproduced in annex 7 to the Convention.

Ad numbers 10 and 27 of the annex (article 18, paragraph 2, and annex 5, section C, of the Convention)

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by the provisions of numbers 10 and 27 of the annex.

Ad number 12 of the annex (article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention)

Switzerland reserves the right to make provision in its domestic legislation for the three-colour system for light signals for pedestrians, pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Ad number 22 of the annex (annex 4, section A, number 2, letter (a) (iii), of the Convention)

Switzerland reserves the right to enact, in its domestic legislation, regulations specifying that access to roads marked by additional sign No. 1, reproduced in the appendix to the annex, is prohibited for vehicles transporting dangerous goods of any type.

Less than one third of the Contracting Parties having informed the Secretary-General that they reject the said proposed amendments within the period of twelve months following the date of their circulation (i.e. 27 May 1994), and in accordance with article 6(2)(a) of the Agreement, the proposed amendments are deemed to have been accepted. The amendments entered into force on 27 November 1995.The amendments

relating to annex I, section C, subsection II of the Convention will enter into force for Germany only as modified by the reservation.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 7 June 1978, with the same reservation and declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic concluded at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23). For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 18 August 1975 with the same reservation and declarations as those made for the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic of 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23). For the text of the reservation and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 417. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Agreement will also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

25. Protocol on Road Markings, additional to the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals opened for signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968

Concluded at Geneva on 1 March 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 April 1985, in accordance with article 4.
REGISTRATION: 25 April 1985, No. 23345.
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/4 and Corr.1; and depositary notification C.N.63.1994.TREATIES-1 of 27 May 1994 and doc. ECE/TRANS/99 (amendments).
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 19.

Note: Drawn up by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirty-second session held at Geneva from 2 January to 2 February 1973 on the basis of a text prepared by the Working Party on Road Transport on its forty-sixth and fiftieth extraordinary sessions (doc. W/TRANS/SCI/450 and Add.1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	27 Feb 1974	11 Aug 1981
Belarus		25 Apr 1984 *a*
Belgium	13 Aug 1973	16 Nov 1988
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		28 Dec 1978 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark		3 Nov 1986 *a*
Finland		1 Apr 1985 *a*
Germany[3,4]	15 Nov 1973	3 Aug 1978
Greece		18 Dec 1986 *a*
Hungary	18 Dec 1973	16 Mar 1976
Luxembourg	4 Jul 1973	25 Nov 1975
Poland		23 Aug 1984 *a*
Russian Federation		6 Apr 1984 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Sweden		25 Jul 1985 *a*
Switzerland	20 Mar 1973	11 Dec 1991
Ukraine		9 May 1984 *a*
Yugoslavia		6 Jun 1977 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

Reservation:

"Paragraph 6 of the Annex to the Protocol on Road Markings Additional to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals (referring to article 29 of the Convention) is applied with the exception of the provision under paragraph 2 according to which road markings have to be white."

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 9 of the Protocol on Road Markings of 1 March 1983, additional to the European Agreement of 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968 [.]

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, considers that the provisions of article 3 of the Protocol on Road Markings of 1 March 1983, additional to the European Agreement of 1971 supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals of 1968, concerning the extension by States of the applicability of the Protocol to territories for the international relations of which they are responsible, are outdated and contrary to the Declaration of the United Nations General Assembly on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960), which proclaimed the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

DENMARK

[Same reservations as those under chapter XI.B-20.]

FINLAND[2]

Reservation:

"With respect to Annex, paragraph 6 (amendment to Article 29 paragraph 2 of the Convention), Finland reserves the right to use yellow colour for the continuous line between the opposite directions of traffic."

GERMANY[3]

Reservation:

Ad paragraph 6 of the annex

(Article 29, paragraph 2, of the Convention):

The Federal Republic of Germany does not consider itself bound by the provision that the zigzag lines showing places where parking is prohibited shall be yellow.

HUNGARY

[Same reservation and declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic done at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]*

POLAND

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic done at Geneva on 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23).]*

Declaration:

All the road markings provided for in item 6, paragraph 2, of the Annex to the said Protocol shall be white.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under Belarus.]

SLOVAKIA[1]

SWEDEN

"The reservations of Sweden to the Convention on Road Signs and Signals and the European Agreement supplementing that Convention also apply to this Protocol."

SWITZERLAND

Reservations:

Ad number 4 of the annex (article 27, paragraph 5, of the Convention)

Switzerland implements article 27, paragraph 5, of the Convention, but not in the manner provided for in number 4 of the annex.

Ad number 6 of the annex (article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention)

Switzerland does not consider itself bound by article 29, paragraph 2, 1st and 2nd sentences, of the Convention, in the version given in number 6 of the annex.

UKRAINE

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under Belarus.]

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 7 June 1978, with the same reservation and declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic of 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B–23). For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] On 5 September 1995, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary–General that the reservation made upon accession to the the Protocol should be modified as follows :

"Whereas Finland has taken into use a danger warning line before the barrier line, which also is yellow;[The Government of Finland declares] that the reservation made by Finland also applies to the barrier line.".

In keeping with the practice followed in similar case, the Secretary–proposes to receive the modification in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (on 20 December 1995). In the absence of any such objection, the said modification will be accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the above–stipulated 90 period, that is on 19 March 1996.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 18 August 1975 with the same reservation and declarations as those made in respect of the European Agreement supplementing the Convention on Road Traffic of 1 May 1971 (chapter XI.B-23). For the text of the reservation and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1137, p. 416. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Protocol will also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

26. Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Passengers and Luggage by Road (CVR)

Concluded at Geneva on 1 March 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 April 1994, in accordance with article 25 (1).
REGISTRATION: 12 April 1994.
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/2 and Corr.1.
STATUS: Signatories: 2. Parties: 6.

Note: Drawn up by the Working Party on Road Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its forty-fifth, forty-eighth, forty-ninth and fiftieth extraordinary sessions (Doc. W/TRANS/SCI/455/Rev.1) and approved by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*	Latvia		14 Jan 1994 *a*
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*	Luxembourg	4 Jul 1973	
Czech Republic[1]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Germany[2]	1 Mar 1974		Yugoslavia		1 Apr 1976 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

SLOVAKIA[1]

(a) Protocol to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Passengers and Luggage by Road (CVR)

Concluded at Geneva on 5 July 1978

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 4).
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/35.
STATUS: Signatories: 1. Parties: 1.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirty-eighth (special) session held at Geneva on 5 July 1978. The Protocol is open for signature at Geneva from 1 September 1978 to 31 August 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Latvia		14 Jan 1994 *a*	Germany[2]	1 Nov 1978	

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 26 January 1976 with the following declarations:

[1] "The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic will not be bound by article 29 of the Convention.

[2] "The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic as a Contracting Party to the Agreement on General Conditions for International Carriage of Passengers by Bus, signed at Berlin on 5 December 1970, will, in the event of conflict between the Convention and the said Agreement, apply provisions of the said Agreement to an operation for which, according to the contract carriage:

– "The places of departure and destination are situated in the territory of a State which has made the declaration, or

– "Carriage is to take place in the territory of at least one State which has made the said declaration and will not be undertaken in the territory of any Contracting Party to the Convention which has not made the declaration."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

27. Agreement on Minimum Requirements for the Issue and Validity of Driving Permits (APC)

Concluded at Geneva on 1 April 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 31 January 1994, in accordance with article see article 7 (1).
REGISTRATION: 31 January 1994.
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/13.
STATUS: Signatories: 1. Parties: 6.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up under the auspices of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe and was open for signature until 1 April 1976, at Geneva.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*	Luxembourg	9 Dec 1975	4 Oct 1982
Bulgaria		28 Dec 1978 *a*	Morocco		31 Mar 1983 *a*
Croatia		2 Nov 1993 *d*	Yugoslavia		23 Jun 1978 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BULGARIA

Reservation:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by article 11 of the Agreement, which provides for compulsory arbitration.

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that article 6 of the Agreement is at variance with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 14 December 1960.

In the People's Republic of Bulgaria the Ministry of Transport and the Ministry of the Interior are the bodies competent to consent to the amendments envisaged in article 8, paragraph 7, of the Agreement.

28. European Agreement on Main International Traffic Arteries (AGR)

Concluded at Geneva on 15 November 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 March 1983, in accordance with article 6 (1).
REGISTRATION: 15 March 1983, No. 21618.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1302, p. 91; vol. 1388, p. 372; depositary notifications C.N.23.1984.TREATIES-1 of 1 March 1984; C.N.290.1985.TREATIES-4 of 11 December 1985*; C.N.175.1988. TREATIES-3 of 14 September 1988; C.N.215.1988.TREATIES-4 of 27 October 1988 (corrigendum to C.N.175.1988. TREATIES-3); C.N.62.1989.TREATIES-3 of 19 April 1989; C.N.45.1990.TREATIES-1 of 24 April 1990; C.N.47.1990.TREATIES-2 of 26 April 1990; C.N.48.1990.TREATIES-3 of 27 April 1990; C.N.173.1990.TREATIES-4 of 8 August 1990; C.N.3.1991.TREATIES-2 of 20 March 1991; C.N.4.1991.TREATIES-3 of 18 March 1991; C.N.39.1994.TREATIES–1 of 11 April 1994; C.N.40.1994.TREATIES–2 of 11 April 1994; C.N.41.1994.TREATIES–3 of 19 April 1994 (amendments to annex I); C.N.174.1988.TREATIES-2 of 23 September 1988 (amendments to annexes II and III); C.N.70.1992.TREATIES–1 of 22 May 1992; C.N.46.1994.TREATIES–4 of 19 April 1994 (amendments to annex II); C.N.9.1995.TREATIES–1 of 14 March 1995 (amendments to annexes I and II); and C.N.452.1995.TREATIES–4 of 8 Janaury 1996 (amendments to annex I).[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 30.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up by the Working Party on Road Transports of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe in the course of its fifty-fourth (special), fifty-sixth (special) and fifty-seventh sessions, and approved by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe. The Agreement was opened for signature at Geneva on 15 November 1975.

* (Owing to a typographical error, depositary notification C.N.290.1985.TREATIES-4 of 11 December 1985 was, when circulated, misnumbered C.N.280.1985.TREATIES-4).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	29 Dec 1976		Lithuania		27 Aug 1993 *a*
Belgium		15 Apr 1985 *a*	Luxembourg	16 Jun 1976	20 Nov 1981
Belarus		17 Dec 1982 *a*	Netherlands[5]		12 Dec 1979 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	Norway		14 Sep 1992 *a*
Bulgaria	14 Dec 1976	17 Nov 1977	Poland	31 Dec 1976	9 Nov 1984
Croatia		2 Feb 1994 *d*	Portugal		8 Jan 1991 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Romania		2 Jul 1985 *a*
Denmark		2 Nov 1987 *a*	Russian Federation		14 Dec 1982 *a*
Finland		19 Nov 1991 *a*	Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
France		15 Dec 1982 *a*	Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Germany[3,4]	19 Nov 1976	3 Aug 1978	Sweden		27 Oct 1992 *a*
Georgia		30 Aug 1995 *a*	Switzerland	30 Jan 1976	5 Aug 1988
Greece		11 Oct 1988 *a*	Turkey		16 Oct 1992 *a*
Hungary		1 Sep 1978 *a*	Ukraine		29 Dec 1982 *a*
Italy		2 Jul 1981 *a*	United Kingdom	22 Dec 1976	
Kazakstan		17 Jul 1995 *a*	Yugoslavia		19 Dec 1980 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 13 of the European Agreement on Main International Traffic Arteries of 15 November 1975 and declares that, before any dispute between Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the European Agreement may be referred to arbitration, in each particular case the consent of all the parties to the dispute must be obtained, and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties to the dispute may act as arbitrators.

BULGARIA[6]

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

HUNGARY

The Hungarian People's Republic declares that, in view of article 15 of the Agreement, it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, under which any dispute which relates to the interpretation or application of the Agreement and which the parties in dispute are unable to settle by negotiations or by other means of settlement shall be referred to compulsory arbitration.

POLAND

Reservation:

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13 of the Agreement.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

The Socialist Republic of Romania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13 of the Agreement, which states that any disputes between the Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of this Agreement and which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other means of settlement shall be referred for a solution to arbitration at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred for a solution to arbitration only with the agreement of all the Parties to the dispute.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by article 13 of the European Agreement on Main International Traffic Arteries of 15 November 1975 and declares that, before any dispute between Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the European Agreement may be referred to arbitration, in each particular case the consent of all the parties to the dispute must be obtained, and that only persons nominated by unanimous agreement of the parties to the dispute may act as arbitrators.

SLOVAKIA[2]

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 13 of the European Agreement on Main International Traffic Arteries of 15 November 1975 and states, that, for the submission to arbitration of any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the European Agreement, the agreement of all the Parties in dispute shall be required in each individual case, and the arbitrators shall only be persons appointed by general agreement between the Parties in dispute.

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to the Convention were adopted as follows:

Object of the proposal:	*Proposed by:*	*Date of circulation:*	*Entry into force:*
Annex I	German Democratic Republic	1 March 1984	4 January 1985
Annex I	Germany, Federal Republic of and Poland	11 December 1985	12 September 1986
Annex I	France	14 September 1988	15 June 1989
Annex II and III	Various Parties	23 September 1988	24 June 1989
Annex I	Germany, Federal Republic of	19 April 1989	20 January 1990
Annex I	Czechoslovakia*	24 April 1990	25 January 1991
Annex I	Italy	26 April 1990	27 January 1991
Annex I	Denmark and Germany, Federal Republic of	27 April 1990	28 January 1991
Annex I	Yugoslavia	8 August 1990	8 May 1991
Annex I	Denmark	18 March 1991	18 December 1991
Annex I	France	20 March 1991	20 December 1991
Annex II	Belgium, Romania and Switzerland	22 May 1992	1 June 1993
Annex I	Germany	11 April 1994	25 January 1995
Annex I	Norway	11 April 1994	25 January 1995
Annex I	Netherlands	19 April 1994	27 January 1995
Annex II	France, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation and Switzerland	19 April 1994	27 January 1995
Annexes I and II	Various Parties	14 March 1995	10 January 1996
Annex I	Various Parties	8 January 1996	

* See note 2 below.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 26 November 1986, with the following reservation :

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares that within the meaning of article 15 of the Agreement, it does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 13 of the Agreement.

See also note 1 above and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 14 April 1981, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1302, p. 168. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] Upon ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that with effect from the day on which the Agreement enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany it will also apply to Berlin (West) subject to the rights and responsibilities of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (14 December 1982 and 2 December 1985) on the one hand, the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany (23 August 1984), France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (26 July 1984 and 29 October 1986) on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence *mutatis mutandis*, as those made to the corresponding ones referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3. See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

6 In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification with respect to article 13. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1302, p. 169.

29. Intergovernmental Agreement on the Establishment of an Inter-African Motor Vehicle Third Party Liability Insurance Card

Opened for signature at New York on 1 October 1978

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 9).
TEXT: Doc. UNCTAD/INS/18.
STATUS: Signatories: 1.

Note: The Agreement was prepared by the Secretariat of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in accordance with a resolution taken at a Round-Table Meeting held by African countries under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Economic Commission for Africa in Yaoundé, United Republic of Cameroon, from 22 to 26 November 1976. The Agreement remained open for signature at New York from 1 October 1978 to 30 September 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Togo	18 June 1979	

30. Convention on Civil Liability for Damage caused during Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road, Rail and Inland Navigation Vessels (CRTD)[1]

Concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1989

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 23 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/79.
STATUS: Signatories: 2.

Note: The Convention, of which the English, French and Russian texts are equally authentic, was adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe of the United Nations. It was open for signature by all States at Geneva from 1 February 1990 until 31 December 1990 inclusive, in accordance with article 22 (1) of the Convention.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Germany[2]	1 Feb 1990		Morocco	28 Dec 1990	

NOTES:

[1] Although listed in this chapter for reasons of convenience, as indicated in the title, this Convention is not limited to transport by road.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 1 February 1990. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

C. TRANSPORT BY RAIL

1. International Convention to Facilitate the Crossing of Frontiers for Passengers and Baggage carried by Rail

Signed at Geneva on 10 January 1952

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1953, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1953, No. 2138.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 163, p. 3; and vol. 328, p. 319 (Modified International Customs Declaration form annexed to the Convention, which entered into force on 24 May 1959).
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 10.[1]

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Austria		8 Jun 1956 *a*
Belgium	10 Jan 1952	22 Jul 1953
France	10 Jan 1952	1 Apr 1953
Italy	10 Jan 1952	22 Jun 1955
Liechtenstein[1]		
Luxembourg	10 Jan 1952	26 Jan 1954
Netherlands[2]		10 Jan 1952 *s*
Norway	10 Jan 1952	28 Oct 1952
Portugal		24 Sep 1956 *a*
Sweden	10 Jan 1952	
Switzerland[1]	10 Jan 1952	5 Jun 1957

NOTES:

[1] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[2] The Government of the Netherlands, on behalf of which the Convention had been signed subject to ratification, gave notice of the withdrawal of this reservation in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 25 May 1952.

2. International Convention to Facilitate the Crossing of Frontiers for Goods carried by Rail

Signed at Geneva on 10 January 1952

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1953, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1953, No. 2139.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 163, p. 27; and vol. 328, p. 319 (Modified International Customs Declaration form annexed to the Convention, which came into force on 24 May 1959).
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 11.[1]

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a)*
Austria		8 Jun 1956 *a*	Netherlands[2]		10 Jan 1952 *s*
Belgium	10 Jan 1952	22 Jul 1953	Norway	10 Jan 1952	28 Oct 1952
France	10 Jan 1952	1 Apr 1953	Portugal		24 Sep 1956 *a*
Italy	10 Jan 1952	22 Jun 1955	Spain		17 Apr 1962 *a*
Liechtenstein[1]			Sweden	10 Jan 1952	
Luxembourg	10 Jan 1952	26 Jan 1954	Switzerland[1]	10 Jan 1952	5 Jun 1957

NOTES:

[1] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Convention apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[2] The Government of the Netherlands, on behalf of which the Convention had been signed subject to ratification, gave notice of the withdrawal of this reservation in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 25 May 1952.

3. European Agreement on Main International Railway Lines (AGC)

Concluded at Geneva on 31 May 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 April 1989, in accordance with article 6 (1).
REGISTRATION: 27 April 1989, No. 26540.
TEXT: Doc. TRANS/SC2/162 and depositary notifications C.N.34.1992.TREATIES–1 of 30 March 1992; and C.N.220.1994.TREATIES–2 of 20 July 1994 (amendments to annex 1)[1].
STATUS: Signatories: 11. Parties: 18.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up under the auspices of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe and is open for signature at Geneva until 1 September 1986.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), succession (d)*
Belarus	27 Aug 1986	1 Apr 1987 *A*	Poland	5 Feb 1986	14 Sep 1988
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	Portugal	1 Sep 1985	
Bulgaria		9 Mar 1990 *a*	Russian Federation	27 Aug 1986	10 Mar 1987 *A*
Croatia		20 May 1994 *d*	Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
France	28 Aug 1986	27 Jan 1989 *AA*	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		5 Oct 1994 *d*
Germany[3,4]	29 Aug 1986	23 Oct 1987	Turkey		4 Jan 1993 *a*
Greece	9 Jul 1986	31 Mar 1995	Ukraine	27 Aug 1986	22 Sep 1987 *A*
Hungary	16 Apr 1986	26 Jun 1987 *AA*	Yugoslavia		31 Jan 1990 *a*
Italy	19 Aug 1986	29 Nov 1991			
Luxembourg	17 Jul 1986				

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or succession.)

BELARUS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 8 of the European Agreement on Main International Railway Lines of 31 May 1985 and declares that the agreement of all the parties to a dispute is required, in each specific case, for the submission to arbitrators of any dispute between Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation or application of the European Agreement and that only persons designated by mutual agreement between the parties to a dispute may act as arbitrators.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

POLAND[5]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as that made by Belarus.]*

SLOVAKIA[2]

UKRAINE

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

[Same reservation, mutatis mutandis, *as that made by Belarus.]*

NOTES:

[1] Amendments to the Convention were adopted as follows:

Amendments to:	*Proposed by:*	*Date of circulation:*	*Date of entry into force:*
Annex 1	Germany	30 March 1992	10 March 1993
Annex 1	Czech Republic, France, Germany, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey and Ukraine	20 July 1994	14 May 1995

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Agreement on 10 May 1990, with the following reservation:
Czechoslovakia shall not consider itself bound by article 8 of the Agreement.
See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Agreement on 22 March 1988 with the following reservation:
Reservation:
The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 8 of the Agreement on Main International Railway Lines (AGC) of 31 May 1985.
In order to refer a dispute which relates to the interpretation or application of the Agreement to arbitration, it is necessary in each single case to have the consent of all States in the dispute. The arbitrators have to be selected jointly by the States in the dispute.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

[5] Upon ratification, the Government of Poland declared that it withdraws its reservation made upon signature. The text of the reservation read as follows:

The Government of Poland declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 8 of the Agreement.

D. WATER TRANSPORT

1. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE LIMITATION OF THE LIABILITY OF OWNERS OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS (CLN)

Concluded at Geneva on 1 March 1973

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 12 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/3.
STATUS: Signatories: 2. Parties: 1.

Note: The Convention was drawn up within the framework of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe and opened for signature at Geneva from 1 March 1973 to 1 March 1974.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Germany[1]	1 Mar 1974		Switzerland	1 Mar 1974	
Russian Federation ...		19 Feb 1981 *a*			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

GERMANY[1]

Upon signature:

1. In the event of an occurrence in its territory, the Federal Republic of Germany will not apply the provisions of the Convention to cost and compensation due under article 4, paragraph 1 (e), for damage caused by water pollution (article 10, para. 1 (b)).

2. The Federal Republic of Germany will not apply the provision of article 4, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention with respect to passengers carried on journeys for which the place of embarkation on board the vessel and the place of disembarkation there from are situated either both in its territory or in the territory of a State which has likewise made use of this reservation. In this case the Federal Republic of Germany will provide for the limitation fund established according to article 5, paragraph 1 (a), an amount higher than that foreseen by the Convention (article 10, para. 1 (c)).

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

In accordance with article 18 (1) of the Convention relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Inland Navigation Vessels of 1973, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 17 of this Convention, to the effect that any dispute between two or more of the Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of this Convention and which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other settlement procedures may, at the request of either of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred for settlement to the International Court of Justice, and declares that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute in each individual case.

Declarations:

In accordance with article 10 (1) (a) of the Convention relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Inland Navigation Vessels of 1973, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to inland waterways of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that are open to navigation only for vessels flying the flag of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[The Government of the of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] to the United Nations notes that article 16 of this Convention, which provides for the possibility of its application by States Parties to the Convention to territories for whose external relations they are responsible, conflicts with the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples of 14 December 1960.

(a) Protocol to the Convention relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Inland Navigation Vessels (CLN)

Concluded at Geneva on 5 July 1978

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 4).
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/32.
STATUS: Signatories: 1.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirty-eighth (special) session held at Geneva on 5 July 1978. The Protocol was open for signature at Geneva from 1 September 1978 to 31 August 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Germany[1]	1 Nov 1978	

NOTES:
[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

2. Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Passengers and Luggage by Inland Waterway (CVN)

Concluded at Geneva on 6 February 1976

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 20 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/20.
STATUS: Signatories: 1. Parties: 1.

Note: The Convention was drawn up within the framework of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe and opened for signature at Geneva from 1 May 1976 until 30 April 1977.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Austria	2 Sep 1976		Russian Federation ...		19 Feb 1981 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

In accordance with article 25 (1) of the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Passengers and Luggage by Inland Waterway of 1976, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24 of that Convention, to the effect that any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties which relates to the interpretation or application of the Convention and which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or other settlement procedures may be referred for settlement to the International Court of Justice if any of the Parties so requests, and hereby declares that such a dispute may only be referred to the International Court of Justice with the consent of all the parties to the disputes in each individual case;

Declaration:

In accordance with article 23 (1) of the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Passengers and Luggage by Inland Waterway of 1976 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to inland waterways of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that are open to navigation only for vessels flying the flag of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

(a) Protocol to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Passengers and Luggage by Inland Waterway (CVN)

Concluded at Geneva on 5 July 1978

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 4).
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/33.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its thirty-eighth (special) session held at Geneva on 5 July 1978. The Protocol was open for signature at Geneva from 1 September 1978 to 31 August 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*

3. United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, 1978

Concluded at Hamburg on 31 March 1978

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 November 1992, in accordance with article 30 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 November 1992, No. 29215.
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.89/13.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 23.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 30 March 1978 by the United Nations Conference on the Carriage of Goods by Sea, held in Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany, from 6 to 31 March 1978. The Conference had been convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in accordance with resolution 31/100[1] adopted by the General Assembly on 15 December 1976. The Convention was opened for signature at Hamburg on 31 March 1978 and remained open for signature by all States at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, until 30 April 1979.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Austria	30 Apr 1979	29 Jul 1993
Barbados		2 Feb 1981 *a*
Botswana		16 Feb 1988 *a*
Brazil	31 Mar 1978	
Burkina Faso		14 Aug 1989 *a*
Cameroon		21 Oct 1993 *a*
Chile	31 Mar 1978	9 Jul 1982
Czech Republic[2]	2 Jun 1993 *d*	23 Jun 1995
Denmark	18 Apr 1979	
Ecuador	31 Mar 1978	
Egypt	31 Mar 1978	23 Apr 1979
Finland	18 Apr 1979	
France	18 Apr 1979	
Germany[3]	31 Mar 1978	
Ghana	31 Mar 1978	
Guinea		23 Jan 1991 *a*
Holy See	31 Mar 1978	
Hungary	23 Apr 1979	5 Jul 1984
Kenya		31 Jul 1989 *a*
Lebanon		4 Apr 1983 *a*
Lesotho		26 Oct 1989 *a*
Madagascar	31 Mar 1978	
Malawi		18 Mar 1991 *a*
Mexico	31 Mar 1978	
Morocco		12 Jun 1981 *a*
Nigeria		7 Nov 1988 *a*
Norway	18 Apr 1979	
Pakistan	8 Mar 1979	
Panama	31 Mar 1978	
Philippines	14 Jun 1978	
Portugal	31 Mar 1978	
Romania		7 Jan 1982 *a*
Senegal	31 Mar 1978	17 Mar 1986
Sierra Leone	15 Aug 1978	7 Oct 1988
Singapore	31 Mar 1978	
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*	
Sweden	18 Apr 1979	
Tunisia		15 Sep 1980 *a*
Uganda		6 Jul 1979 *a*
United Republic of Tanzania		24 Jul 1979 *a*
United States of America	30 Apr 1979	
Venezuela	31 Mar 1978	
Zaire	19 Apr 1979	
Zambia		7 Oct 1991 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

"The Czech Republic delcares that limits of carrier's liability in the territory of the Czech Republic adhere to the provision of article 6 of the Convention."

SLOVAKIA[2]

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 39,* (A/31/39), p. 184.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 6 March 1979 with the following declaration:

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Carriage of Goods by Sea of 1978, declares, in conformity with the provision of its article 26, that the conversion of the amounts of the limits of liability, referred to in paragraph 2 of that article, into the Czechoslovak currency is made in the ratio of 0.48 Czechoslovak crown /Kce/ to 1 monetary unit, defined in paragraph 3 of article 26 of the Convention, and the limits of liability provided for in this Convention to be applied in the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic are fixed as follows: 6,000.—Kcs per package or other shipping unit, or 18.—Kcs per kilogramme of gross weight of the goods.

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

Subsequently, upon ratification, the Government of the Czech Republic declared that it "had decided to withdraw the declaration made by the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic upon signing the Convention on 6 March 1979."

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

4. International Convention on Maritime Liens and Mortgages, 1993

Concluded at Geneva on 6 May 1993

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 19 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.162/7.
STATUS: Signatories: 11; Parties: 2.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 6 May 1993 at Geneva by the United Nations/International Maritime Organization Conference of Plenipotentiaries held at Geneva from 19 April to 7 May 1993. The Conference had been convened in accordance with resolution 46/213[1] adopted by the General Assembly of 20 December 1991. The Convention is open for signature to all States at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, from 1 September 1993 to 31 August 1994, and shall thereafter remain open to accession.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Brazil	28 Mar 1994		Monaco		28 Mar 1995 *a*
China	18 Aug 1994		Morocco	23 Aug 1994	
Denmark	9 Aug 1994		Norway	31 Aug 1994	
Germany	11 Jul 1994		Paraguay	24 May 1994	
Guinea	18 Nov 1993		Sweden	2 Jun 1994	
Finland	29 Aug 1994		Tunisia	24 Nov 1993	2 Feb 1995

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty–sixth Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/46/49), p.156.

E. MULTIMODAL TRANSPORT

1. UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL MULTIMODAL TRANSPORT OF GOODS[1]

Concluded at Geneva on 24 May 1980

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 36 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. TD/MT/CONF/16; depositary notifications C.N.45.1982.TREATIES-1 of 11 March 1982 (procès-verbal of rectification of Russian text) and C.N.194.1982.TREATIES-5 of 23 August 1982 (procès-verbal of rectification of Arabic text).
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 7.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference on a Convention on International Multimodal Transport, held in Geneva from 12 to 30 November 1979 and from 8 to 24 May 1980. The Conference had been convened pursuant to resolution 33/160[2] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 December 1978. The Convention was opened for signature by all States from 1 September 1980 to 31 August 1981 inclusive at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Chile	9 Jul 1981	7 Apr 1982	Rwanda		15 Sep 1987 *a*
Malawi		2 Feb 1984 *a*	Senegal	2 Jul 1981	25 Oct 1984
Mexico	10 Oct 1980	11 Feb 1982	Venezuela	31 Aug 1981	
Morocco	25 Nov 1980	21 Jan 1993	Zambia		7 Oct 1991 *a*
Norway	28 Aug 1981				

NOTES:

[1] Although listed in this chapter for reasons of convenience, this Convention is not limited to transport by road.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-third Session, Supplement No. 45* (A/33/45), p. 119.

2. European Agreement on Important International Combined Transport Lines and Related Installations (AGTC)

Concluded at Geneva on 1 February 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 October 1993, in accordance with article 10 (1).
REGISTRATION: 20 October 1993.
TEXT: Doc. ECE/TRANS/88 and depositary notification C.N.347.1992.TREATIES–7 of 30 December 1992 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic English, French and Russian texts).
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 17.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Europe at its Fifty-third session held at Geneva from 28 January to 1 February 1991. The Agreement was open for signature at the Office of the United Nations at Geneva from 1 April 1991 to 31 March 1992.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Austria	30 Oct 1991	22 Jul 1993	Italy	30 Oct 1991	
Belgium	30 Oct 1991		Luxembourg	30 Oct 1991	13 Jul 1994
Bulgaria	30 Oct 1991	10 Aug 1994	Netherlands[2]	30 Oct 1991	13 May 1992 *A*
Croatia		24 Jul 1995 *a*	Norway	30 Mar 1992	30 Apr 1992 *A*
Czech Republic[1]	2 Jun 1993 *d*	22 Aug 1994 *AA*	Poland	27 Mar 1992	
Denmark	30 Oct 1991	9 Jan 1992 *A*	Romania	30 Oct 1991	21 May 1993
Finland	30 Oct 1991		Russian Federation		29 Jun 1994 *a*
France	16 Apr 1991	28 May 1992 *AA*	Slovakia[1]	28 May 1993 *d*	16 Aug 1994 *AA*
Germany	16 Apr 1991	30 Jul 1992	Slovenia		1 Nov 1994 *a*
Greece	30 Oct 1991	26 Apr 1995	Switzerland	31 Oct 1991	11 Feb 1993
Hungary	30 Oct 1991	4 Feb 1994 *AA*	Turkey	13 Jan 1992	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

DENMARK

Upon signature:

"With reservation for application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

The Russian Federation does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12 of the said Agreement.

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed the Agreement on 30 October 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

CHAPTER XII. NAVIGATION

1. CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION*

Done at Geneva on 6 March 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 17 March 1958, in accordance with article 60.
REGISTRATION: 17 March 1958, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 289, p. 3, and depositary notification C.N.283.1988.TREATIES-3 of 6 January 1989 (procès-verbal of rectification of Spanish authentic text).
STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 152.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature and acceptance by the United Nations Maritime Conference convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 35 (IV).[1] The Conference met at Geneva from 19 February to 6 March 1948. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 289, p. 3.

*As a result of the entry into force of the amendments adopted by the IMCO Assembly by its resolutions A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 and A.371 (X) of 9 November 1977 [see chapter XII.1(*d*)], the name of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) has been changed to "International Maritime Organization (IMO)" and the title of the Convention modified accordingly.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*
Albania		24 May 1993
Algeria		31 Oct 1963
Angola		6 Jun 1977
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	6 Mar 1948	18 Jun 1953
Australia	6 Mar 1948	13 Feb 1952
Austria		2 Apr 1975
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Bahamas		22 Jul 1976
Bahrain		22 Sep 1976
Bangladesh		27 May 1976
Barbados		7 Jan 1970
Belgium	6 Mar 1948	9 Aug 1951
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Benin		19 Mar 1980
Bolivia		6 Jul 1987
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brazil		4 Mar 1963
Brunei Darussalam		31 Dec 1984
Bulgaria		5 Apr 1960
Cambodia		3 Jan 1961
Cameroon		1 May 1961
Canada		15 Oct 1948
Cape Verde		24 Aug 1976
Chile	6 Mar 1948	17 Feb 1972
China[3]		1 Mar 1973
Colombia	6 Mar 1948	19 Nov 1974
Congo		5 Sep 1975
Costa Rica		4 Mar 1981
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Nov 1960
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Cuba		6 Mar 1966
Cyprus		21 Nov 1973
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark		3 Jun 1959
Djibouti		20 Feb 1979
Dominica		18 Dec 1979
Dominican Republic		25 Aug 1953
Ecuador		12 Jul 1956
Egypt	6 Mar 1948	17 Mar 1958
El Salvador		12 Feb 1981
Equatorial Guinea		6 Sep 1972
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Ethiopia		3 Jul 1975
Fiji		14 Mar 1983
Finland	6 Mar 1948	21 Apr 1959
France	6 Mar 1948	9 Apr 1952
Gabon		1 Apr 1976
Gambia		11 Jan 1979
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[4,5]		7 Jan 1959 *s*
Ghana		6 Jul 1959
Greece	6 Mar 1948	31 Dec 1958
Guatemala		16 Mar 1983
Guinea		3 Dec 1975
Guinea-Bissau		6 Dec 1977
Guyana		13 May 1980
Haiti		23 Jun 1953
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	23 Aug 1954
Hungary		10 Jun 1970
Iceland		8 Nov 1960
India	6 Mar 1948	6 Jan 1959
Indonesia[6]		18 Jan 1961
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10 Jun 1954	2 Jan 1958
Iraq		28 Aug 1973
Ireland	6 Mar 1948	26 Feb 1951
Israel		24 Apr 1952
Italy	6 Mar 1948	28 Jan 1957
Jamaica		11 May 1976
Japan		17 Mar 1958
Jordan		9 Nov 1973
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Kenya		22 Aug 1973
Kuwait[7]		5 Jul 1960

Participant	Signature	Definitive signature (s), acceptance
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Lebanon	6 Mar 1948	3 May 1966
Liberia	9 Mar 1954	6 Jan 1959
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 Feb 1970
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Madagascar		8 Mar 1961
Malawi		19 Jan 1989
Malaysia		17 Jun 1971
Maldives		31 May 1967
Malta		22 Jun 1966 *s*
Mauritania[7]		8 May 1961
Mauritius		18 May 1978
Mexico		21 Sep 1954
Monaco		22 Dec 1989
Morocco		30 Jul 1962
Mozambique		17 Jan 1979
Myanmar		6 Jul 1951
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Nepal		31 Jan 1979
Netherlands	6 Mar 1948	31 Mar 1949
New Zealand		9 Nov 1960
Nicaragua		17 Mar 1982
Nigeria		15 Mar 1962
Norway		29 Dec 1958
Oman		30 Jan 1974
Pakistan		21 Nov 1958
Panama		31 Dec 1958
Papua New Guinea		6 May 1976
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Peru		15 Apr 1968
Philippines		9 Nov 1964
Poland	6 Mar 1948	16 Mar 1960
Portugal	6 Mar 1948	17 Mar 1976
Qatar		19 May 1977
Republic of Korea[7]		10 Apr 1962
Romania		28 Apr 1965
Russian Federation		24 Dec 1958
Saint Lucia		10 Apr 1980
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 Apr 1981
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Jul 1990
Saudi Arabia		25 Feb 1969
Senegal		7 Nov 1960
Seychelles		13 Jun 1978
Sierra Leone		14 Mar 1973
Singapore		17 Jan 1966
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
Somalia		4 Apr 1978
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain		23 Jan 1962
Sri Lanka		6 Apr 1972
Sudan		5 Jul 1974
Suriname		14 Oct 1976
Sweden		27 Apr 1959
Switzerland	6 Mar 1948	20 Jul 1955
Syrian Arab Republic		28 Jan 1963
Thailand		20 Sep 1973
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Togo		20 Jun 1983
Trinidad and Tobago		27 Apr 1965
Tunisia		23 May 1963
Turkey	6 Mar 1948	25 Mar 1958
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Arab Emirates		4 Mar 1980
United Kingdom	6 Mar 1948	14 Feb 1949
United Republic of Tanzania		8 Jan 1974
United States of America	6 Mar 1948	17 Aug 1950
Uruguay		10 May 1968 *s*
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Venezuela		27 Oct 1975
Viet Nam		12 Jun 1984
Yemen[8]		14 Mar 1979
Yugoslavia		12 Feb 1960
Zaire		16 Aug 1973

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature or acceptance.)

BAHRAIN[9]

"The acceptance of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization by the State of Bahrain shall, however, in no way signify recognition of, or entry into any relations with Israel".

CAMBODIA[10]

In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Royal Government of Cambodia declares that the measures it has adopted or may adopt forgiving encouragement or assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries (such, for instance, as loan-financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest, or the allocation to Cambodian ships of cargoes owned or controlled by the Royal Government, or the reservation of coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matters as it may adopt with the object of promoting the development of its own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention.

Accordingly, the Royal Government will proceed to a re-examination, before they are put into effect, of any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization.

The Royal Government further declares that its acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law in force in the territory of the Kingdom of Cambodia.

CUBA

In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Revolutionary Government

of the Republic of Cuba declares that its current legislation, which is duly adapted to the encouragement and development of its Merchant Marine, is consistent with the General purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be re-examined by the Government of Cuba in the light of the national policy in this regard.

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark supports the work programme adopted during the first Assembly of the Organization in January 1959 and holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise where the Government of Denmark would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

ECUADOR

The Government of Ecuador declares that the protectionist measures adopted in the interests of its National Merchant Marine and the Merchant Fleet of Greater Colombia *(Flota Mercante Grancolomibiana)*, the vessels belonging to which are regarded as ecuadorian by reason of the participation of the Government of Ecuador in the said Fleet, are measures the sole object of which is to promote the development of the National Merchant Marine and of the Merchant Fleet of Greater Colombia and are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Organization, as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be re-examined by the Government of Ecuador.

FINLAND

"The Government of Finland support the work programme proposed by the Preparatory Committee of the Organization in document IMCO/A.I/11. The Government of Finland hold the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise where the Government of Finland would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

GREECE

"Greece, in re-confirming its acceptance, considers that the aforesaid Organization can play a useful and important role in the field of technical and nautical matters, thus contributing to the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world. In case the Organization extends its activities to matters of commercial and economic nature, the Greek Government may find itself bound to reconsider its acceptance of the Convention and avail itself of its provisions concerning withdrawal as laid down in article 59."

ICELAND

"Iceland will reconsider its ratification, if it subsequently were decided to extend IMCO's competence so as also to deal with questions of an entirely financial or commercial nature.

"Great stress is laid by Iceland on the real validity of article 59 of the Convention, regarding withdrawal."

INDIA[11]

"In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of India declare that any measures which it adopts or may have adopted for giving encouragement and assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries (such, for instance, as loan-financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest, or the allocation of Government-owned or Government-controlled cargoes to national ships or the reservation of the coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matters as the Government of India may adopt, the sole object of which is to promote the development of its own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of India. The Government of India further expressly state that its acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law on the subject in force in the territories of the Republic of India."

INDONESIA[12]

"In accepting the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"On matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, the Government holds the view that assistance and encouragement to its national shipping industries for the development of its domestic and foreign trade and for purposes of security, are consistent with the purposes of the Organization as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention.

"Accordingly, the acceptance shall never have the effect of altering or modifying in any recommendation relating to this subject adopted by the Organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia."

IRAQ[13]

The participation of the Republic of Iraq in this Convention shall, however, in no way signify recognition of, or entry into any relations with Israel.

The Republic of Iraq hereby declares that article 1 *(b)* of the Convention is not in conflict with the measures taken by it to encourage and assist national shipping companies, such as the granting of financial loans, the assignment of cargo vessels flying its flag to carry specific goods and the assignment of commercial vessels, or any other measures aimed at the development and growth of the national fleet or national shipping.

MALAYSIA[14]

"In accepting the Convention of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of Malaysia declares that any measures which she may adopt for giving encouragement or assistance to her national shipping industries (for instance, such as loan financing of national

shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest or the allocation to Malaysian cargo ships owned or controlled by the Malaysian Government, or the reservation of coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matter as she may adopt with the object of promoting the development of her own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention. Accordingly any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be re-examined by the Government of Malaysia. The Government of Malaysia further expressly states that her acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law on the subject in force in Malaysia."

MEXICO

The Government of the United States of Mexico, in accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, on the understanding that nothing in the said Convention is intended to change national legislation relating to restrictive business practices, expressly states that its acceptance of the above-mentioned international instrument neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the application of the laws against monopolies in the territory of the Republic of Mexico.

MOROCCO

In joining the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to declare that it is not in agreement with a possible broadening of the scope of the activities of this Organization from the purely technical and nautical activities into the field of matters of an economic and commercial nature as stated in article 1 *(b)* and *(c)* of the Convention for the Establishment of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. If such a broadening of the field of activities of the Organization were to take place, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco reserves the right to reconsider its position concerning the ensuing situation, and might be led to invoke the provisions of article 59 of the Convention, regarding the withdrawal of members from the Organization.

NORWAY

"The Norwegian Government supports the work programme proposed by the Preparatory Committee of the Organization in document IMCO/A.I/11. The Norwegian Government holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise where the Norwegian Government would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

POLAND

"In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva on 6 March 1948, the Government of the Polish People's Republic declares that it supports the work programme of the Organization, approved by the Assembly at its First Session held in January 1959.

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization shall make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world."

SPAIN

The Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization may not extend its activities to economic or commercial questions but must limit itself to questions of a technical character.

SRI LANKA[15]

In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, as amended, the Government of Ceylon declares that any measures which it adopts or may have adopted for giving encouragement and assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries (such, for instance, as loan-financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest, or the allocation of Government-owned or Government-controlled cargoes to national ships or the reservation of the coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matters as the Government of Ceylon may adopt, the sole object of which is to promote the development of its own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 *(b)* of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of Ceylon. The Government of Ceylon further expressly states that its acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law on the subject in force in Ceylon.

SWEDEN

"In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of Sweden declares that it supports the work programme of the Organization as per document A.I/11 and its corrigendum 1, decided upon by the first meeting of the Assembly of the Organization in January 1959.

"The Government of Sweden holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise in which the Government of Sweden would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

SWITZERLAND

In depositing its instrument of ratification of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), Switzerland makes the general reservation that its participation in the work of IMCO, more particularly as regards that organizations relations with the United Nations, cannot exceed the bounds implicit in Switzerland's status as a perpetually neutral State. In conformity with this general reservation, Switzerland wishes to make a particular reservation both in respect of the text of article VI as incorporated in the Agreement, at present in draft form, between IMCO and the United Nations, and in respect of any similar clause which may replace or supplement that provision in the said agreement or in any other arrangement.

TURKEY

"[Participation by Turkey] will in no way have any effect on the provisions of the Turkish laws concerning cabotage and monopoly."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[9]

"The Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention and amendments does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention and amendments in respect of the said Country.

"The Government of the United Arab Emirates wishes further to indicate that its understanding described above is in conformity with General practice existing in United Arab Emirates regarding signature, ratification, or acceptance to a Convention which a country not recognized by United Arab Emirates is a party."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[17]

"It being understood that nothing in the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization is intended to alter domestic legislation with respect to restrictive business practices, it is hereby declared that ratification of that Convention by the Government of the United States of America does not and will not have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the application of the anti-trust statutes of the United States of America."

VIET NAM

In accepting the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam states to support the purposes of the said Organization as defined in article 1 of the Convention. On the basis of state sovereignty and proceeding from its foreign Policy of peace, friendship, co-operation, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam will take into consideration the recommendations relating to the subject as provided in article 1 (b) of the Convention and relating amendments which may arise.

YUGOSLAVIA

"In joining the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia wishes to declare that it is not in agreement with a possible broadening of the scope of the activities of this Organization from the purely technical and nautical activities into the field of matters of an economic and commercial nature as stated in Article 1, sections under *(b)* and *(c)* of the Convention for the establishment of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. If such a broadening of the field of activities of the Organization were to take place the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia reserves the right to reconsider its position concerning the ensuing situation.

"At the same time, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia declares its readiness to fulfil all its obligations toward the Organization, as stated in the instrument of ratification."

Participation of Territories in the Convention (article 58)

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[16]	3 Oct 1949	Indonesia, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles.
		[By a further notification received on 12 July 1951, notice was given that the participation Netherlands in this Convention, from 27 December 1949, no longer includes the territories under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Indonesia but includes Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles (formerly the Netherlands West Indies) and Netherlands New Guinea]
United Kingdom[18,19,20]	19 Jan 1960	Federation of Nigeria
	2 Oct 1961	Sarawak and North Borneo
	7 Jun 1967	Hong Kong

Associate Membership in the Organization (article 9)

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Associate Members*
Portugal[21]	2 Feb 1990	Macau
United Kingdom[18,19,20]	19 Jan 1960	Federation of Nigeria
	2 Oct 1961	Joint associate membership of Sarawak and North Borneo
	7 Jun 1967	Hong Kong

Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

(*a*) Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.69 (ES.II) of 15 September 1964

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 October 1967 for all Members of the Organization, in accordance with article 52 of the Convention.
REGISTRATION: 6 October 1967, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 607, p. 276.
STATUS: Acceptances: 85.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 54 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In accordance with article 52 of the Convention, the Assembly of the International Maritime Consultative Organization determined that these amendments were of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it did not accept such amendments and within a period of twelve months after they had come into force would, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention.

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Albania		24 May 1993
Algeria	26 Oct 1967	3 Nov 1967
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	30 Sep 1966	5 Oct 1966
Australia	6 Jan 1965	15 Feb 1965
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Belgium	20 Jul 1965	26 Jul 1965
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Benin		19 Mar 1980
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brazil	17 Nov 1966	30 Dec 1966
Bulgaria	29 Sep 1966	3 Oct 1966
Cambodia	18 Aug 1966	22 Aug 1966
Canada	25 Jan 1965	15 Feb 1965
China[22]		
Costa Rica		4 Mar 1981
Côte d'Ivoire	17 Sep 1965	4 Oct 1965
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark	10 Jun 1965	14 Jul 1965
Dominican Republic	28 Jun 1966	11 Jul 1966
Ecuador	12 Aug 1965	18 Aug 1965
Egypt	11 Mar 1966	18 Mar 1966
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Finland	17 Jan 1967	20 Jan 1967
France	5 Apr 1965	21 Apr 1965
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[4,5]	24 Sep 1965	7 Oct 1965
Ghana	2 Apr 1965	17 May 1965
Greece	1 Dec 1965	3 Dec 1965
Iceland	10 Sep 1965	14 Sep 1965
India	23 Feb 1965	17 Mar 1965
Indonesia	11 Oct 1966	21 Oct 1966
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Jun 1966	15 Jun 1966
Ireland	8 Jun 1965	14 Jun 1965
Israel	6 Feb 1967	9 Feb 1967
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Kenya		22 Aug 1973
Kuwait	2 Sep 1966	6 Sep 1966
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Lebanon	15 Feb 1967	20 Feb 1967
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Madagascar	18 Feb 1965	25 Feb 1965
Malta	5 Sep 1966	8 Sep 1966
Mauritania	1 Nov 1966	4 Nov 1966
Mexico	11 Oct 1967	16 Oct 1967
Morocco	6 Sep 1965	7 Oct 1965
Myanmar	27 Sep 1966	6 Oct 1966
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Netherlands	21 Sep 1965	4 Oct 1965
New Zealand	22 Nov 1965	26 Nov 1965
Nigeria	6 Dec 1967	11 Dec 1967
Norway	9 Sep 1965	13 Sep 1965
Pakistan	11 Jun 1965	18 Jun 1965
Panama	28 Jul 1966	2 Aug 1966
Papua New Guinea		6 May 1976
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Philippines	31 Oct 1966	2 Nov 1966
Poland	30 Jun 1965	9 Jul 1965
Republic of Korea	29 Apr 1965	5 May 1965
Romania	29 Jul 1966	3 Aug 1966
Russian Federation	16 Dec 1965	20 Dec 1965
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Oct 1990
Senegal	28 Sep 1966	6 Oct 1966
Sierra Leone		14 Mar 1973
Singapore	14 Feb 1966	18 Feb 1966
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain	16 Jun 1965	28 Jun 1965
Sudan		5 Jul 1974
Sweden	9 Sep 1965	13 Sep 1965
Switzerland	9 Jan 1967	13 Jan 1967

Participant	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Trinidad and Tobago	24 Nov 1966	5 Dec 1966
Tunisia	28 Mar 1966	8 Apr 1966
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Kingdom	26 Jan 1965	15 Feb 1965
United States of America	21 Jul 1966	25 Jul 1966
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Yugoslavia	4 Mar 1966	11 Mar 1966
Zaire		16 Aug 1973

(*b*) Amendment to article 28 of the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.70 (IV) of 28 September 1965

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 November 1968 for all Members, of the Organization in accordance with article 52 of the Convention.
REGISTRATION: 3 November 1968, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 649, p. 335.
STATUS: Acceptances: 80.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 54 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendment to article 28 of the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In accordance with article 52 of the Convention, the Assembly of the International Maritime Consultative Organization determined that these amendments were of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it did not accept such amendments and within a period of twelve months after they had come into force would, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention.

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Albania		24 May 1993
Algeria	26 Oct 1967	3 Nov 1967
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	30 Sep 1966	5 Oct 1966
Australia	20 Jun 1966	23 Jun 1966
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Belgium	1 Jun 1966	6 Jun 1966
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Benin		19 Mar 1980
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brazil	17 Nov 1966	30 Dec 1966
Bulgaria	29 Sep 1966	3 Oct 1966
Canada	25 Apr 1966	29 Apr 1966
China[22]		
Costa Rica		4 Mar 1981
Côte d'Ivoire	17 Mar 1967	20 Mar 1967
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Cuba	9 Feb 1973	9 Feb 1973
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark	10 Nov 1966	15 Nov 1966
Egypt	13 Feb 1967	15 Feb 1967
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Finland	17 Jan 1967	20 Jan 1967
France	1 Mar 1966	14 Mar 1966
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[4, 5]	15 Jul 1966	22 Jul 1966
Ghana	17 Nov 1966	21 Nov 1966
Iceland	8 Mar 1967	13 Mar 1967
India	10 Oct 1966	13 Oct 1966
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	20 Jun 1968	1 Jul 1968
Ireland	20 Jun 1966	23 Jun 1966
Israel	6 Feb 1967	9 Feb 1967
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Kenya		22 Aug 1973
Kuwait	2 Sep 1966	6 Sep 1966
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Lebanon	15 Feb 1967	20 Feb 1967
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Madagascar	24 Jan 1966	27 Jan 1966
Maldives	18 Apr 1968	22 Apr 1968
Malta	5 Sep 1966	8 Sep 1966
Mexico	11 Oct 1967	16 Oct 1967
Morocco	24 Jan 1966	27 Jan 1966
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Netherlands	9 May 1967	15 May 1967
New Zealand	25 Jul 1968	29 Jul 1968
Nigeria	6 Dec 1967	11 Dec 1967
Norway	18 May 1966	23 May 1966
Pakistan	29 Jun 1966	5 Jul 1966
Panama	28 Jul 1966	2 Aug 1966
Papua New Guinea		6 May 1976
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Philippines	31 Oct 1966	2 Nov 1966
Poland	16 Aug 1966	19 Aug 1966
Republic of Korea	5 Jan 1967	10 Jan 1967
Romania	10 Jul 1967	27 Jul 1967
Russian Federation	28 Feb 1966	7 Mar 1966
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Oct 1990
Sierra Leone		14 Mar 1973
Singapore	14 Feb 1966	18 Feb 1966
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain	4 May 1966	9 May 1966
Sudan		5 Jul 1974
Sweden	21 Jul 1966	26 Jul 1966
Switzerland	9 Jan 1967	13 Jan 1967
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Trinidad and Tobago	17 Apr 1967	20 Apr 1967
Tunisia	16 Feb 1966	23 Feb 1966
Turkey	5 Jun 1967	9 Jun 1967
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Kingdom	18 May 1966	23 May 1966
United States of America	25 Jan 1968	1 Feb 1968
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Yugoslavia	22 Nov 1966	28 Nov 1966

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*	*Participant*	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Zaire		16 Aug 1973			

(c) Amendments to articles 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28, 31 and 32 of the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1978 for all Members of the Organization, in accordance with article 52 of the Convention.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1978, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1080, p. 375.
STATUS: Acceptances: 110.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 54 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments to articles 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28, 31 et 32 of the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

In accordance with article 52 of the Convention, the Assembly of the International Maritime Consultative Organization determined that these amendments were of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it did not accept such amendments and within a period of twelve months after they had come into force would, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention.

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Albania		24 May 1993
Algeria	21 Feb 1976	8 Mar 1976
Angola		6 Jun 1977
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	25 Sep 1979	8 Oct 1979
Austria		1 Mar 1977
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Bahamas	20 Jan 1977	31 Jan 1977
Bahrain[8]	22 Sep 1976	22 Sep 1976
Barbados	19 Jun 1975	30 Jun 1975
Belgium	22 Jun 1976	6 Jul 1976
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brazil	19 Jul 1976	30 Jul 1976
Bulgaria		16 Apr 1975
Cameroon		1 Nov 1976
Canada	4 Jul 1975	16 Jul 1975
Cape Verde		24 Aug 1976
Chile	2 Feb 1976	11 Feb 1976
China	18 Apr 1975	28 Apr 1975
Colombia	24 Aug 1979	4 Sep 1979
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Cuba		24 Nov 1975
Cyprus	16 Feb 1976	24 Feb 1976
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark	5 Jul 1976	20 Jul 1976
Dominican Republic	16 Dec 1976	30 Dec 1976
Ecuador	23 Dec 1976	3 Jan 1977
Egypt		16 Nov 1976
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Ethiopia		2 Aug 1977
Finland	4 Oct 1976	19 Oct 1976
France	17 Mar 1975	24 Mar 1975
Gabon		15 Nov 1977
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[23,24]	11 Nov 1975	1 Dec 1975
Ghana		18 Oct 1976
Greece	3 May 1977	16 May 1977
Guinea	25 Mar 1977	1 Apr 1977
Guinea-Bissau		6 Dec 1977
Hungary	15 Dec 1976	30 Dec 1976
Iceland	3 May 1976	13 May 1976
India	9 Jan 1976	16 Jan 1976
Indonesia	12 Nov 1976	23 Nov 1976
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	1 Jul 1973	8 Jul 1975
Iraq[25]		11 Mar 1976
Ireland	26 Oct 1978	6 Nov 1978
Israel	25 Aug 1976	8 Sep 1976
Italy	30 Apr 1976	13 May 1976
Jordan	30 Mar 1977	5 Apr 1977
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Liberia	22 Aug 1975	8 Sep 1975
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Jul 1976	30 Jul 1976
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Madagascar	17 Dec 1975	29 Dec 1975
Maldives	7 Jul 1975	21 Jul 1975
Malta	25 Oct 1976	2 Nov 1976
Mauritius		18 May 1978
Mexico		23 Mar 1976
Morocco[26]		17 Sep 1976
Myanmar	18 Jan 1980	29 Jan 1980
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Netherlands[27]	23 Oct 1975	10 Nov 1975
New Zealand	16 Mar 1976	24 Mar 1976
Nigeria		30 Jun 1976
Norway	16 Apr 1975	28 Apr 1975
Oman	8 Nov 1976	17 Nov 1976
Pakistan	4 May 1976	13 May 1976
Panama		23 May 1975
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Peru	8 Nov 1976	17 Nov 1976
Poland		15 Mar 1976
Portugal	17 Oct 1977	24 Oct 1977
Qatar		19 May 1977
Republic of Korea	29 Oct 1976	8 Nov 1976
Romania	11 Jul 1977	25 Jul 1977
Russian Federation	21 Apr 1975	28 Apr 1975

Participant	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Oct 1990
Saudi Arabia	9 Mar 1977	23 Mar 1977
Seychelles		13 Jun 1978
Singapore	7 Jan 1977	18 Jan 1977
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
Somalia		4 Apr 1978
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain	13 Mar 1975	24 Mar 1975
Sri Lanka	6 May 1976	17 May 1976
Suriname		26 Nov 1976
Sweden	28 Apr 1975	5 May 1975
Switzerland	30 Dec 1975	16 Jan 1976
Syrian Arab Republic	28 Oct 1976	25 Mar 1977
Thailand	17 Nov 1975	1 Dec 1975
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Trinidad and Tobago	12 May 1975	16 May 1975
Tunisia	4 May 1976	13 May 1976
Turkey	19 Dec 1978	28 Dec 1978
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Arab Emirates[26]		4 Mar 1980
United Kingdom	10 Jun 1975	26 Jun 1975
United Republic of Tanzania	16 Sep 1976	28 Sep 1976
United States of America	3 Feb 1976	11 Feb 1976
Uruguay		19 Sep 1978
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Venezuela		27 Oct 1975
Yugoslavia	23 Mar 1976	30 Mar 1976

(*d*) Amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolutions A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 and A.371 (X) of 9 November 1977 [rectification of resolution A.358 (IX)]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 May 1982, for all Members of the Organization, in accordance with article 51 of the Convention (except article 51), and on 28 July 1982 in respect of article 51, in accordance with article 62.
REGISTRATION: 22 May 1982 and 28 July 1982, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1276, p. 468.
STATUS: Acceptances: 116.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 53 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Albania		24 May 1993
Algeria	7 Jun 1976	6 Jul 1976
Angola		6 Jun 1977
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	5 Dec 1979	31 Dec 1979
Australia	29 May 1980	10 Jun 1980
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Bahamas	16 Feb 1979	1 Mar 1979
Bahrain		25 Apr 1980
Bangladesh	21 Sep 1979	8 Oct 1979
Barbados	19 Aug 1977	30 Aug 1977
Belgium	26 Apr 1978	28 Apr 1978
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brazil	25 Jul 1977	1 Aug 1977
Bulgaria		4 Mar 1980
Canada	6 Apr 1977	22 Apr 1977
Cape Verde	15 Apr 1980	23 Apr 1980
Chile	13 Mar 1978	20 Mar 1978
China		14 Mar 1979
Colombia	26 Jul 1985	9 Aug 1985
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Nov 1981
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Cuba		27 Dec 1979
Cyprus		6 Dec 1977
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark	14 Sep 1976	18 Sep 1976
Djibouti	9 Feb 1979	20 Feb 1979
Dominica	3 Dec 1979	18 Dec 1979
Egypt		16 Nov 1976
El Salvador		12 Feb 1981
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Ethiopia	17 Jan 1979	2 Feb 1979
Finland	4 Oct 1976	19 Oct 1976
France	5 Nov 1976	1 Feb 1977
Gambia		11 Jan 1979
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[28,29]	17 Oct 1977	24 Oct 1977
Ghana	29 Jan 1980	5 Feb 1980
Greece	17 Jul 1981	28 Jul 1981
Guinea	25 Mar 1977	1 Apr 1977
Guinea–Bissau		6 Dec 1977
Guyana		13 May 1980
Honduras	24 Sep 1985	9 Oct 1985
Hungary	21 Mar 1980	31 Mar 1980
Iceland	17 Jul 1980	28 Jul 1980
India	20 Apr 1978	1 May 1978
Indonesia	22 Jul 1983	29 Jul 1983
Iraq		5 Sep 1979
Ireland	20 Oct 1981	27 Oct 1981
Israel	17 Dec 1979	31 Dec 1979
Jamaica	30 Mar 1979	9 Apr 1979
Jordan	30 Mar 1977	5 Apr 1977
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Kuwait	18 Dec 1978	28 Dec 1978
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Liberia	31 Oct 1979	19 Nov 1979
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 Sep 1976	13 Sep 1976
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Malaysia	29 Mar 1982	12 Apr 1982
Maldives	12 Feb 1980	25 Feb 1980
Malta	18 Apr 1979	23 Apr 1979
Mexico		19 Dec 1980
Morocco[26]		25 Jul 1980
Mozambique		10 Nov 1983
Myanmar	18 Jan 1980	29 Jan 1980
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Nepal		31 Jan 1979
Netherlands[30]	11 Jul 1977	19 Jul 1977
New Zealand	26 Jul 1978	15 Aug 1978
Nicaragua		17 Mar 1982
Nigeria	13 Nov 1984	11 Dec 1984
Norway	2 Aug 1977	8 Aug 1977
Oman	12 May 1981	22 May 1981
Pakistan	7 Jan 1981	23 Jan 1981
Panama	9 Jun 1977	22 Jun 1977
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Peru	9 Jan 1980	21 Jan 1980
Philippines	5 Nov 1981	17 Nov 1981
Poland		13 Feb 1979
Portugal	15 Feb 1980	3 Mar 1980
Qatar		19 May 1977
Republic of Korea	6 Sep 1978	19 Sep 1978

Participant	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Romania	11 Jul 1977	25 Jul 1977
Russian Federation	22 Jun 1979	2 Jul 1979
Saint Lucia		10 Apr 1980
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 Apr 1981
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Oct 1990
Saudi Arabia	20 Jul 1979	1 Aug 1979
Seychelles		13 Jun 1978
Singapore	30 May 1979	15 Jun 1979
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain	30 Mar 1981	14 Apr 1981
Sri Lanka	30 Jun 1977	12 Jul 1977
Suriname	4 Apr 1979	11 Apr 1979
Sweden	24 Feb 1977	23 Mar 1977
Switzerland	14 May 1981	22 May 1981
Thailand	11 Feb 1981	20 Feb 1981
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Tunisia	24 Jul 1979	1 Aug 1979
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Arab Emirates[26]		4 Mar 1980
United Kingdom[31]	20 Nov 1979	22 Feb 1980
United Republic of Tanzania	19 Apr 1979	23 Apr 1979
United States of America	12 Aug 1980	28 Aug 1980
Uruguay		17 Dec 1980
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Venezuela	20 May 1985	29 May 1985
Yemen[32]	6 Mar 1979	14 Mar 1979
Yugoslavia	25 Jul 1980	4 Aug 1980

(e) Amendments to the Convention relating to the institutionalization of the Committee on technical co-operation in the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.400 (X) of 17 November 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 November 1984 for all Members, of the Organization in accordance with article 62.
REGISTRATION: 10 November 1984, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1380, p. 268.
STATUS: Acceptances: 115.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 64 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments to the Convention relating to the institutionalization of the Committee on Technical Co-operation in the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Albania		24 May 1993
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	18 May 1981	26 May 1981
Australia	29 May 1980	10 Jun 1980
Austria	28 Mar 1983	6 Apr 1983
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Bahamas	16 Feb 1979	1 Mar 1979
Bahrain		25 Apr 1980
Bangladesh	21 Sep 1979	8 Oct 1979
Barbados	8 Aug 1979	20 Aug 1979
Belgium	7 Oct 1985	30 Oct 1985
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brazil	14 Mar 1979	26 Mar 1979
Brunei Darussalam		31 Dec 1984
Bulgaria		4 Mar 1980
Canada	5 Nov 1979	19 Nov 1979
Cape Verde	15 Apr 1980	23 Apr 1980
Chile	31 Jan 1979	13 Feb 1979
China		30 Oct 1979
Colombia	26 Jul 1985	9 Aug 1985
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Nov 1981
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Cuba		26 Oct 1982
Cyprus	3 Jul 1979	10 Jul 1979
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark	20 Dec 1978	2 Jan 1979
Djibouti	9 Feb 1979	20 Feb 1979
Dominica	3 Dec 1979	18 Dec 1979
Dominican Republic		10 Nov 1983
Egypt	11 Nov 1980	17 Nov 1980
El Salvador		12 Feb 1981
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Ethiopia	5 Apr 1979	11 Apr 1979
Finland	12 Nov 1979	19 Nov 1979
Gabon		27 Feb 1979
Gambia		11 Jan 1979
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[33,34]		2 Apr 1979
Ghana	29 Jan 1980	5 Feb 1980
Greece	17 Jul 1981	28 Jul 1981
Guyana		13 May 1980
Honduras	24 Sep 1985	9 Oct 1985
Hungary	21 Mar 1980	31 Mar 1980
Iceland	17 Jul 1980	28 Jul 1980
India	12 Jan 1979	22 Jan 1979
Indonesia	22 Jul 1983	29 Jul 1983
Iraq		5 Sep 1979
Ireland	20 Oct 1981	27 Oct 1981
Israel	17 Dec 1979	31 Dec 1979
Italy[35]	3 Jun 1983	13 Jun 1983
Jamaica	30 Mar 1979	9 Apr 1979
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Kuwait	16 Nov 1979	27 Nov 1979
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Liberia		14 Dec 1979
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Malaysia	18 Sep 1981	28 Sep 1981
Maldives	12 Feb 1980	25 Feb 1980
Malta	18 Apr 1979	23 Apr 1979
Mexico	10 Mar 1983	23 Mar 1983
Morocco[26]		25 Jul 1980
Mozambique		10 Nov 1983
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Nepal		31 Jan 1979
Netherlands[27]	18 Jun 1981	29 Jun 1981
New Zealand	27 Feb 1979	9 Mar 1979
Nicaragua		17 Mar 1982
Nigeria	13 Nov 1984	11 Dec 1984
Norway	11 Aug 1978	5 Sep 1978
Oman	12 May 1981	22 May 1981
Pakistan	7 Jan 1981	23 Jan 1981
Panama	11 Dec 1980	23 Dec 1980
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Peru	9 Jan 1980	21 Jan 1980
Philippines	5 Nov 1981	17 Nov 1981
Poland		2 Jan 1980
Portugal	10 Dec 1982	22 Dec 1982
Republic of Korea		31 May 1979
Romania	3 Sep 1982	14 Sep 1982
Russian Federation	22 Jun 1979	2 Jul 1979
Saint Lucia		10 Apr 1980
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 Apr 1981

Participant	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Oct 1990
Saudi Arabia	20 Jul 1979	1 Aug 1979
Seychelles	29 Jun 1982	7 Jul 1982
Singapore	30 May 1979	15 Jun 1979
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain	30 Mar 1981	14 Apr 1981
Sri Lanka	7 Jan 1980	16 Jan 1980
Suriname	4 Apr 1979	11 Apr 1979
Sweden	20 Dec 1978	5 Jan 1979
Switzerland	14 May 1981	22 May 1981
Thailand	11 Feb 1981	20 Feb 1981
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Togo	13 Jun 1983	20 Jun 1983
Trinidad and Tobago		22 Aug 1984
Tunisia	24 Jul 1979	1 Aug 1979
Turkey	21 Nov 1985	4 Dec 1985
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Arab Emirates		2 Nov 1981
United Kingdom[31]	20 Nov 1980	22 Feb 1980
United Republic of Tanzania	19 Apr 1979	23 Apr 1979
United States of America	12 Aug 1980	28 Aug 1980
Uruguay		17 Dec 1980
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Venezuela	20 May 1985	29 May 1985
Yemen[32]	6 Mar 1979	14 Mar 1979
Yugoslavia	11 Jun 1979	27 Jun 1979

(f) Amendments to articles 17, 18, 20 and 51 of the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.450 (XI) of 15 November 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 November 1984 for all Members of the Organization, in accordance with article 62.
REGISTRATION: 10 November 1984, No. 4214.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1380, p. 288.
STATUS: Acceptances: 117.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 64 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments 17, 18, 20 et 51 to the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant[2]	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Albania		24 May 1993
Algeria		28 Oct 1983
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986
Argentina	26 May 1983	13 Jun 1983
Australia	10 Nov 1980	17 Nov 1980
Austria	28 Mar 1983	6 Apr 1983
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995
Bahamas	9 May 1980	23 May 1980
Bahrain		25 Apr 1980
Bangladesh	28 Feb 1980	17 Mar 1980
Barbados	21 Feb 1980	3 Mar 1980
Belgium	11 Dec 1980	23 Dec 1980
Belize		13 Sep 1990
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993
Brunei Darussalam		31 Dec 1984
Bulgaria		21 Oct 1980
Cameroon		2 Feb 1984
Canada	12 May 1980	23 May 1980
Cape Verde		30 Aug 1983
Chile	9 Mar 1981	16 Mar 1981
China		29 Jul 1981
Colombia	26 Jul 1985	9 Aug 1985
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Nov 1981
Croatia		8 Jul 1992
Cuba		3 Nov 1983
Cyprus	29 Sep 1982	7 Oct 1982
Czech Republic		18 Jun 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986
Denmark	30 Apr 1981	12 May 1981
Djibouti	13 May 1982	1 Jun 1982
Ecuador		30 Jun 1986
Egypt	6 Sep 1982	14 Sep 1982
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993
Estonia		31 Jan 1992
Ethiopia		8 Dec 1982
Finland	4 Jan 1980	14 Jan 1980
France	16 May 1983	26 May 1983
Georgia		22 Jun 1993
Germany[36,37]	6 Jun 1980	23 Jun 1980
Ghana		14 Nov 1983
Greece	17 Jul 1981	28 Jul 1981
Guyana	1 Aug 1985	16 Aug 1985
Honduras	24 Sep 1985	9 Oct 1985
Hungary	22 Apr 1982	3 May 1982
Iceland	17 Jul 1980	28 Jul 1980
India	23 Apr 1980	5 May 1980
Indonesia	22 Jul 1983	29 Jul 1983
Iraq	18 Mar 1983	6 Apr 1983
Ireland	20 Oct 1981	27 Oct 1981
Israel		15 Dec 1982
Italy[35]	3 Jun 1983	13 Jun 1983
Jamaica	15 Apr 1980	30 Apr 1980
Jordan	30 Dec 1983	18 Jan 1984
Kazakstan		11 Mar 1994
Kenya	7 Apr 1983	19 Apr 1983
Kuwait		1 Apr 1986
Latvia		1 Mar 1993
Lebanon	7 Apr 1983	19 Apr 1983
Liberia	17 Dec 1980	8 Jan 1981
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991
Malaysia	25 Mar 1981	2 Apr 1981
Maldives		2 Apr 1980
Mexico	10 Mar 1983	23 Mar 1983
Morocco[26]		25 Jul 1980
Namibia		27 Oct 1994
Nepal	21 Oct 1982	1 Nov 1982
Netherlands[27]	18 Jun 1981	29 Jun 1981
New Zealand	28 Nov 1980	15 Dec 1980
Nicaragua		17 Mar 1982
Nigeria	13 Nov 1984	11 Dec 1984
Norway	17 Jul 1981	28 Jul 1981
Oman	13 May 1982	24 May 1982
Pakistan		10 Dec 1982
Panama	21 Nov 1984	11 Dec 1984
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993
Peru	16 Jul 1982	28 Jul 1982
Philippines	1 Jul 1983	11 Jul 1983
Poland		20 Nov 1980
Portugal		22 Dec 1982
Qatar	18 Jun 1982	29 Jun 1982
Republic of Korea	20 Mar 1980	31 Mar 1980
Romania	3 Sep 1982	14 Sep 1982
Russian Federation	6 Jan 1981	23 Jan 1981
Saint Lucia	12 Sep 1983	14 Sep 1983
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 Apr 1981
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Oct 1990
Saudi Arabia	24 Apr 1985	15 May 1985
Senegal	10 Jun 1983	20 Jun 1983

Participant	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Seychelles	29 Jun 1982	7 Jul 1982
Singapore		1 Nov 1983
Slovakia		24 Mar 1993
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988
Somalia		6 Dec 1983
South Africa		28 Feb 1995
Spain	30 Mar 1981	14 Apr 1981
Sri Lanka	19 Feb 1981	17 Mar 1981
Suriname	19 May 1980	28 May 1980
Sweden	14 Nov 1980	25 Nov 1980
Switzerland	14 May 1981	22 May 1981
Thailand	9 Mar 1983	23 Mar 1983
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993
Togo	13 Jun 1983	20 Jun 1983
Trinidad and Tobago	24 Jun 1983	5 Jul 1983
Tunisia	21 Dec 1982	5 Jan 1983
Turkey	21 Nov 1985	4 Dec 1985
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994
United Arab Emirates		2 Nov 1981
United Kingdom	7 Sep 1983	14 Sep 1983
United Republic of Tanzania	16 May 1983	26 May 1983
United States of America	9 Nov 1981	17 Nov 1981
Uruguay	27 Sep 1983	13 Oct 1983
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986
Venezuela	20 May 1985	29 May 1985
Yemen[38]	13 Jun 1983	20 Jun 1983
Yugoslavia	8 May 1981	15 May 1981

(g) Amendments to the IMO Convention relating to the institutionalization of the Facilitation Committee in the Convention

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.724 (17) of 7 November 1991

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 62 of the Convention).
TEXT: Doc. IMO Resolution A.724 (17).
STATUS: Acceptances: 27.

Note: See *"Note:"* at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 64 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments to the Convention relating to the institutionalization of the facilitation committee in the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMO)*	*Date of deposit of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
Australia		1 Jul 1994
Belgium		5 Apr 1994
Brazil		16 Nov 1995
Cameroon	14 Jun 1993	17 Mar 1994
Canada		24 Jun 1993
Chile		20 Nov 1995
China		27 Oct 1994
Cuba	16 Dec 1993	22 Dec 1993
Denmark		6 Jan 1994
Egypt		12 Jul 1994
Estonia	18 Aug 1992	26 Aug 1992
Finland		26 Jan 1994
Greece		2 Dec 1994
India		31 Oct 1995
Morocco		16 Jun 1995
Netherlands	3 Nov 1993	6 Dec 1993
Norway	25 Aug 1992	10 Sept 1992
Republic of Korea		22 Dec 1994
Russian Federation	4 Aug 1993	23 Aug 1993
Seychelles	26 Jun 1992	14 Jul 1992
Singapore		25 May 1994
Slovakia		12 June 1995
Spain	28 Sep 1993	6 Oct 1993
Sweden		1 Sep 1994
Thailand		19 Apr 1994
Trinidad and Tobago		10 Nov 1995
United Kingdom		14 Sep 1994

(*h*) Amendments to articles 16, 17 and 19 (b) of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

Adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.735 (18) of 4 November 1993

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 62 of the Convention).
TEXT: OMI Resolution A.735. (18).
STATUS: Acceptances: 33.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

Note: Pursuant to article 68 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments the Convention, showing the respective dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization and the dates of their deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*
Argentina	21 Sep 1995	Malta	4 Feb 1994
Australia	10 Mar 1995	Mexico	4 May 1995
Canada	23 Jun 1995	Monaco	27 Jan 1994
China	27 Oct 1994	Morocco	16 Jun 1995
Cuba	28 Feb 1994	Netherlands[39]	26 Sep 1994
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	5 Apr 1994	Nigeria	4 May 1995
Denmark	6 Jan 1994	Poland	29 Dec 1995
Egypt	12 Jul 1994	Republic of Korea	5 Apr 1994
Estonia	22 Feb 1994	Russian Federation	8 Sep 1994
Finland	28 Aug 1995	Singapore	28 Nov 1995
Germany	17 Mar 1995	Slovakia	12 June 1995
Greece	2 Dec 1994	Spain	24 Jan 1995
India	28 Nov 1995	Sweden	1 Sep 1994
Kuwait	15 Sep 1995	Switzerland	21 Dec 1995
Lebanon	10 Jul 1995	Trinidad and Tobago	10 Nov 1995
Liberia	16 Jun 1995	United Arab Emirates	3 Mar 1995
		United Kingdom	14 Sep 1994

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, of 28 March 1947.*

[2] Czechoslovakia had accepted the Convention on 1 October 1963. Subsequently, the Government of Czechoslovakia deposited an instrument of acceptance of the following amendments at IMCO and UN, respectively, on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Amendments adopted by resolution n°	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (IMCO)*	*Date of receipt of the instrument of acceptance (UN)*
A.6 9 (ES.II)	3 Oct 1966	6 Oct 1966
A.70 (IV)	3 Oct 1966	6 Oct 1966
A.315 (ES.V)		23 Nov 1976
A.358 (IX) and A.371 (X)		23 Nov 1976
A.400 (X)	4 Nov 1982	17 Nov 1982
A.450 (XI)	4 Nov 1982	17 Nov 1982

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The Convention was accepted on behalf of the Republic of China on 1 July 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned acceptance, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. For the nature of these communications, see note 3 in chapter VI.14.

In its instrument of acceptance, the Government of the People's Republic of China declared that the acceptance of and signature of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and related conventions and regulations by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Convention on 25 September 1973. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] The application of the Federal Republic of Germany for membership in the Organization was approved on 5 January 1959, in accordance with article 8 of the Convention.

In notes accompanying the respective instruments of acceptance of the amendments to articles 17 and18 and the amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention and amendments "shall also apply to *Land Berlin* with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany". In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General, the Government of Poland stated that the said declarations "are in contradiction to the international status of West Berlin which is not part of the Federal Republic of Germany". Furthermore, in a communication addressed to the Secretary-General with regard to the representation of the interests of Berlin (West) in the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that, in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, Berlin (West) is not part of the Federal Republic of Germany and should not be governed by it. Accordingly, the declaration by the Federal Republic of Germany extending its membership in the aforementioned Organization to include *Land Berlin* is at variance with the Quadripartite Agreement and has no legal validity.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 December 1973, the Permanent Representatives of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations as well as the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations made the following statement:

"With regard to the declaration concerning the representation of the interests of the western sectors of Berlin contained in the instrument, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to bring to the attention of the member states of the United Nations and of IMCO that the extension of the Convention on IMCO to the western sectors of Berlin in 1965 and the consequent representation of the interests of these sectors in IMCO by the Federal Republic of Germany received the prior authorization, under established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on the basis of their supreme authority in these sectors.

"In a communication to the Government of the USSR which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations on June 14, 1873, the three powers reaffirmed that, provided matters of security and status are not affected, the Federal Republic of Germany may represent the interests of the western sectors of Berlin in international conferences and international organizations. For its part, the Government of the USSR, in a communication to the Governments of the three powers which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such a representation.

"The representation of the western sectors of Berlin in IMCO by the Federal Republic of Germany, as described above, therefore continues in full force and effect."

In a communication received on 10 December 1973, the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany to the United Nations made the following statement:

"By their note of 7 December 1973 the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication of the authorities of the German Democratic Republic referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shares the position set out in the note of the three powers. The extension in 1965 of the IMCO Convention to Berlin (West) and the consequent representation of the interests of Berlin (West) in IMCO by the Federal Republic of Germany continue to be in full force and effect."

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 16 April 1974, the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations, stated that the Soviet Union could take note of the extension of the application of the IMCO Convention to the Western sectors of Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany only on the understanding that this action was being taken in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and subject to compliance with established procedures. See also note 4 above.

[6] In a communication received on 9 October 1965, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the Republic of Indonesia from the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. The notification of withdrawal contains the following statement:

"With reference to the provision of Article 59 which stipulates that the withdrawal from IMCO's membership will take effect twelve months from the date on which the notification of withdrawal is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Indonesia will observe her obligations and responsibilities accordingly. Nevertheless, the Indonesian Government has decided to discontinue its participation in the activities of the IMCO as of this date.

"In conclusion, I wish to add that, notwithstanding the withdrawal from IMCO, Indonesia will continue to work for the attainment of mutually beneficial principles of International maritime cooperation."

In a communication received on 29 September 1966, the Presidium Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that his government had decided to resume active participation in the Organization and requested that this communication be considered as superseding the above-mentioned notification of withdrawal.

[7] The applications of Kuwait, Mauritania and the Republic of Korea for membership in the Organization were approved on 5 July 1960, 13 April 1961 and 21 December 1961, respectively, in accordance with article 8 of the Convention.

[8] Democratic Yemen had accepted the Convention on 2 June 1980 with the following declaration:

"The acceptance of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen of the said Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel, or entering with it into relations governed by the Convention thereto acceded."

See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[9] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 November 1976, the Government of Bahrain confirmed that the general reservation "is intended to constitute a general declaration of policy of the Government of the State of Bahrain and should not be interpreted as expanding or diminishing the scope of the Convention or its application to States parties to the Convention."

Upon depositing its instrument of acceptance of the amendments adopted by resolution No. A.315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974 (i.e. chapter XII.1.c), the Government of Bahrain reiterated the same declaration as the one made upon acceptance of the Convention.

With regard to the said reservation the Government of Israel, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 December 1976, stated the following:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Bahrain contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Bahrain cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain, under general international law or under particular treaties."

Identical communications, *mutatis mutandis*, were received from the Government of Israel on 25 July 1980 in respect of the declarations made by Democratic Yemen upon acceptance of the Convention (see note 8 above) and the United Arab Emirates upon acceptance of the Convention and acceptance of the amendments adopted by resolutions A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 and A.371 (X) of 9 November 1977 (i.e. chapter XII.1.d).

[10] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General on 14 September 1961, 30 November 1961 and 14 March 1962, respectively, the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Norway and Greece, referring to the declaration made by Cambodia, stated that they assumed that it was a declaration of policy and did not constitute a reservation; and that it had no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention. They further stated that they would welcome assurances from the Government of Cambodia that the declaration was to be understood in this sense.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 31 January 1962, the Government of Cambodia stated that ". . . the Royal Government agrees that the first part of the declaration which it made at the time of the acceptance of the Convention is of a political nature. It therefore has no legal effect regarding the interpretation of the Convention. The statements contained in the third paragraph of the declaration, on the other hand, constitute a reservation to the Convention by the Royal Government of Cambodia."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 3 July 1962, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that ".. Her Majesty's Government do not share the view of the Cambodian Government that the third paragraph of the declaration constitutes a reservation, but they do not wish on that account, to raise formal objection to the terms of Cambodia's acceptance of the Convention."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 23 July 1962, the Government of France stated that ". . . it considers that, for reasons of principle as well as of fact, it cannot accept the terms of the declaration in question, the third paragraph of which is, moreover,

described by the Permanent Representative of Cambodia as constituting a reservation."

[11] In resolution 1452 (XIV) adopted on 7 December 1959, the General Assembly of the United Nations, noting the statement made on behalf of India at the 614th meeting of its Sixth Committee (Legal) explaining that the Indian declaration was a declaration of policy and that it did not constitute a reservation, expressed the hope "that, in the light of the above-mentioned statement of India an appropriate solution may be reached in the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization at an early date to regularize the position of India".

By a resolution adopted on 1 March 1960, the Council of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, taking note of the statement made on behalf of India referred to in the foregoing resolution and noting, therefore, that the declaration of India has no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention "considers India to be a member of the Organization".

[12] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General on 14 September 1961, 30 November 1961 and 14 March 1962, respectively, the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Norway and Greece, referring to the declaration made by Indonesia, stated that they assumed that it was a declaration of policy and did not constitute a reservation; and that it had no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention. They further stated that they would welcome assurances from the Government of Indonesia that the declaration was to be understood in this sense.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General on 30 October 1961, 12 January 1962 and 28 March 1962, the Government of Indonesia stated that the declaration in question :

> ". . . does not constitute a reservation but is an interpretation of article 1 *(b)* of the said Convention and should be understood as such.
>
> "In view of the above fact, the Government of Indonesia cannot accept the assumption made by [the above-mentioned Governments] that this declaration has no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 April 1962, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that ". . . Her Majesty's Government do not wish to raise formal objection to the terms of Indonesia's acceptance, but they desire to place on record that they do not thereby concede that they will necessarily regard any measures of assistance and encouragement which the Government of Indonesia may give to its national shipping as consistent with the Convention."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 23 July 1962, the Government of France stated that ". . . it considers that, for reasons of principle as well as of fact, it cannot accept the terms of the declaration in question."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 5 September 1962, the Government of the United States of America stated the following:

> "The Government of the United States will not raise objection to the terms of Indonesia's acceptance of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. However, It does not thereby concede that it will necessarily regard every measure of assistance and encouragement which the Government of Indonesia may give to its national shipping as consistent with the Convention."

[13] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 28 November 1973, the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations stated the following:

> "The instrument of acceptance by the Government of Iraq of the above-mentioned Convention contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That statement, therefore, possesses no legal validity whatsoever.
>
> "The Government of Israel utterly rejects that statement and will proceed on the assumption that it has no validity as to the rights and duties of any Member State to the said Organization.
>
> "The declaration of the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect Iraq's obligations under the Constitution of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization or whatever other obligations are binding upon that State by virtue of general international law.
>
> "The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt toward the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[14] In a letter of 3 June 1971, the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia notified the Secretary-General as follows:

> "The declaration by the Malaysian Government with regard to the above-mentioned Convention is a declaration of policy of the Government of Malaysia, and does not constitute a reservation by the Government of Malaysia to the Convention as stated in the instrument of acceptance."

[15] Upon deposit of the instrument of acceptance, the Government of Sri Lanka declared that ". . . the declaration set forth in the instrument of acceptance does not constitute a reservation, but is an interpretation of article 1 *(b)* of the Convention and should be understood as such."

[16] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[17] In a *note verbale* accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Permanent Representative of the United States of America drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact that ... "Article 2 of the Convention provides that the functions of the Organization 'shall be consultative and advisory'. Article 3 of the Convention indicates that the functions of the Organization are to make recommendations and to facilitate consultation and exchange of information. The history of the Convention and the records of the conference at which it was formulated indicate no intention to nullify or alter the domestic legislation of any contracting party relating to restrictive business practices or to alter or modify in any way the application of domestic statutes governing the prevention or regulation of business monopolies. It is considered therefore, that the statement as quoted above is merely a clarification of the intended meaning of the Convention and a safeguard against any possible misinterpretation, particularly as to the application of article 4."

[18] On 15 March 1962, the Federation of Nigeria became a member of the Organization by depositing on that date the instrument of acceptance of the Convention.

[19] In a communication received on 6 August 1964, the Government of the United Kingdom requested the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, "to take note that, as a result of the Agreement relating to Malaysia signed at London on July 9, 1963, and legislation enacted in accordance with that Agreement, Sarawak and North Borneo, together with the State of Singapore, federated with the existing States of the Federation of Malaya and the Federation is now called Malaysia. Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are therefore no longer responsible for the international relations of Sarawak and North Borneo.".

In a subsequent communication received on 4 March 1965, the Government of the United Kingdom, in amplification of the information contained in the above-mentioned communication, drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact "that the Agreement relating to Malaysia which was signed in London on the 9th of July 1963—the date on which Sarawak and North Borneo, together with the State of Singapore, federated with the States of the Federation of Malaya—Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom ceased to be responsible for the international relations of Sarawak and North Borneo." It also requested the Secretary-General "to take note that Her Majesty's Government accordingly consider that the joint associate membership in the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization of Sarawak and North Borneo under article 9 of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization automatically lapsed on the 16th of September 1963."

[20] On 25 August 1987, the Secretary-General received from the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China and from the Acting Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great

Britain and Northern Ireland and Chargé d'Affaires, respectively, the following communications both dated 25 August 1987:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

"I am instructed by her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to refer to the Declaration made by the United Kingdom on 6 June 1967 concerning the application to Hong Kong of the Convention on the International Maritime Organisation, signed at Geneva on 6 March 1948. By virtue of that Declaration and in accordance with articles 72 *(a)* and 8 of the Convention, Hong Kong became an associate member of the Organisation with effect from 7 June1967.

I am also instructed to state that having regard to the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the question of Hong Kong, signed in Beijing on 19 December 1984, the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997 and that the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date."

(Signed) John Birch
Acting Permanent Representative
United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland, and
Charge d'Affaires

China

I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, with reference to the communication which the United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations addressed to Your Excellency today, to notify Your Excellency of the declaration of the People's Republic of China as follows:

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Question of Hong Kong signed in Beijing on 19 December 1984, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong, as an inseparable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, will become a special administrative region with effect from that date. The People's Republic of China will have international responsibility for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

I am also instructed to declare that since China is a contracting State to the Convention on the Maritime Organization, signed in Geneva on 6 March 1948, and the Government of the People's Republic of China accepted the Convention on 1 March 1973, the said Convention will apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997. Accordingly, the Government of the People's Republic of China notifies you that, with effect from 1 July 1997, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will continue to meet the essential requirements of the Convention for being an associate member of the Organization, and therefore may, using the name of "Hong Kong, China", continue to be an associate member of the Organisation.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Li Luye
Permanent Representative of
the People's Republic of China
to the United Nations

[21] On 2 February 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal a declaration, in accordance with article 72 *(a)* of the Convention, to the effect that the said Convention is made applicable to Macau with effect from 2 February 1990 and that, in accordance with article 8 of the said Convention, Macau becomes and Associate Member of the International Maritime Organization as from the same date. The declaration also specifies the following:

"The present declaration is made in conformity with the agreement established by the Joint Liaison Group of the Republic of Portugal and the People's Republic of China in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Governments of the Republic of Portugal and the People's Republic of China on the question of Macau, signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, whereby the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from the 20th of December 1999 and that Portugal will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until the 19th of December 1999.".

In this regard to the said declaration, the Secretary-General received on that same date, a communication from the Government of China identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made in respect of Hong Kong (see note 20).

[22] The amendments to articles 17 and 18, and 28 of the Convention were accepted on behalf of the Republic of China. The dates of receipt of the instruments of acceptance by the Secretary-General of the Organization were 27 January 1966 (articles 17 and 18) and 22 July 1966 (article 28) and the dates of its deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations were 31 January 1966 and 27 July 1966. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned acceptance, the Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations stated that the only government entitled to represent and to assume obligations on behalf of China is the Central Government of the People's Republic of China and that, consequently, the Government of Romania cannot take note of the said acceptance.

[23] The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments IMO on 18 September 1975 and at the UN on 30 September 1975. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[24] With a declaration that the said amendments shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany provided that the Federal Republic of Germany does not make a declaration to the contrary to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization within three months. See also note 23 above.

[25] With the following declaration:

Acceptance of the above amendments by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations with it.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1977, from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq, under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq and attitude of complete reciprocity."

[26] With the same declaration as the one made in respect of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization.

[27] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[28] The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments at the UN on 29 November 1977. See also note I3 in chapter I.2.

[29] In a letter accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that with effect from the day on which the amendments enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany they shall also apply to Berlin (West).

In this connection the Secretary-General received on 10 February 1978, the following communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (the said communication was addressed to the Secretary-General of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, who transmitted it to the Secretary-General):

The Soviet side can take note of the declaration by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the application of the amendments to the IMCO Convention to Berlin (West) only on the understanding that such extension is made in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and in compliance with established procedures.
See also note 28 above.

30 For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

31 22 February 1980: acceptance of the amendments except those relating to article 51 of the Convention.
In a communication accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Government of the United Kingdom stated the following:
"Although this instrument does not include the amendments to article 51 and should not therefore be counted among the acceptances required for the coming into force of those amendments, [the Secretary of State writes] to inform [the Secretary-General], for the sake of clarification, that the Government of the United Kingdom does not wish to make a "declaration" of non-acceptance under the provisions of the present article 51, and will consider itself bound by the amendments to article 51 when these come into force for all Members of IMCO."
28 September 1981: acceptance of amendments to article 51.

32 Democratic Yemen had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments at the IMO on 13 June 1983 and at the UN on 20 June 1983. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

33 The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments at the IMO on 29 January 1980 and at the UN on 5 February 1980. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

34 In a communication accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the said amendments will also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which they will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 33 above.

35 Acceptance by the Government of Italy of the 1977 amendments exclude the amendment to what was article 52 at the time of adoption of resolution A.400(X) of 17 November 1977 and became article 62 with the entry into force of the amendments adopted by resolutions A.315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974 and A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975.

36 The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments at the IMO on 2 June 1980 and at the UN on 10 June 1983. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

37 See notes 29 and 36 above.

38 The Yemen Arab Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments with IMO on 8 November 1983 and with the UN on 10 November 1983. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

39 For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

2. Convention regarding the Measurement and Registration of Vessels Employed in Inland Navigation

Concluded at Bangkok on 22 June 1956

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 9).
TEXT: United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1957.II.F.9 (E/CN.11/461).
STATUS: Signatories: 4.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Inland Waterway Sub-Committee of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East at its third session, held at Dacca, East Pakistan, in October 1955.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Cambodia	22 Jun 1956		Lao People's Democratic Republic	22 Jun 1956	
China[2]					
Indonesia	22 Jun 1956		Thailand	22 Jun 1956	

NOTES:

[1] The Convention was signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 22 June 1956. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 22 June 1956. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

3. Convention relating to the Unification of Certain Rules concerning Collisions in Inland Navigation

Concluded at Geneva on 15 March 1960

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13 September 1966, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 13 September 1966, No. 8310.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 572, p. 133.
STATUS: Signatories: 5. Parties: 10.

Note: The Convention was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its subsidiary bodies (Working Party on River Law and Groups of Rapporteurs). The Inland Transport Committee decided to open it for signature at its nineteenth session, held from 14 to 18 December 1959 (see Report of the Inland Transport Committee on its nineteenth session, document E/ECE/TRANS/514, paragraph 49).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Austria	14 Jun 1960	27 Sep 1962	Poland		8 May 1972 *a*
Belgium	15 Jun 1960		Romania		4 Aug 1969 *a*
France	15 Jun 1960	12 Mar 1962	Russian Federation		26 Jan 1962 *a*
Germany[1,2]	14 Jun 1960	29 May 1973	Switzerland		26 Apr 1972 *a*
Hungary		24 Jul 1973 *a*	Yugoslavia		14 Feb 1962 *a*
Netherlands	14 Jun 1960	15 Jun 1966			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

AUSTRIA

[The Government of Austria] considers the German text as authentic, in accordance with article 19 of the Convention.

BELGIUM

[The Government of Belgium] considers the French text as authentic, in accordance with article 19 of the Convention.

FRANCE

In accordance with article 19 of the Convention, [the Government of France] considers the French text as authentic.

HUNGARY

(a) Pursuant to article 9 of the Convention, the Hungarian People's Republic reserves the right to provide by law that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply:

- To vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;
- To those waterways in the territory of the Hungarian People's Republic which are reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

(b) Pursuant to article 15 of the Convention, the Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention in so far as it concerns the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

POLAND

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention with regard to the reference of disputes to the International Court of Justice. Likewise, it reserves the right not to apply the present Convention to inland waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 15, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute in each particular case.

The Socialist Republic of Romania reserves the right, in accordance with article 9, paragraphs *(a)* and *(b)* of the Convention, to provide by law or international agreement that the provisions of the Convention shall not apply to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities, or to waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

(a) With respect to the Convention as a whole: The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of this Convention will not be applied on inland waterways of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that are open to navigation only by ships sailing under the flag of the USSR;

(b) With respect to article 14: The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by article 14 of this Convention with regard to the reference of disputes to the International Court.

In acceding to the Convention, the Government of the USSR deems it necessary at the same time to state its view that article 10 of the Convention, which limits the number of States which may become Parties to it, is illegal.

YUGOSLAVIA

The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia declares in accordance with article 9 of the afore-mentioned Convention:

(a) that it reserves the right to provide by law or international agreement that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;

(b) that it reserves the right to provide by law that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply on waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands	15 Jun 1966	Surinam

NOTES:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 8 October 1976 with reservations and a declaration. For the text of the reservations and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1025, p. 378. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] The instrument of ratification contains the following statement:

"... The said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

In this connexion, the *Secretary-General* received the following communications:

German Democratic Republic (communication received on 8 October 1976):

"The German Democratic Republic, in connexion with its accession to the Convention Relating to the Unification of Certain Rules Concerning Collisions in Inland Navigation of 15 March 1960, declares that the statement of the Federal Republic of Germany according to which this Convention is to be extended to Berlin (West) cannot have any legal consequences and, furthermore, is invalid. The statement of the FRG is incompatible with the four-power agreements and regulations of the post-war period as well as with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. As is known, the German Democratic Republic is competent for the waterways in Berlin (West)."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (communication received on 13 June 1977—in relation to the communication by the German Democratic Republic):

"The claim of the German Democratic Republic that it is competent for the waterways in the Western Sectors of Berlin is incorrect. Soon after the war it was decided, with the approval of the respective Sector Commandants, that German technical agencies situated in the Eastern Sector of Berlin would exercise limited operational functions in respect of some of the waterways in the Western Sectors of Berlin. This decision in no way conferred on those agencies any form of sovereignty or jurisdiction over any of the canals, waterways or locks located in the Western Sectors of Berlin, and it has no bearing on the validity of the extension to the Western Sectors of Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany, in accordance with established procedures, of the Convention relating to the Unification of Certain Rules concerning Collisions in Inland Navigation.

"When authorising the extension of this Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers, acting in the exercise of their supreme authority, ensured, in accordance with established procedures, that the Convention is applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin in such a way as not to affect matters of security and status. Accordingly, the application of this Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect.

"The German Democratic Republic is not a party to wartime and post-war Four Power agreements or decisions on Germany and Berlin, nor to the Quadripartite Agreement which was concluded in Berlin on 3 September 1971 by the Governments of the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The German Democratic Republic is not, therefore, competent to comment authoritatively on those agreements.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications of a similar nature by States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement (or parties to other relevant agreements concluded between the Four Powers). This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (communication received on 19 July 1977—in relation to the communication by the German Democratic Republic):

"By their note of 13 June 1977, disseminated [on] 6 July 1977, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned instrument extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (communication received on 18 October 1977—in relation to the communication by France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America):

The Soviet side cannot agree with the claim contained in the above-mentioned letter regarding the status of waterways in the Western Sectors of Berlin, which creates a false picture of their *de facto* and *de jure* situation. It is well known that Berlin was never territorially separate from the former Soviet occupation zone of Germany, and the waterways of its Western Sectors were always regarded as an integral part of the water system of that zone and were under the jurisdiction of the Soviet authorities. This situation was reflected and corroborated in the relevant post-war Four-Power agreements and decisions. The corresponding rights and powers were thereafter transferred by the Soviet authorities to the authorities of the German Democratic Republic.

Therefore, the claim contained in the three Power statement that agencies of the German Democratic Republic are competent only to "exercise limited operational functions in respect of some of the waterways in the Western Sectors of Berlin", does not correspond to the real situation. The German Democratic Republic is competent to express its view as to which international agreements regulating problems of inland navigation may apply to these waterways.

The Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the Soviet side, as a party to the wartime and post-war Four-Power agreements and decisions, as well as to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, fully endorses and supports the declaration of the Government of the German Democratic Republic regarding the invalidity of the extension to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany of the Convention relating to the Unification of Certain Rules concerning Collisions in Inland Navigation.

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (communication received on 21 April 1978—in relation to the communication by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics received on 18 October 1977):

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not accept the assertions contained in the communication of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics dated 18 October 1977 concerning the status of waterways in the Western Sectors of Berlin. They reaffirm the views expressed in their communication of 13 June 1977 concerning the status of those waterways and concerning the validity of the extension to the Western Sectors of Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany of the Convention relating to the Unification of Certain Rules Concerning Collisions in Inland Navigation.

"The Soviet communication referred to above also incorrectly asserts that Berlin was never territorially separate from the Soviet Occupation Zone of Germany. In this connection the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to recall *inter alia* the provision in the London Protocol of 12 September 1944 according to which, separately from the Zones of Occupation, a "special Berlin area" under joint occupation was established in Germany."

Federal Republic of Germany (communication received on 30 May 1978—in relation to the note by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics received on 18 October 1977):

"By their Note of 20 April 1978, [...], the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the Note of the Three Powers, wishes once more to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned instrument extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

See also note 1 above.

4. Convention on the Registration of Inland Navigation Vessels

Concluded at Geneva on 25 January 1965

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 June 1982, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1982, No. 21114.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1281, p. 111.
STATUS: Signatories: 8. Parties: 6.

Note: The Convention was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its subsidiary bodies (Working Party on River Law and Groups of Rapporteurs). The Inland Transport Committee, at its twenty-first session held from 20 to 24 January 1964, decided that the question of the opening of the Convention for signature should be settled by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport at its next session (see Report of the Inland Transport Committee on its twenty-third session, document E/ECE/TRANS/535, paragraph 52). The decision to open the Convention for signature was taken by the said Sub-Committee at its eighth session held from 28 to 30 October 1964 (see document TRANS/291, paragraph 17).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Austria	18 Jun 1965	26 Aug 1977	Luxembourg	14 Dec 1965	26 Mar 1982
Belgium	31 Dec 1965		Netherlands[2]	30 Dec 1965	14 Nov 1974
France	31 Dec 1965	13 Jun 1972	Switzerland	28 Dec 1965	14 Jan 1976
Germany[1]	5 Nov 1965		Yugoslavia	17 May 1965	11 Oct 1985

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations, were made upon ratification or accession.)

AUSTRIA

1. Austria accepts Protocol No. 1 annexed to the Convention concerning the Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels.

2. Austria accepts Protocol No. 2 annexed to the Convention concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels.

BELGIUM

Belgium enters the reservations provided for in article 21, paragraph 1 *(b)*, *(c)* and *(d)*.

FRANCE

Upon signature:

France declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1, annexed hereto, concerning Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels, and Protocol No. 2, also annexed hereto, concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels.

Upon ratification:

France, exercising the reservation provided for in article 19 of Protocol No. 1, declares pursuant to article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it will not apply the provisions of article 14, paragraph 2 *(b)*, of this Protocol in the event of a forced sale in its territory.

GERMANY[1]

The Federal Republic of Germany declares that:

1. German registration offices will supply extracts from documents deposited with them and referred to by the entries in the register only to applicants who produce evidence of a legitimate interest in obtaining such extracts.

2. It will not apply the Convention to vessels navigating on lakes and adjacent sections of waterways and belonging to the German Federal Railways.

LUXEMBOURG

Luxembourg declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels, and Protocol No. 2 concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels.

NETHERLANDS

In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1 *(d)* of the Convention, the Netherlands will not apply this Convention to vessels used exclusively for a non-commercial government service.

13 June 1985

[The Netherlands], in accordance with the provision of article 15, paragraph 1, accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning Rights *in rem* in inland navigation vessels

SWITZERLAND

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Switzerland enters the following reservations pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1 *(b)*, *(c)* and *(d)*, of the Convention:

ad (b): Its registration offices will supply extracts as specified in article 2, paragraph 3, of the Convention only to applicants who produce evidence of a legitimate interest in obtaining such extracts;

ad (c): It will not apply the Convention to vessels navigating on lakes and adjacent sections of waterways and belonging to national railways administrations or operating under licence;

ad (d): It will not apply the Convention to vessels used exclusively for a non-commercial government service.

Switzerland declares that it accepts Protocol No. I concerning Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels and declares that, pursuant to article 19 of the said Protocol and to article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention, it will not apply the provisions of article 14, paragraph 2 *(b)*, of the said Protocol in the event of a forced sale in its territory.

YUGOSLAVIA

[The Government of Yugoslavia] exercising the option provided for in article 15 (1), the Government of Yugoslavia specified that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels and Protocol No. 2 concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels, annexed to the Convention.

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

5. Convention on the Measurement of Inland Navigation Vessels

Concluded at Geneva on 15 February 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 April 1975, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 19 April 1975, No. 13899.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 964, p. 177.
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 13.

Note: The Convention was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its subsidiary bodies (Working Party on River Law and Groups of Rapporteurs). The Inland Transport Committee decided to open it for signature at its twenty-fifth session held from 17 to 20 January 1966 (see Report of the Inland Transport Committee on its twenty-fifth session, document E/ECE/TRANS/544, paragraph 63).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Belgium	2 Nov 1966	9 Mar 1972	Netherlands[5]	14 Nov 1966	14 Aug 1978
Bulgaria	14 Nov 1966	4 Mar 1980	Romania		24 May 1976 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*	Russian Federation		19 Feb 1981 *a*
France	17 May 1966	8 Jun 1970	Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Germany[3,4]	14 Nov 1966	19 Apr 1974	Switzerland	14 Nov 1966	7 Feb 1975
Hungary		5 Jan 1978 *a*	Yugoslavia		8 Dec 1969 *a*
Luxembourg	29 Jul 1966	26 Mar 1982			

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

Article 15, paragraph 2:

The extension of measurement certificates shall not be applicable to certificates issued by Belgium in order to guarantee the value and accuracy of the document.

BULGARIA[6]

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

It further declares that the validity of measurement certificates issued by its measurement offices for vessels intended for the carriage of goods may be extended only by one of the said offices.

Upon ratification:

The term of validity of measurement certificates issued by its measurement offices for inland navigation vessels is 15 years and cannot be extended.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

FRANCE

Upon signature of the Protocol of Signature:

Since the measurement signs affixed by the French services are not intended solely to establish the fact of measurement, the said signs shall not be either removed or effaced at the time of remeasurement; instead, an indelible mark consisting of a small cross with vertical and horizontal arms of equal length shall be applied to the left of such signs.

HUNGARY

The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by those provisions of article 14 of the Convention which refer the disputes between Contracting Parties to the International Court of Justice.

NETHERLANDS

In accordance with article 15, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Netherlands Government . . . declares that a measurement certificate issued by one of the three offices mentioned . . . can only be extended by the office that issued it."

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, pursuant to article 15, paragraph 1, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention. The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute, in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

In accordance with article 15, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Measurement of Inland Navigation Vessels the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of that Convention, to the effect that any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or by other settlement procedures may, at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred for settlement to the International Court of Justice, and declares that for the referral of such disputes to the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each individual case;

Declaration:

In accordance with article 10, paragraph 6, of the 1966 Convention on the Measurement of Inland Navigation Vessels, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to inland waterways of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that are open to navigation only for vessels flying the flag of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SLOVAKIA[2]

Notification of distinctive letters of measurement offices under article 10 (5) of the Convention[2]

Participant	*Distinctive letters*	*Participant*	*Distinctive letters*
Belgium	BR-B	Romania	RNR
Bulgaria[7]	LB(Lom) RB(Rousse)	Russian Federation	RSSU
France	F	Switzerland	BS-CH (Basel-Stadt) BL-CH (Basel-Land) AG-CH (Aargau)
Germany[3]	D		
Hungary	HU	Yugoslavia	JR-YU
Luxembourg	L		
Netherlands[8]	[RN (Rotterdam)] [AN (Amsterdam)] [GN (Groningen)] HN (Rijswijk)		

NOTES:

[1] The Convention and the Protocol of Signature were signed on behalf of each of the States mentioned on the same date, with the exception of Belgium, on behalf of which the Convention was signed on 2 November 1966 and the Protocol on 4 November 1966.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 2 January 1974, with a declaration, and choosing "CS" as distinctive letters of measurement offices. Subsequently, on 22 January 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration made upon accession. For the text the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 964, p. 224. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 31 August 1976 choosing "DDR" as distinctive letters of measurement offices and with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 1021, p. 474.

[4] Upon ratification of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) as from the day on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this connexion, the Government of the German Democratic Republic, upon accession to the Convention, declared the following:

"As regards the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) the German Democratic Republic, in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and the French Republic of 3 September 1971, states that Berlin (West) continues not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic only takes note of the statement of the Federal Republic of Germany on the extension of the Convention to Berlin (West) on the understanding that such extension is in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement and that by applying the provisions of the Convention to Berlin (West) matters of status of Berlin (West) are not affected."

See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[6] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification with respect to article 14. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1161, p. 480.

[7] Each of these two groups of distinctive letters to be followed by a figure indicating the serial number of the measurement certificate issued by the office concerned.

[8] In a communication received on 19 May 1989, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General of the following changes concerning the declarations made in respect of articles 2 (3) and 10 (5) of the said Convention:

"After an internal reorganisation of the Netherlands Measuring Office for Navigation Vessels on 1 January 1989, the competent office issuing measurement certificates for the application of art. 2 paragraph 3 and art. 10 paragraph 5 of the Convention, is the Measurement Office in Rijswijk, designated by the letters HN."

6. Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences

Concluded at Geneva on 6 April 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 October 1983, in accordance with article 49 (1).
REGISTRATION: 6 October 1983, No. 22380.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1334, p. 15 and vol. 1365, p. 360 (procès-verbal of rectification of the English and French authentic texts).
STATUS: Signatories: 23. Parties: 78.

Note: Adopted by a Conference of plenipotentiaries which met at Geneva from 12 November to 15 December 1973 and from 11 March to 6 April 1974 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in accordance with resolution 3035 (XXVII)[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated on 19 December 1972. Open for signature from 1 July 1974 to 30 June 1975.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), succession (d)*
Algeria	27 Jun 1975	12 Dec 1986
Bangladesh		24 Jul 1975 *a*
Barbados		29 Oct 1980 *a*
Belgium	30 Jun 1975	30 Sep 1987
Benin		27 Oct 1975 *a*
Brazil	23 Jun 1975	
Bulgaria		12 Jul 1979 *a*
Burkina Faso		30 Mar 1989 *a*
Cameroon		15 Jun 1976 *a*
Cape Verde		13 Jan 1978 *a*
Central African Republic		13 May 1977 *a*
Chile		25 Jun 1975 *s*
China		23 Sep 1980 *a*
Congo		26 Jul 1982 *a*
Costa Rica	15 May 1975	27 Oct 1978
Côte d'Ivoire	1 May 1975	17 Feb 1977
Cuba		23 Jul 1976 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		2 Jun 1993 *d*
Denmark[3]		28 Jun 1985 *a*
Ecuador	22 Oct 1974	
Egypt		25 Jan 1979 *a*
Ethiopia	19 Jun 1975	1 Sep 1978
Finland		31 Dec 1985 *a*
France	30 Jun 1975	4 Oct 1985 *AA*
Gabon	10 Oct 1974	5 Jun 1978
Gambia		30 Jun 1975 *s*
Germany[4, 5]	30 Jun 1975	6 Apr 1983
Ghana	14 May 1975	24 Jun 1975
Guatemala	15 Nov 1974	3 Mar 1976
Guinea		19 Aug 1980 *a*
Guyana		7 Jan 1980 *a*
Honduras		12 Jun 1979 *a*
India	27 Jun 1975	14 Feb 1978
Indonesia	5 Feb 1975	11 Jan 1977
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	7 Aug 1974	
Iraq		25 Oct 1978 *a*
Italy		30 May 1989 *a*
Jamaica		20 Jul 1982 *a*
Jordan		17 Mar 1980 *a*
Kenya		27 Feb 1978 *a*
Kuwait		31 Mar 1986 *a*
Lebanon		30 Apr 1982 *a*
Madagascar		23 Dec 1977 *a*
Malaysia		27 Aug 1982 *a*
Mali		15 Mar 1978 *a*
Malta	15 May 1975	
Mauritania		21 Mar 1988 *a*
Mauritius		16 Sep 1980 *a*
Mexico		6 May 1976 *a*
Morocco		11 Feb 1980 *a*
Mozambique		21 Sep 1990 *a*
Netherlands[6]		6 Apr 1983 *a*
Niger	24 Jun 1975	13 Jan 1976
Nigeria		10 Sep 1975 *a*
Norway		28 Jun 1985 *a*
Pakistan		27 Jun 1975 *s*
Peru		21 Nov 1978 *a*
Philippines	2 Aug 1974	2 Mar 1976
Portugal		13 Jun 1990 *a*
Qatar		31 Oct 1994 *a*
Republic of Korea		11 May 1979 *a*
Romania		7 Jan 1982 *a*
Russian Federation	27 Jun 1975	28 Jun 1979 *A*
Saudi Arabia		24 May 1985 *a*
Senegal	30 Jun 1975	20 May 1977
Sierra Leone		9 Jul 1979 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Somalia		14 Nov 1988 *a*
Spain		3 Feb 1994 *a*
Sri Lanka		30 Jun 1975 *s*
Sudan		16 Mar 1978 *a*
Sweden		28 Jun 1985 *a*
Togo	25 Jun 1975	12 Jan 1978
Trinidad and Tobago		3 Aug 1983 *a*
Tunisia		15 Mar 1979 *a*
Turkey	30 Jun 1975	
United Kingdom[7]		28 Jun 1985 *a*
United Republic of Tanzania		3 Nov 1975 *a*
Uruguay		9 Jul 1979 *a*
Venezuela		30 Jun 1975 *s*
Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1974	7 Jul 1980
Zaire		25 Jul 1977 *a*
Zambia		8 Apr 1988 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or succession.)

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Under Belgian law, the Convention must be approved by the legislative chambers before it can be ratified.

In due course, the Belgian Government will submit this Convention to the legislative chambers for ratification, with the express reservation that its implementation should not be contrary to the commitments undertaken by Belgium under the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the OECD Code of Liberalisation of invisible trade, and taking into account any reservations it may deem fit to make to the provisions of this Convention.

Upon ratification:

I. *Reservations:*

1. For the purposes of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a State member of the European Economic Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established on the territory of that member State, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community.

2. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, Article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code:

(b) Point (a) shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles reflected in Article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) already members of a conference serving these trades, or

(ii) admitted to such a conference under Article 1 (3) of the Code.

3. Articles 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

4. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

(a) the two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

(b) this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

II. Declarations:

1. In accordance with the Resolution on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries, as reproduced in annex II-2 to this convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium shall not prevent non-conference shipping lines from operating, provided that they compete with the conferences on a commercial basis, respecting the principle of fair competition. This government confirms its intention to abide by the said Resolution.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium declares that it will implement the Convention and its annexes in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing, is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another contracting party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trades.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

"In accordance with SUNAMAM's resolutions Nos. 3393, of 12/30/1972, and 4173, of 12/21/1972, which set up and structured the "Bureau de Estudos de Fretes Internacionais da SUNAMAM", and by which the "Superintendêcia Nacional de Marinha Mercante (SUNAMAM)" has the authority to reject any proposal on freight rates put forward by Liner Conferences, the contents of article 14, paragraph 6, of that Convention do not conform to Brazilian Law."

BULGARIA

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the definition of liner conference does not include joint bilateral lines operating on the basis of inter-governmental agreements.

With regard to the text of point 2 of the annex to resolution I, adopted on 6 April 1974, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the provisions of the Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences do not cover the activities of non-conference shipping lines.

CHINA

The joint shipping services established between the People's Republic of China and any other country through consultations and on a basis that the parties concerned may deem appropriate, are totally different from liner conferences in nature, and the provisions of the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences shall not be applicable thereto.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Republic of Cuba enters a reservation concerning the provisions of article 2, paragraph 17, of the Convention, to the effect that Cuba will not apply said paragraph to goods carried by joint liner services for the carriage of any cargo, established in accordance with inter-governmental agreements, regardless of their origin, their destination or the use for which they are intended.

Declaration:

With regard to the definitions in the first paragraph of part one, chapter I, the Republic of Cuba does not accept the inclusion in the concept of "Liner conference or conference" of joint liner services for the carriage of any type of cargo, established in accordance with inter-governmental agreements.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

DENMARK

Reservations:

"1. For the purposes of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a State member of the European Economic Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established on the territory of that member State, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community.

2. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, Article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in con-

ference trades between States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code;

(b) Point (a) shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles reflected in Article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) already members of a conference serving these trades; or

(ii) admitted to such a conference under Article 1 (3) of the Code.

3. Article 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

4. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

(a) the two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

(b) this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement."

Declarations:

The Government of Denmark considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences affords the shipping lines of developing countries extended opportunities to participate in the conference system and is drafted so as to regulate conferences and their activities in open trades (i.e., when opportunities to compete exist). This Government also considers that it is essential for the functioning of the Code and conferences subject thereto that opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis by non-conference shipping lines continue to exist and that shippers are not denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in a number of provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and they are expressly set out in Resolution No. 2 on non–conference shipping lines adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

This Government considers furthermore that any regulations or other measures adopted by a contracting party to the United Nations Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition by non-conference shipping lines would be inconsistent with the above-mentioned basic concepts and would bring about a radical change in the circumstances in which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operating. Nothing in the Convention obliges other contracting parties to accept either the validity of such regulations or measures, or situations where conferences, by virtue of such regulations or measures, acquire effective monopoly in trades subject to the Code.

The Government of Denmark declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing, is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another contracting party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trades.

FINLAND

Reservations:

"1. Articles 2, 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall, on a reciprocal basis, not be applied in conference trades between Finland and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

2. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

a) the two groups of national shipping lines will coordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

b) this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

Declarations:

A. The Government of Finland considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences affords the shipping lines of developing countries extended opportunities to participate in the conference system and is drafted so as to regulate conferences and their activities in open trades (i.e. when opportunities to compete exist). This Government also considers that it is essential for the functioning of the Code and conferences subject thereto that opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis by non-conference shipping lines continue to exist and that shippers are not denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in a number of provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and they are expressly set out in Resolution No. 2 on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

B. This Government considers furthermore that any regulations or other measures adopted by a contracting party to the UN Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition by non-conference shipping lines would be inconsistent with the above-mentioned basic concepts and would bring about a radical change in the circumstances in which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operating. Nothing in the Convention obliges other contracting parties to accept either the validity of such regulations or measures or situations where conferences, by virtue of such regulations or measures, acquire effective monopoly in trades subject to the Code.

C. The Government of Finland declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another contracting party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trades."

FRANCE

Declaration made upon signature:

Under the French Constitution, approval of the Convention is subject to authorization by Parliament.

It is understood that this approval is conditional upon compliance with the commitments undertaken by France under the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the Code of Liberalisation of invisible trade of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, taking into account any reservations which the French Government may deem fit to make to the provisions of this Convention.

Reservations made upon approval:

[Same reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

GERMANY[4]

Upon signature:

"The Convention under the law of the Federal Republic of Germany, requires the approval of the legislative bodies for ratification. At the appropriate time, the Federal Republic of Germany will implement the Convention in conformity with its obligations under the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community as well as under the OECD Code of Liberalisation of Current Invisible Operations."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

1. For the purposes of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a Member State of the European Economic Community, include any vessel operating shipping line established on the territory of such Member State in accordance with the EEC Treaty.
2. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) [hereinafter], article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the European Economic Community or, on the basis of reciprocity, between such States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.
   (b) Paragraph (a) [above] shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third-country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles laid down in such trades, in accordance with the principles laid down in article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:
      (i) already members of a conference serving these trades; or
      (ii) admitted to such a conference under article 1 (3) of the Code.
3. Articles 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the Community or, on a reciprocal basis, between such States and the other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.
4. In trades to which article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that article is interpreted as meaning that:
   (a) The two groups of national shipping lines will coordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;
   (b) this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.
5. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will not prevent non-conference shipping lines from operating as long as they compete with conferences on a commercial basis while adhering to the principle of fair competition, in accordance with the resolution on non-conference lines adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries. It confirms its intention to act in accordance with the said resolution.

INDIA

"In confirmation of paragraph (2) of the statement filed by the Representative of India on behalf of the Group of 77 on 8 April 1974 at the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, it is the understanding of the Government of India that the inter-governmental shipping services established in accordance with intergovernmental agreements fall outside the purview of the Convention on the Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences regardless of the origin of the cargo, their destination or the use for which they are intended."

IRAQ

The accession shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relation therewith.

ITALY

Reservation:

1. In application of the Code of Conduct, the concept of a "national shipping line" may, in the case of a member State of the European Community, include all shipping companies established on the territory of that member State in accordance with the treaty setting up the European Economic Community.

2. (a) Without prejudice to the text of paragraph (b) of this reservation, article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in trade carried by a conference between the member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between those States and the other OECD countries parties to the Code,

(b) The text of paragraph (a) shall not affect the opportunities for shipping lines of developing countries, as third-country shipping lines, to take part in such trade in accordance with the principles set out in article 2 of the Code, provided they have been recognized as national shipping lines under the terms of the Code and:

(i) are already members of a conference carrying such trade, or

(ii) have been accepted for membership of such a conference under the provisions of article 1(3) of the Code.

3. Article 3 and article 14(9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in trade carried out by a conference between the member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between those countries and the other OECD countries parties to the Code.

4. In any trade to which article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of the article is taken to mean that:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines shall co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters relating to trade between their two countries;

(b) The sentence shall be applied solely to matters defined in a conference agreement as requiring the consent of the two groups of national shipping lines concerned and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Italy

– will not prevent non-conference lines from operating as long as they compete with conferences on a commercial basis while adhering to the principle of fair competition, in accordance with the Resolution on non-conference lines adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries;

– confirms its intention of acting in accordance with the said Resolution."

KUWAIT

Understanding:

The accession to the Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of Kuwait.

NETHERLANDS

[Same declarations, identical in essence, as those made by the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification]

NORWAY

[Same declarations and reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

PERU

The Government of Peru does not regard itself as being bound by the provisions of chapter II, article 2, paragraph 4, of the Convention.

PORTUGAL

A. Reservations:

1. In application of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a Member State of the European Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established on the territory of such Member State in accordance with the EEC Treaty.

2 (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between such States and the other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

(b) The text of paragraph (a) shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles reflected in article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) already members of a conference serving these trade; or

(ii) admitted to such a conference under article 1 (3) of the Code.

3. Articles 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between such States and the other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

the two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

B. Declarations:

1. The Government of Portugal considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences affords the shipping lines of developing countries extended opportunities to participate in the conference system and is drafted so as to regulate conferences and their activities in open trades. The Government also considers that it is essential for the functioning of the Code and conferences subject thereto that opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis by non-conference shipping lines continue to exist and that shippers are not denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basis concepts are reflected in a number of provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and they are expressly set out in Resolution No. 2 on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

2. The Government considers furthermore that any regulations or other measures adopted by a Contracting Party to the Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating Party to the Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition by non-conference shipping lines would be inconsistent.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the provisions of the Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences do not apply to joint shipping lines established on the basis of intergovernmental agreements to serve bilateral trade between the countries concerned.

SLOVAKIA[2]

SPAIN

Reservation 1:

For the purposes of implementing the Code of Conduct, the concept of a "national shipping line" may, in the case of a State member of the European Economic Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established in the territory of that State, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community.

Reservation 2:

(a) Without prejudice to the text of (b) below, article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not apply in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on the basis of reciprocity, between these States and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries which are parties to the Code.

(b) The text of (a) above shall not affect the opportunities for participation in such trades, as third-country shipping lines, in accordance with the principles set out in article 2 of the Code, by the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(I) Members of a conference which ensures such trades, or

(II) Admitted to membership of that conference under article 1, paragraph 3, of the Code.

Reservation 3:

Article 3 and article 14, paragraph 9, of the Code shall not apply in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on the basis of reciprocity, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

Reservation 4:

In trades to which article 3 of the Code applies, the final sentence of that article shall be interpreted as follows:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines shall coordinate their positions prior to voting on issues relating to trade between their two countries.

(b) this sentence shall apply solely to issues which, under the conference agreement, require the consent of the two groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all issues dealt with in the conference agreement.

Declaration:

A. The Government of Spain considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences provides the shipping lines of developing countries with ample opportunities to participate in the liner conference system, and that it has been drafted in such a manner as to regulate confer-

ences and their activities within a system of free trade (where there are opportunities for non-conference shipping lines).

This Government also deems it essential to the functioning of the Code and of the conferences whose regulation is referred to that there should continue to be opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis for non-conference shipping lines, and that shippers should not be denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to any loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in several provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and are expressly set out in resolution No. 2, concerning non-conference shipping lines, adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

B. This Government further believes that any regulation or other measures adopted by a Contracting Party to the United Nations Convention and having the purpose or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition for non-conference shipping lines would be incompatible with the basic concepts mentioned above, and would effect a radical change in the circumstances under which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operative. Nothing in the Convention requires other Contracting Parties to accept either the validity of such regulations, or measures or situations whereby conferences, through such regulations or measures, would, in practice, acquire a monopoly on trades subject to the Code.

C. The Government of Spain declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and conclusions stipulated herein and that, accordingly, the Convention shall not prevent it from taking appropriate steps in the event that another Contracting Party adopts measures or practices which impede fair competition on a commercial basis in liner shipping service.

SWEDEN

Reservations and declarations:

[Same declarations and reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

I. *In relation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and to Gibraltar:*

[Same reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

II. In relation to Hong Kong:

1. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, Article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades, on a reciprocal basis, between Hong Kong and any State which has made a reservation disapplying Article 2 in respect of its trades with the United Kingdom

(b) Point (a) above shall not affect the opportunity for participation as a third country shipping lines in such trades in accordance with the principles reflected in Article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) already members of a conference serving these traces; or

(ii) admitted to such a conference under Article 1 (3) of the Code.

2. In trades where Article 2 of the Code applies, Hong Kong shipping lines will, subject to reciprocity, allow participation in redistribution by lines from any country which has agreed to allow participation by United Kingdom lines in redistribution in respect of any of its trades.

3. Article 3 and Article 14 (9) of the Code shall not be applied in conference trades, on a reciprocal basis, between Hong Kong and any State which has made a reservation disapplying Article 3 and Article 14 (9) in respect of its trades with the United Kingdom.

4. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code applies, the last sentence of that article is interpreted as meaning that:

(i) the two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their position before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries; and

(ii) this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement."

[Same declarations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 30* (A/8730), p. 51.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Convention on 30 June 1975 and 4 June 1979, respectively, with a declaration made upon signature. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1334, p. 202. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The instrument also specifies that the accession shall not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 27 June 1975 and 9 July 1979, respectively, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1334, p. 206. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In connection with the said ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany also declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 4 above.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and, as from 1 January 1986, for Aruba. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] On behalf of the United Kingdom, Gibraltar and Hong Kong.

7. United Nations Convention on Conditions for Registration of Ships

Concluded at Geneva on 7 February 1986

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 19 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. TD/RS/CONF/19/Add.1; depositary notifications C.N.131.1986.TREATIES-3 of 30 July 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of original Russian text) and C.N.246.1987.TREATIES-6 of 12 November 1987 (procès-verbal of rectification of original French text).
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 10.

Note: The Convention was adopted by a Conference of plenipotentiaries which met at Geneva from 20 January to 7 February 1986 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in accordance with resolution 37/209[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 20 December 1982. The Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships had held its first part from 16 July to 3 August 1984, and had resumed its work, first at its second part from 28 January to 15 February 1985 and then, at its third part from 8 to 19 July 1985, before adopting the Convention at its fourth and last part. Open for signature from 1 May 1986 to 30 April 1987 in New York.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a),*
Algeria	24 Feb 1987	
Bolivia	18 Aug 1986	
Cameroon	29 Dec 1986	
Côte d'Ivoire	2 Apr 1987	28 Oct 1987
Czech Republic[2]	2 Jun 1993 *d*	
Egypt	3 Mar 1987	9 Jan 1992
Georgia		7 Aug 1995 *a*
Ghana		29 Aug 1990 *a*
Haiti		17 May 1989 *a*
Hungary		23 Jan 1989 *a*
Indonesia	26 Jan 1987	
Iraq		1 Feb 1989 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	21 Apr 1987	28 Feb 1989
Mexico	7 Aug 1986	21 Jan 1988
Morocco	31 Jul 1986	
Oman		18 Oct 1990 *a*
Poland	1 Apr 1987	
Russian Federation	12 Feb 1987	
Senegal	16 Jul 1986	
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Upon signature :

The USSR regards the reference to "Democratic Kampuchea" in the list of countries compiled for the purposes of the present Convention as unlawful, inasmuch as all matters relating to Kampuchean participation in international treaties and agreements lie exclusively within the competence of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly*, Thirty-seventh session, Supplement No. 51 (A/37/51), p. 139.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 9 April 1987. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

CHAPTER XIII. ECONOMIC STATISTICS

1. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 14 DECEMBER 1928

Signed at Paris on 9 December 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 December 1948, in accordance with article V.[1]
REGISTRATION: 9 December 1948, No. 318.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 20, p. 229.
STATUS: Signatories: 8. Parties: 19.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 255 (III)[2] of 18 November 1948.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance*
Australia		9 Dec 1948 *s*	Ireland		28 Feb 1952
Austria		10 Nov 1949	Italy		20 May 1949 *s*
Burma	9 Dec 1948		Japan		2 Dec 1952
Canada		9 Dec 1948 *s*	Netherlands	9 Dec 1948	13 Apr 1950
Denmark	9 Dec 1948	27 Sep 1949	Norway	9 Dec 1948	22 Mar 1949
Egypt		9 Dec 1948 *s*	Pakistan		3 Mar 1952 *s*
Finland		17 Aug 1949	South Africa		10 Dec 1948 *s*
France	9 Dec 1948	11 Jan 1949	Sweden		9 Dec 1948 *s*
Greece	9 Dec 1948	9 Oct 1950	Switzerland	9 Dec 1948	23 Jan 1970
India	9 Dec 1948	14 Mar 1949	United Kingdom		9 Dec 1948 *s*

NOTES:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force on 9 October 1950, in accordance with article V of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I*, A/810, p. 160.

2. International Convention relating to Economic Statistics

Signed at Geneva on 14 December 1928 and amended by the Protocol signed at Paris on 9 December 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 October 1950, the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 9 December 1948, entered into force in accordance with article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 9 October 1950, No. 942.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 73, p. 39.
STATUS: Parties: 24.

Participant	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol of 9 December 1948*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d), in respect of the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 9 December 1948*
Australia	9 Dec 1948	
Austria	10 Nov 1949	
Belgium[1]		2 May 1952
Canada	9 Dec 1948	
Denmark	27 Sep 1949	
Egypt	9 Dec 1948	
Finland	17 Aug 1949	
France	11 Jan 1949	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	9 Oct 1950	
India	14 Mar 1949	
Ireland	28 Feb 1952	
Israel		28 Dec 1950 *a*
Italy	20 May 1949	
Japan	2 Dec 1952	
Luxembourg		23 Jul 1953
Netherlands	13 Apr 1950	
Nigeria		23 Jul 1965 *a*
Norway	22 Mar 1949	
Pakistan	3 Mar 1952	
South Africa	10 Dec 1948	
Sweden	9 Dec 1948	
Switzerland	23 Jan 1970	
United Kingdom[2]	9 Dec 1948	

NOTES:

[1] A declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification by the Government of Belgium stipulates that the ratification applies only to the metropolitan territories, the territories of Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi being expressly excluded.

[2] Notice of application of the Convention to Southern Rhodesia was received from the Government of the United Kingdom on 2 December 1949.

3. *(a)* International Convention relating to Economic Statistics

Geneva, December 14th, 1928[1]

IN FORCE since December 14th, 1930 (Article 14).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (March 27th, 1931)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations* (May 9th, 1930)

Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 *a*)

Returns provided for in Article 2, III (B), will not contain information with regard to areas under crops on native farms, and in native reserves, locations and mission stations[2].

Canada (August 23rd, 1930 *a*)

Australia[2] (April 13th, 1932 *a*)

Does not apply to the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island, New Guinea and Nauru.

(1) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I *(b)*, for separate returns for direct transit trade shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

(2) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I, Paragraph IV, that when the quantity of goods of any kind is expressed in any unit or units of measure other than weight, an estimate of the average weight of each unit, or multiple of units, shall be shown in the annual returns, shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

Union of South Africa (including the mandated territory of *South West Africa*) (May 1st, 1930)

Ireland (September 15th, 1930)

India (May 15th, 1931 *a*)

A. Under the terms of Article 11, the obligations of the Convention shall not extend to the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty the King Emperor.

B[2] (1) Article 2. I *(a)*.—The provisions for returns of "transit trade" made in Annex I, Part 1, 1 *(b)* shall not apply to India nor shall returns of the "land frontier trade" of India be required.

(2) Article 2. II *(a)*.—The question whether a general census of agriculture can be held in India and, if so, on what lines and at what intervals still remains to be settled. For the present, India can assume no obligations under this article.

(3) Article 2. III *(b)*. (1).—For farms in the "permanently settled" tracts in India, estimates of the cultivated areas may be used in compiling the returns.

(4) Article 2. III *(b)*. (2).—The returns of quantities of crops harvested may be based on estimates of yield each year per unit area in each locality.

(5) Article 2. III *(d)*.—Complete returns cannot be guaranteed from Burma, and in respect of the rest of India the returns shall refer to Government forests only.

The Government of India further declared that, with regard to the second paragraph of Article 3 of the Convention, they cannot, with the means of investigation at their disposal, usefully undertake to prepare experimentally the specified tables, and that for similar reasons they are not in a position to accept the proposal contained in Recommendation II of the Convention.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Bulgaria (November 29th, 1929)

Chile (November 20th, 1934 *a*)

Cuba (August 17th, 1932 *a*)

Czechoslovakia[3] (February 19th, 1931)

Denmark (September 9th, 1929)

In pursuance of Article 11, Greenland is excepted from the provisions of this Convention. Furthermore, the Danish Government, in accepting the Convention, does not assume any obligation in respect of statistics concerning the Faroe Islands.

Egypt (June 27th, 1930)

Finland (September 23rd, 1938)

France (February 1st, 1933)

By its acceptance, France does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

Greece (September 18th, 1930)

Italy (June 11th, 1931)

In accepting the present Convention, Italy does not assume any obligation in respect of her Colonies, Protectorates and other Territories referred to in the first paragraph of Article 11.

Latvia (July 5th, 1937)

Lithuania (April 2nd, 1938 *a*)

The Netherlands (September 13th, 1932)

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 *a*)

1. The following shall not be applicable:
   (a) The provisions of Article 2, III (E) and V;
   (b) The provisions concerning the system of valuations known as "declared values" mentioned in Annex I, Part I, para. II (see Article 3);
   (c) Article 3, paragraph 2.
2. The returns mentioned in Article 2. IV, shall apply only to coal, petroleum, natural gas, tin, manganese, gold and silver.
3. The statistics of foreign trade mentioned in Article 3 shall not comprise tables concerning transit.[2]

Norway (March 20th, 1929)

In accordance with Article 11, the Bouvet Island is excepted from the provisions of the present Convention. Furthermore, in ratifying the Convention, Norway does not assume any obligation as regards statistics relating to the Svalbard.

Poland (July 23rd, 1931)

Portugal (October 23rd, 1931)

In accordance with Article 11, the Portuguese Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that the present Convention does not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

Romania (June 22nd, 1931)

Sweden (February 17th, 1930)

Switzerland (July 10th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil	Germany	Yugoslavia
Estonia	Hungary	

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, succession (d)*
Belgium[4]	5 May 1950	Japan	3 Sep 1952
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 *d*		

3. ***(b)*** **Protocol**

Geneva, December 14th, 1928

IN FORCE since December 14th, 1930.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(March 27th, 1931)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations*	(May 9th, 1930)
Southern Rhodesia	(October 14th, 1931 *a*)
Canada	(August 23rd, 1930)
Australia	(April 13th, 1932 *a*)
Union of South Africa (including the mandated territory of *South West Africa*	(May 1st, 1930)
Ireland	(September 15th, 1930)
India	(May 15th, 1931 *a*)
Bulgaria	(November 29th, 1929)
Chile	(November 20th, 1934 *a*)
Cuba	(August 17th, 1932 *a*)
Czechoslovakia[3]	(February 19th, 1931)
Denmark	(September 9th, 1929)
Egypt	(June 27th, 1930)
Finland	(September 23rd, 1938)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

France	(February 1st, 1933)
Greece	(September 18th, 1930)
Italy	(June 11th, 1931)
Latvia	(July 5th, 1937)
Lithuania	(April 2nd, 1938 *a*)
The Netherlands	(September 13th, 1932)
This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.	
Netherlands Indies	(May 5th, 1933 *a*)
Norway	(March 20th, 1929)
Poland	(July 23rd, 1931)
Portugal	(October 23rd, 1931)
Romania	(June 22nd, 1931)
Sweden	(February 17th, 1930)
Switzerland	(July 10th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil	Germany	Yugoslavia
Estonia	Hungary	

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, succession (d)*
Belgium	5 May 1950	Japan	3 Sep 1952
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 *d*		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 2560. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 110, p. 171.

[2] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention, which were consulted in accordance with article 17.

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] Declaration made on signature: In pursuance of article 11 of the Convention, the Belgian Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that it cannot accept, in regard to the Colony of the Belgian Congo, the obligations arising out of the clauses of the present Convention.

CHAPTER XIV. EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL MATTERS

1. AGREEMENT FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF VISUAL AND AUDITORY MATERIALS OF AN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL CHARACTER

Opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on 15 July 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 August 1954, in accordance with article XII.
REGISTRATION: 12 August 1954, No. 2631.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 197, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 32.

Note: The Agreement was approved by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its third session, held at Beirut from 17 November to 11 December 1948, in a resolution[1] adopted at the seventeenth plenary meeting on 10 December 1948.

Participant	*Signature*	*Acceptance, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	29 Dec 1949	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Brazil	15 Sep 1949	15 Aug 1962
Cambodia		20 Feb 1952 *a*
Canada	17 Dec 1949	4 Oct 1950
Congo		26 Aug 1968 *a*
Costa Rica		9 Jun 1971 *a*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		7 Feb 1977 *a*
Cyprus		10 Aug 1972 *a*
Denmark	29 Dec 1949	10 Aug 1955
Dominican Republic	5 Aug 1949	
Ecuador	29 Dec 1949	
El Salvador	29 Dec 1949	24 Jun 1953
Ghana		22 Mar 1960 *a*
Greece	31 Dec 1949	9 Jul 1954
Haiti	2 Dec 1949	14 May 1954
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	31 Dec 1949	30 Dec 1959
Iraq		29 Aug 1952 *a*
Jordan		7 Jul 1972 *a*
Lebanon	30 Dec 1949	12 May 1971
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Jan 1973 *a*
Madagascar		23 May 1962 *a*
Malawi		5 Jul 1967 *a*
Malta		29 Jul 1968 *a*
Morocco		25 Jul 1968 *a*
Netherlands	30 Dec 1949	22 Apr 1968 *a*
Niger		12 Jan 1950
Norway	20 Dec 1949	16 Feb 1950 *a*
Pakistan		13 Nov 1952
Philippines	31 Dec 1949	3 Nov 1992 *d*
Slovenia		16 Sep 1951 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		31 Aug 1965 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		14 Oct 1966
United States of America	13 Sep 1949	30 Jun 1950 *a*
Uruguay	31 Dec 1949	
Yugoslavia		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon acceptance, accession or succession.)

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article IX, inasmuch as it believes that any disputes which may arise between States concerning the interpretation or application of the Agreement must be settled by direct negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba hereby declares that the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 4 of article XIV of the Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character are contrary to the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)), adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1960, which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

The accession of the Libyan Arab Republic to this Agreement does not imply recognition of Israel or the assumption towards Israel of any commitments arising out of this Agreement.

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

"As regards article III, paragraph 1, the words and quantitative restrictions and from the necessity of applying for an import licence' will be deleted, and excluded from the application of the Agreement."

NOTES:

[1] *Records of the General Conference of UNESCO, Third Session, Beirut 1948, vol. II, Resolutions* (3/3C/110, vol. II), p. 113.

2. Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials

Opened for signature at Lake Success, New York, on 22 November 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 May 1952, in accordance with article XI.
REGISTRATION: 21 May 1952, No. 1734.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 131, p. 25.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 84.[1]

Note: The Agreement was approved by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its fifth session, held at Florence from 22 May to 17 June 1950, in a resolution[2] adopted at the fourteenth plenary meeting on 17 June 1950.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	8 Oct 1951	19 Mar 1958
Australia		5 Mar 1992 *a*
Austria		12 Jun 1958 *a*
Barbados		13 Apr 1973 *d*
Belgium	22 Nov 1950	31 Oct 1957
Bolivia	22 Nov 1950	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Burkina Faso		14 Sep 1965 *a*
Cambodia		5 Nov 1951 *a*
Cameroon		15 May 1964 *a*
China[4]		
Colombia	22 Nov 1950	
Congo		26 Aug 1968 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		19 Jul 1963 *a*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		27 Aug 1952 *a*
Cyprus		16 May 1963 *d*
Denmark		4 Apr 1960 *a*
Dominican Republic	22 Nov 1950	
Ecuador	22 Nov 1950	
Egypt	22 Nov 1950	8 Feb 1952
El Salvador	4 Dec 1950	24 Jun 1953
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 *d*
Finland		30 Apr 1956 *a*
France	14 May 1951	14 Oct 1957
Gabon		4 Sep 1962 *a*
Germany[5,6]		9 Aug 1957 *a*
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 *d*
Greece	22 Nov 1950	12 Dec 1955
Guatemala	22 Nov 1950	8 Jul 1960
Haiti	22 Nov 1950	14 May 1954
Holy See		22 Aug 1979 *a*
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	
Hungary		15 Mar 1979 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	9 Feb 1951	7 Jan 1966
Iraq		11 Aug 1972 *a*
Ireland		19 Sep 1978 *a*
Israel	22 Nov 1950	27 Mar 1952
Italy		26 Nov 1962 *a*
Japan		17 Jun 1970 *a*
Jordan		31 Dec 1958 *a*
Kenya		15 Mar 1967 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		28 Feb 1952 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Jan 1973 *a*
Liechtenstein[1]		
Luxembourg	22 Nov 1950	31 Oct 1957
Madagascar		23 May 1962 *a*
Malawi		17 Aug 1965 *a*
Malaysia		29 Jun 1959 *d*
Malta		19 Jan 1968 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Monaco		18 Mar 1952 *a*
Morocco		25 Jul 1968 *a*
Netherlands	22 Nov 1950	31 Oct 1957
New Zealand	16 Mar 1951	29 Jun 1962
Nicaragua		17 Dec 1963 *a*
Niger		22 Apr 1968 *a*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway		2 Apr 1959 *a*
Oman		19 Dec 1977 *a*
Pakistan	9 May 1951	17 Jan 1952
Peru	8 Jul 1964	
Philippines	22 Nov 1950	30 Aug 1952
Poland		24 Sep 1971 *a*
Portugal		11 Jun 1984 *a*
Romania		24 Nov 1970 *a*
Russian Federation		7 Oct 1994 *a*
Rwanda		1 Dec 1964 *d*
San Marino		30 Jul 1985 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		11 Jul 1969 *a*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Spain		7 Jul 1955 *a*
Sri Lanka		8 Jan 1952 *a*
Sweden	20 Nov 1951	21 May 1952
Switzerland[1]	22 Nov 1950	7 Apr 1953
Syrian Arab Republic	7 Aug 1979	16 Sep 1980
Thailand	22 Nov 1950	18 Jun 1951
Tonga		11 Nov 1977 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		14 May 1971 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	22 Nov 1950	11 Mar 1954
United Republic of Tanzania		26 Mar 1963 *a*
United States of America	24 Jun 1959	2 Nov 1966
Uruguay	27 Apr 1964	
Venezuela		1 May 1992 *a*
Yugoslavia		26 Apr 1951 *a*
Zaire		3 May 1962 *d*
Zambia		1 Nov 1974 *d*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

GERMANY[5]

(1) "Until the expiration of the interim period as defined in article 3 of the Treaty between France and the Federal Republic of Germany of 27 October 1956 on the Settlement of the Saar Questions, the above-mentioned Agreement does not apply to the Saar Territory;

(2) "In accordance with the aims of the Agreement, as outlined in its preamble, the Federal Republic's interpretation of the provisions contained in article 1 of the Agreement is that the granting of customs exemption is intended to serve the promotion of a free exchange of ideas and knowledge between the States Parties; that, however, this provision does not aim at furthering the shifting of production to a foreign country if such shifts are made chiefly for commercial reasons."

HUNGARY

The Hungarian People's Republic calls attention to the fact that articles XIII and XIV of the Agreement are at variance with resolution 1514 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its XVth session on 14 December 1960.

IRAQ[7]

Accession by the Republic of Iraq to the Agreement shall [. . .] in no way imply recognition of Israel or lead to entry into any relations with it.

KENYA

"1. Annex B (vi) of the Agreement requires free admission for 'Antiques, being articles in excess of 100 years of age'. Under the relevant laws in force in Kenya, such items are admitted free of duty only if—

"(a) They can be classified as 'Works of Art'; and

"(b) They are not intended for resale and are admitted as such by the Commissioner of Customs and Excise; and

"(c) They are proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Customs and Excise to be 'over 100 years old'.

"If the above conditions are not fulfilled, such articles attract appropriate duty under the Tariff.

"2. With respect to Annex C (i) of the Agreement, films, filmstrips, microfilms and slides of an *educational or scientific character* are granted duty-free entry into Kenya under conditions which accord with those specified in the Agreement. This is not necessarily so in the case of similar materials of a *cultural nature* which are dutiable under the appropriate items in the Tariff. This position may be attributed to the impossibility of defining the word 'cultural' with any degree of precision.

"3. With respect to Annex C (iii), sound recordings of an educational or scientific character for use under conditions specified in the Agreement are admitted into Kenya free of duty. However, no special provision exists for the admission of sound recordings of a cultural character and these attract duty under the relevant items of the Tariff."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

The acceptance of the Libyan Arab Republic to this Agreement does not imply recognition of Israel or the assumption towards Israel of any commitments arising out of this Agreement.

ROMANIA

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of articles XIII and XIV of the Agreement refer is inconsistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1960, by resolution 1514 (XV), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article IX are inconsistent with the principle that all multilateral treaties whose aim and purpose concern the international community as a whole should be open to universal participation.

SWITZERLAND

The Government of Switzerland reserves the right to resume its freedom of action with regard to contracting States which unilaterally apply quantitative restrictions and exchange control measures of a nature to render the Agreement inoperative.

Furthermore, [the signature by the Government of Switzerland] is appended without prejudice to the attitudes of the Government of Switzerland in regard to the Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization signed at Havana on 24 March 1948.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The ratification is subject to the reservation contained in the Protocol annexed to the Agreement.

Territorial application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Belgium	31 Oct 1957	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
France	10 Dec 1951	Tunisia
Netherlands[8]	31 Oct 1957	Surinam and Netherlands New Guinea
	1 Jan 1986	Aruba
New Zealand	29 Jun 1962	Tokelau Islands
	28 Feb 1964	Cook Islands (including Niue)

Territorial Application (cont'd)

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom[9]	11 Mar 1954	Aden (Colony and Protectorate), Barbados, British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei (Protected State), Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gilbraltar, Gold Coast: (*a*) Colony, (*b*) Ashanti, (*c*) Northern Territories, (*d*) Togoland (under United Kingdom Trusteeship), Hong Kong, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla), Virgin Islands, Federation of Malaya (The British Settlements of Penang and Malacca and the Protected States of Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Perlis, Selangor and Trengganu), Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria: (*a*) Colony, (*b*) Protectorate, (*c*) Cameroons (under United Kingdom Trusteeship), St. Helena (including Ascension Island and Tristan da Cunha), Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Singapore (including Christmas and Cocos (Keeling) Islands), Somaliland Protectorate, Tanganyika (under United Kingdom Trusteeship), Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda (Protectorate), Western Pacific High Commission Territories: British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Central and Southern Line Islands, Zanzibar Protectorate
	16 Sep 1954	Cyprus, Falkland Islands (Colony and Dependencies), North Borneo (including Labuan), Tonga (Protected State), Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent)
	18 May 1955	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man
	22 Mar 1956	The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	14 Mar 1960	Bahamas

NOTES:

[1] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Agreement apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[2] Records of the General Conference of UNESCO, Fifth Session, Florence, 1950, *Resolutions (5C/Resolutions)*, p. 64.

[3] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Agreement on 1 June 1952. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[4] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 22 November 1950. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

On depositing the instrument of acceptance of the Agreement, the Government of Romania stated that it considered the above-mentioned signature as null and void, inasmuch as the only Government competent to assume obligations on behalf of China and to represent China at the international level is the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned declaration, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of China to the United Nations stated:

"The Republic of China, a sovereign State and member of the United Nations, attended the Fifth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, contributed to the formulation of the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials and duly signed the said Agreement on 22 November 1950 at the Interim Headquarters of the United Nations at Lake Success. Any statement relating to the said Agreement that is incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said Agreement."

[5] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] A communication was received, on 25 September 1957 from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, stating that "the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials also applies to Land Berlin".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Government of Poland and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3. See also note 5 above.

[7] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 20 October 1972, the Government of Israel made the following declaration:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of a reservation made by the Government of Iraq on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Agreement is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, that declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq, an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[8] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[9] See note 26 in chapter V.2.

3. International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations

Done at Rome on 26 October 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 May 1964, in accordance with article 25.
REGISTRATION: 18 May 1964, No. 7247.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 43.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 50.

Note: The Convention was drawn up by the Diplomatic Conference on the International Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations convened jointly by the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. The Conference was held at Rome at the invitation of the Government of Italy from 10 to 26 October 1961.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina	26 Oct 1961	2 Dec 1991
Australia		30 Jun 1992 *a*
Austria	26 Oct 1961	9 Mar 1973
Barbados		18 Jun 1983 *a*
Belgium	26 Oct 1961	
Bolivia		24 Aug 1993 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Jan 1994 *d*	
Brazil	26 Oct 1961	29 Jun 1965
Bulgaria		31 May 1995 *a*
Burkina Faso		14 Oct 1987 *a*
Cambodia	26 Oct 1961	
Chile	26 Oct 1961	5 Jun 1974
Colombia		17 Jun 1976 *a*
Congo		29 Jun 1962 *a*
Costa Rica		9 Jun 1971 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark	26 Oct 1961	23 Jun 1965
Dominican Republic		27 Oct 1986 *a*
Ecuador	26 Jun 1962	19 Dec 1963
El Salvador		29 Mar 1979 *a*
Fiji		11 Jan 1972 *a*
Finland	21 Jun 1962	21 Jul 1983
France	26 Oct 1961	3 Apr 1987
Germany[2,3]	26 Oct 1961	21 Jul 1966
Greece		6 Oct 1992 *a*
Guatemala		14 Oct 1976 *a*
Holy See	26 Oct 1961	
Honduras		16 Nov 1989 *a*
Hungary		10 Nov 1994 *a*
Iceland	26 Oct 1961	15 Mar 1994
India	26 Oct 1961	
Ireland	30 Jun 1962	19 Jun 1979
Israel	7 Feb 1962	
Italy	26 Oct 1961	8 Jan 1975
Jamaica		27 Oct 1993 *a*
Japan		26 Jul 1989 *a*
Lebanon	26 Jun 1962	
Lesotho		26 Oct 1989 *a*
Luxembourg		25 Nov 1975 *a*
Mexico	26 Oct 1961	17 Feb 1964
Monaco	22 Jun 1962	6 Sep 1985
Netherlands[4]		7 Jul 1993 *a*
Niger		5 Apr 1963 *a*
Nigeria		29 Jul 1993 *a*
Norway		10 Apr 1978 *a*
Panama		2 Jun 1983 *a*
Paraguay	30 Jun 1962	26 Nov 1969
Peru		7 May 1985 *a*
Philippines		25 Jun 1984 *a*
Republic of Moldova		5 Sep 1995 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain	26 Oct 1961	14 Aug 1991
Switzerland		24 Jun 1993 *a*
Sweden	26 Oct 1961	13 Jul 1962
United Kingdom	26 Oct 1961	30 Oct 1963
Uruguay		4 Apr 1977 *a*
Venezuela		30 Oct 1995 *a*
Yugoslavia	26 Oct 1961	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

Declarations:

"Australia, pursuant to article 5 (3), will not apply the criterion of publication;

Australia, pursuant to article 6 (2), will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

Australia, pursuant to article 16 (1) (a), will not, as regards article 12, apply the provision of that article; and

Australia, pursuant to article 16 (1) (b), will not, as regards article 13, apply item (d) of that article."

AUSTRIA

1. In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii), of the Convention, Austria will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State;

2. In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), of the Convention, [. . .], as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, Austria will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by an Austrian national;

3. In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, Austria will not apply article 13 (d).

BULGARIA

Declarations:

1. The Republic of Bulgaria declares in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1(a)(iii), that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

2. The Republic of Bulgaria declares in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1(a)(iv), that as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Republic of Bulgaria.

CONGO

In a communication received on 16 May 1964, the Government of the Congo has notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to make its accession subject to the following declarations:

(1) Article 5, paragraph 3: the "criterion of publication" is excluded;

(2) Article 16: the application of article 12 is completely excluded.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

DENMARK

"1) *With regard to article 6, paragraph 2:* Protection will be granted to broadcasting organisations only if their headquarters is situated in another Contracting State and if their broadcasts are transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

"2) *With regard to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii):* The provisions of article 12 will be applied solely with respect to broadcasting as well as any other communication to the public which is carried out for profit-making purposes.

"3) *With regard to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv):* As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, the protection provided for in article 12 will be limited to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a Danish national.

"4) *With regard to article 17:* Denmark will grant the protection provided for in article 5 only if the first fixation of the sound was made in another Contracting State (the criterion of fixation) and will apply for the purposes of paragraph 1 *(a)* (iii) and (iv) of article 16 the said criterion instead of the criterion of nationality."

FIJI

"(1) In respect of Article 5 (1) *(b)* and in accordance with Article 5 (3) of the Convention, Fiji will not apply, in respect of phonograms, the criterion of fixation;

"(2) In respect of Article 6 (1) and in accordance with Article 6 (2) of the Convention, Fiji will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

"(3) In respect of article 12 and in accordance with article 16 (1) of the Convention,

"*(a)* Fiji will not apply the provisions of Article 12 in respect of the following uses:

"(i) The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public at premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein except where a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard;

"(ii) The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of, a club, society or other organisation which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, except where a charge is made for admission to the place where the phonogram is to be heard, and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purpose of the organisation;

"*(b)* As regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State or as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of a Contracting State which has made a declaration under Article 16 (1) *(a)* (i) stating that it will not apply the provisions of Article 12, Fiji will not grant the protection provided for by Article 12, unless, in either event, the phonogram has been first published in a Contracting State which has made no such declaration."

Communication received on 12 June 1972:

"The Government of Fiji, having reconsidered the said Convention hereby withdraws its declaration in respect of certain provisions of article 12 and in substitution thereof declares in accordance with article 16 (1) of the said Convention that Fiji will not apply the provisions of article 12".

FINLAND [5]

Reservations:

"1. ...

2. *Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i)*
The provisions of article 12 will not be applied with respect to phonograms acquired by a broadcasting organisation before 1 September 1961.

3. *Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii)*
The provisions of article 12 will be applied solely with respect to broadcasting as well as to any other communication to the public which is carried out for profit-making purposes.

4. *Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv)*
As regards phonograms first fixed in another Contracting State, the protection provided for in article 12 will be limited to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed in Finland.

5 ...

6. *Article 17*
Finland will apply, for the purposes of article 5, the criterion of fixation alone and, for the purposes of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), the criterion of fixation instead of the criterion of nationality."

FRANCE

Article 5

The Government of the French Republic declares, in conformity with article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, concerning the protection of phonograms, that it rejects the criterion of the of first publication in favour of the criterion of first fixation.

Article 12

The Government of the French Republic declares, first, that it will not apply the provisions of this article to all phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State, in

conformity with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii) of this Convention.

Secondly, the Government of the French Republic declares that, with regard to phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the extent and duration of the protection provided in this article (article 12), to those which the latter Contracting State grants to phonograms first fixed by French nationals.

29 June 1987

The Government of France specifies that it understands the expression "International Court of Justice", in article 30 of the Convention, as covering not only the Court itself but also a chamber of the Court.

GERMANY[2]

"1. The Federal Republic of Germany makes use of the following reservations provided for in article 5, paragraph 3, and article 16, paragraph 1 a (iv) of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations:

"1) As regards the protection of producers of phonograms it will not apply the criterion of fixation referred to in article 5, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention;

"2) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 of the Convention to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a German national."

ICELAND

Declarations:

Iceland, pursuant to article 5, paragraph 3, will not apply the criterion of fixation.

Iceland, pursuant to article 6, paragraph 2, will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and if the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i), will not apply article 12 with respect to the use of phonograms published before 1 September 1961.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii), will apply article 12 solely with respect to use for broadcasting or for any other communication to the public for commercial purposes.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii), will not apply article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), will, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, limit the protection provided for in article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed in Iceland.

IRELAND

"(1) With regard to article 5, paragraph 1, and in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention: Ireland will not apply the criterion of fixation;

"(2) With regard to article 6, paragraph 1, and in accordance with article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention: Ireland will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

"(3) With regard to article 12, and in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii): Ireland will not protect broadcasts heard in public (a) at any premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein unless a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the recording is to be heard or (b) as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of a club, society or other organisation which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, unless a charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the recording is to be heard and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purposes of the organisation."

ITALY

(1) With regard to article 6, paragraph 1, and in accordance with article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention: Italy will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

(2) With regard to article 12 and in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 *(a)*, of the Convention:

(*a*) Italy will apply the provisions of article 12 to use for broadcasting or for any other communication to the public for commercial purposes, with the exception of cinematography;

(*b*) It will apply the provisions of article 12 only to phonograms fixed in another Contracting State;

(*c*) With regard to phonograms fixed in another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed in Italy; however, if that State does not grant the protection to the same beneficiary or beneficiaries as Italy, that fact will not be considered as a difference in the extent of the protection.

(3) With regard to article 13 and in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 *(b)*, of the Convention: Italy will not apply the provisions of article 13 *(d)*;

(4) With regard to article 5 and in accordance with article 17 of the Convention, Italy will apply only the criterion of fixation for the purposes of article 5; the same criterion, instead of the criterion of nationality, will be applied for the purposes of the declarations provided for in article 16, paragraph 1 *(a)* (iii) and (iv), of the Convention.

JAPAN

Declaration:

"(1) Pursuant to article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Government of Japan will not apply the criterion of publication concerning the protection of producers of phonograms,

"(2) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii) of the Convention, the Government of Japan will apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention in respect of uses for broadcasting or for wire diffusion,

"(3) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention,

(i) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of a Contracting State which has made a declaration under article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i) of the Convention stating that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention, the Government of Japan will not grant the protection provided for by the provisions of article 12 of the Convention.

(ii) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State which applies the provisions of article 12 of the Convention, the Government of Japan will limit the term of the protection provided for by the provisions of article 12 of the Convention to the term for which that State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a Japanese national."

LESOTHO

Reservations:

"Pursuant to article 12 of the said Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that the provisions of this article will not apply in respect of broadcasts made for non-profit making purposes or where communication to the public in public places is not the result of a purely commercial activity;

With regard to article 13:

"... [The Kingdom of Lesotho] does not consider itself bound by the provisions of item (d)."

LUXEMBOURG

1. With regard to the protection of producers of phonograms, Luxembourg will not apply the criterion of publication but only the criteria of nationality and fixation, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention.

2. With regard to the protection of phonograms, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 *(a)* (i), of the Convention, Luxembourg will not apply any of the provisions of article 12.

3. With regard to broadcasting organizations, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 *(b)*, of the Convention, Luxembourg will not apply the protection envisaged in article 13 *(d)* against communication to the public of their television broadcasts.

MONACO

Reservations:

1. With regard to the protection of producers of phonograms, Monaco will not apply the criterion of publication but only the criteria of nationality and fixation, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3.

2. With regard to broadcasting organizations, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i),Monaco will not apply any of the provisions of article 12.

3. With regard to broadcasting organizations, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (b), Monaco will not apply the provisions of article 13 (d) concerning protection against communication to the public of television broadcasts.

NETHERLANDS

Reservation:

"The said Convention shall be observed subject to the following reservations, provided for in article 16, paragraph [1], (a) (iii) and (iv), of the Convention:

– the Kingdom of the Netherlands will not apply article 12 to phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State;

– as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

NIGER

Declarations:

(1) Article 5, paragraph 3: the "criterion of publication" is excluded;

(2) Article 16: the application of article 12 is completely excluded.

NIGERIA

Declarations:

1. With regard to article 5, paragraph 3, the Federal Republic of Nigeria will not apply the criteria of publication under article 5, paragraph 1 (c).

2. With regard to article 6, paragraph 2, the Federal Republic of Nigeria will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and if the broadcast is transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

3. With regard to article 16, paragraph 1 (a):

i) the provisions of article 12 will not be applied in case of communication to the public of phonograms (a) at any premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein unless a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard or (b) as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of a club, society or other organization which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, unless a charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purpose of the organization;

ii) the provisions of article 12 will not apply as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State; and

iii) as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, the Federal Republic of Nigeria will limit the protection provided for in article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by nationals of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

NORWAY[6]

Reservations:

"Pursuant to article 16, section 1, item a (ii), reservation is made to the effect that article 12 shall not apply in respect of use other than use of phonograms in broadcast transmissions."

"b) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, item a (iii), reservation is made to the effect that article 12 shall not be applicable if the producer is not a national of another Contracting State.

"c) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, item a (iv), reservation is made to the effect that the extent and duration of the protection provided for under article 12 for phonograms which are produced by a national in another Contracting State shall not be more comprehensive than protection granted by that State to phonograms first produced by a Norwegian national.

"d) Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 2, reservation is made to the effect that broadcasts are only protected if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State, and the broadcast is transmitted from a transmitter in the same Contracting State."

Declaration:

"The Norwegian Act of 14 December 1956 concerning a Levy on the Public Presentation of Recordings of Artists' Performances, etc., establishes rules for the disbursement of that levy to producers and performers of phonograms.

"A portion of the annual revenue from the levy devolves, as of rights, to producers of phonograms as a group, without distinction as to nationality, in remuneration for the public use of phonograms.

"Under the terms of the Act, contributions from the levy may be made to Norwegian performing artists and their survivors on the basis of individual needs. This benevolent arrangement falls entirely outside the scope of the Convention.

"The régime established by the said Act, being fully consistent with the requirements of the Convention will be maintained."

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Reservations:

1. In accordance with article 5, paragraph 3, the Republic of Moldova declares that it will not apply the criteria of fixation under article 5, paragraph 1 (b).

2. In accordance with article 6, paragraph 2, the Republic of Moldova declares that it will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

3. With reference to article 16, paragraph 1 (a), the Republic of Moldova declares that:

a) It will not apply the provisions of article 12 in the case of communications to the public of phonograms as part of the activities or for the benefit of a club, society or other organization which has been established or is being administered on a non-commercial basis, the purpose of which, generally speaking, is charitable or concerned with the advancement of education, the promotion of the public good and the dissemination of religion, unless a charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard and any of profit thus obtained is used for purposes which differ from those of the organization;

b) It will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State;

c) It will limit the protection stipulated in article 12 for phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State to the extent to which and as long as that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms which were originally fixed by national of the Republic of Moldova.

SLOVAKIA[1]

SPAIN

Declarations:

Article 5

[The Government of Spain] will not apply the criterion of first publication and will apply instead the criterion of first fixation.

Article 6

[The Government of Spain] will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

Article 16

Firstly [the Government of Spain] will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State.

Secondly, the Spanish Government, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, will limit the scope and duration of the protection provided in article 12 to the extent to which that latter Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by nationals of Spain, in conformity with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention.

SWITZERLAND

Reservations:

Ad article 5

The Swiss Government declares, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, that it rejects the criterion of first fixation. It will therefore apply the criterion of first publication.

Ad article 12

In accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the Swiss Government declares that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

The Swiss Government also declares, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, that it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a Swiss national, in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (*a*) (iv) of the Convention.

SWEDEN[7]

(a) ...
(b) ...
(c) With regard to article 16, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv);
(d) ...
(e) ...

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"(1) In respect of article 5 (1) (b) and in accordance with article 5 (3) of the Convention, the United Kingdom will not apply, in respect of phonograms, the criterion of fixation;

"(2) In respect of article 6 (1) and in accordance with article 6 (2) of the Convention, the United Kingdom will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

"(3) In respect of article 12 and in accordance with article 16 (1) of the Convention,

"(a) The United Kingdom will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of the following uses:

"(i) The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public at any premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein except where a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard.

"(ii) The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of, a club, society or other organisation which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, except where a charge is made for admission to the place where the phonogram is to be heard, and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purposes of the organisation.

"(b) As regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State or as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of a Contracting State which has made a declaration under article 16 (1) (a) (i) stating that it

will not apply the provisions of article 12, the United Kingdom will not grant the protection provided for by article 12, unless, in either event, the phonogram has been first published in a Contracting State which has made no such declaration."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom[8]	20 Dec 1966	Gibraltar
	10 Mar 1970	Bermuda

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 13 May 1964, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 96. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] With a declaration to the effect that the Convention shall also apply to *Land Berlin* as from the day on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, Germany (Federal Republic) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred to in the second paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3. See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] On 10 February 1994, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw the reservations to article 6 (2) and 16 (1)(b), and to amend, reducing in scope, the reservation with regard to article 16 (1)(a)(ii) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservations made upon ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1324, p. 380.

[6] In a communication received on 30 June 1989, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General of its decision to substitute a new reservation for the one made to the said Convention upon accession. The text of the reservation so withdrawn reads as follows:

"*(a)* Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, item a (ii), reservation is made to the effect that article 12 shall not apply in respect of use other than for the purpose of economic gain."

[7] With regard to the said declarations, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Sweden on 27 June 1986, the following notification:

"With application of article 18 of the Convention, a notification notifying its withdrawal or amendment of the notifications deposited with the instrument of ratification on July 13, 1962, as follows:

1. The notification relating to article 6, paragraph 2, is withdrawn.

2. The notification under article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii) according to which Sweden will apply article 12 only in relation to broadcasting is reduced in scope to the effect that Sweden will apply article 12 to broadcasting and to such communication to the public which is carried out for commercial purposes.

3. The notification relating to article 17 is withdrawn in so far as reproduction of phonograms is concerned. Sweden will from July 1, 1986, grant protection according to article 10 of the Convention to all phonograms.

The withdrawals and amendments take effect on July 1, 1986."

Subsequently, on 1 December 1995, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Sweden, the following notification:

"With application of article 18 of the Convention Sweden withdraws or amends the notifications deposited with the instrument of ratification on 13 July 1962, as follows:

1. The notification under article 16 (1) (a) (ii), amended by the notification 26 June 1986, to the effect that Sweden will apply article 12 only to broadcasting and such communication to the public which is carried out for commercial purposes is withdrawn with immediate effect.

2. The notification under article 16(1)(b) to the effect that Sweden will apply article 13 (d) only to communication to the public of television broadcasts in a cinema or similar place is withdrawn with immediate effect."

For the text of the declarations so withdrawn and the unamended declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 94.

[8] The territorial applications were effected subject to the same declarations as those made on behalf of the United Kingdom upon ratification of the Convention.

4. Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms

Concluded at Geneva on 29 October 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 April 1973, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 18 April 1973, No. 12430.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 866, p. 67.
STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 54.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the International Conference of States on the Protection of Phonograms convened jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization. The Conference was held at the Palais des Nations, in Geneva, from 18 to 29 October 1971.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), succession (d)*
Argentina		19 Mar 1973 *a*
Australia		12 Mar 1974 *a*
Austria	28 Apr 1972	6 May 1982
Barbados		23 Mar 1983 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Brazil	29 Oct 1971	6 Aug 1975
Bulgaria		31 May 1995 *a*
Burkina Faso		14 Oct 1987 *a*
Canada	29 Oct 1971	
Chile		15 Dec 1976 *a*
China		5 Jan 1993 *a*
Colombia	29 Oct 1971	14 Feb 1994
Costa Rica		1 Mar 1982 *a*
Cyprus		25 Jun 1993 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark	29 Oct 1971	7 Dec 1976
Ecuador	29 Oct 1971	4 Jun 1974
Egypt		15 Dec 1977 *a*
El Salvador		25 Oct 1978 *a*
Fiji		15 Jun 1972 *a*
Finland	21 Apr 1972	18 Dec 1972
France	29 Oct 1971	12 Sep 1972
Germany[2]	29 Oct 1971	7 Feb 1974
Greece		2 Nov 1993 *a*
Guatemala		14 Oct 1976 *a*
Holy See	29 Oct 1971	4 Apr 1977
Honduras		16 Nov 1989 *a*
Hungary		24 Feb 1975 *a*
India	29 Oct 1971	1 Nov 1974
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Oct 1971	
Israel	29 Oct 1971	10 Jan 1978
Italy	29 Oct 1971	20 Dec 1976
Jamaica		7 Oct 1993 *a*
Japan	21 Apr 1972	19 Jun 1978 *A*
Kenya	4 Apr 1972	6 Jan 1976
Liechtenstein	28 Apr 1972	
Luxembourg	29 Oct 1971	25 Nov 1975
Mexico	29 Oct 1971	11 Sep 1973
Monaco	29 Oct 1971	21 Aug 1974
Netherlands[3]		7 Jul 1993 *a*
New Zealand		3 May 1976 *a*
Nicaragua	29 Oct 1971	
Norway	28 Apr 1972	10 Apr 1978
Panama	28 Apr 1972	20 Mar 1974
Paraguay		30 Oct 1978 *a*
Peru		7 May 1985 *a*
Philippines	29 Apr 1972	
Republic of Korea		1 Jul 1987 *a*
Russian Federation		9 Dec 1994 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain	29 Oct 1971	16 May 1974
Sweden	29 Oct 1971	18 Jan 1973
Switzerland	29 Oct 1971	24 Jun 1993
Trinidad and Tobago		27 Jun 1988 *a*
United Kingdom	29 Oct 1971	5 Dec 1972
United States of America	29 Oct 1971	26 Nov 1973
Uruguay	29 Oct 1971	6 Oct 1982
Venezuela		30 Jul 1982 *a*
Yugoslavia	29 Oct 1971	
Zaire		25 Jul 1977 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

EGYPT[4]

HUNGARY

"A. *Ad* article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2:

In the opinion of the Hungarian People's Republic, article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention have a discriminatory character. The Convention is a general, multilateral one and therefore every State has the right to be a party to it, in accordance with the basic principles of international law.

"B. *Ad* article 11, paragraph 3:

The Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 11, paragraph 3 of the Convention are inconsistent with the principles of the independence of colonial countries and peoples, formulated, *inter alia*, also in resolution No. 1514 (XV) of the United Nations General Assembly."

SLOVAKIA[1]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	4 Dec 1974	Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Montserrat, St. Lucia, Seychelles, British Virgin Islands

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 5 October 1984. Subsequently, on 1 February 1985, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Czechoslovakia, the following reservation:

"The provision of article 11, paragraph 3 of the Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms is in contradiction to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which was adopted at the XVth session of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution C 1514/XV of 14 December 1960)."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration relating to Israel. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of said declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 1067, p. 327.

5. Protocol to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials of 22 November 1950

Concluded at Nairobi on 26 November 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 January 1982, in accordance with article VIII, paragraph 17 (a).
REGISTRATION: 2 January 1982, No. 20669.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1259, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 13. Parties: 28.

Note: The Protocol, approved on 30 March 1976 by a Special Committee of Governmental Experts convened in pursuance of resolution 4.112 of the General Conference of UNESCO, was adopted on the Report of Programme Commission II at the thirty-fourth plenary meeting of the nineteenth session of the General Conference of UNESCO at Nairobi, Kenya, on 26 November 1976, and opened for signature on 1 March 1977.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), succession (d)*
Australia		5 Mar 1992 *a*
Austria	4 Feb 1993	28 Jun 1994
Barbados		10 Apr 1979 *a*
Belgium	18 Jun 1980	25 Sep 1986
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		15 May 1992 *a*
Denmark	18 Jun 1980	17 Feb 1983
Egypt		18 Sep 1981 *a*
Finland		17 Feb 1987 *a*
France	18 Jun 1980	3 Jan 1986
Germany[1,2]	18 Jun 1980	17 Aug 1989
Greece		4 Mar 1983 *a*
Holy See		22 Feb 1980 *a*
Iraq		13 Apr 1978 *a*
Ireland	18 Jun 1980	18 Jun 1980
Italy	18 Jun 1980	2 Jul 1981 *A*
Luxembourg	18 Jun 1980	22 Jun 1982
Netherlands[3]	18 Jun 1980	15 Jul 1981 *A*
New Zealand[4]	9 Nov 1981	
Oman	19 Dec 1977	
Portugal		11 Jun 1984 *a*
Russian Federation		7 Oct 1994 *a*
San Marino		30 Jul 1985 *a*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		2 Oct 1992 *a*
United Kingdom[5]	18 Jun 1980	9 Jun 1982
United States of America	1 Sep 1981	15 May 1989
Venezuela		1 May 1992 *a*
Yugoslavia		13 Nov 1981 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

"Pursuant to paragraph 16 (a), Australia declares that it will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the Protocol."

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"Austria shall not be bound by Part II, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H."

BARBADOS

"The Government of Barbados hereby declares that it will not be bound by annex H."

BELGIUM, DENMARK, FRANCE[6], GERMANY[1,2], IRELAND, ITALY, NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

Each of the Governments of Belgium, Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

DENMARK

Reservation:

Pursuant to paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Denmark declares that it will not be bound by part II, part IV, annex C.I, annex F, annex G and annex H.

FINLAND

[Finland] shall not be bound by parts II and IV and annexes C.1, F and G of the Protocol.

GREECE

Reservation:

The Government of Greece will not be bound by part II, part IV, and annexes C.1, F, G and H.

IRAQ[7]

Entry into the above Protocol by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations with it.

IRELAND

"Ireland will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.I, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H, or by any of those Parts or Annexes."

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

"(a) Italy shall not be bound by part II, part IV, annex C.1, annex F, annex G and annex H;

"(b) Italy, within the framework of the European Economic Community, will examine the possibility of accepting annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that annex."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of Luxembourg will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the Protocol and will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

NETHERLANDS

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

"In conformity with paragraph 16 *(a)* of the said Protocol, the Kingdom shall not be bound by part II, part IV, annex C.1, annex F, annex G and annex H thereof."

NEW ZEALAND

Upon signature:

"The Government of New Zealand shall not be bound by annex C.1, annex F and annex H of the Protocol."

PORTUGAL

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 16 (a) of the Protocol, [Portugal] shall not be bound by parts II and IV (a) and annexes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol.

SPAIN

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 16 of the Protocol, Spain shall not be bound by parts II and IV and annexes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The United Kingdom shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H;

"The United Kingdom, within the framework of the European Economic Community, will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex."

Upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reserves the right to extend the Protocol at a later date, to any territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible and to which the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials has been extended in accordance with the provisions of article XIII thereof."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article VII, Section 16 (a), of the Protocol, the United States hereby declares that it will not be bound by Annexes C.1, F, G, and H. The United States will examine the possibility of withdrawing this declaration with regard to annex C.1, and of accepting that annex, in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that annex."

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] Upon ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany confirmed this declaration made upon signature. In addition, in a letter accompanying its instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 1 above.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe and as from 1 January 1986 for Aruba. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] The signature of the Protocol extends to Tokelau Islands.

[5] In a communication received on 20 April 1989, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared that subject to the same declarations made by the United Kingdom, the Protocol shall extend, with effect from the date of receipt of the said communication, to the following territories for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible:

Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Anguilla, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Gibraltar, Monserrat, St. Helena, St Helena Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus.

In this connection, on 7 August 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina an objection, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made in this regard in note 12 of chapter IV.3, however also referring to General Assembly resolutions 41/40/, 42/19 and 43/25.

[6] Upon ratification of the Convention, the Government of France confirmed the declaration made upon signature.

[7] With reference to the declaration made by the Government of Iraq, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel on 1 May 1979, the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon it under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

6. International Agreement for the Establishment of the University for Peace

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 5 December 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 April 1981, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 7 April 1981, No. 19735.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1223, p. 87.
STATUS: Parties: 34.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by resolution 35/55[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 5 December 1980. It was open for definitive signature by all States at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 5 December 1980 to 31 December 1981.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), accession, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), accession, succession (d)*
Bangladesh		8 Apr 1981 *s*	Nicaragua		3 Apr 1981 *s*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	Pakistan		30 Mar 1981 *s*
Cambodia		10 Apr 1981 *s*	Panama		20 Mar 1981 *s*
Cameroon		16 Aug 1982	Peru		9 Apr 1981 *s*
Chile		2 Mar 1981 *s*	Philippines		20 Mar 1984
Colombia		18 Mar 1981 *s*	Russian Federation		23 Dec 1987
Costa Rica		5 Dec 1980 *s*	Saint Lucia		2 Sep 1986
Cuba		9 Aug 1985	Senegal		1 Apr 1981 *s*
Cyprus		15 Mar 1983	Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *s*
Dominican Republic		21 Nov 1983	Spain		21 Apr 1981 *s*
Ecuador		18 Mar 1981 *s*	Sri Lanka		10 Aug 1981 *s*
El Salvador		7 Apr 1981 *s*	Suriname		3 Jun 1981 *s*
Guatemala		14 Sep 1981 *s*	Togo		3 Jun 1981 *s*
Honduras		10 Apr 1981 *s*	Turkey		27 Nov 1995 *a*
India		3 Dec 1981 *s*	Uruguay		19 Nov 1985
Italy		27 Nov 1981 *s*	Venezuela		5 Dec 1980 *s*
Mexico		15 May 1981 *s*	Yugoslavia		19 Jan 1983

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 31* (A/35/49) p. 103.

7. Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology

Concluded at Madrid on 13 September 1983

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1994, in accordance with article 21 (1).
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1994.
TEXT: Doc. ID/WG.397/8; see also hereinafter the Protocol of the reconvened plenipotentiary meeting (XIV.7a).
STATUS: Signatories: 47. Parties: 37.

Note: The Statutes were adopted at the Ministerial Level Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology held at Madrid, Spain, from 7 to 13 September 1983 under the auspices of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. They were open for signature at Madrid on 12 and 13 September 1983 and remain open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, until their entry into force.

Pursuant to article 21 (1), the Statutes are to enter into force when at least twenty–four States, including the Host State[1] of the Centre, have deposited instruments of ratification or acceptance and having further ascertained among themselves that sufficient financial resources are ensured, have then deposited with the Secretary–General notifications indicating their agreement to the entry into force of the Statutes.

Participant	*Signature, signature ad referendum (S), confirmation of signature ad referendum (C)*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*	*Notification under article 21 (1)*
Afghanistan	13 Sep 1983 *S*		
	28 Mar 1984 *C*	6 Jul 1988	
Algeria	13 Sep 1983	11 Sep 1987	22 Dec 1992
Argentina	13 Sep 1983	8 May 1990	22 Dec 1992
Bhutan	31 May 1984	7 May 1985	22 Dec 1992
Bolivia	13 Sep 1983		
Brazil	5 May 1986 *S*	9 Mar 1990	4 Feb 1993
Bulgaria	13 Sep 1983 *S*	23 Jun 1986 *A*	
Chile	13 Sep 1983	27 Apr 1994	
China	13 Sep 1983	13 Apr 1992 *A*	22 Dec 1992
Colombia	21 Nov 1986		
Congo	13 Sep 1983		
Costa Rica	14 Aug 1990 *S*		
Croatia	20 Oct 1992	26 Aug 1993 *A*	20 Sep 1993
Cuba	13 Sep 1983	30 Jun 1986	22 Dec 1992
Ecuador	13 Sep 1983	26 Oct 1994	
Egypt	13 Sep 1983	13 Jan 1987	22 Dec 1992
Greece	13 Sep 1983		
Hungary	13 Jan 1987	13 Jan 1987 *A*	31 Aug 1993
India	13 Sep 1983	9 Jul 1985	22 Dec 1992
Indonesia	13 Sep 1983		
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Apr 1988 S		
Iraq	28 Feb 1984	19 Feb 1985	22 Dec 1992
Italy	13 Sep 1983	20 Sep 1990	22 Dec 1992
Kuwait[2]	13 Sept 1983	21 Oct 1986	
Mauritania	13 Sep 1983		
Mauritius	19 Sept 1984	5 Jan 1989	11 May 1993
Mexico	13 Sep 1983 *S*		
	21 May 1984 *C*	21 Jan 1988	
Morocco	19 Oct 1984	28 Jun 1990	22 Dec 1992
Nigeria	13 Sep 1983	13 Mar 1991	27 Apr 1994
Pakistan	4 Nov 1983	5 Apr 1994	
Panama	11 Dec 1984	12 Aug 1986	22 Dec 1992

Participant	*Signature, signature ad referendum (S), confirmation of signature ad referendum (C)*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*	*Notification under article 21 (1)*
Peru	22 Mar 1984	6 Jan 1995	
Poland	1 Aug 1990		
Romania		5 Dec 1995 *a*	
Russian Federation	1 Jul 1992	30 Nov 1992 *A*	22 Dec 1992
Senegal	29 Jun 1984	4 May 1985	23 Dec 1993
Slovenia		28 Dec 1994 *a*	
Spain	13 Sep 1983		
Sri Lanka	12 Nov 1991	1 Oct 1993	3 Feb 1994
Sudan	13 Sep 1983	21 Oct 1991	22 Dec 1992
Syrian Arab Republic	17 Oct 1991		
Thailand	13 Sep 1983		
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		27 Apr 1994 *a*	
Trinidad and Tobago	13 Sep 1983		
Tunisia	27 Oct 1983	20 Sep 1990	22 Dec 1992
Turkey	22 Sep 1987	10 Jan 1989	22 Dec 1992
Uruguay		5 Dec 1995 *a*	
Venezuela	13 Sep 1983	15 Oct 1985	22 Dec 1992
Viet Nam	17 Sep 1984	15 Apr 1993 *A*	15 Apr 1993
Yugoslavia[3]	13 Sep 1983	18 Mar 1987	22 Dec 1992
Zaire	13 Sep 1983		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

CHILE[4]

Reservations:

(a) The Government of Chile hereby enters a reservation to article 13, paragraph 3, of the Statutes inasmuch as, under the provisions of its Constitution and internal law, the property and assets of the Centre may be expropriated by virtue of a general or special law authorizing such expropriation on the ground of public benefit or national interest as may be determined by legislation.

(b) The Government of Chile hereby enters a reservation to article 13, paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, of the Statutes inasmuch as the privileges and immunities of representatives of the Members and of officials and experts of the Centre shall be granted in accordance with the terms of the said paragraphs save where any such person holds Chilean nationality.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba formulates an express reservation to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 14 of the Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, because it considers that the provisions thereof contravene the regulations of article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 20 March 1883, to which Cuba is a party, and the Cuban legislation guaranteeing the implementation of that Convention.

ITALY

Declaration:

Pending adoption of the Headquarters Agreement, article 13, paragraphs 2 and 9, of the Statutes, will be implemented within the limits established by applicable norms of the Italian legal system.

MEXICO

In accordance with article 19 of the 1967 Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, the United Mexican States declares that it will apply the general policy regarding copyright established by the governing body of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, insofar as it reflects the principles relating to that subject embodied in the above-mentioned Paris Convention.

SPAIN

Upon signature:
Reservation:

In respect of article 13 (4).

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Upon signature:
Reservation:

"The reservation of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to articles 10 and 11 of these statutes relates specifically to the non-acceptance by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago of

any obligation with respect to the financing of the International Centre by assessed contributions or by voluntary contributions on the part of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, in the absence of any decision on the selection of a host country for the International Centre, and consequently in the absence of any reliable indication of the cost of the International Centre, and the proportion of that cost to be borne by the host country, on the one hand, or by other member States, on the other hand."

NOTES:

[1] In accordance with the Protocol of the Reconvened Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnolgy of 4 April 1984 [see chapter XIV.7 (a)], the Governments of Italy and India are to host the Centre. For the date of deposit of their instruments of ratification and notifications under article 21 (1), see the table in this chapter.

[2] The instrument was accompanied by an understanding to the effect that the ratification by Kuwait of the said Convention does not mean a recognition of Israel nor that treaty relations will arise with Israel.

[3] Some States have indicated that, without prejudice to further decisions, they did not consider valid the notification by Yugoslavia. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in turn indicated that in its opinion there were no legal grounds whatsoever to question the legality of its notification.

[4] The International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology informed the Secretary-General on 12 May 1994, that these reservations had been accepted by the Board of Governors on 27 April 1994.

(a) Protocol of the Reconvened Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology

Concluded at Vienna on 4 April 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1994, in accordance with article 21 of the Statutes.[1]
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1994.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.96.1984.TREATIES-3 of 12 June 1984.
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 32.

Note: The Reconvened Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology held at Vienna, Austria, from 3 to 4 April 1984, adopted the said Protocol, in the English language only, in order to complete article 1(2) of the Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, concluded at Madrid on 13 September 1983. The Protocol was opened for signature to all Contracting Parties to the Statutes at Vienna, from 4 to 12 April 1984, and shall remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, until the entry into force of the Statutes.

The Protocol, for all legal and practical purposes, completes the Statutes and is therefore considered as an integral part thereto and shall become effective upon the entry into force of the Statutes in accordance with article 21 thereof.

Participant	*Signature ad referendum*	*Definitive signature, confirmation of signature (C)*
Afghanistan		15 Aug 1984
Algeria		4 Nov 1985
Argentina		4 Apr 1984
Bhutan		31 May 1984
Brazil	5 May 1986	9 Mar 1990 *C*
Bulgaria		4 Apr 1984
Chile		4 Apr 1984
Colombia		14 Sep 1987
Costa Rica	14 Aug 1990	
Croatia		26 Aug 1993
Cuba		4 Apr 1984
Ecuador	17 Jul 1990	
Egypt	2 Jan 1986	13 Jan 1987 *C*
Greece		4 Apr 1984
Hungary		14 Sep 1987
India		4 Apr 1984
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Apr 1988	
Iraq		23 Oct 1984
Italy		4 Apr 1984
Mauritius		19 Sep 1984
Mexico	25 Oct 1984	21 Jan 1988 *C*
Morocco		19 Oct 1984
Nigeria		2 May 1985
Panama		11 Dec 1984
Peru		4 Apr 1984
Poland	1 Aug 1990	
Russian Federation		18 Sep 1992
Senegal		29 Jun 1984
Sri Lanka		1 Oct 1993
Sudan		29 Jan 1993
Trinidad and Tobago		8 Feb 1985
Tunisia		5 Aug 1992
Turkey		22 Sep 1987
Venezuela		4 Apr 1984
Viet Nam		17 Sep 1984
Yugoslavia		4 Apr 1984

NOTES:

[1] The Protocol shall become effective upon the entry into force of the Statutes in accordance with article 21 thereof.

CHAPTER XV. DECLARATION OF DEATH OF MISSING PERSONS

1. Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons

Established and opened for accession on 6 April 1950 by the United Nations Conference on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 January 1952, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 24 January 1952, No. 1610.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119, p. 99.
STATUS: Parties: 6.
TERMINATION: 24 January 1972, in accordance with article 1 of the Protocol of 15 January 1967 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 808, p. 296.)

Note: The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 369 (IV)[1] of 3 December 1949 and met at Lake Success, New York, from 15 March to 6 April 1950. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119, p. 99.

In accordance with article 17 (1), the Convention was to cease to have effect on 23 January 1957. However, the Convention remained in force until 24 January 1972 as a result of the adoption of the protocols of 16 January 1957 and 15 January 1967 extending it (see chapters XV.2 and XV.3).

Participant	*Accession*	*Participant*	*Accession*
Belgium[2]	22 Jul 1953	Israel	7 May 1952
China[3]		Italy	25 Mar 1958
Germany[4]	30 Jan 1956	Pakistan	6 Dec 1955
Guatemala	25 Dec 1951		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession.)

GERMANY[4]

"The Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons also applies to Land Berlin.

"Moreover, the Permanent Observer on instructions from his government has the honour to communicate to the Secretary-General that in accordance with article 2, sub-paragraph 3, of the Convention the Amtsgericht Schöneberg in Berlin-Schöneberg has been designated as the tribunal which shall be exclusively competent to receive applications and to issue declarations of death which otherwise would have come within the competence of the tribunals specified in article 2, sub-paragraph 2. This transfer of competence to the Amtsgericht Schöneberg also applies to Land Berlin.

"Furthermore, the Permanent Observer on instructions from his government has the honour to notify the Secretary-General that in accordance with article 1, sub-paragraph 2, the Federal Government has extended the application of the Convention to persons who subsequent to 1945 disappeared under circumstances similar to those specified in its article 1, sub-paragraph 1. This extension of the application of the Convention likewise applies to Land Berlin."

ISRAEL

"Having regard to the provisions of the domestic law of Israel according to which matters of marriage are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the established Religious Courts, the effect to be given to declarations of death, whether issued pursuant to the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons or satisfying the conditions and requirements contained in articles 1, 2 and 3 of the said Convention, and valid by virtue of article 6 thereof, as regards the dissolution of marriages, will depend upon the extent to which the appropriate Religious Court exercising jurisdiction in a given case will be able to recognize the same in accordance with its own religious law."

PAKISTAN

11 April 1956

The Government of Pakistan extends the application of the Convention to persons having disappeared subsequent to 1945.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session* (A/1251 & Corr.1 and 2), p. 65.

[2] With a declaration to the effect that the Government of Belgium does not assume any obligations as regards the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

[3] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 20 December 1950. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

2. Protocol for extending the period of validity of the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons

Opened for accession at New York on 16 January 1957

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 January 1957, in accordance with article III *(a)*.
REGISTRATION: 22 January 1957, No. 1610.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 258, p. 392.
STATUS: Parties: 6.
TERMINATION of the Convention of 6 April 1950 (see chapter XV.1).

Participant	*Accession*	*Participant*	*Accession*
Cambodia	30 Jul 1957	Israel	22 Jan 1957
China[1]		Italy	25 Mar 1958
Germany[2,3]	23 Oct 1958	Pakistan	21 Jan 1957
Guatemala	8 Aug 1961		

NOTES:

[1] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 9 September 1957. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned accession, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Hungary, India, Poland and Yugoslavia, on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. For the nature of these communications, see note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] A note accompanying the instrument of accession contains the following statement:

"The Protocol for extending the period of validity of the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons also applies to Land Berlin.

"Moreover, the Permanent Observer, on instructions from his Government, has the honour to communicate to the Secretary-General that, in accordance with article 2, sub-paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Amtsgericht Schöneberg in Berlin-Schöneberg has been designated as the tribunal which shall be exclusively competent to receive applications and to issue declarations of death which otherwise would have come within the competence of the tribunals specified in article 2, sub-paragraph 2. This transfer of competence of the Amtsgericht Schöneberg also applies to Land Berlin.

"Furthermore, the Permanent Observer, on instructions from his Government, has the honour to notify the Secretary-General that, in accordance with article 1, sub-paragraph 2 the Federal Government has extended the application of the Convention to persons who subsequent to 1945 disappeared under circumstances similar to those specified in its article 1, sub-paragraph 1. This extension of the application of the Protocol likewise applies to Land Berlin."

See also note 2 above.

3. Protocol for the further extension of the period of validity of the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons

Opened for accession at New York on 15 January 1967

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 January 1967, in accordance with article 3.
REGISTRATION: 24 January 1967, No. 1610.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 588, p. 290.
STATUS: Parties: 5.
TERMINATION of the Convention of 6 April 1950 (see chapter XV.1).

Note: The draft protocol was drawn up by the Secretary-General in accordance with a desire expressed by several States Parties to the Convention of 6 April 1950.

Participant	*Accession*	*Participant*	*Accession*
Cambodia	11 Aug 1967	Israel	15 Sep 1967
China[1]		Italy	24 Jan 1967
Guatemala	24 Jan 1967	Pakistan	24 Jan 1967

NOTES:

[1] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 23 January 1967. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

CHAPTER XVI. STATUS OF WOMEN[1]

1. CONVENTION ON THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN

Opened for signature at New York on 31 March 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 July 1954, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 7 July 1954, No. 2613.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 135.
STATUS: Signatories: 47. Parties: 108.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature pursuant to resolution 640 (VII),[2] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 December 1952.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		16 Nov 1966 *a*
Albania		12 May 1955 *a*
Angola		17 Sep 1986 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina	31 Mar 1953	27 Feb 1961
Australia		10 Dec 1974 *a*
Austria	19 Oct 1959	18 Apr 1969
Bahamas		16 Aug 1977 *d*
Barbados		12 Jan 1973 *a*
Belarus	31 Mar 1953	11 Aug 1954
Belgium		20 May 1964 *a*
Bolivia	9 Apr 1953	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	20 May 1953	13 Aug 1963
Bulgaria		17 Mar 1954 *a*
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 *a*
Canada		30 Jan 1957 *a*
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 *d*
Chile	31 Mar 1953	18 Oct 1967
China[3]		
Colombia		5 Aug 1986 *a*
Congo		15 Oct 1962 *d*
Costa Rica	31 Mar 1953	25 Jul 1967
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	31 Mar 1953	8 Apr 1954
Cyprus	10 Sep 1968	12 Nov 1968
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	29 Oct 1953	7 Jul 1954
Dominican Republic	31 Mar 1953	11 Dec 1953
Ecuador	31 Mar 1953	23 Apr 1954
Egypt		8 Sep 1981 *a*
El Salvador	24 Jun 1953	
Ethiopia	31 Mar 1953	21 Jan 1969
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		6 Oct 1958 *a*
France	31 Mar 1953	22 Apr 1957
Gabon	19 Apr 1967	19 Apr 1967
Germany[5, 6]		4 Nov 1970 *a*
Ghana		28 Dec 1965 *a*
Greece	1 Apr 1953	29 Dec 1953
Guatemala	31 Mar 1953	7 Oct 1959
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	24 Jan 1978
Haiti	23 Jul 1957	12 Feb 1958
Hungary	2 Sep 1954	20 Jan 1955
Iceland	25 Nov 1953	30 Jun 1954
India	29 Apr 1953	1 Nov 1961
Indonesia	31 Mar 1953	16 Dec 1958
Ireland		14 Nov 1968 *a*
Israel	14 Apr 1953	6 Jul 1954
Italy		6 Mar 1968 *a*
Jamaica		14 Aug 1966 *a*
Japan	1 Apr 1955	13 Jul 1955
Jordan		1 Jul 1992 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		28 Jan 1969 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon	24 Feb 1954	5 Jun 1956
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *a*
Liberia	9 Dec 1953	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Luxembourg	4 Jun 1969	1 Nov 1976
Madagascar		12 Feb 1964 *a*
Malawi		29 Jun 1966 *a*
Mali		16 Jul 1974 *a*
Malta		9 Jul 1968 *a*
Mauritania		4 May 1976 *a*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	31 Mar 1953	23 Mar 1981
Mongolia		18 Aug 1965 *a*
Morocco		22 Nov 1976 *a*
Myanmar	14 Sep 1954	
Nepal		26 Apr 1966 *a*
Netherlands	8 Aug 1968	30 Jul 1971
New Zealand		22 May 1968 *a*
Nicaragua		17 Jan 1957 *a*
Niger		7 Dec 1964 *d*
Nigeria	11 Jul 1980	17 Nov 1980
Norway	18 Sep 1953	24 Aug 1956
Pakistan	18 May 1954	7 Dec 1954
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 *a*
Paraguay	16 Nov 1953	22 Feb 1990
Peru		1 Jul 1975 *a*
Philippines	23 Sep 1953	12 Sep 1957
Poland	31 Mar 1953	11 Aug 1954
Republic of Korea		23 Jun 1959 *a*
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Romania	27 Apr 1954	6 Aug 1954
Russian Federation	31 Mar 1953	3 May 1954
Senegal		2 May 1963 *d*
Sierra Leone		25 Jul 1962 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands[7]		3 Sep 1981 *a*
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	
Spain		14 Jan 1974 *a*
Swaziland		20 Jul 1970 *a*
Sweden	6 Oct 1953	31 Mar 1954
Thailand	5 Mar 1954	30 Nov 1954
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		24 Jun 1966 *a*
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 *a*
Turkey	12 Jan 1954	26 Jan 1960
Uganda		21 Jun 1995 *a*
Ukraine	31 Mar 1953	15 Nov 1954
United Kingdom		24 Feb 1967 *a*
United Republic of Tanzania		19 Jun 1975 *a*
United States of America		8 Apr 1976 *a*
Uruguay	26 May 1953	
Venezuela		31 May 1983 *a*
Yemen[8]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	31 Mar 1953	23 Jun 1954
Zaire		12 Oct 1977 *a*
Zambia		4 Feb 1972 *a*
Zimbabwe		5 Jun 1995 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA

1. *As regards Article VII:* The People's Republic of Albania declares its disagreement with the last sentence of article VII and considers that the juridical effect of a reservation is to make the Convention operative as between the State making the reservation and all other States parties to the Convention, with the exception only of that part thereof to which the reservation relates.

2. *As regards Article IX:* The People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article IX which provides that disputes between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and declares that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

"The Government of Antigua and Barbuda reserves from the application of this Convention all matters relating to the recruitment to, and conditions of service in, the armed forces of Antigua and Barbuda."

ARGENTINA

The Argentine Government reserves the right not to submit to the procedure set out in this article [article IX] any dispute which is directly connected with territories which fall within Argentine sovereignty.

AUSTRALIA

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that the accession by Australia shall be subject to the reservation that article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards recruitment to and conditions of service in the Defence Forces.

"The Government of Australia furthermore declares that the Convention shall not extend to Papua New Guinea."

AUSTRIA

"In ratifying the Convention on the Political Rights of Women the Federal President of the Republic of Austria declares, that Austria reserves its right to apply the provision of article III to this Convention, as far as service in the armed forces is concerned, within the limits established by national legislation."

BELARUS[9]

As regards article VII:

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".]

BELGIUM[10]

In exercise of the option available to each State under article VII of the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, the Government of Belgium declares that it submits the following reservations to article III of the Convention:

1. The Constitution reserves the exercise of royal powers to men.

As regards the exercise of the functions of regency, article III of the Convention shall not prevent the application of the constitutional rules as interpreted by the Belgian State.

BULGARIA[11]

As regards article VII:

[Same declaration and reservation as the ones reproduced under "Albania".]

CANADA

"Inasmuch as under the Canadian constitutional system legislative jurisdiction in respect of political rights is divided between the provinces and the Federal Government, the Government of Canada is obliged, in acceding to this Convention, to make a reservation in respect of rights within the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces."

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK

Subject to a reservation with respect to article III of the Convention, in so far as it relates to the right of women to hold military appointments or to act as heads of recruitment services or to serve on recruitment boards.

ECUADOR

"The Government of Ecuador signs this Convention subject to a reservation with respect to the last phrase in article I, 'without any discrimination', since article 22 of the Political Constitution

of the Republic specifies that "a vote in popular elections is obligatory for a man and optional for a woman".

FIJI

"The reservations of the United Kingdom 1 (a), (b), (d) and (f) are affirmed and are redrafted as more suitable to the situation of Fiji in the following terms:

"Article III is accepted subject to reservations, pending notification of withdrawal of any case, insofar as it relates to:

"(a) succession to the Crown;

"(b) certain offices primarily of a ceremonial nature;

"(d) recruitment to and conditions of service in the armed forces;

"(f) the employment of married women in the civil service

"All other reservations made by the United Kingdom are withdrawn."

FINLAND

As regards Article III: "A decree may be issued to the effect that only men or women can be appointed to certain functions, which because of their nature, can be properly discharged either only by men or by women."

FRANCE[12]

GERMANY[5]

"The Federal Republic of Germany accedes to the Convention with the reservation that article III of the Convention does not apply to service in the armed forces."

GUATEMALA

1. Articles I, II and III shall apply only to female citizens of Guatemala in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the Republic.

2. In order to satisfy constitutional requirements, article IX shall be interpreted subject to the provisions of article 149, paragraph 3 (b) of the Constitution of the Republic.

HUNGARY[13]

As regards article VII:

[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".]

INDIA

"Article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards recruitment to, and conditions of service in any of the Armed Forces of India or the Forces charged with the maintenance of public order in India."

INDONESIA

"The last sentence of article VII and the whole article IX do not apply to Indonesia."

IRELAND

"Article III is accepted subject to reservation in so far as it relates to

"(a) the employment of married women in the public service;

"(b) the unequal remuneration of women in certain positions in the public service,

"and subject to the following declarations:

"(1) that the exclusion of women from positions of employment for which by objective standards or for physical reasons they are not suitable is not regarded as discriminatory;

"(2) that the fact that jury service is not at present obligatory for women is not regarded as discriminatory."

ITALY

"In acceding to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, done at New York on 31 March 1953, the Italian Government declares that it reserves its rights to apply the provisions of Art. III as far as service in the armed forces and in special armed corps is concerned within the limits established by national legislation."

LESOTHO

"Article III is accepted subject to reservation, pending notification of withdrawal in any case, so far as it relates to: Matters regulated by Basotho Law and Custom."

MALTA

"In acceding to this Convention, the Government of Malta hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by article III in so far as that article applies to conditions of service in the Public Service and to Jury Service."

MAURITIUS

"The Government of Mauritius hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by article III of the Convention in so far as that Article applies to recruitment to and conditions of service in the armed forces or to jury service."

MEXICO

Declaration:

"It is expressly understood that the Government of Mexico will not deposit its instrument of ratification pending the entry into force of the amendment to the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States which is now under consideration, providing that citizenship rights shall be granted to Mexican women."

MONGOLIA[14]

"To articles IV and V:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic declares its disagreement with paragraph 1 of article IV and paragraph 1 of article V and considers that the present Convention should be open to all States for signature or accession.

MOROCCO

The consent of all the parties concerned is required for the referral of any dispute to the International Court of Justice.

NEPAL

As regards article IX of the Convention: "A dispute shall be referred for decision to the International Court of Justice only at the request of all the parties to the dispute."

NETHERLANDS[15]

NEW ZEALAND

"Subject to a reservation with respect to Article III of the Convention, in so far as it relates to recruitment and conditions of service in the armed forces of New Zealand."

PAKISTAN

"Article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards recruitment to and conditions of services charged with the maintenance of public order or unsuited to women because of the hazards involved."

POLAND

As regards article VII and IX:
[Same declaration and reservation as the ones reproduced under "Albania".]

ROMANIA

As regards article VII and IX:
[Same declaration and reservation as the ones reproduced under "Albania".]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[9]

As regards article VII:
[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".]

SIERRA LEONE

"In acceding to this Convention, the Government of Sierra Leone hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by article III in so far as that article applies to recruitment to and conditions of service in the Armed Forces or to jury service."

SLOVAKIA[4]

SOLOMON ISLANDS

10 May 1982

In relation to the succession:
The Government of Solomon Islands declared that Solomon Islands maintains the reservations entered by the United Kingdom save in so far as the same cannot apply to Solomon Islands.

SPAIN

Articles I and III of the Convention shall be interpreted without prejudice to the provisions which in current Spanish legislation define the status of head of family.

Articles II and III shall be interpreted without prejudice to the norms relating to the office of Head of State contained in the Spanish Fundamental Laws.

Article III shall be interpreted without prejudice to the fact that certain functions, which by their nature can be exercised satisfactorily only by men or only by women, shall be exercised exclusively by men or by women, as appropriate, in accordance with Spanish legislation.

SWAZILAND

"(a) Article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards remuneration for women in certain posts in the Civil Service of the Kingdom of Swaziland;

"(b) The Convention shall have no application to matters which are regulated by Swaziland Law and Custom in accordance with Section 62 (2) of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Swaziland. [(a) The office of Nggwenyama; (b) the office of Ndlovukazi (the Queen Mother); (c) the authorization of a person to perform the functions of Regent for the purposes of section 30 of this Constitution; (d) the appointment, revocation of appointment and suspension of Chiefs; (e) the composition of the Swazi National Council, the appointment and revocation of appointment of members of the Council, and the procedure of the Council; (f) the Ncwala Ceremony; (g) the Libutfo (regimental) system.]

TUNISIA

[Article IX] For any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in every case.

UKRAINE[9]

As regards article VII:
[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[16]

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accedes to the Convention with the following reservations submitted in accordance with article VII:

"(1) Article III is accepted subject to reservations, pending notification of withdrawal in any case, in so far as it relates to:

"(a) succession to the Crown;

"(b) certain offices primarily of a ceremonial nature;

"(c) the function of sitting and voting in the House of Lords pertaining to holders of hereditary peerages and holders of certain offices in the Church of England;

"(d) recruitment to and conditions of service in the armed forces;

"(e) jury service in Grenada, [...] as well as in the Kingdom of Tonga;

"(f) ...

"(g) remuneration for women in the Civil Service of [...] Hong Kong, as well as of the Protectorate of Swaziland;

"(h) ...

"(i) in the State of Brunei, the exercise of the royal powers, jury service or its equivalent and the holding of certain offices governed by Islamic Law.

"(2) The United Kingdom reserves the right to postpone the application of this Convention in respect of women living in the Colony of Aden, having regard to the local customs and traditions. Further, the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply this Convention to Rhodesia unless and until the United Kingdom informs the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it is in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

VENEZUELA

Reservation with regard to article IX:
[Venezuela] does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention.

YEMEN[8]

(a) The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that it does not accept the last sentence of article VII and considers that the juridical effect of a reservation is to make the Convention operative as between the State making the reservation and all other States parties to the Convention with the exception only of that part thereof to which the reservation relates.

(b) The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by the text of article IX, which provides that disputes between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may, at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CANADA

Objection to the reservations made in respect of articles VII and IX by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

CHINA[17]

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:
[Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".]

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in respect of articles VII and IX.

ETHIOPIA

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:
[Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".]

ISRAEL

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:
[Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".]

NORWAY

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Argentina in respect of article VII.

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala in respect of articles I, II and III.

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:
[Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".]

PAKISTAN[12]

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Argentina in respect of article VII.

Objection to the reservation made by France and recorded in the procès-verbal of signature of the Convention.

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala in respect of articles I, II and III.

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:
[Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".]

PHILIPPINES

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Albania in respect of articles VII and IX.

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Romania in respect of articles VII and IX.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Mongolia in respect of articles IV, paragraph 1, and V, paragraph 1.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SWEDEN

Objection to reservations:
[Same objections as the ones listed under "Norway".]

YUGOSLAVIA

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala, in respect of articles I, II and III, as these reservations "are not in accordance with the principles contained in Article I of the Charter of the United Nations and with the aims of the Convention".

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[18]	30 Jul 1971	Suriname
United Kingdom[19]	24 Feb 1967	Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, State of Brunei, Protectorate of Swaziland, Kingdom of Tonga

NOTES:

[1] For other multilateral treaties concerning the status of women, see chapters IV and VII.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 20* (A/2361), p. 27.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 9 June 1953 and 21 December 1953, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned ratification, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Denmark, Hungary, India, Norway, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. For the nature of these communications, see note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 March 1953 and 6 April 1995, respectively, with reservations, one of which regarding article IX of the Convention, had been withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the said reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 157. Subsequently, on 10 June 1974, the Government of Czechoslovakia formulated an objection to the reservation made by Spain. For the text of the objection, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 940, p. 340. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with reservations and a declaration on 27 March 1973. For the text of the reservations and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 861, p. 203. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a letter accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that "the said

Convention shall also apply to Land Berlin with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications were addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Those communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred to in the second paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, on 27 December 1973, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the German Democratic Republic a communication identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one reproduced in the fourth paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3.

Finally, communications were received on the same subject from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (on 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany (on 15 July 1974): those communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in the fifth and sixth paragraphs of footnote 4 in chapter III.3.

See also note 5 above.

[7] In a communication received on 10 May 1982, the Government of Solomon Islands declared that Solomon Islands maintains the reservations entered by the United Kingdom save in so far as the same cannot apply to Solomon Islands.

[8] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[9] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 and 21 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, pp. 170, 154 and 169, respectively.

[10] By a notification received by the Secretary-General on 19 June 1978, the Government of Belgium withdrew reservation No. 2 relating to article III of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 353.

[11] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 136.

[12] In a communication received on 26 November 1960, the Government of France gave notice of the withdrawal of the reservation made in the procès-verbal of signature of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 159.

[13] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article IX made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 202, p. 382.

[14] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations to articles VI and IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 543, p. 362.

[15] On 17 December 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands a notification of withdrawal of its reservation (the reservation concerned the succession to the Crown) relating to article III of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 790, p. 130.

[16] The Secretary–General received the following communciations from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the dates indicated hereinafter:

(12 February 1968):

Withdrawal of the reservation contained in sub–paragraph (e), in respect of the Bahamas, as formulated upon accession.

(15 October 1974):

Withdrawal of the reservation contained in sub-paragraph *(f)* (employment of married women in Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service and in the Civil Service) in respect of the territories where the reservation was still applicable, that is to say: Northern Ireland, Antigua, Hong Kong and St. Lucia. The same reservation had been withdrawn in respect of St. Vincent by a notification received on 24 November 1967.

On that same date, withdrawal of the reservation contained in sub-paragraph *(e)* in respect of the Seychelles, to which the said reservation applied originally.

(4 January 1995):

Withdrawal of the reservations contained in sub–paragraph *(e)* in respect of the Isle of Man and Montserrat; in sub–paragraph *(g)* in respect of Gibraltar; and sub–paragraph *(h)* in respect of Bailiff in Guernsey.

[17] Various communications were received by the Secretary-General on behalf of the Republic of China, objecting to the reservations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In this connection, see note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[18] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[19] For the reservations to article III of the Convention in its application to certain territories, and for the reservations regarding the application of the Convention to the Colony of Aden and to Rhodesia, see "United Kingdom" under *"Declarations and Reservations"* in this chapter.

2. Convention on the Nationality of Married Women

Done at New York on 20 February 1957

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 August 1958, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 11 August 1958, No. 4468.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 309, p. 65.
STATUS: Signatories: 27. Parties: 64.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature pursuant to resolution 1040 (XI)[1] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 29 January 1957.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Albania		27 Jul 1960 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina		10 Oct 1963 *a*
Armenia		18 May 1994 *a*
Australia		14 Mar 1961 *a*
Austria		19 Jan 1968 *a*
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 *d*
Barbados		26 Oct 1979 *a*
Belarus	7 Oct 1957	23 Dec 1958
Belgium	15 May 1972	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	26 Jul 1966	4 Dec 1968
Bulgaria		22 Jun 1960 *a*
Canada	20 Feb 1957	21 Oct 1959
Chile	18 Mar 1957	
China[2]		
Colombia	20 Feb 1957	
Cuba	20 Feb 1957	5 Dec 1957
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus		26 Apr 1971 *d*
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	20 Feb 1957	22 Jun 1959
Dominican Republic	20 Feb 1957	10 Oct 1957
Ecuador	16 Jan 1958	29 Mar 1960
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		15 May 1968 *a*
Germany[4,5]		7 Feb 1974 *a*
Ghana		15 Aug 1966 *a*
Guatemala	20 Feb 1957	13 Jul 1960
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	
Hungary	5 Dec 1957	3 Dec 1959
Iceland		18 Oct 1977 *a*
India	15 May 1957	
Ireland	24 Sep 1957	25 Nov 1957
Israel	12 Mar 1957	7 Jun 1957
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 *d*
Jordan		1 Jul 1992 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Luxembourg	11 Sep 1975	22 Jul 1977
Malawi		8 Sep 1966 *a*
Malaysia		24 Feb 1959 *a*
Mali		2 Feb 1973 *a*
Malta		7 Jun 1967 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico		4 Apr 1979 *a*
Netherlands[6]		[8 Aug 1966 *a*]
New Zealand	7 Jul 1958	17 Dec 1958
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1986 *a*
Norway	9 Sep 1957	20 May 1958
Pakistan	10 Apr 1958	
Poland		3 Jul 1959 *a*
Portugal	21 Feb 1957	
Romania		2 Dec 1960 *a*
Russian Federation	6 Sep 1957	17 Sep 1958
Saint Lucia		14 Oct 1991 *d*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		18 Mar 1966 *d*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	
Sri Lanka		30 May 1958 *a*
Swaziland		18 Sep 1970 *a*
Sweden	6 May 1957	13 May 1958
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		20 Apr 1994 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 *a*
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 *a*
Ukraine	15 Oct 1957	3 Dec 1958
United Kingdom[7]	[20 Feb 1957]	[28 Aug 1957]
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
Uruguay	20 Feb 1957	
Venezuela		31 May 1983 *a*
Yugoslavia	27 Mar 1957	13 Mar 1959
Zambia		22 Jan 1975 *d*

Declaration and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Article 7: The Argentine Government expressly reserves the rights of the Republic with respect to the Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands), the South Sandwich Islands and the lands included within the Argentine Antarctic Sector, declaring that they do not constitute a colony or possession of any nation but are part of Argentine territory and lie within its dominion and sovereignty.

Article 10: The Argentine Government reserves the right not to submit disputes directly or indirectly linked with the territories

under Argentine sovereignty to the procedure indicated in this article.

BRAZIL

"Reservation is made concerning application of article 10."

CHILE

The Government of Chile makes a reservation with regard to article 10, in the sense that it does not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the purpose of the settlement of disputes which may arise between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention.

GUATEMALA

Article 10 of the said Convention shall, by reason of constitutional requirements, be applied without prejudice to article 149, paragraph 3 (b) of the Constitution of the Republic.

INDIA

Reservation as to Article 10:

"Any dispute which may arise between any two or more contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiations shall with the consent of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the parties agree to another mode of settlement."

TUNISIA

[Article 10] For any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice, the agreement all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in every case.

URUGUAY

On behalf of Uruguay we hereby make a reservation to the provisions of article 3 which has a bearing on the application of the Convention. The Constitution of Uruguay does not authorize the granting of nationality to an alien unless he is the child of a Uruguayan father or mother, in which case he may become a natural citizen. This case apart, an alien who fulfils the constitutionality and legal conditions may be granted only legal citizenship, and not nationality.

VENEZUELA

[See chapter XVI.1.]

Territorial application

Declarations made under paragraph 1 of article 7 of the Convention.

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	14 Mar 196	All the non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible
Netherlands[6]	8 Aug 1966	Netherlands Antilles, Surinam
New Zealand	17 Dec 1958	The Cook Islands (including Niue), the Tokelau Islands, and the Trust Territory of Western Samoa
United Kingdom[7]	28 Aug 1957	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man

Notifications under paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom[7]	18 Mar 1958	Aden, the Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, British Somaliland, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya, the Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis), the British Virgin Islands, Malta, Mauritius, North Borneo, St. Helena, Sarawak, the Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar
	19 May 1958	The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	3 Nov 1960	Tonga
	1 Oct 1962	Brunei

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/3572), p. 18.

[2] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 20 February 1957 and 22 September 1958, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned ratification, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of India, Poland, and the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and of China, on the other hand. For the nature of these communications, see note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 3 September 1957 and 5 April 1962, respectively. See also note 5 below and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with a reservation and a declaration on 27 December 1973. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 76. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] With the following declaration:

"The said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

In this respect, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (24 May 1974):

The Soviet Government does not object to the extension to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women provided that this is done in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and that matters of security and status shall not thereby be affected. In this connexion, the Soviet Government would like to draw attention to the fact that the Western Sectors of Berlin are not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany, that the permanent residents of the Western Sectors of Berlin are not nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany and that representation abroad of the interests of the Western Sectors of Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany is permissible only to the extent specified in the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 (annex IV).

Czechoslovakia (30 May 1974):

"The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic declares, in accordance with the Four-Power Agreement of September 3, 1971, that West Berlin is not a part of the Federal Republic of Germany and neither can be administered by it.

"The declaration of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany contained in its instrument of accession to the above-mentioned Convention, that the validity of the Convention shall also apply to West Berlin is contradictory to the Four-Power Agreement stipulating that the agreements concerning the security and the statute of West Berlin cannot be expanded by the Federal Republic of Germany to West Berlin.

"Therefore the declaration of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany cannot have any legal effect."

German Democratic Republic (16 July 1974):

With regard to the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) and in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic, the German Democratic Republic declares that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not to be governed by it. The declaration by the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that this Convention will also apply to Berlin (West) is at variance with the Quadripartite Agreement, which states that treaties affecting matters of security and of the status of Berlin (West) may not be applied to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany.

Ukrainian SSR (6 August 1974):

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic refrains from raising an objection to the extension to Berlin (West) of the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women only on the understanding that this action is being taken in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and will not affect matters of security and status. In this connexion, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic wishes to direct attention to the fact that the Western Sectors of Berlin are not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany, permanent residents of Berlin (West) are not nationals of the Federal Republic of Germany and representation abroad of the interests of Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany is permitted only to the extent defined by the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 (annex IV).

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (8 July 1975—in relation to the communications by Czechoslovakia and by the German Democratic Republic):

"The communications mentioned in the Notes listed above refer to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. This Agreement was concluded in Berlin between the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. The Governments sending these communications are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement and are therefore not competent to make authoritative comments on its provisions.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to bring the following to the attention of the States Parties to the instruments referred to in the above-mentioned communications. When authorising the extension of these instruments to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers, acting in the exercise of their supreme authority, ensured in accordance with established procedures that those instruments are applied in the Western Sectors of Berlin in such a way as not to affect matters of security and status.

"Accordingly, the application of these instruments to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications of a similar nature by States which are not signatories to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (19 September 1975—in relation to the communication by Czechoslovakia and by the German Democratic Republic):

[Declaration identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, *to the one of the same date, reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.]*

See also note 4 above.

[6] See note 8 in chapter I.1. On 16 January 1992, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Netherlands a notification of denunciation (for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba). In accordance with article 9 (1), the denunciation will take effect one year after the date of receipt of the said notification, i.e., on 16 January 1993.

[7] On 24 December 1981, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a notification of denunciation of the said Convention:

The notification specifies that the denunciation is effected on behalf of United Kingdom of Great Britain and of the following territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible and to which the Convention was extended in accordance with the provisions of article 7: Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Saint Christopher-Nevis, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, State of Brunei, United Kingdom Sovereign Bases Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the Island of Cyprus.

In accordance with the provisions of article 9 (2) of the Convention, the denunciation will take effect one year after the date of receipt of the said notification, that is to say, on 24 December 1982.

3. Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages

Opened for signature at New York on 10 December 1962

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 December 1964, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 23 December 1964, No. 7525.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 521, p. 231.
STATUS: Signatories: 17. Parties: 45.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature pursuant to resolution 1763 (XVII),[1] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 7 November 1962.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina		26 Feb 1970 *a*
Austria		1 Oct 1969 *a*
Barbados		1 Oct 1979 *a*
Benin		19 Oct 1965 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil		11 Feb 1970 *a*
Burkina Faso		8 Dec 1964 *a*
Chile	10 Dec 1962	
China[2]		
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	17 Oct 1963	20 Aug 1965
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	31 Oct 1963	8 Sep 1964
Dominican Republic		8 Oct 1964 *a*
Fiji		19 Jul 1971 *d*
Finland		18 Aug 1964 *a*
France	10 Dec 1962	
Germany[4,5]		9 Jul 1969 *a*
Greece	3 Jan 1963	
Guatemala		18 Jan 1983 *a*
Guinea	10 Dec 1962	24 Jan 1978
Hungary		5 Nov 1975 *a*
Iceland		18 Oct 1977 *a*
Israel	10 Dec 1962	
Italy	20 Dec 1963	
Jordan		1 Jul 1992 *a*
Mali		19 Aug 1964 *a*
Mexico		22 Feb 1983 *a*
Mongolia		6 Jun 1991 *a*
Netherlands	10 Dec 1962	2 Jul 1965
New Zealand	23 Dec 1963	12 Jun 1964
Niger		1 Dec 1964 *a*
Norway		10 Sep 1964 *a*
Philippines	5 Feb 1963	21 Jan 1965
Poland	17 Dec 1962	8 Jan 1965
Romania	27 Dec 1963	21 Jan 1993
Samoa		24 Aug 1964 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
South Africa		29 Jan 1993 *a*
Spain		15 Apr 1969 *a*
Sri Lanka	12 Dec 1962	
Sweden	10 Dec 1962	16 Jun 1964
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		2 Oct 1969 *a*
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 *a*
United Kingdom		9 Jul 1970 *a*
United States of America	10 Dec 1962	
Venezuela		31 May 1983 *a*
Yemen[6]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	10 Dec 1962	19 Jun 1964
Zimbabwe		23 Nov 1994 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

DENMARK

"With the reservation that article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Kingdom of Denmark."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Dominican Republic wishes the laws of the Dominican Republic to continue to have precedence in respect of the possibility, provided for in article 1, paragraph 2, of entering into a civil marriage by means of a proxy or procuration. Consequently, it can accept the said provisions only with reservations.

FIJI

"The Government of Fiji withdraws the reservation, and declarations in respect of the law of Scotland and in respect of Southern Rhodesia, made on 9th July, 1970 by Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, and affirms that the Government of Fiji declares it to be their understanding that:

"(a) paragraph 1 of Article 1, and the second sentence of Article 2, of the Convention are concerned with the entry into marriage under the laws of a State Party and not with the recognition under the laws of one State or territory of the validity of marriages contracted under the laws of another State or territory; and

"(b) paragraph 2 of Article 1 does not require legislative provision to be made where no such legislation already exists, for marriages to be contracted in the absence of one of the parties."

FINLAND

"With the reservation that article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Republic of Finland."

GREECE

With reservation to article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

With regard to article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention, Guatemala declares that since its legislation, in respect of its nationals, does not call for the requirements relating to publicity of the marriage and the presence of witnesses for it to be solemnized, it does not consider itself obliged to comply with those requirements where the parties are Guatemalans.

HUNGARY

In acceding to the Convention, the Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider paragraph 2 of article 1 of the Convention as binding the Hungarian People's Republic to grant, under the terms thereof, permit of marriage when one of the intending spouses is not present.

ICELAND

"Article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Republic of Iceland."

NETHERLANDS

In signing the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, [the Government of the Netherlands] hereby declare that, in view of the equality which exists, from the standpoint of public law, between the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the Government of the Kingdom reserves the right to ratify the Convention in respect of only one or two parts of the Kingdom and to declare at a later date, by written notification to the Secretary-General, that the Convention is to apply also to the other part or parts of the Kingdom.

NORWAY

"With the reservation that article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Kingdom of Norway."

PHILIPPINES

"The Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages was adopted for the purpose, among other things, of insuring to all persons complete freedom in the choice of a spouse. The first paragraph of Article 1 of the Convention requires that the full and free consent of both parties shall be expressed in the presence of the competent authority and of witnesses.

"Considering the provisions of its Civil Code, the Philippines, in ratifying this Convention interprets the second paragraph of Article 1 (which authorizes, in exceptional cases, the solemnization of marriage by proxy) as not imposing upon the Philippines the obligation to allow within its territory the celebration of proxy marriages or marriages of the kind contemplated in that paragraph, where such manner of marriage is not authorized by the laws of the Philippines. Rather, the solemnization within Philippine territory of a marriage in the absence of one of the parties under the conditions stated in said paragraph will be permitted only if so allowed by Philippine law."

ROMANIA

Reservation:

Romania will not apply the provisions of article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, regarding the celebration of marriage in the absence of one of the future spouses.

SWEDEN

With reservation to article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[8]

"(a) ...

"(b) It is the understanding of the Government of the United Kingdom that paragraph (1) of article 1 and the second sentence of article 2, of the Convention are concerned with entry into marriage under the laws of a State Party and not with the recognition under the laws of one State or territory of the validity of marriages contracted under the laws of another State or territory; nor is paragraph (1) of article 1 applicable to marriages by cohabitation with habit and repute under the law of Scotland;

"(c) Paragraph (2) of article 1 does not require legislative provision to be made, where no such legislation already exists, for marriages to be contracted in the absence of one of the parties;

"(d) The provisions of the Convention shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until the Government of the United Kingdom inform the Secretary-General that they are in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"With the understanding that legislation in force in the various States of the United States of America is in conformity with this Convention and that action by the United States of America with respect to this Convention does not constitute acceptance of the provisions of article 8 as a precedent for any subsequent instruments."

VENEZUELA

[See chapter XVI.1.]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[7]	2 Jul 1965	Netherlands Antilles, Surinam
United Kingdom[8]	9 Jul 1970	Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent), State of Brunei, Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom
	15 Oct 1974	Montserrat

NOTE:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/5217), p. 28.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 4 April 1963. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 8 October 1963 and 5 March 1965, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a note accompanying the instrument of accession, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention "shall also apply to *Land Berlin* with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Those communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred to in the second paragraph of note 4 in chapter III.3.

In this respect, the Government of the German Democratic Republic, upon accession to the Convention on 16 July 1974, made a declaration which is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one reproduced in the fourth paragraph of note 3 in chapter III.3.

In reference to that declaration, communications were received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (8 July 1975) and from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (19 September 1975), which are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding communications reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day (3 October 1990), it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 4 above.

[6] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[8] In a notification received on 15 October 1974, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservation corresponding to sub-paragraph *a*, according to which it reserved the right to postpone the application of article 2 of the Convention to Montserrat pending notification to the Secretary-General that the said article would be applied there.

CHAPTER XVII. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

1. Convention on the International Right of Correction

Opened for signature at New York on 31 March 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 August 1962, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 24 August 1962, No. 6280.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 435, p. 191.
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 14.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 630 (VII)[1] of 16 December 1952, and it was opened for signature at the closing of the seventh session of the General Assembly.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Argentina	11 Jun 1953		France	2 Apr 1954	16 Nov 1962
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*	Guatemala[2]	1 Apr 1953	9 May 1957
Burkina Faso		23 Mar 1987 *a*	Guinea	19 Mar 1975	
Chile	22 Apr 1953		Jamaica		15 Jun 1967 *a*
Cuba		17 Nov 1954 *a*	Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Cyprus	20 Jun 1972	13 Nov 1972	Paraguay	16 Nov 1953	
Ecuador	31 Mar 1953		Peru	12 Nov 1959	
Egypt	27 Jan 1955	4 Aug 1955	Sierra Leone		25 Jul 1962 *a*
El Salvador	11 Mar 1958	28 Oct 1958	Uruguay		21 Nov 1980 *a*
Ethiopia	31 Mar 1953	21 Jan 1969	Yugoslavia		31 Jan 1956 *a*

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 20* (A/2361), p. 22.

[2] The Convention was signed on behalf of Guatemala with reservation to article V of the Convention. Upon ratification, the Government of Guatemala did not maintain the said reservation.

CHAPTER XVIII. MISCELLANEOUS PENAL MATTERS[1]

1. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE SLAVERY CONVENTION SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 25 SEPTEMBER 1926

Done at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 7 December 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 December 1953, in accordance with article III.[2]
REGISTRATION: 7 December 1953, No. 2422.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 182, p. 51.
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 57.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 794 (VIII)[3] of 23 October 1953.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), acceptance, succession (d)*
Afghanistan		16 Aug 1954 *s*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Australia		9 Dec 1953 *s*
Austria	7 Dec 1953	16 Jul 1954
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 *d*
Bangladesh		7 Jan 1985
Barbados		22 Jul 1976 *d*
Belgium	24 Feb 1954	13 Dec 1962
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984
Canada		17 Dec 1953 *s*
Chile		20 Jun 1995 *a*
China[4]		
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba		28 Jun 1954 *s*
Denmark		3 Mar 1954 *s*
Dominica		17 Aug 1994 *d*
Ecuador	7 Sep 1954	17 Aug 1955
Egypt	15 Jun 1954	29 Sep 1954
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		19 Mar 1954
France	14 Jan 1954	14 Feb 1963
Germany[5,6]		29 May 1973
Greece	7 Dec 1953	12 Dec 1955
Guatemala		11 Nov 1983
Guinea		12 Jul 1962
Hungary		26 Feb 1958
India		12 Mar 1954 *s*
Iraq		23 May 1955
Ireland		31 Aug 1961
Israel		12 Sep 1955
Italy		4 Feb 1954 *s*
Liberia		7 Dec 1953 *s*
Mali		2 Feb 1973
Mauritania		6 Jun 1986
Mexico		3 Feb 1954 *s*
Monaco	28 Jan 1954	12 Nov 1954
Morocco		11 May 1959
Myanmar	14 Mar 1956	29 Apr 1957
Netherlands	15 Dec 1953	7 Jul 1955
New Zealand		16 Dec 1953 *s*
Nicaragua		14 Jan 1986
Niger		7 Dec 1964
Norway	24 Feb 1954	11 Apr 1957
Romania		13 Nov 1957 *s*
Saint Lucia		14 Feb 1990 *d*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa		29 Dec 1953 *s*
Spain		10 Nov 1976 *s*
Sweden		17 Aug 1954 *s*
Switzerland		7 Dec 1953 *s*
Syrian Arab Republic		4 Aug 1954
Turkey		14 Jan 1955 *s*
United Kingdom		7 Dec 1953 *s*
United States of America	16 Dec 1953	7 Mar 1956
Yugoslavia	11 Feb 1954	21 Mar 1955

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Netherlands[7]	7 Jul 1955	Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea, Surinam

NOTES:

[1] For other multilateral treaties concerning penal matters, see chapters III, IV, VI, VII and VIII, as well as Nos. 14 and 15 in Part II.

[2] The amendments set forth in the Annex to the Protocol entered into force on 7 July 1955, in accordance with article III of the Protocol.

[3] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/2630), p. 50.

[4] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 7 December 1953 and 14 December 1955, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol on 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] With the following declaration:

"The said Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 4 December 1973 from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations, the following communication:

The 1926 Slavery Convention, as amended by the 1953 Protocol, deals with matters relating to the territories under the sovereignty of the countries Parties to the Convention within the limits of which they exercise jurisdiction. As is well known, the western sector of Berlin is not an integral part of the Federal Republic of Germany and cannot be governed by it. In that connexion, the Soviet Union regards the above-mentioned statement by the Federal Republic of Germany as unlawful and as having no legal force, with all the consequences flowing therefrom, since the extension of the validity of the Convention to the Western Sector of Berlin raises questions relating to its status, thus conflicting with the relevant provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic, upon acceptance of the Protocol on 16 July 1974, made a declaration which is identical in essence to the above-quoted declaration.

The following communication on the same subject was received on 17 July 1974 from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America:

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America reaffirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

"The purpose and effect of the established procedures referred to above, which were specifically endorsed in Annex IV A and B to the Quadripartite Agreement, are precisely to ensure that agreements and arrangements to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that questions of security and status remain unaffected and to take account of the fact that these Sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it. The extension of the Convention of 1926, as amended by the Protocol of 1953, to the Western Sectors of Berlin received the prior authorization under these established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States. The rights and responsibilities of the Governments of those three countries remain unaffected thereby. There is thus no question that the extension to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Convention of 1926, as amended by the Protocol of 1953, is in any way inconsistent with the Quadripartite Agreement.

"Accordingly, the application to the Western Sectors of Berlin of the Convention of 1926, as amended by the Protocol of 1953, continues in full force and effect."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received on 27 August 1974 from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany a declaration to the effect that the said Government shared the position set out in the above-quoted declaration, and that the extension of the Protocol to Berlin (West) would continue in full force and effect.

In reference to the declaration by the Government of the German Democratic Republic, communications were received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (8 July 1975) and from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (19 September 1975), which are identical in substance, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding communications reproduced in note 4 in chapter III.3.

See also note 5 above.

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

2. Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926 and amended by the Protocol done at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 7 December 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 July 1955, the date on which the amendments, set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 7 December 1953, entered into force in accordance with article III of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 7 July 1955, No. 2861.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 212, p. 17.
STATUS: Parties: 91.

Participant[1]	*Definitive signature or participation in the Convention of 1926 and in the Protocol of 7 December 1953*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d) to the Convention as amended*
Afghanistan	16 Aug 1954	
Albania		2 Jul 1957 *a*
Algeria		20 Nov 1963 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988	
Australia	9 Dec 1953	
Austria	16 Jul 1954	
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976	
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 *a*
Bangladesh	7 Jan 1985	
Barbados	22 Jul 1976	
Belarus		13 Sep 1956 *a*
Belgium	13 Dec 1962	
Bolivia	6 Oct 1983	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil		6 Jan 1966 *a*
Cameroon	27 Jun 1984	
Canada	17 Dec 1953	
Chile	20 Jun 1995	
China[2]		
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	28 Jun 1954	
Cyprus		21 Apr 1986 *d*
Denmark	3 Mar 1954	
Dominica	17 Aug 1994	
Ecuador	17 Aug 1955	
Egypt	29 Sep 1954	
Ethiopia		21 Jan 1969
Fiji	12 Jun 1972	
Finland	19 Mar 1954	
France	14 Feb 1963	
Germany[3]	29 May 1973	
Greece	12 Dec 1955	
Guatemala	11 Nov 1983	
Guinea	12 Jul 1962	
Hungary	26 Feb 1958	
India	12 Mar 1954	
Iraq	23 May 1955	
Ireland	31 Aug 1961	
Israel	12 Sep 1955	
Italy	4 Feb 1954	
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 *d*
Jordan		5 May 1959 *a*
Kuwait		28 May 1963 *a*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liberia	7 Dec 1953	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		14 Feb 1957 *a*
Madagascar		12 Feb 1964 *a*
Malawi		2 Aug 1965 *a*
Mali	2 Feb 1973	
Malta		3 Jan 1966 *d*
Mauritania	6 Jun 1986	
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	3 Feb 1954	
Monaco	12 Nov 1954	
Mongolia		20 Dec 1968 *a*
Morocco	11 May 1959	
Myanmar	29 Apr 1957	
Nepal		7 Jan 1963 *a*
Netherlands	7 Jul 1955	
New Zealand	16 Dec 1953	
Nicaragua	14 Jan 1986	
Niger	7 Dec 1964	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	11 Apr 1957	
Pakistan		30 Sep 1955 *a*
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 *a*
Philippines		12 Jul 1955 *a*
Romania	13 Nov 1957	
Russian Federation		8 Aug 1956 *a*
Saint Lucia	14 Feb 1990	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981
Saudi Arabia		5 Jul 1973 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981	
South Africa	29 Dec 1953	
Spain	10 Nov 1976	
Sri Lanka		21 Mar 1958 *a*
Sudan		9 Sep 1957 *d*
Sweden	17 Aug 1954	
Switzerland	7 Dec 1953	
Syrian Arab Republic	4 Aug 1954	
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		15 Jul 1966 *a*
Turkey	14 Jan 1955	
Uganda		12 Aug 1964 *a*
Ukraine		27 Jan 1959 *a*
United Kingdom	7 Dec 1953	
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
United States of America	7 Mar 1956	
Yemen[4]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	21 Mar 1955	
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 *d*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN[5]

Reservation:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

NOTES:

[1] The Republic of Viet Nam had acceded to the Convention on 14 August 1956. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 14 December 1955. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Convention of 25 September 1926 was received on 16 July 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. As an instrument of acceptance of the amending Protocol of 7 December 1953 was deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the latter has been applying the Convention as amended since 16 July 1974 (see also note 9 in chapter XVIII.3). See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[5] On 25 June 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following objection concerning the reservation:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instruments of accession of Bahrain [to the Slavery Convention signed on 25 September 1926 and amended by the Protocol of 7 December 1953 and to the Supplementary Convention on the abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery of 7 September 1956] contain a declaration in respect of Israel.

"In the view of the Government of the State of Israel such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of these Conventions and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain under general International Law or under particular Conventions.

"The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity."

3. Slavery Convention

Geneva, September 25th, 1926[1]

IN FORCE since March 9th, 1927 (Article 12).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan (November 9th, 1935 *a*)
Austria (August 19th, 1927)
United States of America[2] (March 21st, 1929 *a*)
Subject to the reservation that the Government of the United States, adhering to its policy of opposition to forced or compulsory labour except as punishment for crime of which the person concerned has been duly convicted, adheres to the Convention except as to the first subdivision of the second paragraph of Article five, which reads as follows:
"(I) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes."
Belgium (September 23rd, 1927)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (June 18th, 1927)
Canada (August 6th, 1928)
Australia (June 18th, 1927)
New Zealand (June 18th, 1927)
Union of South Africa
(including *South West Africa*) (June 18th, 1927)
Ireland (June 18th, 1930 *a*)
India (June 18th, 1927)
The signature of the Convention is not binding in respect of Article 3 in so far as that article may require India to enter into any convention whereby vessels, by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Indians, or of the fact that one half of the crew is Indian, are classified as native vessels, or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of such other States are not subject.
Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
China[3] (April 22nd, 1937)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia[4] (October 10th, 1930)
Denmark (May 17th, 1927)
Ecuador (March 26th, 1928 *a*)
Egypt (January 25th, 1928 *a*)
Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Finland (September 29th, 1927)
France (March 28th, 1931)
Syria and *Lebanon* (June 25th, 1931 *a*)
Germany (March 12th, 1929)
Greece (July 4th, 1930)
Haiti (September 3rd, 1927 *a*)
Hungary[5] (February 17th, 1933 *a*)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Iraq (January 18th, 1929 *a*)
Italy (August 25th, 1928)
Latvia (July 9th, 1927)
Liberia (May 17th, 1930)
Mexico (September 8th, 1934 *a*)
Monaco (January 17th, 1928 *a*)
Burma[6]
The Convention is not binding upon Burma in respect of Article 3 in so far as that Article may require her to enter into any convention whereby vessels by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Burmans, or of the fact that one-half of the crew is Burman, are classified as native vessels or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of these other States are not subject.
The Netherlands[7] (including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (January 7th, 1928)
Nicaragua (October 3rd, 1927 *a*)
Norway (September 10th, 1927)
Poland (September 17th, 1930)
Portugal (October 4th, 1927)
Romania (June 22nd, 1931)
Spain (September 12th, 1927)
For Spain and the *Spanish Colonies*, with the exception of the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.
Sudan (September 15th, 1927 *a*)
Sweden (December 17th, 1927)
Switzerland (November 1st, 1930 *a*)
Turkey (July 24th, 1933 *a*)
Yugoslavia (September 28th, 1929)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania[8]
Colombia
Dominican Republic *a*
Iran
Ad referendum and interpreting Article 3 as without power to compel Iran to bind herself by any arrangement or convention which would place her ships of whatever tonnage in the category of native vessels provided for by the Convention on the Trade in arms.
Lithuania
Panama
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[9]	*Accession, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession, succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 *d*	Guinea	30 Mar 1962 *d*
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 *d*	Israel	6 Jan 1955
Bangladesh	7 Jan 1985	Mali	2 Feb 1973 *d*
Barbados	22 Jul 1976 *d*	Mauritania	6 Jun 1986
Benin	4 Apr 1962 *d*	Morocco[10]	11 May 1959 *d*
Bolivia	6 Oct 1983	Niger	25 Aug 1961 *d*
Cameroon	7 Mar 1962 *d*	Saint Lucia	14 Feb 1990 *d*
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 *d*	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	9 Nov 1981
Chile	20 Jun 1995	Senegal	2 May 1963 *d*
Congo	15 Oct 1962 *d*	Seychelles	5 May 1992 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 *d*	Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 *d*
Croatia	12 Oct 1992 *d*	Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*
Czech Republic[4]	22 Feb 1993 *d*	Suriname	12 Oct 1979 *d*
Dominica	17 Aug 1994 *d*	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 Jan 1994 *d*
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 *d*	Togo	27 Feb 1962 *d*
Ghana	3 May 1963 *d*		
Guatemala	11 Nov 1983		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 1414. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 60, p. 253.

[2] This accession, given subject to reservation, has been communicated to the signatory States for acceptance.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 130, p. 444.

[6] See note 3 in Part II.2 of the League of Nations Treaties.

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[8] The Government of Albania deposited on 2 July 1957 the instrument of accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 7 December 1953 (see chapter XVIII.2).

[9] In a notification received on 16 July 1974 the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 22 December 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 17 June 1974, concerning the application, as from 22 December 1958, of the Slavery Convention of 25 September 1926, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Slavery Convention, September 25th, 1926 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[10] By virtue of its acceptance of the Protocol of amendment on 7 December 1953.

4. Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery

Done at the European Office of the United Nations at Geneva on 7 September 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 April 1957, in accordance with article 13.
REGISTRATION: 30 April 1957, No. 3822.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 266, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 36. Parties: 114.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 608 (XXI)[1] of 30 April 1956 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and met at the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva from 13 August to 4 September 1956. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and two resolutions for the texts of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 226, p. 3.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		16 Nov 1966 *a*
Albania		6 Nov 1958 *a*
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina		13 Aug 1964 *a*
Australia	7 Sep 1956	6 Jan 1958
Austria		7 Oct 1963 *a*
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 *d*
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 *a*
Bangladesh		5 Feb 1985 *a*
Barbados		9 Aug 1972 *d*
Belarus	7 Sep 1956	5 Jun 1957
Belgium	7 Sep 1956	13 Dec 1962
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sept 1993 *d*
Brazil		6 Jan 1966 *a*
Bulgaria	26 Jun 1957	21 Aug 1958
Cambodia		12 Jun 1957 *a*
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 *a*
Canada	7 Sep 1956	10 Jan 1963
Central African Republic		30 Dec 1970 *a*
Chile		20 Jun 1995 *a*
China[3]		
Congo		25 Aug 1977 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		10 Dec 1970 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cuba	10 Jan 1957	21 Aug 1963
Cyprus		11 May 1962 *d*
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	27 Jun 1957	24 Apr 1958
Djibouti		21 Mar 1979 *a*
Dominica		17 Aug 1994 *d*
Dominican Republic		31 Oct 1962 *a*
Ecuador		29 Mar 1960 *a*
Egypt		17 Apr 1958 *a*
El Salvador	7 Sep 1956	
Ethiopia		21 Jan 1969 *a*
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 *d*
Finland		1 Apr 1959 *a*
France	7 Sep 1956	26 May 1964
Germany[5,6]	7 Sep 1956	14 Jan 1959
Ghana		3 May 1963 *a*
Greece	7 Sep 1956	13 Dec 1972
Guatemala	7 Sep 1956	11 Nov 1983
Guinea		14 Mar 1977 *a*
Haiti	7 Sep 1956	12 Feb 1958
Hungary	7 Sep 1956	26 Feb 1958
Iceland		17 Nov 1965 *a*
India	7 Sep 1956	23 Jun 1960
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		30 Dec 1959 *a*
Iraq	7 Sep 1956	30 Sep 1963
Ireland		18 Sep 1961 *a*
Israel	7 Sep 1956	23 Oct 1957
Italy	7 Sep 1956	12 Feb 1958
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 *d*
Jordan		27 Sep 1957 *a*
Kuwait		18 Jan 1963 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Sep 1957 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 *d*
Liberia	7 Sep 1956	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 *a*
Luxembourg	7 Sep 1956	1 May 1967
Madagascar		29 Feb 1972 *a*
Malawi		2 Aug 1965 *a*
Malaysia		18 Nov 1957 *a*
Mali		2 Feb 1973 *a*
Malta		3 Jan 1966 *d*
Mauritania		6 Jun 1986 *a*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Mexico	7 Sep 1956	30 Jun 1959
Mongolia		20 Dec 1968 *a*
Morocco		11 May 1959 *a*
Nepal		7 Jan 1963 *a*
Netherlands	7 Sep 1956	3 Dec 1957
New Zealand		26 Apr 1962 *a*
Nicaragua		14 Jan 1986 *a*
Niger		22 Jul 1963 *a*
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Norway	7 Sep 1956	3 May 1960
Pakistan	7 Sep 1956	20 Mar 1958
Peru	7 Sep 1956	
Philippines		17 Nov 1964 *a*
Poland	7 Sep 1956	10 Jan 1963
Portugal	7 Sep 1956	10 Aug 1959
Romania	7 Sep 1956	13 Nov 1957
Russian Federation	7 Sep 1956	12 Apr 1957
Saint Lucia		14 Feb 1990 *d*
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 *a*
San Marino	7 Sep 1956	29 Aug 1967

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Saudi Arabia		5 Jul 1973 *a*
Senegal		19 Jul 1979 *a*
Seychelles		5 May 1992 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Singapore		28 Mar 1972 *d*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Spain		21 Nov 1967 *a*
Sri Lanka	5 Jun 1957	21 Mar 1958
Sudan	7 Sep 1956	9 Sep 1957
Suriname		12 Oct 1979 *d*
Sweden		28 Oct 1959 *a*
Switzerland		28 Jul 1964 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic[7]		17 Apr 1958 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Jan 1994 *d*
Togo		8 Jul 1980 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia		15 Jul 1966 *a*
Turkey	28 Jun 1957	17 Jul 1964
Uganda		12 Aug 1964 *a*
Ukraine	7 Sep 1956	3 Dec 1958
United Kingdom	7 Sep 1956	30 Apr 1957
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 *a*
United States of America		6 Dec 1967 *a*
Yugoslavia	7 Sep 1956	20 May 1958
Zaire		28 Feb 1975 *a*
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 *d*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN

[See in chapter XVIII.2.]

Territorial Application

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territories
Australia	6 Jan 1958	All the non-self governing, trust and other non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible
France	26 May 1964	All the territories of the Republic (Metropolitan France, overseas departments and territories)
Italy	12 Feb 1958	Somaliland under Italian Administration
Netherlands[8]	3 Dec 1957	Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand	26 Apr 1962	The Cook Islands (including Niue) and the Tokelau Islands
United Kingdom	30 Apr 1957	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man
United States of America	6 Dec 1967	All territories for the international relations of which the United States of America is responsible

Territorial applications under paragraph 2 of article 12 of the Convention

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territories
United Kingdom[9,10]	6 Sep 1957	Aden, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya, Antigua, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis, Virgin Islands, Malta, Mauritius, North Borneo, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Solomon Islands Protectorate, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Zanzibar, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Bahrain, Qatar, The Trucial States (Abu Dhabi, Ajman, Dubai, Fujairah, Ras al Khaimah, Sharjah and Ummal Qaiwain)
	18 Oct 1957	Dominica and Tonga
	21 Oct 1957	Kuwait
	30 Oct 1957	Uganda

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
	14 Nov 1957	Trinidad and Tobago
	1 Jul 1957	The Federation of Nigeria

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2889), p. 7.

[2] The Convention had been signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 7 September 1956. See also note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 23 May 1957 and 28 May 1959 respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned ratification, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Hungary, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. For the nature of these communications, see note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 September 1956 and 13 June 1958, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 16 July 1974. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] A note accompanying the instrument of ratification contains a statement that "the Supplementary Convention . . . also applies to Land Berlin as from the date on which the Convention enters into force in the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the one hand, and by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred to in the second paragraph of note 3 in chapter III.3.

See also note 5 above.

[7] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See note 5 in chapter I.1.

[8] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[9] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[For the text of the declaration, see note 20 in chapter IV.1.]

[10] See note 26 in chapter V.2.

5. International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 June 1983, in accordance with article 18 (b).
REGISTRATION: 3 June 1983, No. 21931.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1316, p. 205; and depositary notifications C.N.209.1987.TREATIES-6 of 8 October 1987 and C.N.324.1987.TREATIES-9 of 1 February 1987 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Russian text).
STATUS: Signatories: 40. Parties: 76.

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 34/146[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 17 December 1979. It was opened for signature from 18 December 1979 to 31 December 1980.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		6 Aug 1986 *a*
Argentina		18 Sep 1991 *a*
Australia		21 May 1990 *a*
Austria	3 Oct 1980	22 Aug 1986
Bahamas		4 Jun 1981 *a*
Barbados		9 Mar 1981 *a*
Belarus		1 Jul 1987 *a*
Belgium	3 Jan 1980	
Bhutan		31 Aug 1981 *a*
Bolivia	25 Mar 1980	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brunei Darussalam		18 Oct 1988 *a*
Bulgaria		10 Mar 1988 *a*
Cameroon		9 Mar 1988 *a*
Canada	18 Feb 1980	4 Dec 1985
Chile	3 Jan 1980	12 Nov 1981
China		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		22 Aug 1989 *a*
Cyprus		13 Sep 1991 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark		11 Aug 1987 *a*
Dominica		9 Sep 1986 *a*
Dominican Republic	12 Aug 1980	
Ecuador		2 May 1988 *a*
Egypt	18 Dec 1980	2 Oct 1981
El Salvador	10 Jun 1980	12 Feb 1981
Finland	29 Oct 1980	14 Apr 1983
Gabon	29 Feb 1980	
Germany[3,4]	18 Dec 1979	15 Dec 1980
Ghana		10 Nov 1987 *a*
Greece	18 Mar 1980	18 Jun 1987
Grenada		10 Dec 1990 *a*
Guatemala	30 Apr 1980	11 Mar 1983
Haiti	21 Apr 1980	17 May 1989
Honduras	11 Jun 1980	1 Jun 1981
Hungary		2 Sep 1987 *a*
Iceland		6 Jul 1981 *a*
India		7 Sep 1994 *a*
Iraq	14 Oct 1980	
Israel	19 Nov 1980	
Italy	18 Apr 1980	20 Mar 1986
Jamaica	27 Feb 1980	
Japan	22 Dec 1980	8 Jun 1987
Jordan		19 Feb 1986 *a*
Kenya		8 Dec 1981 *a*
Kuwait		6 Feb 1989 *a*
Lesotho	17 Apr 1980	5 Nov 1980
Liberia	30 Jan 1980	
Liechtenstein		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	18 Dec 1979	29 Apr 1991
Malawi		17 Mar 1986 *a*
Mali		8 Feb 1990 *a*
Mauritius	18 Jun 1980	17 Oct 1980
Mexico		28 Apr 1987 *a*
Mongolia		9 Jun 1992 *a*
Nepal		9 Mar 1990 *a*
Netherlands[5]	18 Dec 1980	6 Dec 1988
New Zealand[6]	24 Dec 1980	12 Nov 1985
Norway	18 Dec 1980	2 Jul 1981
Oman		22 Jul 1988 *a*
Panama	24 Jan 1980	19 Aug 1982
Philippines	2 May 1980	14 Oct 1980
Portugal	16 Jun 1980	6 Jul 1984
Republic of Korea		4 May 1983 *a*
Romania		17 May 1990 *a*
Russian Federation		11 Jun 1987 *a*
Saint Kitts and Nevis		17 Jan 1991 *a*
Saudi Arabia		8 Jan 1991 *a*
Senegal	2 Jun 1980	10 Mar 1987
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		26 Mar 1984 *a*
Sudan		19 Jun 1990 *a*
Suriname	30 Jul 1980	5 Nov 1981
Sweden	25 Feb 1980	15 Jan 1981
Switzerland	18 Jul 1980	5 Mar 1985
Trinidad and Tobago		1 Apr 1981 *a*
Togo	8 Jul 1980	25 Jul 1986
Turkey		15 Aug 1989 *a*
Uganda	10 Nov 1980	
Ukraine		19 Jun 1987 *a*
United Kingdom[7]	18 Dec 1979	22 Dec 1982
United States of America	21 Dec 1979	7 Dec 1984
Venezuela		13 Dec 1988 *a*
Yugoslavia	29 Dec 1980	19 Apr 1985
Zaire	2 Jul 1980	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1, of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that, in order for any dispute between parties to the Convention concerning the interpretation or application thereof to be referred to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute must be secured in each individual case.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic condemns international terrorism, which takes the lives of innocent people, constitutes a threat to their freedom and personal inviolability and destabilizes the international situation, whatever the motives used to explain terrorist actions. Accordingly, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention should be applied in a manner consistent with the stated aims of the Convention, which include the development of international co-operation in adopting effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking as manifestations of international terrorism through, *inter alia,* the extradition of alleged offenders.

BULGARIA[8]

Declaration on article 9, paragraph 1:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria condemns all acts of international terrorism, whose victims are not only governmental and public officials but also many innocent people, including mothers, children, old-aged, and which exerts an increasingly destabilizing impact on international relations, complicates considerably the political solution of crisis situations, irrespective of the reasons invoked to explain terrorist acts. The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention should be applied in a manner consistent with the stated aims of the Convention, which include the development of international co-operation in adopting effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking as manifestations of international terrorism, including extradition of alleged offenders.

CHILE

The Government of the Republic [of Chile], having approved this Convention, states that such approval is given on the understanding that the aforesaid Convention prohibits the taking of hostages in any circumstances, even those referred to in article 12.

CHINA

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China makes its reservation to article 16, paragraph 1, and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

DOMINICA

Understanding:

"The aforesaid Convention prohibits the taking of hostages in any circumstances, even those referred to in article 12."

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

With the reservation permitted under article 16 (2) of the said Convention.

Upon ratification:

Reservation with respect to the application of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

HUNGARY[9]

INDIA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of India declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention at the request of one of them."

ISRAEL

Upon signature:

"1. It is the understanding of Israel that the Convention implements the principle that hostage taking is prohibited in all circumstances and that any person committing such an act shall be either prosecuted or extradited pursuant to article 8 of this Convention or the relevant provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or their additional Protocols, without any exception whatsoever."

"2) The Government of Israel declares that it reserves the right, when depositing the instrument of ratification, to make reservations and additional declarations and understandings."

ITALY

Upon signature:

The Italian Government declares that, because of the differing interpretations to which certain formulations in the text lend themselves, Italy reserves the right, when depositing the instrument of ratification, to invoke article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969 in conformity with the general principles of international law.

JORDAN

"The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan declares that their accession to the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages can in no way be construed as constituting recognition of, or entering into treaty relations with the "state of Israel".

KENYA

"The Government of the Republic of Kenya does not consider herself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the article 16 of the Convention."

KUWAIT[10]

Declaration:

It is understood that the accession to this Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait.

Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Interpretative declaration:

The Principality of Liechtenstein construes article 4 of the Convention to mean that the Principality of Liechtenstein

undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein under the conditions laid down in its domestic legislation.

MALAWI

"While the Government of the Republic of Malawi accepts the principles in article 16, this acceptance would nonetheless be read in conjunction with [the] declaration [made by the President and the Minister for Foreign Affaires of Malawi] of 12 December, 1966 upon recognition as compulsory, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under article 36, paragraph 2, of the State of the Court."

MEXICO

In relation to article 16, the United Mexican States adhere to the scope and limitations established by the Government of Mexico on 7 November 1945, at the time when it ratified the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

6 August 1987

The Government of Mexico subsequently specified that the said declaration should be understood to mean that, in so far as article 16 is concerned, the United Mexican States accede subject to the limits and restrictions laid down by the Mexican Government when recognizing, on 23 October 1947, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the State of the Court.

NETHERLANDS

Reservation:

"In cases where the judicial authorities of either the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles or Aruba cannot exercise jurisdiction pursuant to one of the principles mentioned in article 5, paragraph 1, the Kingdom accepts the aforesaid obligation [laid down in article 8] subject to the condition that it has received and rejected a request for extradition from another State party to the Convention."

Declaration:

"In the view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands article 15 of the Convention, and in particular the second sentence of that article, in no way affects the applicability of article 33 of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

[Same reservation and declaration identical in substance, mutatis mutandis, *as those made by Belarus.]*

SAUDI ARABIA[10]

Reservation:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself obligated with the provision of paragraph 1, of article 16, of the Convention concerning arbitration.

Declaration:

2. The accession of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to this Convention does not constitute a recognition of Israel and does not lead to entering into any transactions or the establishment of any relations based on this Convention.

SLOVAKIA[2]

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

TURKEY

Reservation:

In acceding to the Convention the Government of the Republic of Turkey, under article 16 (2) of the Convention declares that it doesn't consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the said article.

UKRAINE

[Same reservation and declaration identical in substance, mutatis mutandis, *as those made by Belarus.]*

VENEZUELA

Declaration:

The Republic of Venezuela declares that it is not bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

YUGOSLAVIA

Upon signature:

"With the reservation with regard to article 9, subject to subsequent approval pursuant to the constitutional provisions in force in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia".

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia herewith states that the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention should be interpreted and applied in practice in the way which would not bring into question the goals of the Convention, i.e. undertaking of efficient measures for the prevention of all acts of the taking of hostages as a phenomenon of international terrorism, as well as the prosecution, punishment and extradition of persons considered to have perpetrated this criminal offence."

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46* (A/34/46), p. 245.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 27 January 1988, with the following reservation to article 16 (1):

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of its article 16, paragraph 1, and states that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to a conciliation procedure or to the International Court of Justice the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the said reservation. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 May 1988 with the following reservation and declaration:

Reservation regarding article 16, paragraph 1:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that in every single case the consent of all parties in the dispute is necessary to submit to arbitration or refer to the

International Court of Justice any dispute between the States Parties to the Convention concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Declaration regarding article 9, paragraph 1:

The German Democratic Republic decisively condemns any act of international terrorism. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic holds the opinion that article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention shall be applied in such a way as to be in correspondence with the declared aims of the Convention which embrace the taking of effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of international terrorism, including the taking of hostages.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany, subject to the Allied rights, responsibilities and legislation.

With regard to the above declaration, the Secretary-General received, on 9 November 1981, from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the following communication:

The declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany when depositing the instrument of ratification, to the effect that the said Convention shall extend to Berlin (West), is incompatible with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. That Agreement, as is generally known, does not grant the Federal Republic of Germany the right to extend to West Berlin international agreements which affect matters of security and status. The above-mentioned Convention belongs precisely to that category of agreement.

The 1979 Convention contains provisions on the establishment of criminal jurisdiction over hostage-taking offences committed in the territories of States parties or on board a ship or aircraft registered in those States, as well as provisions relating to extradition of and court proceedings against offenders. Thus, the Convention concerns sovereign rights and obligations which cannot be exercised by a State in a territory which does not come under its jurisdiction.

In view of the foregoing, the Soviet Union considers the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany on extending the application of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages to Berlin (West) to be illegal and to have no legal force.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (4 June 1982):

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is an integral part (annex IV A), of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States confirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected and provided that the extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of the Three Powers, which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed *inter alia* to afford the authorities of the Three Powers the opportunity to ensure that international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany which are to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status are not affected.

When authorizing the extension of the above-mentioned Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers took such steps as were necessary to ensure that matters of security and status were not affected. Accordingly, the validity of the Berlin declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with established procedures is unaffected and the application of the Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect, subject to Allied rights, responsibilities and legislation.

Federal Republic of Germany (12 August 1982):

"By their note of 28 May 1982 [...] the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect, subject to Allied rights, responsibilities and legislation.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[6] For New Zealand (except Tokelau), Cook Islands and Niue.

[7] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom.

[8] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 16 (1) of the Convention, made upon accession which reads as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article16, paragraph 1 of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that submission of any dispute concerning interpretation and application of the Convention between parties to the Convention to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice requires the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

[9] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 16 made upon accession which reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention, since in its opinion, the jurisdiction of any arbitral tribunal or of the International Court of Justice can be founded only on the voluntary prior acceptance of such jurisdiction by all the Parties concerned.

[10] On 17 May 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession by the Government of Kuwait to the above-mentioned Convention contains a declaration in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of Kuwait under general international law or under particular Conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel, will insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

On 22 May 1991, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel a communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, with regard to the declaration made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

6. International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 4 December 1989

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 19 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/RES/44/34.
STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 9.

Note: The Convention was adopted by Resolution A/44/34[1] on 4 December 1989. It is open for signature by all States until 31 December 1990 at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Angola	28 Dec 1990		Nigeria	4 Apr 1990	
Barbados		10 Jul 1992 *a*	Poland	28 Dec 1990	
Belarus	13 Dec 1990		Romania	17 Dec 1990	
Cameroon	21 Dec 1990		Seychelles		12 Mar 1990 *a*
Congo	20 Jun 1990		Suriname	27 Feb 1990	10 Aug 1990
Cyprus		8 Jul 1993 *a*	Togo		25 Feb 1991 *a*
Georgia		8 Jun 1995 *a*	Ukraine	21 Sep 1990	13 Sep 1993
Germany	20 Dec 1990		Uruguay	20 Nov 1990	
Italy	5 Feb 1990	21 Aug 1995	Yugoslavia	12 Dec 1990	
Maldives	17 Jul 1990	11 Sep 1991	Zaire	20 Mar 1990	
Morocco	5 Oct 1990				

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/44/49), p. 306.

7. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 February 1977, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 20 February 1977, No. 15410.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 167.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 90.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 14 December 1973.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		19 Jul 1993 *a*
Argentina		18 Mar 1982 *a*
Armenia		18 May 1994 *a*
Australia	30 Dec 1974	20 Jun 1977
Austria		3 Aug 1977 *a*
Bahamas		22 Jul 1986 *a*
Barbados		26 Oct 1979 *a*
Belarus	11 Jun 1974	5 Feb 1976
Bhutan		16 Jan 1989 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	27 Jun 1974	18 Jul 1974
Burundi		17 Dec 1980 *a*
Cameroon		8 Jun 1992 *a*
Canada	26 Jun 1974	4 Aug 1976
Chile		21 Jan 1977 *a*
China		5 Aug 1987 *a*
Costa Rica		2 Nov 1977 *a*
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus		24 Dec 1975 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark[2]	10 May 1974	1 Jul 1975
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		1 Dec 1982 *a*
Dominican Republic		8 Jul 1977 *a*
Ecuador	27 Aug 1974	12 Mar 1975
Egypt		25 Jun 1986 *a*
El Salvador		8 Aug 1980 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Finland	10 May 1974	31 Oct 1978
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 *a*
Germany[3,4]	15 Aug 1974	25 Jan 1977
Ghana		25 Apr 1975 *a*
Greece		3 Jul 1984 *a*
Guatemala	12 Dec 1974	18 Jan 1983
Haiti		25 Aug 1980 *a*
Hungary	6 Nov 1974	26 Mar 1975
Iceland	10 May 1974	2 Aug 1977
India		11 Apr 1978 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		12 Jul 1978 *a*
Iraq		28 Feb 1978 *a*
Israel		31 Jul 1980 *a*
Italy	30 Dec 1974	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica		21 Sep 1978 *a*
Japan		8 Jun 1987 *a*
Jordan		18 Dec 1984 *a*
Kuwait		1 Mar 1989 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Liberia		30 Sep 1975 *a*
Liechtenstein		28 Nov 1994 *a*
Malawi		14 Mar 1977 *a*
Maldives		21 Aug 1990 *a*
Mexico		22 Apr 1980 *a*
Mongolia	23 Aug 1974	8 Aug 1975
Nepal		9 Mar 1990 *a*
Netherlands[5]		6 Dec 1988 *a*
New Zealand[6]		12 Nov 1985 *a*
Nicaragua	29 Oct 1974	10 Mar 1975
Niger		17 Jun 1985 *a*
Norway	10 May 1974	28 Apr 1980
Oman		22 Mar 1988 *a*
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 *a*
Panama		17 Jun 1980 *a*
Paraguay	25 Oct 1974	24 Nov 1975
Peru		25 Apr 1978 *a*
Philippines		26 Nov 1976 *a*
Poland	7 Jun 1974	14 Dec 1982
Portugal		11 Sep 1995 *a*
Republic of Korea		25 May 1983 *a*
Romania	27 Dec 1974	15 Aug 1978
Russian Federation	7 Jun 1974	15 Jan 1976
Rwanda	15 Oct 1974	29 Nov 1977
Seychelles		29 May 1980 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		8 Aug 1985 *a*
Sri Lanka		27 Feb 1991 *a*
Sudan		10 Oct 1994 *a*
Sweden	10 May 1974	1 Jul 1975
Switzerland		5 Mar 1985 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		25 Apr 1988 *a*
Togo		30 Dec 1980 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		15 Jun 1979 *a*
Tunisia	15 May 1974	21 Jan 1977
Turkey		11 Jun 1981 *a*
Ukraine	18 Jun 1974	20 Jan 1976
United Kingdom	13 Dec 1974	2 May 1979
United States of America	28 Dec 1973	26 Oct 1976
Uruguay		13 Jun 1978 *a*
Yemen[7]		9 Feb 1987 *a*
Yugoslavia	17 Dec 1974	29 Dec 1976
Zaire		25 Jul 1977 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

ARGENTINA

In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

BELARUS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

BULGARIA[8]

BURUNDI

In respect of cases where the alleged offenders belong to a national liberation movement recognized by Burundi or by an international organization of which Burundi in a member, and their actions are part of their struggle for liberation, the Government of the Republic of Burundi reserves the right not to apply to them the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1.

CHINA

[The People's Republic of China] declares that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Convention, the People's Republic of China has reservations on paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the said paragraph.

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, recognizing that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention should not, without consent of both parties, be submitted to international arbitration and to the International Court of Justice.

ECUADOR

Upon signature:

Ecuador wishes to avail itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, declaring that it does not consider itself bound to refer disputes concerning the application of the Convention to the International Court of Justice.

EL SALVADOR

The State of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention.

FINLAND

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Finland reserves the right to apply the provision of article 8, paragraph 3, in such a way that extradition shall be restricted to offences which, under Finnish Law, are punishable by a penalty more severe than imprisonment for one year and, provided also that other conditions in the Finnish Legislation for extradition are fulfilled."

Declaration made upon signature:

"Finland also reserves the right to make such other reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when ratifying this Convention."

GERMANY[3]

Upon signature:

"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying this Convention, to state its views on the explanations of vote and declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

GHANA[9]

"(i) Paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention provides that disputes may be submitted to arbitration, failing which any of the parties to the dispute may refer it to the International Court of Justice by request. Since Ghana is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration, she wishes to exercise her option under article 13 (2) to make a reservation on article 13 (1). It is noted that such a reservation can be withdrawn later under article 13 (3)."

HUNGARY[10]

INDIA

"The Government of the Republic of India does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention."

IRAQ[11]

(1) The resolution of the United Nations General Assembly with which the above-mentioned Convention is enclosed shall be considered to be an integral part of the above-mentioned Convention.

(2) Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention shall cover the representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by the League of Arab States or the Organization of African Unity.

(3) The Republic of Iraq shall not bind itself by paragraph (1) of article 13 of the Convention.

(4) The accession of the Government of the Republic of Iraq to the Convention shall in no way constitute a recognition of Israel or a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

ISRAEL[12]

Declarations:

"The Government of the State of Israel declares that its accession to the Convention does not constitute acceptance by it as binding of the provisions of any other international instrument, or acceptance by it of any other international instrument as being an instrument related to the Convention.

The Government of Israel reaffirms the contents of its communication of 11 May 1979 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

Reservation:

"The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

JAMAICA

"Jamaica avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

JORDAN[11]

Reservation:

The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan declares that its accession [. . .] cannot give rise to relations with "Israel".

KUWAIT[11]

Declaration:

[The Government of Kuwait] wishes to reiterate Kuwait's complete reservation on paragraph 1 of article 13 in the Convention, for its accession to it does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and does not engage them into any treaty relations as a result.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Interpretative declaration:

The Principality of Liechtenstein construes articles 4 and 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention, to mean that the Principality of Liechtenstein undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein under the conditions laid down in its domestic legislation.

MALAWI

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi [declares], in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 13, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

MONGOLIA

Declaration made upon signature and renewed upon ratification:

"The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"In view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands article 12 of the Convention, and in particular the second sentence of that Article, in no way affects the applicability of article 33 of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees".

Reservation:

"In cases where the judicial authorities of either the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles or Aruba cannot exercise jurisdiction pursuant to one of the principles mentioned in article 3, para. 1, the Kingdom accepts the aforesaid obligation [laid down in article 7] subject to the condition that it has received and rejected a request for extradition from another State party to the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

Reservation:

The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply the provisions of the Convention to Tokelau pending the enactment of the necessary implementing legislation in Tokelau law.

PAKISTAN

"Pakistan shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention".

PERU

With reservation as to article 13 (1).

POLAND

Reservation:

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

PORTUGAL

Reservation:

Portugal does not extradite anyone for crimes which carry the death penalty or life imprisonment under the law of the requesting State nor does it extradite anyone for violations which carry security measure for life.

ROMANIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

SLOVAKIA[1]

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 and article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[11]

Declaration:

1. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, concerning arbitration and the results thereof.

2. Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention in no way implies recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with Israel concerning any question regulated by this Convention.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

TUNISIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

No dispute may be brought before the International Court of Justice unless by agreement between all parties to the dispute.

UKRAINE

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

YEMEN[7, 11]

Reservation:

In acceding to this Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which states that disputes between States parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may, at the request of anyone of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Declaration

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that its accession to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or serve as grounds for the establishment of relations of any sort with Israel.

ZAIRE

The Republic of Zaire does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice. In the light of its policy based on respect for the sovereignty of States, the Republic of Zaire is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration and hopes that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice not at the request of one of the parties but with the consent of all the interested parties.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

GERMANY[3]

30 November 1979

The statement by the Republic of Iraq on sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention does not have any legal effects for the Federal Republic of Germany.

25 March 1981

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the reservation made by the Government of Burundi concerning article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

ISRAEL

"The Government of the State of Israel does not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention.

28 June 1982

"The Government of the State of Israel regards the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn.

In the view of the Government of Israel, the purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven."

ITALY

(a) The Italian Government does not consider as valid the reservation made by Iraq on 28 February 1978 with regard to article 1, paragraph 1(b), of the said Convention;

(b) With regard to the reservation expressed by Burundi on 17 December 1980, [the Italian Government considers that] the purpose of the Convention is to ensure the punishment, world-wide, of crimes against internationally protected persons, includ-

ing diplomatic agents, and to deny a safe haven to the perpetrators of such crimes. Considering therefore that the reservation expressed by the Government of Burundi is incompatible with the aim and purpose of the Convention, the Italian Government cannot consider Burundi's accession to the Convention as valid as long as it does not withdraw that reservation.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

15 January 1982

"The purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven. Accordingly the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regard the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and are unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom[13,14,15]	2 May 1979	Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Belize, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, the Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the Island of Cyprus.
	16 Nov 1989	Anguilla

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 11 October 1974 and 30 June 1975, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 234. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] In a notification received on 12 March 1980, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification of the Convention, which specified that until further decision, the Convention would not apply to the Faeroe Islands or to Greenland. The notification indicates 1 April 1980 as the effective date of withdrawal.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention, with reservation, on 23 May 1974 and 30 November 1976, respectively. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 230. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared as follows:

With effect from the day on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany it will also apply to Berlin (West) subject to the rights and responsibilities of the Allied authorities.

With respect to the above declaration, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (21 July 1977):

The declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany when it deposited the instrument of ratification concerning the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) is incompatible with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and can therefore have no legal force. The Quadripartite Agreement, as is well known, does not allow the Federal Republic of Germany to represent the interests of Berlin in matters of status and security in the international arena. The above-mentioned Convention directly affects matters of status and security. It therefore follows that the Federal Republic of Germany cannot assume the rights and obligations of ensuring the observance of the provisions of this Convention in Berlin (West).

Since under the Quadripartite Agreement the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States retain their rights and responsibility with respect to the representation abroad of interests of Berlin (West) and its permanent residents, including rights and responsibility concerning matters of security and status, both in international organizations and in relations with other countries, the Soviet Union will, in any matters which may arise in connexion with the application and implementation of the Convention in Berlin (West), address itself to the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (7 December 1977—in relation to the declaration made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics received on 21 July 1977):

"We have the honour to refer to the Note from the Director of the General Legal Division in charge of the Office of Legal Affairs [...] dated 10 August 1977 concerning the ratification by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany with declaration, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, Including Diplomatic Agents, and in particular to refer to paragraph 2 of that note which reported a communication made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics relating to the application of that Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin.

"In a communication to the Government of the USSR which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, the Governments of France, the US and the UK confirmed that, provided matters of security and status are not affected and provided that extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the USSR, in a communication to the Government of France, the UK and the US, which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such an extension.

"The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed *inter alia* to afford the authorities of France, the UK and the US the opportunity to ensure that international agreements concluded by the FRG which are to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are ex-

tended in such a way that matters of security and status remain unaffected. The extension of the aforesaid Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin received the authorization, under these established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States who took the necessary steps to ensure that matters of security and status would not be affected thereby. Consequently, pursuant to the declaration on Berlin made by the FRG, this Convention has been validly extended to the WSB. Accordingly, the application of this Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect."

Federal Republic of Germany (13 February 1978):

"By their Note of 3 December 1977, disseminated [on] 19 January 1978, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication [of 21 July 1977] referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the Note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that, subject to the rights and responsibilities of the Three Powers, the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned instrument extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

German Democratic Republic (22 December 1978):

Concerning the application of the Convention to Berlin (West), the German Democratic Republic states, in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not to be governed by it. The statement of the Federal Republic of Germany, according to which this Convention is to be extended to Berlin (West), is inconsistent with the Quadripartite Agreement which stipulates that agreements concerning matters of security and the status of Berlin (West) must not be extended by the Federal Republic of Germany to Berlin (West). Accordingly, the statement made by the Federal Republic of Germany can have no legal effects.

Czechoslovakia (25 April 1979):

"According to the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, the Federal Republic of Germany cannot extend international conventions to Berlin (West) if the conventions in question relate to matters of security and the status of Berlin (West). Since the above-mentioned multilateral international Convention leaves no doubt as to its direct relation to the matters of security and the status of Berlin (West) there is no legal ground for its extension to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany.

"In view of all these facts the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic cannot accept the extension of the said Convention to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany, is not in a position to regard the extension as legally valid and cannot attach to it any legal effects."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (21 August 1979—relating to the communications from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia received on 22 December 1978 and 25 April 1979, respectively):

"With regard to the communications referred to above, our Governments reaffirm that States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions.

"The three Governments do not consider it necessary, nor do they intend to respond to any further communications on this subject from States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change of the position of the three Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (18 October 1979—relating to the communications from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia received on 22 December 1978 and 25 April 1979, respectively):

"By their Note of 20 August 1979, disseminated [on] 21 August 1979, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States rejected the assertions made in the communications referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

Hungary (27 November 1979):

[Communication identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, *to the one of 25 April 1979 by Czechoslovakia.]*

Czechoslovakia (25 January 1980):

"The Czechoslovak side continues to hold the view that also States that are not signatories of the Four-Power Agreement of 3 September 1971 must proceed from the criteria set forth by the Four-Power Agreement, since no other criteria exist. We furthermore believe that it is the inalienable right of every State to adjudge its treaty relations from its own will. The exercise of such a right even by a non-signatory State cannot be hindered by third State parties."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (18 February 1982—relating to the declaration made by Czechoslovakia on 25 January 1980):

"With regard to the communication of the Government of Czechoslovakia referred to above, our Governments reaffirm their position as stated in their note of 21 August 1979 to the Secretary-General in connexion with this Convention. The Quadripartite Agreement is an international treaty concluded between the four contracting parties and not open to participation by any other State. In concluding this Agreement, the four powers acted on the basis of their quadripartite rights and responsibilities, and of the corresponding war-time and post-war agreements and decisions of the four powers, which are not affected. The Quadripartite Agreement is a part of conventional, not customary international law. Accordingly, Czechoslovakia, as a third State not a party to the Quadripartite Agreement, has no right whatsoever to comment authoritatively on it."

Federal Republic of Germany (2 April 1982—relating to the declaration made by Czechoslovakia on 25 January 1980):

"By their note of 18 February 1982, disseminated [on] 12 March 1982, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertion made in the communication referred to in depositary notification [. . .] of 27 February 1980. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of 18 February 1982, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under the established procedure continues in full force and effect.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day [3 October 1990], it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *Land Berlin*.

See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[6] The instrument of accession specifies that the Convention will also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue.

[7] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[8] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, made upon signature and renewed upon ratification. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 228.

[9] In a notification received on 18 November 1976, the Government of Ghana informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to with-

draw the reservation contained in its instrument of accession, concerning article 3 (1)(c) of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 235.

[10] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 13 (1) of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 235.

[11] The Secretary-General received on 11 May 1979 from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon it under general international law or under particular treaties.

The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis* have been received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 11 March 1985 in respect of the reservation made by Jordan; on 21 August 1987 in respect of the declaration by Democratic Yemen; on 26 July 1988 in respect of the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic; and on 17 May 1989 in respect of the declaration made by Kuwait.

[12] The communication of 11 May 1979 refers to the reservation made by Iraq upon accession to the Convention. See note 11 above.

[13] The Secretary-General received, on 25 May 1979 from the Government of Guatemala ,the following communication:

The Government of Guatemala [does] not accept [the extension by the United Kingdom of the Convention to the Territory of Belize] in view of the fact the said Territory is a territory concerning which a dispute exists and to which [Guatemala] maintains a claim that is the subject, by mutual agreement, of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes between the two Governments concerned.

In this respect, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 November 1979, stated the following:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their sovereignty over Belize and do not accept the reservation submitted by the Government of Guatemala."

[14] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands [and dependencies], which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[*For the text of the declaration see note 20 in chapter IV.1.*]

[15] The Government of the United Kingdom specified that the application of the Convention had been extended to Anguilla as from 26 March 1987.

8. Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1994

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 27 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/49/742 of 2 December 1994.
STATUS: Signatures: 43. Parties: 4.

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 49/59 of the General Assembly dated 9 December 1994. The Convention was open for signature on 15 December 1994 and will remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 31 December 1995.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a)*
Argentina	15 Dec 1994	
Australia	22 Dec 1995	
Bangladesh	21 Dec 1994	
Belarus	23 Oct 1995	
Belgium	21 Dec 1995	
Bolivia	17 Aug 1995	
Brazil	3 Feb 1995	
Canada	15 Dec 1994	
Czech Republic	27 Dec 1995	
Denmark	15 Dec 1994	11 Apr 1995
Fiji	25 Oct 1995	
Finland	15 Dec 1994	
France	12 Jan 1995	
Germany	1 Feb 1995	
Haiti	19 Dec 1994	
Honduras	17 May 1995	
Italy	16 Dec 1994	
Japan	6 Jun 1995	6 Jun 1995 A
Liechtenstein	16 Oct 1995	
Luxembourg	31 May 1995	
Malta	16 Mar 1995	
Netherlands	22 Dec 1995	
New Zealand	15 Dec 1994	
Norway	15 Dec 1994	3 Jul 1995
Pakistan	8 Mar 1995	
Panama	15 Dec 1994	
Philippines	27 Feb 1995	
Poland	17 Mar 1995	
Portugal	15 Dec 1994	
Romania	27 Sep 1995	
Russian Federation	26 Sep 1995	
Samoa	16 Jan 1995	
Senegal	21 Feb 1995	
Sierra Leone	13 Feb 1995	
Slovakia	28 Dec 1995	
Spain	19 Dec 1994	
Sweden	15 Dec 1994	
Togo	22 Dec 1995	
Tunisia	22 Feb 1995	
Ukraine	15 Dec 1994	17 Aug 1995
United Kingdom	19 Dec 1995	
United States of America	19 Dec 1994	
Uruguay	17 Nov 1995	

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance or acession.)

SLOVAKIA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"If a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention is not settled by negotiation, the Slovak Republic prefers its submission to the International Court of Justice in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention. Therefore a dispute, to which the Slovak Republic might be a Party can be submitted to arbitration only with the explicit consent of the Slovak Republic."

CHAPTER XIX. COMMODITIES

1. International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956

Opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations from 15 November 1955 to 15 February 1956

TEXT: United Nations publications, sales No.: 1956.II.D.1 (E/CONF.19/5). (See also amended text in chapter XIX.3.)

---

2. Protocol amending the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956

Adopted at the second session of the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil held in Geneva from 31 March to 3 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 April 1958, in accordance with article 4.
REGISTRATION: 29 May 1958, No. 4355.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 302, p. 121.

---

3. International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956

As amended by the Protocol of 3 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 June 1959, in accordance with article 36 (5).
REGISTRATION: 26 June 1959, No. 4806.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 336, p. 177.

---

4. International Coffee Agreement, 1962

Done at New York on 28 September 1962

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 July 1963 in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 64, and definitively on 27 December 1963 in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 64.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1963, No. 6791.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 469, p. 169, and vol. 515, p. 322 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Russian text of the Agreement).

---

5. International Coffee Agreement, 1968

Open for signature at New York from 18 to 31 March 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 October 1968 in accordance with paragraph (2) of article 62, and definitively on 30 December 1968 in accordance with paragraph (1) of article 62.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1968, No. 9262.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 647, p. 3.

---

5. *(a)* Extension with modifications of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968

Approved by the International Coffee Council in resolution No. 264 of 14 April 1973

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 October 1973.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1973, No. 9262.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 893, p. 350.

---

5. *(b)* International Coffee Agreement, 1968

Open for signature at New York from 18 to 31 March 1968, as extended with modifications by the International Coffee Council in resolution No. 264 of 14 April 1973

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 October 1973, in accordance with the provisions of resolution No. 264 of the International Coffee Council.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1973, No. 9262 (Registration of the extension: see chapter XIX.5 *(a)*).
TEXT: Document of the International Coffee Organization.

5. *(c)* Protocol for the Continuation in Force of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, as extended

Concluded at London on 26 September 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1975, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1975, No. 9262.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 982, p. 332.

5. *(d)* International Coffee Agreement, 1968

Open for signature at New York from 18 to 31 March 1968, as extended by the Protocol of 26 September 1974

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 October 1975, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1, of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1975, No. 9262 (registration of the Protocol of 26 September 1974).

6. International Sugar Agreement, 1968

Opened for signature at New York from 3 to 24 December 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 January 1969, in accordance with paragraph (2) of article 63, an definitively on 17 June 1969 in accordance with paragraph (1) of article 63.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1969, No. 9369.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 654, p. 3.

7. Agreement establishing the Asian Coconut Community

Opened for signature at Bangkok on 12 December 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 July 1969, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 30 July 1969, No. 9733.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 684, p. 163; vol. 803, p. 514 [amendment to article 11 (2)] and depositary notification C.N.302.1980.TREATIES-1 of 29 October 1980 [amendment to article 5 (3)].[1]
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 7.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up at the meeting of the Inter-Governmental Consultations on the Asian Coconut Community, held at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East in Bangkok from 26 to 28 November 1968, which was attended by the representatives of the Governments of Sri Lanka, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand and of the United Nations Development Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a)*
India	12 Dec 1968	18 Jun 1969	Philippines	12 Dec 1968	26 Aug 1969
Indonesia	12 Dec 1968	30 Jul 1969 *A*	Samoa		28 Dec 1972 *a*
Malaysia	30 Jun 1969	22 Feb 1972	Sri Lanka	11 Mar 1969	25 Apr 1969 *a*
Papua New Guinea		11 Nov 1976 *a*	Thailand	26 Jun 1969	

NOTES:

[1] Amendments were adopted in accordance with article 15 of the Agreement as follows, to enter into force upon adoption:
— On 21 December 1971, at the fifth regular session of the Asian Coconut Community, held in Jakarta (amendment to article 11 (2));
— On 30 August 1980, at the eighteenth regular session of the Asian Coconut Community, held at Port Moresby (amendment to article 5 (3)).

8. Agreement establishing the Pepper Community

Opened for signature at Bangkok on 16 April 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 March 1972, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 29 March 1972, No. 11654.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 818, p. 89.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 4.

Note: This Agreement was drawn up at the meeting of the Inter-Governmental Consultations on the Pepper Community, held at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East in Bangkok from 24 to 27 February 1971, which was attended by the representatives of the Governments of Sri Lanka, India, Indonesia and Malaysia and of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Brazil		30 Mar 1981 *a*	India	21 Apr 1971	29 Mar 1972

9. International Cocoa Agreement, 1972

Concluded at Geneva on 21 October 1972

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 30 June 1973, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 67.
REGISTRATION: 30 June 1973, No. 12652.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 882, p. 67.

10. International Sugar Agreement, 1973

Concluded at Geneva on 13 October 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 January 1974 [see article 36(2)], and definitively on 15 October 1974, in accordance with article 36 (1).
Validity extended until 31 December 1977, see under chapters XIX.10 *(a)* and *(c)*.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1974, No. 12951.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 906, p. 69 and vol. 958, p. 279 (rectification of authentic texts).

10. (a) Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1973

Approved by the International Sugar Council in resolution No. 1 of 30 September 1975

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 January 1976, in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution No. 1 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 30 September 1975.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1976, No. 12951.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 472.

10. (b) International Sugar Agreement, 1973

Concluded at Geneva on 13 October 1973, as extended by the International Sugar Council in resolution No. 1 of 30 September 1975

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 January 1976, in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution No. 1 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 30 September 1975.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1976, No. 12951 (registration of the extension).
TEXT: See under chapter XIX.10, and annex to resolution No. 1.

10. (c) Second extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1973, as extended

Approved by the International Sugar Council in resolution No. 2 of 18 June 1976

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 January 1977, in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution No. 2 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 18 June 1976.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1977, No. 12951.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1031, p. 402.

10. (d) International Sugar Agreement, 1973

Concluded at Geneva on 13 October 1973, as extended further by the International Sugar Council in resolution No. 2 of 18 June 1976

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 January 1977, in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution No. 2 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 18 June 1976.
REGISTRATION: 28 December 1976, No. 12951 (registration of the extension).
TEXT: See chapter XIX.10, and annex to resolution No. 2.

10. (*e*) THIRD EXTENSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1973, AS FURTHER EXTENDED

Approved by the International Sugar Council in resolution No. 3 of 31 August 1977

EFFECTIVE DATE: See "*Note:*" below.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1978, No. 12951.
TEXT: Resolution No. 3 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 31 August 1977.

Note: The International Sugar Agreement, 1973, as extended, would have expired on 31 December 1977. By its resolution No. 3 of 31 August 1977 the International Sugar Council, acting pursuant to article 42(3) of the Agreement, decided to extend the Agreement until 31 December 1978 should the new Agreement not have entered into force by 1 January 1978. The said decision did not take effect, the International Sugar Agreement, 1977, having entered into force provisionally on 1 January 1978 (see under chapter XIX.18).

11. Agreement establishing the Asian Rice Trade Fund

Drawn up at Bangkok on 16 March 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1974, in accordance with article 19.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1974, No. 13679.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 955, p. 195; depositary notifications C.N.26.1979.TREATIES-1 of 28 February 1979 and C.N.101.TREATIES-2 of 22 May 1979 [amendments to paragraphs (i) and (iii) of article 1].
STATUS: Signatories: 5. Parties: 4.

Note: The text of the Agreement was drawn up by the intergovernmental meeting on the establishment of an Asian Rice Trade Fund convened by the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East at Bangkok, Thailand, from 12 to 16 March 1973; it was approved and initialled by the representatives of Democratic Kampuchea, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand.

The signatories agreed on 29 November 1973 to extend to 31 May and 1 December 1974, respectively, the time-limits provided for by articles 17 and 19 of the Agreement for signature and deposit of instruments of acceptance.

The Board of Directors of the Asian Rice Trade Fund, in a resolution adopted at Manila on 10 January 1979, proposed certain amendments to article 1 (i) and (iii) of the Agreement. In accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the Agreement the proposed amendments have come into force on 15 December 1981 upon acceptance by all members of the Fund. Following is a list of the States which have accepted the amendments and the dates of their acceptance:

Participant	*Date of acceptance*
Sri Lanka	1 Jun 1979
Bangladesh	14 Jun 1979
India	24 Jun 1980
Philippines	15 Dec 1981

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Acceptance, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Acceptance, accession (a)*
Bangladesh	29 Jun 1973	1 Dec 1974	Philippines[2]	19 Apr 1973	11 Mar 1975 *a*
Cambodia	18 Apr 1973		Sri Lanka	31 May 1974	29 Nov 1974
India	29 Jun 1973	28 Nov 1974			

NOTES:

[1] The Republic of Viet Nam had signed the Agreement on 16 April 1974 and deposited an instrument of acceptance on 11 March 1975. In this regard see note 2 below and note 31 in chapter I.2 and note 1 in chapter III.6.

[2] The States Parties unanimously decided that the instruments of acceptance by the Governments of the Philippines and of the Republic of Viet Nam, having been received after the time-limit of 1 December 1974, should be treated as instruments of accession.

12. Protocol for the Continuation in Force of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, as extended

Concluded at London on 26 September 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1975, in accordance with article 5 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1975, No. 9262.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 982, p. 332.

13. Fifth International Tin Agreement, 1975

Concluded at Geneva on 21 June 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 July 1976, in accordance with article 50 *(a)*, and definitively on 14 June 1977, in accordance with article 49 *(a)*.
Validity extended until 30 June 1982, by Resolution No. 121 adopted by the International Tin Council on 14 January 1981.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1976, No. 14851. Registration of the extension: 1 July 1981.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1014, p. 43.

14. International Cocoa Agreement, 1975

Concluded at Geneva on 20 October 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 October 1976, in accordance with article 69 (2), and definitively on 7 November 1978, in accordance with article 69 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1976, No. 15033.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1023, p. 253.

15. International Coffee Agreement, 1976

Concluded at London on 3 December 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 October 1976, in accordance with article 61 (2), and definitively on 1 August 1977, in accordance with article 61 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1976, No. 15034.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1024, p. 3.

15. (*a*) International Coffee Agreement, 1976

Approved by the International Coffee Council in resolution No. 318 of 25 September 1981

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 October 1982, in accordance with paragraph 2 of resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 25 September 1981.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1982, No. 15034.
TEXT: Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 25 September 1981.

15. (*b*) International Coffee Agreement, 1976

Concluded at London on 3 December 1975, as extended until 30 September 1983 by the International Coffee Council in resolution No. 318 of 25 September 1981

EFFECTIVE DATE: 1 October 1982, in accordance with resolution No. 318.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1982, No. 15034 (registration of the extension).
TEXT: Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 25 September 1981.

16. Agreement establishing the International Tea Promotion Association

Concluded at Geneva on 31 March 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 February 1979, in accordance with article 19 (1).
REGISTRATION: 23 February 1979, No. 17582.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1128, p. 367.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 8.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up by the Intergovernmental Conference of the Tea Producing Countries for the establishment of an International Tea Promotion Association, which met in Geneva from 7 to 17 September 1976. (The Conference had been convened by the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT.) In accordance with the provisions of the resolution adopted on 17 September 1976 by the Conference, the Governments of nine countries whose total volume of exports of tea accounted for more than two-thirds of the total volume of exports of tea of all countries qualified to participate in the Agreement had, as at 31 March 1977, notified the Director of the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT their approval of the text of the Agreement.

In accordance with the provisions of article 18, the Agreement has been opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 15 April 1977 until and including 15 October 1977.

By a Resolution adopted by the Governing Board of the International Tea Promotion Association on 21 November 1984, it was decided to suspend for an initial period of two years the following articles of the Agreement establishing the International Tea Promotion Association: article 1, paragraph 2, but only with regard to the phrase "and to formulate programmes to achieve this objective"; article 1, paragraph 3; article 11; article 12 and article 13.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Bangladesh		2 Apr 1979 *a*	Mozambique		29 Mar 1984 *a*
India[1]	[20 Jul 1977]	[1 Nov 1977]	Sri Lanka[2]	[22 Sep 1977]	[1 Nov 1977]
Indonesia	7 Jul 1977	31 Aug 1978	Uganda	14 Oct 1977	23 Aug 1978
Kenya	2 Aug 1977	17 May 1978	United Republic of Tanzania	27 Jul 1977	28 Jul 1978
Malawi	17 Aug 1977	22 Feb 1978			
Mauritius	2 Aug 1977	25 Nov 1977			

NOTES:

[1] On 25 July 1984, a notification of withdrawal was received from the Government of India.

[2] On 29 September 1982, a notification of withdrawal was received from the Government of Sri Lanka.

17. Agreement establishing the Southeast Asia Tin Research and Development Centre

Concluded at Bangkok on 28 April 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 February 1978, in accordance with article 8.
REGISTRATION: 10 February 1978, No. 16434.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1075, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 3.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up within the framework of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. It was open for signature at the headquarters of the Commission, in Bangkok, until 30 April 1977.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*
Indonesia[1]	28 Apr 1977	11 Jan 1978	Thailand[1]	28 Apr 1977	11 Jan 1978
Malaysia[1]	28 Apr 1977	11 Jan 1978			

NOTES:

[1] By notifications, the last of which was received by the Secretary-General on 11 January 1978, the Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand agreed to extend until 31 October 1977 the time-limit for lodging their instrument of ratification previously set at 31 July 1977 under article 7 *(c)* of the Agreement.

The instruments of ratification by the Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, which were lodged with the Secretary-General on 12 and 20 September and 18 October 1977, respectively, were officially deposited with the Secretary-General on 11 January 1978, the date of receipt of the last notification of acceptance referred to in the preceding paragraphs.

18. International Sugar Agreement, 1977

Concluded at Geneva on 7 October 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 January 1978, in accordance with article 75 (2), and definitively on 2 January 1980, in accordance with article 75 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1978, No. 16200.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1064, p. 219; vol. 1102, p. 355; vol. 1103,p. 398; vol. 1119, p. 388; vol. 1122, p. 391; vol. 1132, p. 444; vol. 1157, p. 459 (procés-verbaux of rectification of the original French and Russian, French and Spanish, Russian, French, and French, Spanish and Russian, respectively).

18. (*a*) Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1977

Approved by the International Sugar Council in decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1983, in accordance with decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982 adopted by the International Sugar Council.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1983, No. 16200.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1297, p. 433.

Note: The International Sugar Agreement of 1977 would have expired on 31 December 1982. By its decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982, adopted at its thirteenth and fourteenth sessions, respectively, the International Sugar Council, acting pursuant to article 83 (1) of the Agreement, decided to extend the Agreement until 31 December 1984. All Parties to the International Sugar Agreement, 1977 are considered as having accepted the said extension in the absence of a notification of withdrawal.

18. (*b*) Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1977

Concluded at Geneva on 7 October 1977, as extended until 31 December 1984 by the International Sugar Council in decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1983, for all States Party to the International Sugar Agreement, 1977, in accordance with article 83 (2).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1983, No. 16200.
TEXT: Decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982 adopted by the International Sugar Council.

19. Agreement establishing the International Tropical Timber Bureau

Concluded at Geneva on 9 November 1977

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 24).
TEXT: Doc. TT/CONF.2.

Note: The text of the Agreement was established by the Intergovernmental meetings of tropical timber producing countries, held at Geneva from 27 September 1976 to 1 October 1976 and from 31 October 1977 to 9 November 1977 within the framework of the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT (see document TT/Conf.2). The Agreement was opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 16 January 1978, in accordance with article 22.

20. International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1979

Concluded at Geneva on 6 October 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 23 October 1980, in accordance with article 61 (2), and definitively on 15 April 1982, in accordance with article 61 (1).
REGISTRATION: 23 October 1980, No. 19184.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1201, p. 191.

21. Agreement establishing the Common Fund for Commodities

Concluded at Geneva on 27 June 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 June 1989, in accordance with article 57 (1) (see "*Note:*").
REGISTRATION: 19 June 1989, No. 26691.
TEXT: Doc. TD/IPC/CF/CONF/24 and depositary notification C.N.42.1982.TREATIES-3 of 12 March 1982 (procès-verbal of rectification of Russian and Spanish authentic texts including annexes A and B).
STATUS: Signatories: 119. Parties: 104.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 27 June 1980 by the United Nations Negotiating Conference on a Common Fund under the Integrated Programme for Commodities, which met at Geneva from 5 to 27 June 1980 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Agreement was opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 1 October 1980, and will remain open for signature until one year after the date of its entry into force.

At a meeting convened on 3 June 1982 in Geneva by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, under article 57 (1) of the Agreement, the Contracting Parties decided to extend until 30 September 1983 the time-limit for the fulfilment of the requirements for its entry into force.

Subsequently, by a later decision taken at a Meeting of those States which had deposited prior to 30 September 1983 an instrument of ratification, approval or acceptance, meeting which was held on 19 June 1989, it was decided further to extend to 19 June 1989 [the date of the decision] the date by which the requirements should be fulfilled.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Voluntary contributions for use in the Second Account (article 13)*	
			Currency Unit	*Amount*
Afghanistan	11 Sep 1981	28 Mar 1984		
Algeria	15 Mar 1982	31 Mar 1982		
Angola	29 Jun 1983	28 Jan 1986		
Argentina	22 Sep 1982	1 Jul 1983		
Australia[1]	[20 May 1981]	[9 Oct 1981]		
Austria	8 Jul 1981	4 May 1983		
Bangladesh	23 Dec 1980	1 Jun 1981		
Barbados	2 Jan 1985			
Belgium[2]	31 Mar 1981	6 Jun 1985	Belgian Franc	100 million
Benin	10 Sep 1981	25 Oct 1982		
Bhutan	22 Sep 1983	18 Sep 1984		
Botswana	18 Nov 1981	22 Apr 1982		
Brazil	16 Apr 1981	28 Jun 1984		
Bulgaria	29 Jul 1987	24 Sep 1987 *AA*		
Burkina Faso	20 Aug 1981	8 Jul 1983		
Burundi	8 Apr 1981	1 Jun 1982		
Cameroon	30 Jun 1981	1 Feb 1983		
Canada[1]	[15 Jan 1981]	[27 Sep 1983]		
Cape Verde	9 Oct 1981	30 Jul 1984		
Central African Republic	28 Jan 1982	2 Aug 1983		
Chad	16 Dec 1981	6 Jun 1984		
China	5 Nov 1980	2 Sep 1981 *AA*		
Colombia	14 Jun 1983	8 Apr 1986		
Comoros	10 Sep 1981	27 Jan 1984		
Congo	22 Oct 1981	4 Nov 1987		
Costa Rica	29 Jul 1981			
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Jul 1987			
Cuba	22 Jun 1983	21 Jul 1988		
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	29 Jun 1983	5 Jun 1987		
Denmark	27 Oct 1980	13 May 1981		
Djibouti	9 Oct 1984	25 Nov 1985		

Participant	Signature	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)	Voluntary contributions for use in the Second Account (article 13)	
			Currency Unit	Amount
Dominican Republic	15 Jun 1983			
Ecuador	3 Oct 1980	4 May 1982		
Egypt	19 Oct 1981	11 Jun 1982		
El Salvador	28 Jun 1983			
Equatorial Guinea	22 Jul 1983	22 Jul 1983		
Ethiopia	30 Sep 1981	19 Nov 1981		
European Community	21 Oct 1981	6 Jul 1990 *AA*		
Finland	27 Oct 1980	30 Dec 1981		
France	4 Nov 1980	17 Sep 1982 *AA*		
Gabon	10 Sep 1981	30 Nov 1981		
Gambia	23 Oct 1981	14 Apr 1983		
Germany[3,4]	10 Mar 1981	15 Aug 1985		
Ghana	1 Dec 1982	19 Jan 1983		
Greece	21 Jul 1981	10 Aug 1984		
Grenada	28 Jun 1983			
Guatemala	1 Jun 1983	22 Mar 1985		
Guinea	6 Oct 1981	9 Dec 1982		
Guinea-Bissau	11 Sep 1981	7 Jun 1983		
Guyana	8 Jun 1983			
Haiti	19 Jan 1981	20 Jul 1981		
Honduras	28 Jun 1983	26 May 1988		
India	18 Sep 1981	22 Dec 1981 *A*		
Indonesia	1 Oct 1980	24 Feb 1981		
Iraq	7 Apr 1981	10 Sep 1981		
Ireland	24 Feb 1981	11 Aug 1982		
Italy	17 Dec 1980	20 Nov 1984		
Jamaica	6 Jan 1983	7 Jan 1985		
Japan	28 Nov 1980	15 Jun 1981 *A*	Yen	Equivalent of US $27,000 000
Kenya	10 Mar 1982	6 Apr 1982		
Kuwait	1 Dec 1981	26 Apr 1983		
Lesotho	7 Sep 1981	6 Dec 1983		
Liberia	21 Oct 1981			
Luxembourg	29 Dec 1980	4 Oct 1985		
Madagascar	8 Jun 1983	21 Oct 1987		
Malawi	17 Mar 1981	15 Dec 1981		
Malaysia	30 Dec 1980	22 Sep 1983		
Maldives	19May 1988	11 Jul 1988		
Mali	17 Jun 1981	11 Jan 1982		
Mauritania	18 Oct 1988	28 Aug 1990		
Mexico	19 Dec 1980	11 Feb 1982		
Morocco	22 Jan 1981	29 May 1987		
Mozambique	21 Dec 1982	20 Sep 1993 *a*		
Nepal	7 Sep 1981	3 Apr 1984		
Netherlands[5]	1 Oct 1980	9 Jun 1983 *A*		
New Zealand[1,6]	[12 Feb 1982]	[27 Sep 1983]		
Nicaragua	7 Sep 1981	5 Mar 1984		
Niger	19 Oct 1981	19 Oct 1981 *AA*		

Participant	Signature	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)	Voluntary contributions for use in the Second Account (article 13)	
			Currency Unit	Amount
Nigeria	20 Jul 1981	30 Sep 1983		
Norway	27 Oct 1980	15 Jul 1981		
Pakistan	4 May 1982	9 Jun 1983		
Papua New Guinea	27 Oct 1981	27 Jan 1982		
Peru	25 Sep 1981	29 Jul 1987		
Philippines	24 Feb 1981	13 May 1981		
Portugal	30 Jan 1981	3 Jul 1989		
Republic of Korea	27 Nov 1981	30 Mar 1982		
Russian Federation	14 Jul 1987	8 Dec 1987 *AA*		
Rwanda	6 Oct 1981	23 Mar 1983		
Saint Lucia	20 Dec 1984			
Samoa	2 Apr 1982	6 Mar 1984		
Sao Tome and Principe	20 Jun 1983	6 Dec 1983		
Saudi Arabia	11 Jan 1983	16 Mar 1983		
Senegal	11 Nov 1981	20 Jun 1983		
Sierra Leone	24 Sep 1981	7 Oct 1982		
Singapore	17 Dec 1982	16 Dec 1983		
Somalia	27 Oct 1981	27 Aug 1984		
Spain	27 May 1981	5 Jan 1984		
Sri Lanka	21 Jan 1981	4 Sep 1981		
Sudan	13 May 1981	30 Sep 1983		
Suriname	20 Jun 1983			
Swaziland	18 Nov 1987	29 Jun 1988		
Sweden	27 Oct 1980	6 Jul 1981		
Switzerland	30 Mar 1981	27 Aug 1982		
Syrian Arab Republic	26 Mar 1982	8 Sep 1983		
Thailand	8 Jun 1983	6 Aug 1992 *a*		
Togo	29 Jun 1983	10 Apr 1984		
Tunisia	2 Mar 1982	15 Dec 1982		
Turkey[1]	[7 Sep 1981]	[29 Aug 1990]		
Uganda	19 Mar 1982	19 Mar 1982		
United Arab Emirates	8 Jun 1982	26 Apr 1983		
United Kingdom	16 Dec 1980	31 Dec 1981	Pound sterling	4,270,000
United Republic of Tanzania	7 Sep 1981	11 Jun 1982		
United States of America	5 Nov 1980			
Uruguay	13 Feb 1986			
Venezuela	5 Dec 1980	31 Mar 1982		
Yemen[7]	16 Dec 1981	8 Jan 1986		
Yugoslavia	7 Jan 1982	14 Feb 1983		
Zaire	17 Mar 1981	27 Oct 1983		
Zambia	3 Feb 1981	16 Mar 1983		
Zimbabwe	8 Jun 1983	28 Sep 1983		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ARGENTINA

Reservation made upon signature and maintained upon ratification:

The Argentine Republic, exercising its prerogative under article 58 of the Agreement, enters a reservation regarding article 53 of that Agreement as it cannot accept compulsory arbitration as the only means of settling disputes of the kind referred to in this article, and as it believes that the parties to such disputes must be free to determine by mutual agreement the means of settlement best suits to each particular case.

BELGIUM

In accordance with article 11, paragraph 3, of the Agreement, the payment of the Paid-in Shares subscribed by Belgium (2,640,699 Units of Account)will be effected in three instalments in accordance with the specified procedure, the first of which will take place within 60 days after the entry into force of the Agreement.

With regard to the amount subscribed by Belgium for Payable Shares (915,543 Units of Account), it shall be subject to call by the Fund, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, only as provided in article 17, paragraph 12.

BULGARIA

Upon signature:

[Same declaration identical in substance, mutatis mutandis, *as that made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.]*

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, in conformity with article 58 of the Agreement, that it does not consider itself bound by the arbitration procedures for the settlement of disputes established in article 53.

JAPAN

"The Government of Japan shall contribute to the initial resources of the Second Account of the Common Fund an amount in Japanese yen that is equivalent to twenty-seven million United States dollars (U.S.$27 million) in accordance with article 13 of the Agreement."

The Government of Japan opts for payment of the above contribution in three equal annual instalments, with the first one to be made in cash or in notes within one year after the entry into force of the Agreement. The notes are understood to be irrevocable, non-negotiable, non-interest bearing promissory notes, issued in lieu of a cash payment and payable to the Fund at par value upon demand. It is also understood that the notes are to be treated in the same manner as notes of the same kind from other contributors.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon approval:

In view of its well known position, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot recognize the legality of the names "Republic of Korea" and "Democratic Kampuchea" contained in the schedules to the Agreement establishing the Common Fund for Commodities.

SINGAPORE

"The Government of the Republic of Singapore declares that it is not in agreement with the manner in which the share of individual countries to the Directly Contributed Capital was determined. Nevertheless, the Government of the Republic of Singapore will make contributions as presently indicated in schedule A of the Agreement. This should not however prejudice in any way Singapore's position on its share of any contributions to be made under other agreements."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

Our accession to and ratification of the Agreement shall not in any way imply recognition of Israel and shall not, consequently, lead to involvement with it any transactions as are regulated by the provisions of the Agreement.

Reservation:

The Syrian Arab Republic enters a reservation in respect of article 53 of the Agreement, with regard to the binding nature of arbitration.

VENEZUELA

Upon signature, maintained upon ratification:

With reservation as to article 53.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ISRAEL

14 November 1983

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument deposited by the Syrian Arab Republic contains a declaration of a political character in respect of the State of Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel this Agreement is not the place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic under general international law or under specific conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in regard to the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Declarations under article 11 (1) of the Agreement[8]
(Procedure for the payment of Shares of Directly Contributed Capital)

Participant	*Procedure selected [formula (a) or (b)] under article 11 (1)*	*Currency selected (by States having chosen procedure of payment (b))*	*Amended option[9] (currency selection indicates option (b))*
Argentina	(b)	French francs	
Australia[1]	[(a)]		[French franc]
Austria[10]	(b)	Deutsche mark	French franc
Bangladesh	(b)	US dollar	French franc
Belgium	(b)	French franc	
Canada[1]	[(b)]	[French franc]	
Central African Republic	(b)	French franc	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	(a)		French franc
Denmark	(b)	French franc	
Finland	(b)	French franc	
Germany[3,11]	(b)	[Deutsche mark]	
Ghana	(b)	French franc	
Greece	(b)	French franc	
India	(a)		French franc
Ireland	(b)	French franc	
Italy	(b)	French franc	
Jamaica	(a)		French franc
Japan	(a)		
Malawi	(b)	US dollar	
Malaysia	(b)	US dollar	French franc
Mauritania	(b)	French franc	
Morocco	(b)	French franc	
Mozambique		French franc	
New Zealand[1]	[(b)]	[French franc]	
Niger	(b)	US dollar	
Norway	(a)		French franc
Pakistan	(b)	US dollar	(a)
Papua New Guinea	(b)	US dollar	
Peru	(b)	French franc	
Republic of Korea	(a)		French franc
Singapore	(b)	Pound sterling	French franc
Spain	(b)	French franc	
Sri Lanka	(a)		French franc
Swaziland	(b)	French franc	
Sweden	(a)		French franc
Switzerland	(a)		French franc
Tunisia	(b)	French franc	
Turkey[1]	[(a)]		[French franc]
United Kingdom	(b)	Pound sterling	
United Republic of Tanzania	(b)	US dollar	
Venezuela	(a)		French franc

NOTES:

[1] The Secretary-General was informed by the Common Fund for Commodities that, pursuant to article 30 of the Agreement, the following Governments had notified the Common Fund, by a letter on the following dates, their decision to withdraw from the Common Fund. The withdrawal became effective on the dates specified by the Governments, which were not less than twelve months after the receipt of their notice by the Fund, as indicated hereinafter:

Participant	*Date of the notification:*	*Effective date:*
Australia	15 Aug 1991	20 Aug 1992
Canada	8 Jun 1992	9 Jun 1993
New Zealand	15 Feb 1993	17 Feb 1994
Turkey	29 Jul 1994	1 Aug 1995

[2] The payment of the voluntary contribution will be made after the entry into force of the Common Fund, the terms of which are specified in article 57 of the Agreement.

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] The instrument of ratification states that the said Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it will enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles.

[6] The Agreement shall also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue. See also note 1 in this chapter.

[7] The Yemen Arab Republic had signed and ratified the Agreement on 7 September 1981 and 14 January 1986, respectively. See note 32 in chapter I.2.

[8] At its 9th session held on 20 July 1989, the Governing Council decided that any Member State which had not yet made known its selection of one of the payment procedures provided for in article 11, paragraph 1 *(see table)*, was to notify in writing the Secretary-General of UNCTAD of its selection not later than 18 August 1989, and that any Member State which had not notified its selection by 18 August 1989 would be deemed to have selected the procedure provided for under article 11, paragraph 1 (a).

At its 10th session, held on 21 July 1989, the Governing Council decided that the rates of conversion deemed to apply at the date of payment shall be the rate of the Unit of Account as defined in Schedule F of the Agreement and as determined by the International Monetary Fund, on the thirtieth business day before the actual date of payment.

[9] Prior to the entry into force of the Agreement, a number of States had notified a change in the option which they had exercised under article 11 (1) (see depositary notification of 17 July 1989). See also note 8 above.

[10] In notification received on 10 August 1983, the Government of Austria indicated that, in accordance with article 11 (1) (b), Austria's contribution to the Common Fund for Commodities will be paid in German marks until such time as payment in Austrian shillings becomes possible.

[11] On 8 June 1989, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its notification under article 11 (1).

22. International Cocoa Agreement, 1980

Concluded at Geneva on 19 November 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: In whole, provisionally on 1 August 1981, in accordance with the decision taken on 30 June 1981 by the meeting of Governments convened by the Secretary-General under article 66 (3).

REGISTRATION: 1 August 1981, No. 20313.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1245, p. 221; vol. 1276, p. 520 (procès-verbal of rectification of original English, French and Russian texts); and United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1288, p. 437 (rectification of the authentic Russian text).

23. Sixth International Tin Agreement

Concluded at Geneva on 26 June 1981

ENTRY INTO FORCE: In whole, provisionally on 1 July 1982, in accordance with a decision taken on 23 June 1982 by a meeting of Governments convened by the Secretary–General under article 55 (3) of the Agreement.[1]

REGISTRATION: 1 July 1982, No. 21139.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1282, p. 205; and vol. 1287, p. 360 (procès–verbal of rectification of the Spanish authentic text); vol. 1294, p. 412 (procès–verbal of rectification of original Arabic, French and Spanish texts) and vol. 1300, p. 413 (procès–verbal of rectification of the French authentic text).

STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 25.

Note: The text of the Agreement was adopted by the United Nations Tin Conference which was held at Geneva from 9 March to 26 June 1981. The Agreement was opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 3 August 1981 to 30 April 1982.

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraphs 1 and 5 of article 54 of the said Agreement, the International Tin Council decided, at its session held in London on 6 May 1982, to establish standard conditions of accession to the Agreement so as to allow Governments which had not been able to sign the Agreement by 30 April 1982 to accede thereto prior to 1 July 1982, the date of its intended entry into force, the sole conditions being that they accept the obligations under the Agreement.

Subsequently, on 27 April 1987, the International Tin Council adopted a resolution extending the Agreement for two years as from 1 July 1987, in accordance with its article 59 (2).

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Austria	4 Feb 1982	4 Feb 1982[2]	
Belgium	27 Apr 1982	27 Apr 1982[2]	26 Jun 1984
Canada	29 Apr 1982	11 May 1982[2]	30 Jun 1983
Denmark	27 Apr 1982	27 Apr 1982[2]	9 Oct 1985
European Community	27 Apr 1982	27 Apr 1982[2]	
Finland	11 Mar 1982	28 May 1982[2]	6 Dec 1983
France	27 Apr 1982	28 May 1982	14 Jun 1983 AA
Germany[3]	27 Apr 1982	27 Apr 1982[2]	
Greece	30 Apr 1982	30 Apr 1982[2]	16 May 1985
India		28 Jun 1982	26 May 1983 *a*
Indonesia	8 Oct 1981		2 Feb 1982
Ireland	27 Apr 1982	2 Jun 1982	
Italy	27 Apr 1982	27 Apr 1982[2]	12 Dec 1984
Japan	19 Feb 1982	28 May 1982[2]	28 Jun 1982 A
Luxembourg	27 Apr 1982	27 Apr 1982[2]	26 Jun 1984
Malaysia	4 Sep 1981		4 Sep 1981
Netherlands[4]	30 Mar 1982	30 Mar 1982[2]	28 Mar 1984 A
Nigeria	30 Apr 1982		15 Jul 1983
Norway	18 Nov 1981		9 Jun 1982
Poland	30 Apr 1982	9 Dec 1982[2]	
Sweden	29 Apr 1982		9 Jun 1982
Switzerland	8 Apr 1982	22 Apr 1983	22 Apr 1983
Thailand	26 Jan 1982	28 May 1982	11 Aug 1983
United Kingdom	22 Apr 1982	26 May 1982	
Zaire	30 Apr 1982		16 Nov 1982

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

BELGIUM, DENMARK, EUROPEAN COMMUNITY, FRANCE, GERMANY[3], IRELAND, ITALY, LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:
Declaration
With the understanding that the Agreement will not be used to facilitate or support manipulations of the tin market.

GREECE

Upon signature:
With the understanding that the Agreement will not be used to facilitate or support manipulations of the tin market.
Upon notification of provisional application:
"The Greek Government reserves its position with respect to article 23 (Arrears in contribution to the Buffer Stock Account) as far as the payment of interest on arrears is concerned for the period before the ratification by Greece of the Agreement.

NOTES:

[1] For the following participants:
Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, European Economic Community, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Thailand and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

[2] Within the limitations of constitutional and/or legislative procedures, in accordance with article 53 (2): no contribution to Buffer Stock Account [article 53 (2)].

[3] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

24. International Agreement on Jute and Jute Products, 1982

Concluded at Geneva on 1 October 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: In whole, provisionally on 9 January 1984 in accordance with article 40 (3) and definitively on 26 August 1986, in accordance with article 40 (1).
REGISTRATION: 9 January 1984, No. 22672.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1346, p. 59; depositary notifications C.N.218.1985.TREATIES-4 of 13 December 1985 (adoption of an authentic Chinese text)[NO TAG] and C.N.143.1988.TREATIES-2 of 22 August 1988 [Decision 2 (IX) Renegotiation of the Agreement].

25. International Coffee Agreement, 1983

Adopted by the International Coffee Council on 16 September 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 October 1983, in accordance with article 61 (2), and definitively on 11 September 1985, in accordance with article 61 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1983, No. 22376.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1333, p. 119.

(a) Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, with modifications

Approved by the International Coffee Council in Resolution No. 347 of 3 July 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1989, in accordance with paragraph 5 and 6 of Resolution No. 347.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1989, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 347 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 3 July 1989.

(b) International Coffee Agreement, 1983

Adopted by the International Coffee Council on 16 September 1982, as modified and extended by Resolution No. 347 of 3 July 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1989, in accordance with paragraph 5 and 6 of Resolution No. 347.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1989, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 347 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 3 July 1989.

(c) Second Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as modified

Adopted by the International Coffee Council by Resolution No. 352 of 28 September 1990

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1991, in accordance with paragraphs 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 352.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1991, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 352 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 28 September 1990 at its fifty sixth session.

(d) International Coffee Agreement, 1983

Adopted by the International Coffee Council on 16 September 1982, as modified by Resolution No. 347 of 3 July 1989 and extended further by Resolution No. 352 of 28 September 1990

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1991, in accordance with paragraphs 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 352.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1991, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 352 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 28 September 1990 at its Fifty sixth session.

(e) Third Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as modified

Adopted by the International Coffee Council by Resolution No. 355 of 27 September 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1992, in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 355.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1992, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 27 September 1991 at its Fifty-seventh session.

(f) International Coffee Agreement, 1983

Adopted by the International Coffee Council on 16 September 1982, as modified by resolution No. 347 of 3 July 1989 and extended further by Resolution No. 355 of 27 September 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1992, in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 355.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1992, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 27 September 1991 at its fiftyseventh session.

(g) Fourth Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1993, as modified

Adopted by the International Coffee Council under Resolution No. 363 of 4 June 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1993, in accordance with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Resolution No. 363.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1993, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 363 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1993.

(h) International Coffee Agreement, 1993

Adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1983, as modified by resolution No. 347 of 3 July 1989 and further extended by resolution No. 363 of 4 June 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1993, in accordance with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Resolution No. 363.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1993, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 363, adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1993.

26. International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983

Concluded at Geneva on 18 November 1983

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1985, provisionally, in accordance with article 37 (2).
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1985, No. 23317.
TEXT: Doc. TD/TIMBER/11; depositary notifications C.N.188.1984.TREATIES-8 of 23 August 1984 (adoption of the authentic Chinese text)[1], C.N.204.1984.TREATIES-10 of 19 September 1984 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Russian and Spanish texts) and C.N.21.1987.TREATIES-1 of 20 April 1987 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Chinese authentic text).
STATUS: Signatories: 35. Parties: 54.

Note: The Agreement was adopted within the framework of UNCTAD by the United Nations Conference on Tropical Timber, 1983, which met in Geneva from 14 to 31 March and 7 to 18 November 1983, the Agreement was open for signature by Governments invited to the United Nations Conference on Tropical Timber, 1983, at the United Nations Headquarters in November on 2 January 1984 until one month after the date of its entry into force.

On 24 June 1985, at its first session, held in Geneva, the International Tropical Timber Council decided, in accordance with article 35 of the Agreement, that the conditions of accession for non-signatory Governments shall be that the States accept all the obligations of the Agreement and that the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession would be the date of the opening of the second session of the Council.

At its second session, from 23 to 27 March 1987, the International Tropical Timber Council decided, that for all States acceding to the Agreement the conditions shall be that they accept all the obligations of the Agreement. The Council also decided that the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession shall be the duration of the Agreement [Decision 1 (III)].

Subsequently, by Decision 3(VI), confirmed at Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire, on 24 May 1989, the International Tropical Timber Council decided, in accordance with article 42 (1) of the Agreement, to extend the Agreement for a period of two years from 1 April 1990 to 31 March 1992.

Subsequently, the Agreement was extended for a further period of two years with effect from 1 April 1992 until 31 March 1994 by Decision 4 (X) of the International Tropical Timber Council, taken at its tenth session held in Quito, Ecuador, from 29 May to 6 June 1991, in accordance with article 42 (2) of the Agreement.

At its Second Special Session held in Geneva on 21 January 1994, the International Tropical Timber Council, by Decision 1 (S-II), has extended the above Agreement until the entry into force of the successor Agreement, i.e. the International Tropical Timber Agreement 1994 (see chapter XIX.39).

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Australia			16 Feb 1988 *a*
Austria			6 Mar 1986 *a*
Belgium	29 Jun 1984	28 Sep 1984	21 Feb 1986
Bolivia	1 Nov 1984	25 Jun 1985	
Brazil	31 Mar 1985	31 Mar 1985	
Canada			21 May 1986 *a*
Cameroon	15 Apr 1985	14 Jun 1985	19 Nov 1985
China			2 Jul 1986 *a*
Colombia			27 Mar 1980 *a*
Congo	7 Mar 1985		28 Mar 1985
Côte d'Ivoire	27 Mar 1985	27 Mar 1985	
Denmark	29 Jun 1984		28 Sep 1984
Ecuador	31 Mar 1985	31 Mar 1985	19 Jan 1988
Egypt	31 Mar 1985	31 Mar 1985	16 Jan 1986
European Community	29 Jun 1984	29 Mar 1985	
Fiji			9 Aug 1995 *a*
Finland	10 May 1984		13 Feb 1985
France	29 Jun 1984	29 Jun 1984	6 Aug 1985 *AA*
Gabon	25 Jun 1984	19 Mar 1985	31 Oct 1988
Germany[2,3]	29 Jun 1984	29 Jun 1984	21 Mar 1986
Ghana	29 Mar 1985		29 Mar 1985
Greece	29 Jun 1984	28 Nov 1984	26 Jul 1988

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Guyana			7 Oct 1992 *a*
Honduras	27 Sep 1984	29 Mar 1985	
India			19 Feb 1986 *a*
Indonesia	13 Jun 1984		9 Oct 1984
Ireland	29 Jun 1984		4 Oct 1984
Italy	29 Jun 1984		29 Mar 1985
Japan	28 Mar 1984		28 Jun 1984 *A*
Liberia	8 Mar 1984		29 Mar 1985
Luxembourg	29 Jun 1984	28 Sep 1984	21 Feb 1986
Malaysia	14 Dec 1984		14 Dec 1984
Myanmar			16 Nov 1993 *a*
Nepal			3 Jul 1990 *a*
Netherlands[4]	29 Jun 1984	20 Sep 1984	29 May 1987 *A*
New Zealand			5 Aug 1992 *a*
Norway	23 Mar 1984		21 Aug 1984
Panama			3 Mar 1989 *a*
Papua New Guinea			27 Nov 1985 *a*
Peru	31 Mar 1985	31 Mar 1985	
Philippines	31 Mar 1985	31 Mar 1985	
Portugal			3 Jul 1989 *a*
Republic of Korea			25 Jun 1985 *a*
Russian Federation	28 Mar 1985		20 May 1985 *A*
Spain	27 Feb 1985	24 Apr 1985	1 Apr 1986
Sweden	23 Mar 1984		9 Nov 1984
Switzerland	30 Apr 1985		9 May 1985
Thailand			9 Oct 1985 *a*
Togo			8 May 1986 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	29 Apr 1985		9 May 1986
United Kingdom	29 Jun 1984		18 Sep 1984
United States of America	26 Apr 1985	26 Apr 1985	25 May 1990 *A*
Venezuela			31 Mar 1994 *a*
Zaire			20 Nov 1990 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance or approval. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

(a) In the event that the European Economic Community becomes a party to the present Agreement, the participation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the Agreement shall not give rise to any obligations on its part in relation to the Community.

(b) In view of its well-known position on the Korean question, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot recognize as lawful the designation "Republic of Korea" contained in Annex "B" to the Agreement.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance or approval. .)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

6 August 1985

On behalf of the European Economic Community and its member States, [the European Economic Community and its members] wish to inform you of their reaction to the [declaration made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics]. The international Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983, states, in article 5, paragraph 1, that "Any reference in this Agreement to

'Governments' shall be construed as including the European Economic Community and any other intergovernmental organisation having responsibilities in respect of the negotiation, conclusion and application of international agreements, in particular commodity agreements".

In application of the provision, the European Economic Community signed the International Tropical Timber Agreement on 29 June 1984, and notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 29 March 1985 that the community would apply that Agreement provisionally, in accordance with the rules set forth in article 36.

[It] wishes to point out also that article 43 of the International Tropical Timber Agreement prohibits any reservation to the Agreement.

The Community and its member States are therefore of the opinion that the above declaration can in no way be enforceable against them, and they regard it as being without effect.

NOTES:

[1] The authentic Chinese text of the Agreement was established by the depositary and submitted for adoption in accordance with the testimonium.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany specified that "the Agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany". See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

27. INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1984

Concluded at Geneva on 5 July 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally on 1 January 1985, in accordance with article 38 (2), and definitively on 4 April 1985, in accordance with article 38 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1985, No. 23225.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1388, p. 3.

28. International Wheat Agreement, 1986

(*a*) Wheat Trade Convention, 1986

Concluded at London on 14 March 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1986, in accordance with article 28 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1986, No. 24237.
TEXT: Doc. IWA (86) 1 of International Wheat Council and depositary notification C.N.139.1986. TREATIES–4/4 of 18 September 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original).
STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 46.

Note: The Convention which together with the Food Aid Convention, 1986, (see hereinafter under chapter XIX.28 (*b*)) constitute the International Wheat Agreement, 1986, was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 1 May 1986 until and including 30 June 1986.

In accordance with the provisions of article 33 (2), the Wheat Trade Convention was to expire on 30 June 1991. At its 115th session, held on 25 and 26 June 1991, the International Wheat Council definitively extended the Convention for a period of two years, until 30 June 1993, and at its hundred and eighteenth session, held on 1 December 1992, the Committee extended the Convention for another periode of 2 years, until 30 June 1995.

Moreover, the International Wheat Council decided to extend the time-limit for the deposit of the instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession by the following participants, as indicated hereinafter:

Session	*Date*		*Decision taken*
105th	30 June to 3 July	1986	Extension until 30 June 1987: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, European Economic Community, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, India, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Iraq, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, Pakistan, Panama, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela and Yemen.
106th	9 to 11 December	1986	Extension until 30 June 1987: Hungary.
107th	8 to 10 July	1987	Extension until 30 June 1988: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, European Economic Community, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Switzerland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela and Yemen.
	15 September	1987	Extension until 30 September 1987: Mauritius[1].
109th	6 to 7 July	1988	Extension until 30 June 1989: Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Egypt, European Economic Community, Greece, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Venezuela and Yemen.
111th	10 to 12 July	1989	Extension until 30 June 1990: Argentina, Brazil, European Economic Community, Greece, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Italy, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela and Yemen.
113th	10 to 11 July	1990	Extension until 30 June 1991: Argentina, Brazil, European Economic Community, Greece, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Morocco, Panama, Saudi Arabia and Yemen
115th	25 to 26 June	1991	Extension until 30 June 1993: Brazil, European Economic Community, Greece, Iran, Islamic Republic of, Morocco, Panama, Saudi Arabia and Yemen.
118th	1 December	1992	Extension until 30 June 1993: Côte d'Ivoire.
119th	21 and 22 June	1993	Extension until 30 June 1995: Côte d'Ivoire, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Morocco, Panama, Saudi Arabia and Yemen.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Algeria			23 Nov 1987 *a*
Argentina	25 Jun 1986	25 Jun 1986	9 Aug 1990
Australia			27 Jun 1986 *a*
Austria			2 Sep 1987 *a*
Barbados	26 Jun 1986		2 Jul 1986
Belgium	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	2 Jun 1989
Bolivia		30 Jun 1986	1 Jun 1987 *a*

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Brazil	12 Jun 1986	12 Jun 1986	
Canada	23 Jun 1986		23 Jun 1986
Cuba	30 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	29 Jul 1987
Denmark	26 Jun 1986		26 Jun 1986
Ecuador	1 May 1986	1 May 1986	12 Aug 1987
Egypt	29 May 1986	2 Jul 1986	12 Jul 1988
El Salvador		11 Jul 1986	
European Community	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	21 Aug 1991 *AA*
Finland	1 May 1986	18 Jun 1986	2 Mar 1987
France	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	21 Sep 1987 *AA*
Germany[2, 3]	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	14 Mar 1988
Greece	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	6 Mar 1992
Holy See			23 Jun 1986 *a*
Hungary			12 Mar 1987 *a*
India		27 Jun 1986	24 Sep 1986 *a*
Iraq			17 Jun 1987 *a*
Ireland	26 Jun 1986		26 Jun 1986
Israel			21 Nov 1988 *a*
Italy	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	28 Jul 1989
Japan	24 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	15 Dec 1986 *A*
Luxembourg	26 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	28 Jun 1989
Malta			9 Feb 1987 *a*
Mauritius			16 Sep 1987 *a*
Morocco	3 Jun 1986	3 Jun 1986	
Netherlands[4]	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	29 Dec 1989 *A*
Norway	30 Jun 1986		30 Jun 1986 *AA*
Pakistan		30 Jun 1986	13 Jan 1987 *a*
Panama		3 Jul 1986	
Portugal	26 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	17 Jul 1989
Republic of Korea		30 Jun 1986	22 Jun 1987 *a*
Russian Federation	18 Jun 1986		30 Jun 1986 *A*
South Africa	24 Jun 1986		24 Jun 1986
Spain	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	14 Sep 1987
Sweden	25 Jun 1986		25 Jun 1986
Switzerland	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	21 Sep 1987
Tunisia	14 May 1986	14 May 1986	15 May 1987
Turkey		30 Jun 1986	27 Feb 1987 *a*
United Kingdom[5]	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1989
United States of America	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	27 Jan 1988
Yemen[6]	27 Jun 1986		

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance or approval. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ARGENTINA

Bearing in mind that since the European Economic Community is one of the signatories to the Food Aid Convention, 1986, and the Wheat Trade Convention, 1986, the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community is applicable, and that in Part Four, Annex IV of this Treaty, the 'Falkland Islands and dependencies' and the 'British Antarctic Territory', are listed as dependent territories of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Argentine Republic declares that the inclusion of the Malvinas South Georgia and South Sandwich

Islands under the incorrect designation of 'Falkland Islands and dependencies' does not in any way affect its rights over those islands, which form part of its national territory. Occupation by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has prompted the United Nations General Assembly to adopt resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40 and 42/19, recognizing the existence of a sovereignty dispute relating to the Malvinas question and urging the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to engage in negotiations with a view to arriving as soon as possible at a definitive peaceful solution to the dispute through the good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General, who is to keep the General Assembly informed of progress.

The Argentine Republic likewise rejects the inclusion by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the so-called 'British Antarctic Territory', while reaffirming its rights to the Argentine Antarctic sector, including sovereignty and the corresponding maritime jurisdiction. It also recalls the safeguards against claims of territorial sovereignty in Antarctica established by article IV of the Antarctic Treaty, signed at Washington on 1 December 1959, to which the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are parties.

The Argentine Republic does not accept that article XV of the Food Aid Convention, 1986, and article 8 of the International Wheat Agreement, 1986, apply to disputes relating to territories under foreign occupation or colonial domination in respect of which there is a sovereignty dispute to resolve for which the United Nations has recommended specific action.

CUBA

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The signature of the Republic of Cuba to the International Wheat Agreement, 1986, shall not be interpreted as recognition or acceptance on the part of the Government of the Republic of Cuba of the racist Government of South Africa, which does not represent the South African People and which, because of its systematic practice of the discriminatory policy of *apartheid*, has been expelled from international agencies, condemned by the United Nations and rejected by all the peoples of the world.

The signature of the Republic of Cuba to the International Wheat Agreement, 1986, shall not be interpreted as recognition or acceptance on the part of the Government of the Republic of Cuba of the Republic of Korea, because Cuba considers that it does not genuinely represent the interests of the Korean people.

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that the provisions contained in articles 24, 26 and 27 of the Agreement are discriminatory because they exclude a number of States from the right to sign, provisionally apply and accede to the Agreement, which is contrary to the principle of universality.

ITALY

The Government of Italy will apply the Wheat Trade Convention, 1986, provisionally within the limits authorized by the Italian legal order.

JAPAN

"The Government of Japan implements the Convention, during the period of provisional application, within the limitations of its internal legislations and budgets."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"The Government of the Republic of Korea will provisionally apply, within the limitations of the domestic legislation and budgetary process of the Republic of Korea, the Wheat Trade Convention, 1986."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

(a) Should the European Economic Community become a party to this Convention, the participation to the Convention by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall not create for it any obligations with regard to that community.

(b) In the light of the well-known position on the Korean question, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot accept as valid the designation "Republic of Korea" contained in the annex to the Convention.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States of America will provisionally apply within the limitations of the United States internal legislation and budgetary process the Wheat Trade Convention, 1986."

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

28 January 1987

(Made on behalf of the European Economic Community and of its member States with respect to the declaration made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics):

Article 2 of the International Wheat Agreement, 1986 provides that any reference to a Government or Governments shall be construed as including a reference to the European Economic Community.

Further to this provision, the European Economic Community signed the International Wheat Agreement on 26 June 1986 and informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations that same day that it would apply the Agreement provisionally in accordance with the rules set forth in article 26 of the Agreement.

Accordingly, the Community and its member States consider unacceptable the declaration which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made concerning the European Economic Community when it signed and accepted the Agreement, which declaration was notified to the Community on 20 August 1986. This declaration can in no circumstances be invoked against them and they consider it null and void.

NOTES:

[1] Decision taken on 15 September 1987, pursuant to a consultation by correspondence.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a letter accompanying its instrument, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] For the United Kingdom, the British Virgin Islands, Gibraltar and Saint Helena.

[6] The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

(*b*) Food Aid Convention, 1986

Concluded at London on 13 March 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1986, in accordance with article XXI (2).
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1986, No. 24237.
TEXT: Document IWA (86) 1 of International Wheat Council and depositary notification C.N.139.1986. TREATIES-4/4 of 18 September 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original).
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 23.

Note: The Convention, which together with the Wheat Trade Convention, 1986, constitute the International Wheat Agreement, 1986, was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 1 May 1986 until and including 30 June 1986.

In accordance with the provisions of article XXII (1), the Food Aid Convention, 1986, was to expire on 30 June 1989. The Food Aid Committee at its fifty-seventh session extended the Convention for a period of two years until 30 June 1991, at its sixty-second session extended it further for an additional period of two more years, until 30 June 1993, and at its sixty-fifth session, held on 1 December 1992, the Committe extended the Convention further for a period of two years, until 30 June 1995.

Moreover, the Food Aid Committee decided to extend the time-limit for the deposit of the instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession by the following participants as indicated hereinafter:

Session	*Date*		*Decision taken*
52nd	3 July	1986	Extension until 30 June 1987: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, European Economic Community, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.
54th	7 July	1987	Extension until 30 June 1988: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, European Economic Community, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.
56th	5 July	1988	Extension until 30 June 1989: Argentina, Belgium, European Economic Community, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
58th	13 July	1989	Extension until 30 June 1990: Argentina, European Economic Community, Greece, Italy, Netherlands and Portugal.
60th	12 July	1990	Extension until 30 June 1991: Argentina, European Economic Community and Greece.
62nd	27 June	1991	Extension until 30 June 1993: European Economic Community and Greece.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Argentina	25 Jun 1986	25 Jun 1986	9 Aug 1990
Australia			29 Jun 1988 *a*
Austria	27 Jun 1986		26 Aug 1987
Belgium	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	2 Jun 1989
Canada	23 Jun 1986		23 Jun 1986
Denmark	26 Jun 1986		26 Jun 1986
European Community	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	21 Aug 1991 *AA*
Finland	1 May 1986	18 Jun 1986	2 Mar 1987
France	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	21 Sep 1987 *AA*
Germany[1, 2]	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	14 Mar 1988
Greece	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	6 Mar 1992
Ireland	26 Jun 1986		26 Jun 1986
Italy	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	28 Jul 1989
Japan	24 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	15 Dec 1986 *A*
Luxembourg	26 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	28 Jun 1989
Netherlands[3]	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	29 Dec 1989 *A*
Norway	30 Jun 1986		30 Jun 1986 *AA*
Portugal	26 Jun 1986	30 Jun 1986	17 Jul 1989
Spain	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	14 Sep 1987
Sweden	25 Jun 1986		25 Jun 1986

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Switzerland	26 Jun 1986		26 Jun 1986
United Kingdom[4]	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1989
United States of America	26 Jun 1986	26 Jun 1986	27 Jan 1988

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

ARGENTINA

[Same declarations and reservations as for chapter XIX.28 (a).]

ITALY

[Same declaration as for chapter XIX.28 (a).]

JAPAN

[Same declaration as for chapter XIX.28 (a).]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

[Same declaration as for chapter XIX.28 (a).]

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] In a letter accompanying its instrument, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 1 above.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] For the United Kingdom, the British Virgin Islands, Gibraltar and Saint. Helena.

29. Terms of Reference of the International Nickel Study Group

Adopted on 2 May 1986 by the United Nations Conference on Nickel, 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 May 1990, in accordance with paragraph 19 (b).
REGISTRATION: 23 May 1990, No. 27296.
TEXT: Doc. TD/NICKEL/12 and depositary notification C.N.145.1986.TREATIES–1 of 28 August 1986.
STATUS: Parties: 13 **(Upon the entry into force of the Statutes and the assumption of office by the Secretary-General of the Group, notifications of application or of withdrawal are to be made with the Secretary-General of the Group, in accordance with the provisions of article 19 (c) and 20. Only the Secretary-General of the Group is therefore henceforth in a position to indicate the exact number of participants.).**

Note: The Terms of Reference, of which the Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were adopted on 2 May 1986 by the United Nations Conference on Nickel, 1985, which met in Geneva from 28 October 1985 to 7 November 1985 and from 28 April 1986 to 2 May 1986.

Participant	*Provisional application*	*Definitive application*
Australia		12 Mar 1990
Canada		20 Sep 1986
Cuba	18 Dec 1989	
Finland		12 Sep 1986
France	28 Oct 1986	
Germany[1, 2]	19 Sep 1986	
Greece	2 Dec 1986	
Indonesia		2 May 1990
Japan		11 Apr 1990
Netherlands[3]	19 Sep 1986	15 Jun 1990
Norway		5 Jan 1988
Russian Federation[4]		19 Nov 1990
Sweden		19 Sep 1986

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional or definitive application.)

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"The Government of Australia nevertheless wishes to state its opinion that the issue of the precise legal nature of the Terms of Reference [whether the Terms of Reference is or not a treaty] can be determined following consideration by the members of the Group once the Terms of Reference have come into effect.

The Australian authorities wish to request that, in the light of the above, Australia should be considered as having duly notified the Secretary–General and as having completed the necessary procedures for the purposes of calculating, under Paragraph 19 (a) of the Terms of Reference, the number of states and percentage of world trade in nickel required for the coming into effect of the Terms of Reference."

CANADA

With a view to ensuring the viability of the Group, the Government of Canada wishes to confirm that it would not support putting these terms of reference into effect in whole or in part until such time as an appropriate number of countries representing sufficient world trade have been able to notify similar acceptance. Therefore, pursuant to provision 19(B) of the terms of reference, the Government of Canada would not envisage the convening by the United Nations of an early meeting should less than 15 states accounting for 50 percent of the world trade notify by the September 20, 1986 deadline.

At the same time, on the basis of consultation with prospective members of the INSG, the Government of Canada proposes to convene an informal meeting to consider appropriate next steps in the establishment of the Group, including planning for an inaugural meeting.

CUBA

The Government of the Republic of Cuba wishes to state that, in view of the non–fulfilment as yet of the coming–into–effect requirements established in paragraph 19 (a) of the resolution adopted by the United Nations Conference on Nickel, 1985, and the annexed terms of reference, establishing an International Nickel Study Group which requirements are that when at least 15 countries which in total account for over 50% of the world trade in nickel have given notice of provisional or definitive application, the definitive application by the Republic of Cuba of the provisions of the resolution and the annexed terms of reference referred to above will be considered subject to the following conditions:

(a) A higher level of participation in the Group, in order to ensure the effective functioning of the Group and hence an acceptable level of contribution.
(b) The taking into account of the limitations existing for the Republic of Cuba in offering certain statistics on nickel production, consumption and trade.

The Government of the Republic of Cuba states that, for the reasons given above and in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 19 (c) of the resolution and annexed terms of reference, it has chosen the option of provisional application of the terms of reference, and further study of its definitive accession in the light of subsequent decisions on the conditions laid down."

GERMANY[1]

The Federal Republic of Germany reserves its position in relation to the text of paragraph 13 of the Terms of Reference of the International Nickel Study Group. In this respect it refers to the proposal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland [made during the Conference, to amend paragraph 13 of the Terms of Reference] as reproduced in Annex III of the resolution adopted by the United Nations Conference on Nickel 1985 (doc. TD/NICKEL/12):

Annex III

Proposal submitted by the delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

"13. (a) The Group shall have legal personality. It shall in particular, but subject to paragraph 6 (b) above, have the capacity to enter into contracts, to acquire and to dispose of movable and immovable property and to institute legal proceedings.

(b) The members of the Group shall not be liable to meet any obligations of the Group (whether in contract, tort or otherwise). Their obligations shall be limited to meeting their respective budget contribution under paragraph 14 of these Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure. The Group shall not have the power and shall not be taken to have been authorized by the members, to incur any obligation outside the scope of these Terms of Reference or the Rules of Procedure.

(c) All contracts of the Group shall incorporate subparagraph (b) of this paragraph.

(d) The status of the Group in the territory of the host Government shall be governed by a Headquarters Agreement between the host Government and the Group, to be concluded as soon as possible after these Terms of Reference have come into effect."

GREECE

Greece supports the British proposal [see under Federal Republic of Germany] to amend the Constitution of the Group, with the aim to restrain its contractual competence.

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] In this regard, on 25 August 1987, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany the following communication:

On 19 September 1986, the Federal Republic of Germany signed the final document negotiated within UNCTAD on the establishment of an International Nickel Study Group, and, in accordance with paragraph 19 (c) of the Terms of Reference contained in the final document, gave written notice of the provisional application of the Terms of Reference. In so doing the Federal Republic of Germany endorsed the reservation made by the United Kingdom (see Annex II to the Terms of Reference).

According to the United Nations Secretariat, seven countries accounting for 30.83% of the world trade in nickel have so far notified the provisional or definitive application of the INSG Terms of Reference.

As a result of this unexpectedly low level of participation, the INSG has not yet been established because pursuant to their paragraph 19 (a) the Terms of Reference do not come into effect until at least 15 countries which in total account for over 50% of the world trade in nickel have notified provisional or definitive application.

Against this background, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to state the following concerning its provisional application of the Terms of Reference notified on 19 September 1986:

1. *Definitive* membership of the INSG by the Federal Republic of Germany can only be considered under the following conditions:

(a) A high minimum level of participation (80%) remains the primary prerequisite for the proper functioning of the INSG, in the view of the Federal Republic of Germany. During the negotiating conference, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany made it clear that the other major nickel producing and nickel consuming countries must also become members of the group. The participants in the conference were even agreed that the envisaged INSG must attract so many countries that its membership accounts for at least 80% of the world trade in nickel.

(b) The Federal Republic of Germany confirms in this connection the reservation likewise notified on 19 September 1986 (Annexes II and III to the Terms of Reference).

2. For this reason, the Federal Republic of Germany chose the option of *provisional* application of the Terms of Reference, as provided in paragraph 19 (c) thereof. This does not "automatically" lead to definitive membership. The Federal Republic of Germany will therefore decide on its definitive accession in due course, taking into account the extent to which the conditions specified under paragraph 1 above have been met.

See also note 1 above.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] With effect from 1 January 1991.

30. International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986

Concluded at Geneva on 1 July 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1987, provisionally, in accordance with article 55 (2) and definitively on 1 December 1988.[1]
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1987, No. 24591.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1445, No. 24591; and depositary notifications C.N.262.1990.TREATIES-2 of 14 November 1990 (amendment to article 26 (1) (C)); C.N.169.1991.TREATIES-4 of 14 October 1991 [(amendment to article 26, section 1-A, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b)]; C.N.177.1992.TREATIES-1 of 13 August 1992 [modification to article 17 (1)]; and C.N.143.1994.TREATIES-1/2/3 of 20 June 1994.[2]
STATUS: Signatories: 4. Parties: 9.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 1 July 1986 by the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil, 1986, which met at Geneva from 18 June to 2 July 1986. The Agreement was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters from 1 September until and including 31 December 1986, by any Government invited to the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil, 1986, in accordance with its article 52 (1).

In accordance with the provisions of article 60 (1), the Agreement was to expire on 31 December 1991. In accordance with article 60 (2), the International Olive Oil Council, by resolution No. RES-1/63-IV/90 of 13 December 1990, adopted at its sixty-third session, held in Madrid from 10 to 14 December 1990, decided, in accordance with article 60 (2), to extend the Agreement for a period of one year from 31 December 1991 to 31 December 1992. The resolution further indicated that the Agreement shall be automatically prolonged for a second period of one year ending on 31 December 1993, unless Members indicate otherwise by written notification to the Executive Secretariat of the International Olive Oil Council by 30 April 1991. In the absence of such notification the Agreement was automatically prolonged for a second period of one year ending on 31 December 1993.

Moreover, the International Olive Council decided to extend the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval, or accession, as indicated hereinafter:

Date of the decision:	*Extension until:*	
17 February 1987	31 December 1987	
17 December 1987	5 June 1988	
9 June 1988	31 December 1988	
1 December 1988	30 June 1989	
12 to 16 June 1989	31 December 1989	
27 to 30 November 1989	30 June 1990	
14 to 18 May 1990	31 December 1990	
10 to 14 December 1990	30 June 1991	
29 May 1991	31 December 1991	
20 November 1991	30 June 1992	
28 May 1992	31 December 1992	for Israel, Lebanon and Morocco.
10 June 1993	31 December 1993	
18 November 1993	31 May 1994	for Lebanon.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Algeria	23 Dec 1986	23 Dec 1986	29 Dec 1987
Cyprus			5 Nov 1992 *a*
Egypt			12 Jul 1988 *a*
European Community			12 Dec 1986 *s*
Israel			31 Dec 1992 *a*
Morocco	18 Dec 1986	18 Dec 1986	28 Jul 1993
Tunisia	17 Dec 1986	17 Dec 1986	23 Jul 1987
Turkey	30 Dec 1986	30 Dec 1986	21 Jun 1988
Yugoslavia			20 Apr 1988 *a*

NOTES:

[1] By Resolution No. RES-2/59-IV/88, adopted on 1 December 1988 during its fifty-ninth extraordinary session held in Madrid from 29 November to 2 December 1988, the International Olive Oil Council decided, in accordance with article 10 (2) of the Agreement to adjust the Member's participation shares pertaining to the Administrative Budget, as listed in Annex A to the Agreement, the total of the said shares thus reaching 100%. As a consequence, the conditions provided for in article 55 (1) of the Agreement were met, and accordingly the Agreement entered into force on 1 December 1988.

[2] At its sixty-third session, the Council recommended to its Members that article 17 (7), which stipulates that the contributions provided for in article 17 shall be determined in United States dollars, shall henceforth be determined in ECUS (European Currency Units). The Council retained 15 August 1991 as the date by which members were to notify the depositary of their acceptance of the amendment, which time-limit was subsequently extended to 15 November 1991. By that later date however only two participants had accepted the amendment (Tunisia on 14 August 1991 and Turkey on 25 September 1991) and the amendment was accordingly considered withdrawn.

The International Olive Oil Council, by Resolution No. RES-2/68-IV/93, adopted during its sixty-eighth session held in Capri from 7 to 11 June 1993, has decided in accordance with article 10 (2), article 17 (3) and article 20 (1) and (2) of the Agreement to modify from 1 January 1993 the Members' participation shares pertaining to the administrative budget, and the shares for the purposes of contribution to the Publicity fund (Annexes A and B to the Agreement).

(*a*) Protocol of 1993 extending the International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, with amendments

Concluded at Geneva on 10 March 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 January 1994, provisionally, and definitively on 25 March 1994, in accordance with article 8 (1).
REGISTRATION: 26 January 1994.
TEXT: Doc. TD/OLIVE OIL.9/4; and depositary notification C.N.343.1995.TREATIES–4 du 10 November 1995 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic italian text of the Protocol).
STATUS: Signatories: 9. Parties: 10.

Note: The Protocol, of which the Arabic, English, French, Italian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted at the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1993, held in Geneva on 8, 9 and 10 March 1993. The Protocol was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, in New York, from 1 May until 31 December 1993 in accordance with its article 5. In accordance with article 1, paragraph 2, so far as the Parties to the Protocol are concerned, the Agreement and the Protocol shall be read and interpreted as one single instrument and shall be known as the "International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, as amended and extended, 1993".

Moreover, the International Olive Oil Council took the following decisions as indicated hereinafter:

Date of the decision:	*Extension until:*
28 January 1994	Extension until 31 March 1994 of the time–limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval in the case of those Governments which have not made a notification of provisional application of the Agreement as amended and extended.
	Extension until 30 June 1994 of the time–limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by Governments which have made a notification of provisional application of the Agreement as amended and extended.
11 April 1994	Extension until 30 June 1994 of the time–limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification acceptance or approval by signatory Governments.
31 May 1994	Extension until 31 December 1994 of the time–limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval of the Protocol and accession by Lebanon to the Agreement.
17 November 1994	Extension until 30 June 1995 of the time–limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval by Algeria, Egypt, Morocco and accession by Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic.
1 June 1995	Extension until 31 December 1995 of the time–limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval and accession by Lebanon, Morocco and the Syrian Arab Republic.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Provisional application of the Agreement as amended and extended*
Algeria	29 Dec 1993	8 Feb 1995	
Cyprus	17 Dec 1993	26 Jan 1994	
Egypt	30 Dec 1993	18 Jan 1995	
European Community	21 Dec 1993	21 Dec 1993 *AA*	
Israel	30 Dec 1993	30 Dec 1993	
Lebanon		7 Jul 1995 *a*	
Morocco	23 Jun 1993		31 Mar 1994
Tunisia	23 Aug 1993	30 Jun 1994	30 Dec 1993
Turkey	21 Dec 1993	25 Mar 1994	
Yugoslavia	23 Dec 1993	23 Dec 1993	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or notification of provisional application.)

TURKEY

Upon signature:

"The signature, acceptance or ratification of this Protocol by the Republic of Turkey shall in no way imply the recognition of the 'Republic of Cyprus' by Turkey. Nor should it imply any change in Turkey's well–known position that the Greek Cypriot side does not possess the right or authority to become party to international instruments on behalf of Cyprus as a whole. Turkey's accession to this Protocol, therefore, should not signify any obligation on the part of Turkey to enter into any dealings with 'Republic of Cyprus' as are regulated by the Protocol."

(*b*) International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, as amended and extended, 1993

Concluded at Geneva on 1 July 1986 as amended and extended by the Protocol of 1993, concluded at Geneva on 10 March 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 January 1994, provisionally and definitively on 25 March 1994, in accordance with article 8 (1) of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 26 January 1994.
TEXT: Doc. TD/OLIVE OIL.9/4 and depositary notification C.N.284.1994.TREATIES–3 of 11 November 1994 [amendment of designations and definitions in article 26, section 1, paragraph A, sub–paragraph (a)].
STATUS: Parties: 10.

Note: See "*Note:*" in chapter XIX.30 *a*).

Participant	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA) of the Protocol*
Algeria		8 Feb 1995
Cyprus		26 Jan 1994
Egypt		18 Jan 1995
European Community		21 Dec 1993 *AA*
Israel		30 Dec 1993
Morocco	31 Mar 1994	30 Jun 1994
Lebanon		7 Jul 1995 *a*
Tunisia	30 Dec 1993	
Turkey		25 Mar 1994
Yugoslavia		23 Dec 1993

31. International Cocoa Agreement, 1986

Concluded at Geneva on 25 July 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 January 1987, provisionally, in accordance with article 70 (3).
REGISTRATION: 20 January 1987, No. 24604.
TEXT: Doc. TD/COCOA.7/22; depositary notifications C.N.189.1986.TREATIES–1 of 29 September 1986; C.N.51.1987.TREATIES–4 of 5 May 1987 (procès–verbal of rectification of the original English text); C.N.186.1987.TREATIES–10 of 10 September 1987 (adoption of the authentic Chinese text); C.N.20.1988.TREATIES–1 of 8 April 1988 (procès–verbal of rectification of the original Chinese text); C.N.267.1987.TREATIES–13 of 7 December 1987 (communication by the International Cocoa Council concerning the inclusion of Mexico in Annex B)[NO TAG]; C.N.115.1990.TREATIES–1 of 29 May 1990 (partial extension of the Agreement with list of provisions extended: see "*Note*" below) and C.N.77.1991.TREATIES–1 of 25 June 1991 [procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic text of Annex E (Russian version)].

Note: L'Accord a été adopté le 25 juillet 1986 à Genève par la Conférence des Nations Unies de 1986 sur le cacao. L'Accord a été ouvert au Siège de l'Organisation des Nations Unies à New York, du 1er septembre jusqu'au 30 septembre 1986, inclus, à la signature, des parties à l'Accord international de 1980 sur le cacao et de tout Gouvernement invité à la Conférence des Nations Unies sur le cacao, 1984, conformément à son article 65.

Aux termes des dispositions du paragraphe 1 de l'article 75, l'Accord venait à expiration le 30 septembre 1990. Le Conseil international du cacao, à sa trente-neuvième session, a prorogé pour partie l'Accord pour une période de deux ans, jusqu'au 30 septembre 1992 et à sa quarante–troisième, a prorogé l'Accord tel que, dans sa présente forme prorogée, jusqu'au 30 septembre 1993.

32. International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1987

Concluded at Geneva on 20 March 1987

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 December 1988, provisionally, in accordance with article 60 (2) and definitively on 3 April 1989, in accordance with article 61 (1).
REGISTRATION: 29 December 1988, No. 26364.
TEXT: Doc. TD/RUBBER.2/EX/R.1/Add.7 and depositary notification C.N.82.1988.TREATIES-2 of 26 May 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Russian texts).
STATUS: Signatories: 23. Parties: 28.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 20 March 1987 by the United Nations Conference on Natural Rubber, which met lastly at Geneva from 9 to 20 March 1987 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Agreement was opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, from 1 May to 31 December 1987, in accordance with its article 56.

Subsequently, the International Rubber Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision	*Decision:*
3–7 April 1989	Extension until 28 December 1989 with retroactive effect from 2 January 1989, of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by signatory States of the International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1987, which have been unable to deposit their instruments by 1 January 1989.
15 November 1989	Extension until 31 December 1990 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States which apply the Agreement provisionally and which could not deposit their instruments by 28 December 1989.
12, 13 November 1990	Extension until 31 December 1991 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States which apply the Agreement provisionally and which could not deposit their instruments by 31 December 1990.
21, 23 October 1991	Extension until 31 December 1992 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States which apply the Agreement provisionally and which could not deposit their instruments by 31 December 1991.
30 November 1992 and 1 December 1992	Extension until 30 May 1993 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States which apply the Agreement provisionally and which could not deposit their instruments by 31 December 1992.
27,28 May 1993	Extension until 31 August 1993 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States which apply the Agreement provisionally and which could not deposit their instruments by 30 May 1993.
22, 25, 30 November 1993	Extension until 31 January 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States which apply the Agreement provisionally and which could not deposit their instruments by 31 August 1993.

Further, by resolutions 152 (XXVIII) adopted at its twenty-eighth session held from 22, 25-30 November 1993 and 164 (XXX) adopted at its thirtieth session held from 28 November, 1 and 2 December 1994, the International Natural Rubber Council decided, pursuant to article 66 of the Agreement, to extend the International Rubber Agreement 1987, until 28 December 1994 and further until 28 December 1995, respectively.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Belgium	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	24 Dec 1991
China	1 Dec 1987		6 Jan 1988
Côte d'Ivoire			22 Dec 1991 *a*
Denmark	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	30 Oct 1992 *A*
European Community	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	30 Oct 1992 *AA*
Finland	21 Dec 1987	6 Dec 1988	18 Apr 1989
France	18 Dec 1987	7 Oct 1988	6 Jul 1992 *AA*
Germany[1,2]	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	30 Oct 1992
Greece[3]	18 Dec 1987	29 Dec 1988	12 Mar 1991
Indonesia	21 Aug 1987		2 Nov 1987
Ireland	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	30 Oct 1992
Italy	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	30 Oct 1992
Japan	18 Dec 1987		3 Jun 1988 *A*

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Luxembourg	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	24 Dec 1991
Malaysia	25 Jun 1987		25 Jun 1987
Morocco	14 Sep 1987	30 Dec 1988	9 Aug 1993
Netherlands[4]	6 Nov 1987		29 Dec 1988 *A*
Nigeria			28 Nov 1989 *a*
Norway	21 Dec 1987		29 Dec 1988
Portugal	18 Dec 1987		30 Oct 1992
Russian Federation			3 Apr 1989 *a*
Spain	18 Dec 1987	28 Dec 1988	2 Dec 1993
Sri Lanka			11 Jul 1990 *a*
Sweden	21 Dec 1987		29 Dec 1988
Switzerland			28 Jun 1989 *a*
Thailand	23 Dec 1987	29 Dec 1988	24 Sep 1990
United Kingdom[5]	18 Dec 1987	22 Dec 1988	30 Oct 1992
United States of America	28 Aug 1987	9 Nov 1988	

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] In a letter accompanying its notification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the said agreement shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force provisionally for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 1 above.

[3] Provisional application with effect from 1 January 1989.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] For Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
Upon ratification, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland specified that the ratification shall extend to the United Kingdom and the Bailiwick of Jersey.

33. International Sugar Agreement, 1987

Concluded at London on 11 September 1987

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 March 1988, provisionally and in whole, in accordance with article 39 (3)[NO TAG].
REGISTRATION: 24 March 1988, No. 25811.
TEXT: Doc. TD/SUGAR/11/5 and depositary notification C.N.19.1988.TREATIES-2 of 22 March 1988 (procès-verbal concerning the adoption of the authentic Arabic and Chinese texts).

34. Terms of Reference of the International Tin Study Group

Adopted on 7 April 1989 by the United Nations Tin Conference, 1988

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 21 (a)].
TEXT: Doc. TD/TIN.7/13.
STATUS: Parties: 12.

Note: The Terms of Reference, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were adopted on 7 April 1989 by the United Nations Tin Conference, 1988 which met in Geneva from 21 November to 2 December 1988 and from 29 March to 7 April 1989. The terms of reference are open to acceptance at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Participation	*Provisional acceptance*	*Definitive acceptance*	*Participation*	*Provisional acceptance*	*Definitive acceptance*
Belgium	6 Nov 1991		Luxembourg	6 Nov 1991	
European Community		6 Nov 1991	Malaysia		18 Oct 1989
France	26 Nov 1991	7 Aug 1992	Netherlands[1]		6 Nov 1991
Greece	29 Jun 1990	11 May 1993	Nigeria		19 Dec 1989
Indonesia		9 Mar 1990	Portugal		6 Nov 1991
Italy		15 May 1992	Thailand		16 Apr 1990

NOTES:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

35. Terms of Reference of the International Copper Study Group

Adopted on 24 February 1989 by the United Nations Conference on Copper, 1988

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 January 1992, in accordance with article 22 (d).
REGISTRATION: 23 January 1992, No. 28603.
TEXT: Doc. TD/COPPER/14 and depositary notification C.N.314.1992.TREATIES–7 of 16 November 1992 (amendments to paragraphs 13 and 14).
STATUS: Parties: 20.[1]

Note: The Terms of Reference, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were adopted on 24 February 1989 by the United Nations Conference on Copper, 1988 which met in Geneva from 13 to 24 June 1988 and from 20 to 24 February 1989. The terms of reference are open to acceptance at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Participation	*Provisional acceptance*	*Definitive acceptance*	*Participation*	*Provisional acceptance*	*Definitive acceptance*
Belgium	6 Nov 1991		Luxembourg	6 Nov 1991	
Canada		19 Jun 1992	Mexico		3 Apr 1995
Chile	29 Jun 1990	25 Oct 1994	Netherlands[2]		6 Nov 1991
China		12 Jul 1990	Norway		27 Feb 1991
European Community		6 Nov 1991	Peru	28 Jun 1990	16 May 1995
Finland		19 Jun 1990	Philippines[1]	[13 Jan 1992]	[10 Sep 1993]
France	26 Nov 1991	7 Aug 1992	Poland	29 Jun 1990	6 Feb 1991
Germany	22 Jan 1992	16 Dec 1992	Portugal		6 Nov 1991
Greece	29 Jun 1990	11 May 1993	Spain	6 Nov 1991	1 Feb 1994
Indonesia		30 Jul 1992	United States of America	15 Mar 1990	11 Nov 1994
Italy		22 Jan 1992	Zambia		18 Nov 1992
Japan		30 Oct 1992			

NOTES:

[1] On 4 December 1995, the Government of the Philippines notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw from the Terms of Reference as from 2 February 1996.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

36. International Agreement on Jute and Jute Products, 1989

Concluded at Geneva on 3 November 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 April 1991, provisionally, in accordance with article 40 (3).
REGISTRATION: 12 April 1991, No. 28026.
TEXT: Doc. TD/JUTE.2/EX/L.1 and Add.1.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 28.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Jute and Jute Products held in Geneva from 30 October to 3 November 1989. It is open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 1 January 1990 to 31 December 1990 inclusive by Governments invited to the United Nations Conference on Jute and Jute Products, 1989.

The International Jute Council, at its fifteenth session, held from 23 to 26 April 1991, established conditions of accession to the Agreement in its decision 1 (XV), *inter alia*, that instruments of accession were to be deposited by 30 November 1991.

Subsequently, the International Jute Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision		*Subject*
29 to 31 Oct	1991	Extension until 30 June 1992 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession.
29 to 3 May	1992	Extension until 30 June 1993 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession.
20 to 23 Apr	1993	Extension until 30 June 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession.
12, 14 and 15 May	1994	Extension until 30 June 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession.
22 to 25 April	1995	Extension until 30 June 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of accession.

Subsequently, pursuant to article 46 (2) of the Agreement, the International Jute Council, by Decision 1 (XXIII) adopted at its twenty-third session held in Dhaka from 22 to 25 April 1995, decided to extend the Agreement for a period of two years until 11 April 1998.

Participation	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Australia			25 Oct 1991 *a*
Austria			16 Apr 1993 *a*
Bangladesh	7 Jun 1990		29 Jan 1991
Belgium	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	
China			18 Jul 1990 *s*
Denmark	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	30 Oct 1992 *A*
Egypt	31 Dec 1990		16 May 1991
European Community	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	30 Oct 1992 *AA*
Finland	16 Nov 1990	20 Mar 1991	
France	20 Dec 1990	20 Dec 1990	2 Aug 1994 *AA*
Germany	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	12 Nov 1991
Greece	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	30 Oct 1992
India	28 Aug 1990		17 Sep 1990
Indonesia	27 Dec 1990		3 Apr 1991
Ireland	20 Dec 1990	4 Apr 1991	30 Oct 1992
Italy	20 Dec 1990	24 Oct 1991	30 Oct 1992
Japan	27 Mar 1990		13 Jul 1990 *A*
Luxembourg	20 Dec 1990	20 Dec 1990	
Nepal			9 Sep 1992 *a*
Netherlands[1]	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	30 Oct 1992 *A*
Norway	16 Nov 1990		28 Dec 1990
Pakistan	11 Dec 1990		30 Jan 1991
Portugal	20 Dec 1990		30 Oct 1992
Spain	20 Dec 1990	22 Mar 1991	22 Nov 1993
Sweden	16 Nov 1990		20 Mar 1991
Switzerland			9 Nov 1990 *s*
Thailand			27 Mar 1992 *a*
United Kingdom[2]	20 Dec 1990	14 Aug 1991	30 Oct 1992
United States of America[3]	[31 Dec 1990]		[31 Dec 1990 *A*]

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or definitive signature.)

FRANCE

Declaration:

It being understood that the constitutional procedures required for this purpose cannot be completed before 31 December 1990, the French Government, in accordance with the provisions of article 39 of the International Agreement of 1989, hereby declares that it will apply this Agreement provisionally, within the limits of its constitutional procedures, when the Agreement enters into force in accordance with article 40.

NOTES:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[2] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Bailiwick of Jersey.

[3] Notification of withdrawal with effect from 19 June 1994 received on 21 March 1994.

37. International Sugar Agreement, 1992

Concluded at Geneva on 20 March 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 January 1993, provisionally, in accordance with article 40 (3).
REGISTRATION: 20 January 1993. No. 29467.
TEXT: Doc. TD/SUGAR.12/6.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 35[1].

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 20 March 1992 by the United Nations Sugar Conference, 1992, and is the successor Agreement to the International Sugar Agreement, 1987 (see chapter XIX.27), which expires on 31 December 1992. The International Sugar Agreement, 1992, was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters from 1 May 1992 until 31 December 1992, in accordance with its article 36.

Date of decision	*Subject*
20 January 1993	Establishment of conditions for accession to the Agreement for the States listed in Annex A of the Agreement and extension until 31 December 1993 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of the 1992 International Sugar Agreement of their instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval.
2 December 1993	Extension until 31 December 1994 the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of the Agreement of their instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval.
24 November 1994	Extension until 31 December 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
1 December 1995	Extension until 31 December 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.

Subsequently, at its eighth session held in London on 1 December 1995, the International Sugar Organization decided to extend the Agreement for a further 2 years until 31 December 1997.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Argentina	29 Dec 1992	29 Dec 1992	
Australia	24 Dec 1992		24 Dec 1992
Austria	29 Dec 1992		19 Jul 1993
Barbados[1]	[31 Dec 1992]	[19 Jan 1993]	[20 Jan 1993]
Belarus			27 Sep 1993 *a*
Belize			24 Jan 1994 *a*
Brazil	30 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993	
Colombia	31 Dec 1992	31 Dec 1992	
Côte d'Ivoire			23 Mar 1993 *a*
Cuba	3 Nov 1992	3 Nov 1992	14 Oct 1994
Dominican Republic	25 Nov 1992	19 Jan 1993	
Ecuador			29 Dec 1993 *a*
El Salvador		1 Dec 1995	
European Community	20 Nov 1992		20 Nov 1992 *AA*
Fiji	4 Dec 1992		21 Dec 1992
Finland[1]	[22 Dec 1992]	[22 Dec 1992]	[21 Sep 1993]
Guatemala	31 Dec 1992	18 Mar 1993	
Guyana	24 Dec 1992		24 Dec 1992
Hungary	31 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993	19 Mar 1993 *AA*
India	31 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993	20 Jan 1993
Jamaica	23 Dec 1992	18 Jan 1993	23 Mar 1993
Japan	29 Dec 1992		29 Dec 1992 *A*
Kenya			6 Nov 1995 *a*
Latvia			7 Jul 1994 *a*
Malawi			13 Sep 1993 *a*
Mauritius	18 Dec 1992		18 Dec 1992
Panama	23 Dec 1992	23 Dec 1992	

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Republic of Korea	23 Dec 1992		15 Apr 1993
South Africa	22 Dec 1992		22 Dec 1992
Swaziland	23 Dec 1992		23 Dec 1992
Sweden[1]	[18 Dec 1992]		[21 Jan 1993]
Switzerland	30 Dec 1992	30 Dec 1992	27 Jan 1994
Thailand	30 Dec 1992	30 Dec 1992	8 Apr 1993
Trinidad and Tobago	31 Dec 1992		9 Sep 1993
Ukraine			28 Oct 1994 *a*
Zambia	31 Dec 1992		
Zimbabwe			14 Dec 1994 *a*

NOTES:

[1] Notifications of withdrawal received by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter :

States:	*Notification received on:*	*Date of effect:*
Barbados	1 Sep 1994	1 Oct 1994
Finland	27 Jun 1995	27 Jul 1995
Sweden	23 Jun 1995	23 Jul 1995

38. International Cocoa Agreement, 1993

Concluded at Geneva on 16 July 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 February 1994, provisionally and in whole, in accordance with article 56.[1]
REGISTRATION: 22 February 1994, No. 30692.
TEXT: Doc. TD/COCOA.8/17.
STATUS: Signatories: 40. Parties: 37.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Cocoa on 16 July 1993, and is the successor Agreement to the International Cocoa Agreement, 1986. the International Cocoa Agreement, 1993, was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters from 16 August 1993 until 30 September 1993, by Parties to the International Cocoa Agreement, 1986, and Governments invited to the United Nations Cocoa Conference, 1992, in accordance with its article 52.

The International Cocoa Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision	*Subject*
9 to 18 September 1993	Extension of the time-limit for signature and the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the Agreement until 28 February 1994 and establishment of the standard conditions for accession.
23 February 1994	Extension of the time-limit for signature and the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the Agreement until 30 September 1994 and confirmation of the standard conditions for accession.
8 to 16 September 1994	Extension of the time-limit for signature and the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the Agreement until 30 September 1995.
11 to 15 September 1995	Extension of the time-limit for signature and the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the Agreement until 30 September 1996.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Austria	30 Jun 1995		
Belgium	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Benin	2 Feb 1994		
Brazil	2 Feb 1994	18 Feb 1994	
Cameroon	11 Jan 1994	11 Jan 1994	
Côte d'Ivoire	3 Sep 1993	3 Sep 1993	18 May 1994
Czech Republic	7 Jun 1994		23 Jun 1994 *AA*
Denmark[1]	17 Feb 1994	17 Feb 1994	
Ecuador	16 Sep 1993	16 Sep 1993	26 Oct 1994
European Community	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Finland	1 Oct 1993		1 Oct 1993 *A*
France	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Gabon	30 Sep 1993	21 Dec 1993	
Germany	18 Feb 1994	18 Feb 1994	
Ghana	22 Sep 1993	12 Oct 1993	
Greece	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Grenada	18 Feb 1994	18 Feb 1994	
Guatemala	28 Feb 1994		
Hungary[1]	9 Dec 1993	18 Feb 1994	22 Feb 1994 *AA*
Ireland	16 Feb 1994	16 Aug 1994	
Italy	16 Feb 1994	6 Jan 1995	
Jamaica	6 Dec 1993	6 Dec 1993	28 Feb 1994
Japan	8 Feb 1994	8 Feb 1994	18 Jan 1995 *A*
Luxembourg	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Malaysia	21 Dec 1993		25 Jan 1994
Netherlands[2]	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Nigeria	23 Sep 1993	17 Feb 1994	2 Dec 1994
Norway	30 Sep 1993		14 Oct 1993

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Papua New Guinea			1 Sep 1995 *a*
Portugal	28 Feb 1994		31 Aug 1995
Russian Federation	13 Sep 1994		2 Nov 1994 *A*
Sao Tome and Principe	6 Mar 1995	6 Mar 1995	
Sierra Leone	7 Oct 1993	7 Oct 1993	
Slovakia	15 Feb 1994		26 Apr 1994 *AA*
Spain	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	29 Sep 1994
Sweden	30 Sep 1993		30 Sep 1993
Switzerland	30 Nov 1993	30 Nov 1993	17 Jun 1994
Togo	22 Sep 1993	12 Oct 1993	
Trinidad and Tobago	30 Sep 1993		30 Sep 1993
United Kingdom[3]	16 Feb 1994	16 Feb 1994	
Venezuela	13 Sep 1994		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

JAPAN

Declaration:

"The Government of Japan implements the said Agreement during the period of provisional application within the limitations of its internal legislation and budgets."

NOTES:

[1] The conditions required under paragraph 1 of article 56 of the Agreement for its definitive entry into force not having been fulfilled as at 1 October 1993 and neither the conditions required under paragraph 2 of the said article 56 for the provisional entry into force, the Secretary–General convened on 22 February 1994 in London, under article 56 (3) of the Agreement, a Meeting of the Governments and Organisation which had deposited an instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or a notification of provisional application of the Agreement i.e.: Belgium, Brazil, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, European Community, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Sierra Leone, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom. At this Meeting, the above–mentioned Governments and Organisation decided to put the Agreement into force provisionally and in whole among them as of 22 February 1994.

The participants also decided that the Governments of Denmark and Hungary (which had not taken part in the meeting although they had been invited having deposited a notification of provisional application, could notify to the Secretary–General their acceptance of the above decision to put the Agreement into force, and that in the event of such an acceptance, they would be added to the above list of participants which apply the Agreement provisionally as of 22 February 1994. Both Governments notified to the Secretary–General their acceptance.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Bailiwick of Jersey.

39. International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994

Concluded at Geneva on 26 January 1994

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 41 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. TD/TIMBER.2/L.8 and depositary notification C.N.89.1995.TREATIES-2 of 22 May 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts).
STATUS: Signatures: 28. Parties: 22.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 26 January 1994 at Geneva by the United Nations Conference on Tropical Timber, 1993. It is the successor agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983, which expired on 31 March 1994. It will be opened for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 1 April 1994 until one month after the date of its entry into force, by Governments invited to the United Nations Conference for the Negotiation of a Successor Agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983, in accordance with article 38 (1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA), definitive signature (s)*
Bolivia	17 Aug 1995		17 Aug 1995
Cambodia	3 Feb 1995		3 Feb 1995 *A*
Cameroon	22 Dec 1994	31 Aug 1995	
Canada	3 May 1995		
Colombia	8 Nov 1995		
Congo	22 Jun 1994	25 Oct 1995	
Ecuador	1 Jun 1994		6 Sep 1995
Egypt	8 Nov 1994		
Fiji	27 Jan 1995	27 Jan 1995	
Gabon	27 May 1994	2 Aug 1995	
Germany	30 Aug 1995	30 Aug 1995	
Ghana	12 Jul 1995		28 Aug 1995
Honduras	9 May 1995	2 Nov 1995	
Indonesia	21 Apr 1994		17 Feb 1995
Japan	13 Dec 1994	13 Dec 1994	9 May 1995 *A*
Liberia			9 Dec 1994 *s*
Malaysia	14 Feb 1995		1 Mar 1995
Myanmar	6 Jul 1995		
Netherlands[1]	6 Jul 1995	6 Jul 1995	
New Zealand			6 Jun 1995 *s*
Norway	25 Jan 1995		1 Feb 1995
Panama	22 Jun 1994	4 May 1995	
Papua New Guinea	28 Aug 1995	28 Aug 1995	
Peru	29 Aug 1994		21 Sep 1995
Philippines	29 Sep 1995		
Republic of Korea	12 Sep 1995		12 Sep 1995
Switzerland	29 Aug 1995		
Togo	12 Jul 1994		4 Oct 1995 *A*
United States of America	1 Jul 1994		
Venezuela	4 Oct 1995		

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

40. International Coffee Agreement, 1994

Adopted by the International Coffee Council on 30 March 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally, on 1 October 1994, and definitively, on 19 May 1995 in accordance with article 40(3)[1].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1994.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.83.1994.TREATIES-2 of 31 May 1994.
STATUS: Signatures: 49. Parties: 57.

Note: At its sixty-fourth session held in London from 21 to 30 March 1994, the International Coffee Council approved by Resolution No. 366, the International Coffee Agreement, 1994. It shall be considered as a continuation of the International Coffee, 1983, as extended. The Agreement was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 18 April 1994 until and including 26 September 1994 by Contracting Parties to the International Coffee Agreement, 1983 or the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as extended, and Governments invited to the sessions of the International Coffee Council at which this Agreement was negotiated, in accordance with its article 38.

Subsequently, the International Coffee Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision	*Subject*
26 to 30 September 1994	Establishment of conditions of accession which may be effected up to and including 31 March 1995.
30 September 1994	Extension to 31 March 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval.
	Extension to 31 December 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of notifications of provisional application by non-signatory States but which are Contracting Parties to the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as extended.
19 and 20 January 1995	Extension to 25 September 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.
26 September 1995	Extension to 25 September 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Angola	7 Jun 1994		7 Jun 1995 *A*
Belgium	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	
Benin	4 Aug 1994		
Bolivia	23 Sep 1994		28 Jul 1995
Brazil	7 Jul 1994	7 Jul 1994	25 Sep 1995
Burundi	30 Jun 1994	20 Sep 1994	22 Sep 1995 *A*
Central African Republic	29 Aug 1994		
Colombia	2 Aug 1994	13 Sep 1994	
Congo			1 Oct 1994 *a*
Costa Rica	26 Sep 1994	26 Sep 1994	
Côte d'Ivoire	23 Sep 1994		23 Sep 1994
Cuba	22 Aug 1994	26 Sep 1994	9 Feb 1995
Cyprus	19 Sep 1994		22 Mar 1995
Denmark[2]	19 Sep 1994		19 Sep 1994 *AA*
Dominican Republic	20 Sep 1994		
Ecuador	22 Jul 1994	27 Jul 1994	8 Nov 1994
El Salvador	6 Jul 1994	26 Sept 1994	5 Apr 1995
Equatorial Guinea			27 Apr 1995 *a*
Ethiopia	26 Sep 1994		26 Jul 1995
European Community	19 Sep 1994		19 Sep 1994 *AA*
Finland	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	26 Sep 1995 *A*
France	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	
Gabon			17 Feb 1995 *a*
Germany	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	
Ghana	9 Sep 1994		
Greece	26 Sep 1994	26 Sept 1994	

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Guatemala	26 Sep 1994	26 Sep 1994	
Guinea	26 Sep 1994		12 Apr 1995 *A*
Honduras	15 Sep 1994		
India	26 Aug 1994		16 Sep 1994
Indonesia	23 Sep 1994		17 Feb 1995
Ireland	23 Sep 1994		19 May 1995
Italy	20 Jun 1994		19 Sep 1995
Jamaica	26 Sep 1994		26 Sep 1994
Japan		13 Dec 1994	18 May 1995 *a*
Kenya	10 Aug 1994		10 Aug 1994
Luxembourg	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	
Madagascar	16 Sep 1994	26 Sep 1994	
Malawi	13 Sep 1994		13 Sep 1994
Nigeria			21 Sep 1995 *a*
Netherlands[3]	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	22 Sep 1995 *A*
Norway	19 Sep 1994		26 Sep 1994
Papua New Guinea		30 Dec 1994	1 Sep 1995 *a*
Paraguay	23 Sep 1994	23 Sep 1994	
Portugal	19 Sep 1994		
Rwanda			11 Sep 1995 *a*
Spain	19 Sep 1994	19 Sep 1994	4 Aug 1995
Sweden	19 Sep 1994		19 Sep 1994
Switzerland	26 Sep 1994	26 Sep 1994	23 Aug 1995
Thailand			21 Mar 1995 *a*
Togo	23 Sep 1994		13 Oct 1995 *A*
Trinidad and Tobago	23 Sep 1994		26 Sep 1994
Uganda	13 Jul 1994		26 Sep 1994
United Kingdom[4]	19 Sep 1994		23 Sep 1994
United Republic of Tanzania	26 Sep 1994		18 Sep 1995
Venezuela	26 Sep 1994		18 Aug 1995
Zambia			7 Mar 1995 *a*
Zaire	26 Aug 1994	22 Sep 1994	22 Sep 1995

NOTES:

[1] At a meeting held in London, the Representatives of the States and Organisation, listed below decided to put the Agreement into force provisionally among themselves as of 1 October 1994, pursuant to the provisions of article 40 (3) of the Agreement: Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Community, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Netherlands, Norway, Paraguay, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom and Zaire. Subsquently, the International Coffee Council decided, by Resolution No. 373 of 19 May 1995, adopted during its sixty–seventh session, and in accordance with article 40 (3) of the Agreement, that the International Coffee Agreement, 1994 shall enter into force definitively as from the date of adoption of this Resolution, i.e. on 19 May 1995 among those Governments which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or made notifications of provisional application of the Agreement.

[2] With a declaration of non–application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey and St. Helena.

41. International Grains Agreement, 1995

(a) Grains Trade Convention, 1995

Concluded at London on 7 December 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1995, in accordance with article 28 (2)[1].
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1995.
TEXT: Doc. International Wheat Council CL 122/5.
STATUS: Signatures: 15. Parties: 18.

Note: The International Grains Agreement, 1995, consists of the Grains Trade Convention, 1995, concluded at London on 7 December 1994, and the Food Aid Convention, concluded at London on 5 December 1994 (see hereinafter under chapter XIX.41 *b*). The Grains Trade Convention, was established at a Conference of governments organized by the International Wheat Council on 7 December 1994, while the Food Aid Convention, 1995, was established by the Food Aid Committee at its 69th session on 5 December 1994. Both Conventions, of which the English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 1 May 1995 until and including 30 June 1995, in accordance with their respective articles 24 and XVII.

At its first session, held in London on 6 July 1995, the International Grains Council took the following decision:

Date of decision	*Subject*
6 July 1995	Extension until 30 June 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States/Organization: Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, European Community, Iraq, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Korea (Republic of), Malta, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America and Yemen.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Algeria		20 Jun 1995	
Argentina		30 Jun 1995	
Australia			28 Jun 1995 *a*
Canada	26 Jun 1995		26 Jun 1995
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Jun 1995		
Cuba	22 Jun 1995	22 Jun 1995	16 Oct 1995
Egypt	30 Jun 1995		
European Community	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995	
Holy See	20 Jun 1995		28 Jun 1995
Hungary	29 Jun 1995		29 Jun 1995 *AA*
India	22 Jun 1995		27 Jun 1995
Japan	21 Jun 1995	21 Jun 1995	1 Dec 1995 *A*
Mauritius			29 Jun 1995 *a*
Morocco	26 Jun 1995	26 Jun 1995	
Norway	21 Jun 1995	21 Jun 1995	
Panama	30 Jun 1995		
Republic of Korea		23 Jun 1995	
Tunisia	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995	
Turkey		30 Jun 1995	
South Africa		16 Aug 1995	
Switzerland	16 Jun 1995	16 Jun 1995	
United States of America	26 Jun 1995		

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession .)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria, the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden, having become Member States of the European Community on 1 January 1995, will no longer be individual members of this Convention but will be covered by Community membership of the Convention. The European Community accordingly also undertakes to exercise the rights and perform the undertakings laid down in this Convention for those three countries as soon as this Convention is applied provisionally."

NOTES:

[1] A Conference of Governments held in London on 6 July 1995 decided to bring the Grains Trade Convention, 1995 into force as of 1 July 1995, among the Governments and International Organization which had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or notifications of provisional application, pursuant to the provisions of article 28 (2) of the Convention.

(*b*) Food Aid Convention, 1995

Concluded at London on 5 December 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1995, in accordance with article XXI (2)[1].
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1995.
TEXT: Doc. Food Aid Committee FAC(95)1.
STATUS: Signatures: 18. Parties: 14.

Note: See "*Note:*" under chapter XIX.41 a).

At its first session, held in London on 6 July 1995, the International Grains Council took the following decision:

Date of decision	*Subject*
6 July 1995	Extension until 30 June 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States/Organization : Argentina, Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom, the United States of America and the European Community.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Argentina	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995	
Australia			28 Jun 1995 *a*
Belgium	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995	
Canada	26 Jun 1995		26 Jun 1995
Denmark	28 Jun 1995		28 Jun 1995
European Community	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995	
Finland	30 Jun 1995		30 Jun 1995 *A*
France	26 Jun 1995	26 Jun 1995	
Germany	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995	
Ireland	30 Jun 1995		
Italy	30 Jun 1995		
Japan	21 Jun 1995	21 Jun 1995	1 Dec 1995 *A*
Luxembourg	30 Jun 1995		
Norway	21 Jun 1995	21 Jun 1995	
Portugal	30 Jun 1995		
Spain	29 Jun 1995	29 Jun 1995	
Sweden	28 Jun 1995		28 Jun 1995
Switzerland	16 Jun 1995		16 Jun 1995
United States of America	26 Jun 1995		

Notes:

[1] The Conference of Governments held in London on 6 July 1995, decided to bring the Food Aid Convention, 1995 into force as of 1 July 1995, among the Governments and Intergovernmental Organization which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession or notifications of provisional application pursuant to the provisions of article XXI (2) of the Convention.

42. International Rubber Agreement, 1995

Concluded at Geneva on 17 February 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 61).
TEXT: TD/Rubber.3/10; and depositary notification C.N.175.1995.TREATIES-3 of 10 October 1995 (proposed corrections to the original).
STATUS: Signatories: 20. Parties: 3.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 17 February 1995 at Geneva, by the United Nations Conference on Natural Rubber, 1994, at its seventh plenary meeting. It was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 3 April to 28 December 1995, inclusive, by the Governments invited to the United Nations Conference on Natural Rubber 1994, in accordance with its article 57.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application*	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*
Austria	22 Dec 1995		
Belgium	22 Dec 1995		
Denmark	22 Dec 1995		
European Community	22 Dec 1995		
Finland	22 Dec 1995		
France	28 Dec 1995		
Germany	22 Dec 1995		
Greece	22 Dec 1995	22 Dec 1995	
Indonesia	28 Dec 1995		
Ireland	22 Dec 1995		
Italy	22 Dec 1995		
Japan	19 Dec 1995		19 Dec 1995 *A*
Luxembourg	22 Dec 1995		
Malaysia	27 Dec 1995		
Netherlands	22 Dec 1995		
Spain	21 Dec 1995	21 Dec 1995	
Sri Lanka	8 Dec 1995		
Sweden	22 Dec 1995		
Thailand	28 Dec 1995		
United Kingdom	22 Dec 1995		

CHAPTER XX. MAINTENANCE OBLIGATIONS

1. Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance

Done at New York on 20 June 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 May 1957, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 25 May 1957, No. 3850.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 268, p. 3, and vol. 649, p. 330 (procès-verbal of rectification of Spanish authentic text).
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 54.

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on Maintenance Obligations convened pursuant to resolution 572 (XIX)[1] of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, adopted on 17 May 1955. The Conference met at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 29 May to 20 June 1956. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 268, p. 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		10 Sep 1969 *a*
Argentina		29 Nov 1972 *a*
Australia		12 Feb 1985 *a*
Austria	21 Dec 1956	16 Jul 1969
Barbados		18 Jun 1970 *a*
Belgium		1 Jul 1966 *a*
Bolivia	20 Jun 1956	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	31 Dec 1956	14 Nov 1960
Burkina Faso		27 Aug 1962 *a*
Cambodia	20 Jun 1956	
Cape Verde		13 Sep 1985 *a*
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 *a*
Chile		9 Jan 1961 *a*
China[2]		
Colombia	16 Jul 1956	
Croatia		20 Sep 1993 *d*
Cuba	20 Jun 1956	
Cyprus		8 May 1986 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark	28 Dec 1956	22 Jun 1959
Dominican Republic	20 Jun 1956	
Ecuador	20 Jun 1956	4 Jun 1974
El Salvador	20 Jun 1956	
Finland		13 Sep 1962 *a*
France[4]	5 Sep 1956	24 Jun 1960
Germany[5,6]	20 Jun 1956	20 Jul 1959
Greece	20 Jun 1956	1 Nov 1965
Guatemala	26 Dec 1956	25 Apr 1957
Haiti	21 Dec 1956	12 Feb 1958
Holy See	20 Jun 1956	5 Oct 1964
Hungary		23 Jul 1957 *a*
Ireland		26 Oct 1995 *a*
Israel	20 Jun 1956	4 Apr 1957
Italy	1 Aug 1956	28 Jul 1958
Luxembourg		1 Nov 1971 *a*
Mexico	20 Jun 1956	23 Jul 1992
Monaco	20 Jun 1956	28 Jun 1961
Morocco		18 Mar 1957 *a*
Netherlands	20 Jun 1956	31 Jul 1962
New Zealand[7]		26 Feb 1986 *a*
Niger		15 Feb 1965 *a*
Norway		25 Oct 1957 *a*
Pakistan		14 Jul 1959 *a*
Philippines	20 Jun 1956	21 Mar 1968
Poland		13 Oct 1960 *a*
Portugal		25 Jan 1965 *a*
Romania		10 Apr 1991 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain		6 Oct 1966 *a*
Sri Lanka	20 Jun 1956	7 Aug 1958
Suriname		12 Oct 1979 *a*
Sweden	4 Dec 1956	1 Oct 1958
Switzerland		5 Oct 1977 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Tunisia		16 Oct 1968 *a*
Turkey		2 Jun 1971 *a*
United Kingdom[8]		13 Mar 1975 *a*
Uruguay		18 Sep 1995 *a*
Yugoslavia	31 Dec 1956	29 May 1959

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 of the Convention concerning the competence of the International Court of Justice and affirms that the agreement of all the parties concerned is required in each case before a dispute can be brought before the International Court of Justice.

ARGENTINA

(a) The Argentine Republic reserves the right, with respect to article 10 of the Convention, to restrict the application of the

expression "highest priority" in the light of the provisions governing exchange controls in Argentina.

(b) In the event that another Contracting Party extends the application of the Convention to territories over which the Argentine Republic exercises sovereignty, such extension shall in no way affect the latter's rights (the reference is to article 12 of the Convention).

(c) The Argentine Government reserves the right not to apply the procedure provided for in article16 of the Convention in any dispute directly or indirectly related to the territories referred to in its declaration concerning article 12.

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"Australia wishes to declare, in accordance with Article 12, that with the exception of the Territory of Norfolk Island, the Convention shall not be applicable to the territories for the International relations of which Australia is responsible."

ISRAEL

"*Article 5:* The Transmitting Agency shall transmit under paragraph 1 any order, final or provisional, and any other judicial act, obtained by the claimant for the payment of maintenance in a competent tribunal of Israel, and, where necessary and possible, the record of the proceedings in which such order was made.

"*Article 10:* Israel reserves the right:

"a) to take the necessary measures to prevent transfers of funds under this Article for purposes other than the bona fide payment of existing maintenance obligations;

"b) to limit the amounts transferable pursuant to this Article, to a mounts necessary for subsistence."

NETHERLANDS

The Government of the Kingdom makes the following reservation with regard to article 1 of the Convention: the recovery of maintenance shall not be facilitated by virtue of this article if, the claimant and the respondent being both in the Netherlands, or, respectively, in Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles or Netherlands New Guinea, and assistance having been granted or similar arrangements made under the Assistance to the Needy Act (*Loi sur l'Assistance des Pauvres*), no recovery was in general obtained for such assistance from the respondent, having regard to the circumstances of the case in question.

"The Convention has for the time being been ratified for the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe only. If, in accordance with article 12, the application of the Convention will at any time be extended to the parts of the Kingdom outside Europe, the Secretary-General will be duly notified thereof. In that event the notification will contain such reservation as may be made on behalf of any of these parts of the Kingdom."

SWEDEN[9]

Article 1: Sweden reserves the right to reject, where the circumstances of the case under consideration appear to make this necessary, any application for legal support aimed at the recovery of maintenance from a person who entered Sweden as a political refugee.

11 November 1988

Article 9: "Where the proceedings are pending in Sweden, the exemptions in the payment of costs and the facilities provided in paragraph 1 shall be granted only to persons resident in a State Party to the Convention or to any person who would otherwise enjoy such advantages under an agreement concluded with the State of which he is a national."

TUNISIA

(1) Persons living abroad may only claim the advantages provided for in the Convention when considered non-residents under the exchange regulations in force in Tunisia.

(2) A dispute may only be referred to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [3]

POLAND

5 February 1969

The Government of the Polish People's Republic wishes to express its objection, in accordance with article 17, paragraph 1, of the said Convention, to the first two reservations made by the Government of Tunisia in its instrument of accession.

UNITED KINGDOM

13 March 1975

"With reference to article 17 (1) of the Convention . . . the Government of the United Kingdom [objects] to reservations (b) and (c) made by Argentina in respect of articles 12 and 16 upon accession to the Convention."

SLOVAKIA[3]

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	12 Feb 1985	Norfolk Island
France	24 Jun 1960	Comoro Archipelago, French Polynesia, French Somaliland, New Caledonia and Dependencies, St. Pierre and Miquelon
Netherlands[10]	12 Aug 1969	Netherlands Antilles

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Nineteenth Session, Supplement No. 1A* (E/2730/Add.1), p. 5.

[2] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 4 December 1956 and 25 June 1957 respectively. See note concerning signatures,ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned accession, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Poland on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. The objection made on that occasion by the Government of Poland and the communication from the Government of the Republic of China are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis,* to the corresponding communications referred to in note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 3 October 1958. Subsequently, on 21 April 1973, Czechoslovakia notified an objection with regard to the reservation made by the Government of Argentina to article 10 of the Convention. For the text of the objection see United Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 867, p. 214. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The instrument of ratification by France contains the following declaration:

(a) That the Convention shall apply to the territories of the French Republic, namely: the metropolitan departments, the departments of Algeria, the departments of the Oases and of Saoura, the departments of Guadeloupe, Guiana, Martinique and Réunion and the Overseas Territories (St. Pierre and Miquelon, French Somaliland, the Comoro Archipelago, New Caledonia and Dependencies and French Polynesia);

(b) That its application may be extended, by subsequent notification, to the other States of the Community or to one or more such States.

[5] See note 13 in chapter I.2

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention also applies to *Land Berlin.*

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the one hand and by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the other hand. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis,* to those referred to in note 4 in chapter III.3.

See also note 5 above.

[7] The Convention shall not extend to the Cook Islands nor to Niue or Tokelau.

[8] "In accordance with article 12 of the Convention, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland hereby gives notice that the provisions of the Convention shall not apply to any of the territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible."

[9] In a communication received on 11 November 1988, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General that it withdraws, with effect from that date, the reservation made upon ratification in respect to article 9, paragraph 2 of the Convention and makes limited reservations in respect of paragraph 1 of the same article (see under *Reservations and Declarations*). The text of the reservation so withdrawn reads as follows:

Article 9: Where the proceedings are pending in Sweden, the exemptions in the payment of costs and the facilities provided in article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2, shall be granted only to nationals of or stateless persons resident in another State Party to this Convention or to any person who would in any case enjoy such advantages under an agreement concluded with the State of which he is a national.

It should be noted that the reservation of 11 November 1988 in respect of paragraph 1 of Article 9 constitutes in substance a partial withdrawal of the original reservation to paragraph 1, since it differs from it only in that the facilities and exemptions concerned are now granted to all residents, and not only as previously the case, to nationals and stateless residents.

[10] Subject to the reservation with regard to article 1 which was made by the Netherlands upon ratification of the Convention. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

CHAPTER XXI. LAW OF THE SEA

1. Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone

Done at Geneva on 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 September 1964, in accordance with article 29.
REGISTRATION: 22 November 1964, No. 7477.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516, p. 205.
STATUS: Signatories: 42. Parties: 51.

Note: The four Conventions and the Optional Protocol of Signature listed in this Chapter were prepared and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 1105 (XI)[1], adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 February 1957, and met at the European Office of the United Nations at Geneva from 24 February to 27 April 1958. The Conference also adopted the Final Act and nine resolutions for the text of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450, p. 11. For the *travaux préparatoires* and the proceedings of the Conference, see *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vols. I to VII, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, vols. I to VII.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Austria	27 Oct 1958	
Belarus	30 Oct 1958	27 Feb 1961
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 *a*
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	31 Oct 1958	31 Aug 1962
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 *a*
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
China[3]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 *d*
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Guatemala	29 Apr 1958	
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Holy See	30 Apr 1958	
Hungary	31 Oct 1958	6 Dec 1961
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	6 Sep 1961
Italy		17 Dec 1964 *a*
Jamaica		8 Oct 1965 *d*
Japan		10 Jun 1968 *a*
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 *a*
Latvia		17 Nov 1992 *a*
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 *d*
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Lithuania		31 Jan 1992 *a*
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 *a*
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 *a*
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 *a*
Malta		19 May 1966 *d*
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 *d*
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 *a*
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	
Netherlands	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Romania	31 Oct 1958	12 Dec 1961
Russian Federation	30 Oct 1958	22 Nov 1960
Senegal[5]		25 Apr 1961 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 *a*
Spain		25 Feb 1971 *a*
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Swaziland		16 Oct 1970 *a*
Switzerland	22 Oct 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 *a*
Ukraine	30 Oct 1958	12 Jan 1961
United Kingdom	9 Sep 1958	14 Mar 1960
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela	30 Oct 1958	15 Aug 1961
Yugoslavia	29 Apr 1958	28 Jan 1966

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BELARUS

Article 20: The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that government ships in foreign territorial waters have immunity and that the measures mentioned in this article may therefore be applied to them only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-section D. Rules applicable to warships): The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

BULGARIA

Article 20: The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that government ships in foreign waters have immunity and that the measures set forth in this article may therefore apply to such ships only with the consent of the flag state.

Article 23 (Sub-section D. Rules applicable to warships): The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

Article 20: The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that government ships in the territorial sea of another State have immunity and that the measures set forth in this article may therefore apply to such ships only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-section D. Rules applicable to warships): The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial sea.

COLOMBIA

With respect to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, the delegation of Colombia declares that, under article 98 of the Colombian Constitution, authorization by the Senate is required for the passage of foreign troops through Colombian territory and that, by analogy, such authorization is accordingly also required for the passage of foreign warships through Colombian territorial waters.

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

HUNGARY

Articles 14 and 23: "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that the coastal State is entitled to make the passage of warships through its territorial waters subject to previous authorization.

Article 21: "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that the rules contained in Sub-Section B of Section III of Part I of the Convention are generally inapplicable to government ships operated for commercial purposes so far as they encroach on the immunities enjoyed under international law by all government ships, whether commercial or non–commercial, on foreign territorial waters. Consequently, the provisions of Sub-Section B restricting the immunities of government ships operated for commercial purposes are applicable only upon consent of the State whose flag the ship flies."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Reservation:

Article 14: The Iranian Government maintains the objection on the ground of excess of competence, expressed by its delegation at the twelfth plenary meeting of the Conference on the Law of the Sea on 24 April 1958, to the articles recommended by the Fifth Committee of the Conference and incorporated in part in article 14 of this Convention. The Iranian Government accordingly reserves all rights regarding the contents of this article in so far as it relates to countries having no sea coast.

ITALY

The Government of the Republic of Italy, beside exercising control for the purposes of article 24, paragraph 1 in the zone of the high seas contiguous to the territorial sea, reserves the right to exercise surveillance within the belt of sea extending twelve nautical miles from the coast for the purpose of preventing and punishing infringements of the customs regulations in whatever point of this belt such infringements may be committed.

LITHUANIA

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

". . .The Republic of Lithuania declares the establishing of the procedure for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters for the warships of those States which have established the procedure for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters."

MEXICO

The Government of Mexico considers that government ships, irrespective of the use to which they are put, enjoy immunity, and it therefore enters an express reservation with regard to article 21 of Sub-Section C (Rules applicable to government ships other than warships) in so far as it applies to article 19, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, and article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3, of Sub-Section B (Rules applicable to merchant ships).

ROMANIA

Article 20: The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that government ships have immunity in foreign territorial waters and that the measures envisaged in this article may not be applied to such ships except with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23: The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the coastal State has the right to provide that the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters shall be subject to previous approval.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Article 20: The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that government ships in foreign territorial waters have immunity and that the measures mentioned in this article may therefore be applied to them only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-Section D. Rule applicable to warships): The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers

that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SOLOMON ISLANDS

"The succession of Solomon Islands to the said Treaty shall be without prejudice to the right of Solomon Islands

(1) to employ straight base lines drawn between its islands as the basis for the delimitation of its territorial sea and contiguous zone, and

(2) to designate all waters enclosed by the said straight base lines as internal or archipelagic water."

SPAIN

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

TUNISIA

Reservation:

The Government of the Tunisian Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 4 of this Convention.

UKRAINE

Article 20: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that government ships in foreign territorial waters have immunity and that the measures mentioned in this article may therefore be applied to them only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-Section D. Rule applicable to warships): The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Save as may be stated in any further and separate notices that may hereafter be given, ratification of this Convention on behalf of the United Kingdom does not extend to the States in the Persian Gulf enjoying British protection. Multilateral conventions to which the United Kingdom becomes a party are not extended to these States until such times as an extension is requested by the Ruler of the State concerned."

VENEZUELA

With reference to article 12 that there are special circumstances to be taken into consideration in the following areas: The Gulf of Paria and zones adjacent thereto; the area between the coast of Venezuela and the island of Aruba; and the Gulf of Venezuela.

Reservation made upon ratification:

With express reservation in respect of article 12 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 24 of the said Convention.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

Objections to the following reservations:

"(a) The declaration made with reference to article 12 by Venezuela on signature and the reservation made to that article by Venezuela on ratification.

"(b) The reservation made to article 14 by Iran on signature.

"(c) The reservations made to articles 14 and 23 by Czechoslovakia and Hungary on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(d) The reservation made to paragraph 4 of article 16 by Tunisia on signature.

"(e) The reservation made with regard to the application of articles 19 and 20 to government ships operated for commercial purposes by Czechoslovakia on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(f) The reservations made to article 20 by Bulgaria on signature and on ratification.

"(g) The reservations made to article 20 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(h) The reservation made to article 21 by Hungary on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(i) The reservations made to article 23 by Bulgaria on signature and on ratification.

"(j) the reservations made to article 23 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(k) The reservation made to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 24 by Venezuela on ratification.

If the statements referred to above with regard to article 23 are juridically in the nature of declarations rather than of reservations strictly so-called, the objections recorded by [the Government of Australia] will serve to record disagreement with the opinions so declared."

31 January 1968

"The Government of Australia places on record the formal objection to the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

29 September 1976

"Objection to the reservation by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, 1958, and contained in the instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic to the said Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone."

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark declares that it does not find acceptable:

"The reservations made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Hungary to article 14;

"The reservations made by the Government of Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4;

"The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19;

"The reservations made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20 and the reservations made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Mexico to article 21.

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Convention, according to article 29, as between Denmark and the Contracting Parties concerned."

31 October 1974

"The Government of Denmark does not find acceptable the reservations made by the German Democratic Republic on December 27, 1973 to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

"The Government of Denmark also finds unacceptable the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic on the same date to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas.

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Conventions as between Denmark and the German Democratic Republic."

FIJI

"The Government of Fiji maintains all other objections communicated to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom Government to the reservations or declarations made by certain States with respect to this Convention, reserving only its position on that Government's observation bearing on the application of the Optional Protocol of Signature pending final disposition of the question of the succession by the Government of Fiji to the said Protocol."

ISRAEL

"Objection to all reservations and declarations made in connection with the signing or ratification of or accession to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and the Convention on the High Seas which are incompatible with the purposes and objects of these Conventions. This objection applies in particular to the declaration or reservation made by Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4, of the first of the above-mentioned Conventions on the occasion of signature."

JAPAN

"1. The Government of Japan wishes to state that it does not consider acceptable any unilateral statement in whatever form, made by a State upon signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, which is intended to exclude or modify for such State legal effects of the provisions of the Convention.

"2. In particular, the Government of Japan finds unacceptable the following reservations:

"(a) The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, and by the Government of Hungary to article 21.

"(b) The reservation made by the Government of Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4.

"The reservation made by the Government of Italy to article 24 in its instrument of accession.

"The reservation made by the Government of Mexico to article 21 in its instrument of accession."

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Republic formally expresses its objection to all reservations and statements made in connexion with signature or ratification of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone or in connexion with accession to the said Convention which are inconsistent with the aims and purposes of this Convention.

This objection applies in particular to the statements or reservations made with regard to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declare that they do not find acceptable

– "the reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, and by the Governments of Hungary and Czechoslovakia to article 21;

– "the reservations made by the Iranian Government to article 14;

– "the declaration by the Government of Colombia as far as it amounts to a reservation on article 14;

"the reservation made by the Government of the Tunisian Republic to article 16, paragraph 4;

– "the declarations made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on article 23, and the declarations made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Hungary on the articles 14 and 23 as far as these declarations amount to a reservation to the said articles;

– "the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Italy to article 24, paragraph 1.

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserve all rights regarding the reservations made by the Government of Venezuela on ratifying the present Convention in respect of article 12 and article 24, paragraphs 2 and 3."

17 March 1967

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands do not find acceptable the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

PORTUGAL

27 December 1966

"The Government of Portugal cannot accept the reservation proposed by the Mexican Government requiring the exemption of government ships from the dispositions laid down in the Convention, irrespective of the use to which these ships are put."

THAILAND

Objections to the following reservations:

"1. the reservations to article 20 made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR;

"2. the reservations to article 21 made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Mexico and Hungary;

"3. the reservations to article 23 made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR."

TONGA

"The Government of Tonga affirms that in the absence of any other statement expressing a contrary intention, it wishes to maintain all objections communicated to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom to the reservations or declarations made by States with respect to any conventions of which the Secretary-General is the depositary."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

6 November 1959

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objections to the following reservations and declarations:

"(a) The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, and the USSR to article 20, and by Hungary to article 21.

"(b) The reservation made by the Government of Iran to article 14.

"(c) The reservation made by the Government of the Tunisian Republic to article 16, paragraph 4."

5 April 1962

"The reservations made by the Government of Venezuela to article 12 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 24."

2 November 1966

"The reservation to article 21 of Sub-section C contained in the Mexican instrument of accession."

13 May 1975

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objection to the reservations by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone". (*In this connexion, the Government of the United Kingdom indicated that they had not received the circular letter reproducing the text of the reservations made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic until early in August 1974.*)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[6]

19 September 1962

"The United States does not find the following reservations acceptable:

"1. The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, and by Hungary to article 21.

"2. The reservations made by the Government of the Tunisian Republic to article 16, paragraph 4.

"3. The reservation made by the Government of Venezuela to article 12 and to article 24, paragraphs 2 and 3."

17 June 1965

"Objection to the reservation made by the Government of Italy in its instrument of accession."

28 September 1966

"Objection to the reservation made by the Government of Mexico in its instrument of accession."

11 July 1974

"The Government of the United States does not find acceptable the reservations made by the German Democratic Republic to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas. The Government of the United States, however, considers those Conventions as continuing in force between it and the German Democratic Republic except that provisions to which the above-mentioned reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations."

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/3572), p. 54.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 27 December 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 84. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 30 October 1958 and 31 August 1961, respectively, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516, p. 256. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The Secretary-General received, on 9 June 1971, a communication from the Government of Senegal denouncing this Convention as well as the Convention on the Living Resources of the High Seas, and specifying that the denunciation would take effect on the thirtieth day from its receipt. The said communication, as well as the related exchange of correspondence between the Secretariat and the Government of Senegal, was circulated by the Secretary-General to all States entitled to become parties to the Conventions concerned under their respective clauses.

The notification of denunciation was registered by the Government of Senegal as at 9 June 1971, under Nos. 7477 and 8164. (See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 781, p. 332.)

In this connection, a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom was received by the Secretary-General on 2 January 1973, stating *inter alia:*

". . . As regards the notification by the Government of Senegal purporting to denounce the two Conventions of 1958, the Government of the United Kingdom wish to place on record that in their view those Conventions are not susceptible to unilateral denunciation by a State which is a party to them and they therefore cannot accept the validity or effectiveness of the purported denunciation by the Government of Senegal. Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom regard the Government of Senegal as still bound by the obligations which they assumed when they became a party to those Conventions and the Government of the United Kingdom fully reserve all their rights under them as well as their rights and the rights of their nationals in respect of any action which the Government of Senegal have taken or may take as a consequence of the said purported denunciation.

"As regards the various arguments that are set out in the correspondence referred to above with reference to certain other questions relating to the law of treaties, including in particular the question of the functions of the Secretary-General as a depositary of the Conventions of 1958 and the question of the duties of the Secretariat in relation to the registration of treaties and in relation to acts, notifications and communications, relating to treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom do not consider it necessary at this stage to express any view on those matters but they fully reserve their position in relation thereto and expressly reserve their right formally to make their views known at a later date.

"The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations requests

that copies of this Note should be transmitted by the Secretariat to all States concerned, that is to say, all States Members of the United Nations or Members of any of the Specialised Agencies, and, since the notification by the Government of Senegal was registered by Senegal, further requests that the statement of the position of the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to that notification, as set out in the second paragraph of the present Note, should similarly be registered."

The said communication was registered in the name of the Government of the United Kingdom on 2 January 1973 under Nos. 7477 and 8164 (see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 854, pp. 214 and 220).

[6] On 27 October 1967, the Government of the United States of America transmitted to the Secretary-General the following communication with reference to its previous communications regarding ratifications and accessions to the Law of the Sea Conventions with reservations which were unacceptable to the United States of America:

"The Government of the United States of America has received an inquiry regarding the applicability of several of the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 between the United States and States which ratified or acceded to those Conventions with reservations which the United States found to be unacceptable. The Government of the United States wishes to state that it has considered and will continue to consider all the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 as being in force between it and all other States that have ratified or acceded thereto, including States that have ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States. With respect to States which ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States, the Conventions are considered by the United States to be in force between it and each of those States except that provisions to which such reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations. The United States considers that such application of the Convention does not in any manner constitute any concurrence by the United States in the substance of any of the reservations involved."

2. Convention on the High Seas

Done at Geneva on 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 September 1962, in accordance with article 34.
REGISTRATION: 3 January 1963, No. 6465.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450, p. 11.
STATUS: Signatories: 47. Parties: 62.

Note: See "*Note:*" in same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	28 Apr 1959
Albania		7 Dec 1964 *a*
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Austria	27 Oct 1958	10 Jan 1974
Belarus	30 Oct 1958	27 Feb 1961
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 *a*
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	31 Oct 1958	31 Aug 1962
Burkina Faso		4 Oct 1965 *a*
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 *a*
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 *a*
China[1]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	16 Feb 1972
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Cyprus		23 May 1988 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 *d*
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France	30 Oct 1958	
Germany[3,4]	30 Oct 1958	26 Jul 1973
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Guatemala	29 Apr 1958	27 Nov 1961
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Holy See	30 Apr 1958	
Hungary	31 Oct 1958	6 Dec 1961
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Indonesia	8 May 1958	10 Aug 1961
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	6 Sep 1961
Italy		17 Dec 1964 *a*
Jamaica		8 Oct 1965 *d*
Japan		10 Jun 1968 *a*
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 *a*
Latvia		17 Nov 1992 *a*
Lebanon	29 May 1958	
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 *d*
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 *a*
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 *a*
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 *a*
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 *d*
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 *a*
Mongolia		15 Oct 1976 *a*
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	28 Dec 1962
Netherlands	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Poland	31 Oct 1958	29 Jun 1962
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Romania	31 Oct 1958	12 Dec 1961
Russian Federation	30 Oct 1958	22 Nov 1960
Senegal		25 Apr 1961 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 *a*
Spain		25 Feb 1971 *a*
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Swaziland		16 Oct 1970 *a*
Switzerland	24 May 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 *a*
Ukraine	30 Oct 1958	12 Jan 1961
United Kingdom	9 Sep 1958	14 Mar 1960
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela	30 Oct 1958	15 Aug 1961
Yugoslavia	29 Apr 1958	28 Jan 1966

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA

Article 9: The Government of the People's Republic of Albania considers that, in virtue of well-known principles of international law, all Government ships owned or operated by a State, without exception, irrespective of the purpose for which they are used, are subject to the jurisdiction only of the State under whose flag they sail.

Declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania declares that the definition of piracy as given in the Convention is not consistent with present international law and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on the high seas.

BELARUS

Article 9: The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration:

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

BULGARIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Article 9: The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration made upon signature:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

Declaration made upon ratification:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

CZECH REPUBLIC [2]

HUNGARY

Article 9: "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that, according to the general rules of international law, ships owned or operated by a State and used on government service whether commercial or non-commercial, enjoy on the high seas the same immunity as warships."

Declaration:

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the definition of piracy as given in the Convention is not consistent with present international law and does not serve the general interests of the freedom of navigation on the high seas."

INDONESIA

Reservation:

"The terms 'territorial sea' and 'internal waters' mentioned in the Convention, as far as the Republic of Indonesia is concerned, are interpreted in accordance with Article 1 of the Government Regulation in Lieu of an Act No. 4 of the Year 1960 (State Gazette 1960, No. 22) concerning Indonesian Waters, which, in accordance with Article 1 of the Act No. 1 of the Year 1961 (State Gazette 1961, No. 3) concerning the Enactment of All Emergency Acts and All Government Regulations in Lieu of an Act which were promulgated before January 1, 1961, has become Act, which Article word by word is as follows:

"*Article 1:*

"1. The Indonesian Waters consist of the territorial sea and the internal waters of Indonesia.

"2. The Indonesian territorial sea is a maritime belt of a width of twelve nautical miles, the outer limit of which is measured perpendicular to the baselines or points on the baselines which consist of straight lines connecting the outermost point on the low water mark of the outermost islands or part of such islands comprising Indonesian territory with the provision that in case of straits of a width of not more than twenty-four nautical miles and Indonesia is not the only coastal state the outer limit of the Indonesian territorial sea shall be drawn at the middle of the strait.

"3. The Indonesian internal waters are all waters lying within the baselines mentioned in paragraph 2.

"4. One nautical mile is sixty to one degree of latitude."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Reservations:

Article 2: With respect to the words "no State may validly purport to subject any part of them to its sovereignty", it shall be understood that this prohibition does not apply to the continental shelf, which is governed by article 2 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf.

Articles 2, 3 and 4: The Iranian Government maintains the objection on the ground of excess of competence, expressed by its delegation at the twelfth plenary meeting of the Conference on the Law of the Sea on 24 April 1958, to the articles recommended by the Fifth Committee of the Conference and incorporated in the afore-mentioned articles of the Convention on the High Seas. The Iranian Government accordingly reserves all rights regarding the contents of these articles in so far as they relate to countries having no sea coast.

Article 2(3)—article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2: Application of the provisions of these articles relating to the laying of submarine cables and pipelines shall be subject to the authorization of the coastal State, in so far as the continental shelf is concerned.

MEXICO

Article 9: The Government of Mexico enters an express reservation with regard to article 9, since it considers that government ships, irrespective of the use to which they are put, enjoy immunity; it therefore does not accept the limitation imposed in the article in question, which provides that only ships owned or operated by a State and used only on government non-commercial service shall have immunity from the jurisdiction of other States on the high seas.

MONGOLIA[5]

a) ...

b) Subject to the following declaration in respect of article 15:

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the definition of piracy given in article 15 of the Convention does not cover acts which under contemporary international law should be regarded as acts of piracy and thus does not adequately reflect the requirements that must be fulfilled in order to fully ensure freedom of navigation on international waterways.

POLAND

Article 9: "The Government of the Polish People's Republic considers that the rule expressed in article 9 applies to all ships owned or operated by a State."

Declaration:

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic considers that the definition of piracy as contained in the Convention does not fully correspond with the present state of international law in this respect."

ROMANIA

Article 9: The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies to all government ships regardless of the purpose for which they are used.

Declaration:

The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the definition of piracy as given in article 15 of the Convention on the High Seas does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Article 9: The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration:

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

SLOVAKIA[2]

SPAIN

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

UKRAINE

Article 9: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration:

The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"In depositing their instrument of ratification Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that, save as may be stated in any further and separate notices that may hereafter be given, ratification of this Convention on behalf of the United Kingdom does not extend to the States in the Persian Gulf enjoying British protection. Multilateral conventions to which the United Kingdom becomes a party are not extended to these States until such time as an extension is requested by the Ruler of the State concerned."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

"Objections to the reservations hereunder:

(a) The reservation made to articles 2, 3 and 4 by Iran on signature.

(b) The reservation made to paragraph 3 of article 2 and to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 26 by Iran on signature.

(c) The reservation made to article 9 by Bulgaria on signature and on ratification.

(d) The reservations made to article 9 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on signature and confirmed on ratification.

(e) The reservation made by Indonesia on ratification.

In relation to the reservation made by Indonesia [...] the Australian Government has previously informed the Indonesian Government that it does not recognize the validity in international law of the Regulation referred to in the reservation and that it does not consider itself bound by it."

1 February 1965

"Objection of the Government of Australia to the reservation contained in the instrument of accession by Albania to the Convention on the High Seas done at Geneva on 29 April 1958."

31 January 1968

"The Government of Australia places on record the formal objection to the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

29 September 1976

"Objection of the Australian Government to the reservation by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas, 1958, and contained in the instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic to that Convention."

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark declares that it does not find acceptable:

"The reservations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 9;

"The reservation made by the Government of Iran to article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2;

"The reservation made by the Government of Indonesia regarding the interpretation of the terms 'territorial sea' and 'internal waters';

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Convention, according to article 34, as between Denmark and the Contracting Parties concerned."

31 October 1974

"The Government of Denmark does not find acceptable the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic on December 27, 1973 to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

"The Government of Denmark also finds unacceptable the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic on the same date to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas.

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Conventions as between Denmark and the German Democratic Republic."

FIJI

"The Government of Fiji declares that it withdraws the observations made by the United Kingdom with respect to the reservation made on ratification of the Convention by the Government of Indonesia and substitutes therefore the following observation:

"With respect to the reservation made by the Government of Indonesia on ratification of the above-mentioned Convention on the High Seas, the Government of Fiji states that it considers that the extent of Indonesian national waters referred to therein is subject to the rule of international law that, where the establishment of a straight baseline has the effect of enclosing as internal waters areas which previously had been considered as part of the high seas, a right of innocent passage shall exist in those waters, subject to the regulations of the national authorities respecting police, customs, quarantine and control of pollution, and without prejudice to the exclusive right of such authorities in respect of the exploration and exploitation of the natural resources of such waters and of the subjacent seabed and subsoil.

"Furthermore, the Government of Fiji maintains all other objections communicated to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom Government to the reservations or declarations made by certain States with respect to this Convention, reserving only its position on that Government's observations bearing on the application of the Optional Protocol of Signature pending final disposition of the question of the succession by the Government of Fiji to the said Protocol."

GERMANY[3]

15 July 1974

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the following reservations to be inconsistent with the aims and purposes of the Convention of 29 April 1958 on the High Seas and therefore to be unacceptable:

"1. The reservation made to the Convention by the Government of Indonesia;

"2. The reservation declared at signature of the Convention by the Government of Iran to articles 2, 3 and 4 and to article 2, item 3, in conjunction with article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention, the latter in so far as that reservation is to open up the possibility of refusing permission to lay submarine cables and pipelines even where certain conditions have been fulfilled;

"3. The reservations and the declarations to be qualified in substance as reservations made to article 9 of the Convention by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Mexico, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

"4. The declarations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia and Hungary to the definition of piracy as given in the Convention in so far as the said declarations are to be qualified as reservations.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany furthermore considers the reservation made on 27 December 1973 by the German Democratic Republic to article 9 of the Convention to be inconsistent with the aims and purposes of the Convention and therefore to be unacceptable.

"This also applies to the declaration made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the same date to the definition of piracy as given in the Convention in so far as that declaration is to be qualified as a reservation. "The present declaration does not affect the applicability, in all other respects, of the Convention under international law as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Parties to the Convention having made the reservations and declarations referred to above."

2 March 1977

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the reservation made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic to article 9 of the Convention of 29 April 1958 on the High Seas as well as the declaration made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic to article 15 of that Convention, in so far as the latter is in substance to be qualified as a reservation, to be inconsistent with the aims and purposes of the Convention and therefore unacceptable.

"The present declaration does not affect the applicability, in all other respects, of the Convention under international law as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Mongolian People's Republic."

ISRAEL

"Objection to all reservations and declarations made in connection with the signing or ratification of or accession to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and the Convention on the High Seas which are incompatible with the purposes and objects of these Conventions. This objection applies in particular to the declaration or reservation made by Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4, of the first of the above-mentioned Conventions on the occasion of signature."

JAPAN

"1. The Government of Japan wishes to state that it does not consider acceptable any unilateral statement in whatever form, made by a State upon signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention on the High Seas, which is intended to exclude or modify for such State legal effects of the provisions of the Convention.

"2. In particular, the Government of Japan finds unacceptable the following reservations:

"(a) The reservations made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 9.

"(b) The reservations made by the Government of Iran to article 2 and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"The reservations made by the Government of Indonesia.

"The reservation made by the Government of Albania to article 9 in its instrument of accession.

"The reservation made by the Government of Mexico to article 9 in its instrument of accession."

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Republic formally expresses its objection to all reservations and statements made in connexion with signature or ratification of the Convention on the High Seas or in connexion with accession to the said Convention which are inconsistent with the aims and purposes of this Convention.

This objection applies in particular to the statements or reservations made with regard to the Convention on the High Seas by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declare that they do not find acceptable

"the reservations to article 9 made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

"the declarations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the definition of piracy given in the Convention, as far as these declarations amount to a reservation;

"the reservations made by the Iranian Government to articles 2, 3 and 4, and

"to articles 2, paragraph 3, and 26, paragraphs 1 and 2;

"the declaration made by the Government of Iran on article 2 as far as it amounts to a reservation to the said article;

"the reservation made by the Government of Indonesia."

17 March 1967

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands do not find acceptable the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

PORTUGAL

27 December 1966

"The Government of Portugal cannot accept the reservation proposed by the Mexican Government requiring the exemption of government ships from the dispositions laid down in the Convention, irrespective of the use to which these ships are put."

THAILAND

Objection to the following reservations and declarations:

"Reservations to article 9 made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR;

"Declarations to article 15 made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR;

"Reservation made by the Government of Indonesia."

TONGA

"The Government of the Kingdom of Tonga withdraws the observations made by the United Kingdom with respect to the reservation made on ratification of the Convention by the Government of Indonesia and substitute therefore the following observation:

"With respect to the reservation made by the Government of Indonesia on ratification of the above-mentioned Convention on the High Seas, the Government of Tonga states that it considers that the extent of Indonesian national waters referred to therein is subject to the rule of international law that, where the establishment of a straight baseline has the effect of enclosing as internal waters areas which previously had been considered as part of the high seas, a right of innocent passage shall exist in those waters, subject to the regulations of the national authorities respecting police, customs, quarantine and control of pollution, and without prejudice to the exclusive right of such authorities in respect of the exploration and exploitation of the natural resources of such waters and of the subjacent seabed and subsoil."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

6 November 1959

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objections to the following reservations and declarations:

"The reservations to article 9, made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, and the USSR.

"The reservations to articles 2, 3 and 4, and article 2(3) made by the Iranian Government."

5 April 1962

"Objection to the reservation made on ratification by the Government of Indonesia.

Her Majesty's Government have already stated to the Indonesian Government that they cannot regard as valid under international law the provisions of 'Government Regulation No. 4, 1960, in lieu of an Act concerning Indonesian Waters' to the extent that these provisions embody a claim to territorial waters extending to 12 miles or purport to demarcate territorial waters by the drawing of straight base lines between the outermost islands, or points, of a group of islands or purport to treat as internal waters all waters enclosed by those lines."

17 June 1965

"Objection to the reservation to article 9 contained in the Albanian instrument of accession to the Convention."

2 November 1966

"Objection to the reservation to article 9 contained in the Mexican instrument of accession."

13 May 1975

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objection to the reservations by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas." *(In this connection, the Government of the United Kingdom indicated that they had not received the depositary notification reproducing the text of the reservations made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic until early in August 1974.)*

10 January 1977

"The views of the United Kingdom Government regarding reservations and declarations made in connection with this Convention were set out in the letter of the 5th of November 1959 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

"The United Kingdom Government now desire to place on record their formal objection to the reservation by the Government of Mongolia concerning article 9 of this Convention."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[6]

19 September 1962

"The United States does not find the following reservations acceptable:

"1. The reservations to article 9 made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"2. The reservations made by the Iranian Government to articles 2, 3, and 4 and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"3. The reservation made by the Government of Indonesia."

19 August 1965

"The reservation to article 9 made by the Government of Albania in its instrument of accession."

28 September 1966

"The reservation made by the Government of Mexico in its instrument of accession."

11 July 1974

"The Government of the United States does not find acceptable the reservations made by the German Democratic Republic to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas. The Government of the United States, however, considers those Conventions as continuing in force between it and the German Democratic Republic except that provisions to which the above-mentioned reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations."

NOTES:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China, on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified on 30 October 1958 and 31 August 1961, respectively, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450, p. 142. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 27 December 1973 with a reservation and declarations. For the text of the reservation and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, p. 905, p. 80. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] With the following statement:

"... The said Convention ... shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 5 November 1973, the following communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

The Soviet Union can take note of the declaration by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning application to Berlin (West) of the Convention on the High Seas... only on the understanding that such application conforms to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and is subject to observance of the established procedures.

Communications identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were received from the Government of Czechoslovakia (on 6 December 1973) and from the Government of the Byelorussian SSR (on 13 February 1974). Furthermore, on 27 December 1973, the following communication was received on the same subject from the Government of the German Democratic Republic:

In respect of the application of the Convention on the High Seas to Berlin (West), the German Democratic Republic takes note of the Declaration on this matter made by the Federal Republic of Germany, with the reservation that the provisions of this Convention are to be applied to Berlin (West) in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic according to which Berlin (West) is not a part of the Federal Republic of Germany and may not be governed by it.

With regard to the aforesaid declaration, the Secretary-General received on 8 July 1975, from the Governments of the United States of America, France and the United Kingdom the following declaration:

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to point out that the German Democratic Republic is not a party to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, which was concluded in Berlin by the Governments of the French Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, and is not therefore competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions.

"The above referred to communication contains an incomplete and therefore misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement. In this connection the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States wish to draw attention to the fact that the provision of the Quadripartite Agreement referred to in the communication states that "the ties between the Western Sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany will be maintained and developed, taking into account that these Sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it.

"The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States do not consider it necessary to respond to any further communications containing incomplete and misleading references to provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement from States which are not signatories to that Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of those Governments in this matter." See also note 3 above.

[5] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession concerning article 9. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1025, p. 370.

[6] See note 6 in chapter XXI.1.

3. Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas

Done at Geneva on 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 March 1966, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 20 March 1966, No. 8164.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 559, p. 285.
STATUS: Signatories: 36. Parties: 37.

Note: See "*Note:*" in the same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 *a*
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 janv 1994 *d*
Burkina Faso		4 Oct 1965 *a*
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 *a*
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
China[1]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	3 Jan 1963
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 *d*
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France	30 Oct 1958	18 Sep 1970
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Indonesia	8 May 1958	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	
Jamaica		16 Apr 1964 *d*
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 *a*
Lebanon	29 May 1958	
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 *d*
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 *a*
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 *a*
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 *a*
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 *d*
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 *a*
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	
Netherlands	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 *d*
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Senegal[2]		25 Apr 1961 *a*
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 *a*
Spain		25 Feb 1971 *a*
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Switzerland	22 Oct 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 *d*
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 *a*
United Kingdom	9 Sep 1958	14 Mar 1960
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela	30 Oct 1958	10 Jul 1963
Yugoslavia	29 Apr 1958	28 Jan 1966

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

DENMARK

Denmark does not consider itself bound by the last sentence of article 2 of the Convention.

SPAIN

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"In depositing their instrument of ratification . . . Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that, save as may be stated in any further and separate notices that may hereafter be given, ratification of this Convention on behalf of the United Kingdom does not extend to the States in the Persian Gulf enjoying British protection. Multilateral conventions to which the United Kingdom becomes a party are not extended to these States until such time as an extension is requested by the Ruler of the State concerned."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Subject to the understanding that such ratification shall not be construed to impair the applicability of the principle of 'abstention', as defined in paragraph A.1 of the documents of record in the proceedings of the Conference [on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva from 24 February to 27 April 1958], identified as A/CONF.13/ C.3/L.69, 8 April 1958."

NOTES:

[1] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 3 in chapter I.1).

[2] See note 5 in chapter XXI.1.

4. Convention on the Continental Shelf

Done at Geneva on 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 June 1964, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 10 June 1964, No. 7302.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 499, p. 311.
STATUS: Signatories: 44. Parties: 57.

Note: See "*Note:*" in the same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	
Albania		7 Dec 1964 *a*
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Belarus	31 Oct 1958	27 Feb 1961
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Bulgaria		31 Aug 1962 *a*
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 *a*
Canada	29 Apr 1958	6 Feb 1970
Chile	31 Oct 1958	
China[1]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	8 Jan 1962
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	16 Feb 1972
Croatia		3 Aug 1992 *d*
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Cyprus		11 Apr 1974 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	12 Jun 1963
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Ecuador	31 Oct 1958	
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 *d*
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France		14 Jun 1965 *a*
Germany[3]	30 Oct 1958	
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Greece		6 Nov 1972 *a*
Guatemala	29 Apr 1958	27 Nov 1961
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Indonesia	8 May 1958	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	6 Sep 1961
Jamaica		8 Oct 1965 *a*
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 *a*
Latvia		2 Dec 1992 *a*
Lebanon	29 May 1958	
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 *d*
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 *a*
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 *a*
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 *a*
Malta		19 May 1966 *d*
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 *d*
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 *a*
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	
Netherlands	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	18 Jan 1965
Nigeria		28 Apr 1971 *a*
Norway		9 Sep 1971 *a*
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Peru	31 Oct 1958	
Poland	31 Oct 1958	29 Jun 1962
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Romania		12 Dec 1961 *a*
Russian Federation	31 Oct 1958	22 Nov 1960
Senegal[4]		25 Apr 1961 *a*
Sierra Leone		25 Nov 1966 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 *a*
Spain		25 Feb 1971 *a*
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Swaziland		16 Oct 1970 *a*
Sweden		1 Jun 1966 *a*
Switzerland	22 Oct 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Jul 1968 *a*
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 *a*
Ukraine	31 Oct 1958	12 Jan 1961
United Kingdom	9 Sep 1958	11 May 1964
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela	30 Oct 1958	15 Aug 1961
Yugoslavia	29 Apr 1958	28 Jan 1966

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

CANADA

"The Government of Canada wishes to make the following declaration with respect to article 1 of the Convention:

"In the view of the Canadian Government the presence of an accidental feature such as a depression or a channel in a submerged area should not be regarded as constituting an interruption in the natural prolongation of the land territory of the coastal state into and under the sea."

CHINA

"With regard to the determination of the boundary of the continental shelf as provided in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 6 of

the Convention, the Government of the Republic of China considers:

(1) that the boundary of the continental shelf appertaining to two or more States whose coasts are adjacent to and/or opposite each other shall be determined in accordance with the principle of the natural prolongation of their land territories; and

(2) that in determining the boundary of the continental shelf of the Republic of China, exposed rocks and islets shall not be taken into account."

FRANCE

In depositing this instrument of accession, the Government of the French Republic declares:

Article 1

In the view of the Government of the French Republic, the expression "adjacent" areas implies a notion of geophysical, geological and geographical dependence which *ipso facto* rules out an unlimited extension of the continental shelf.

Article 2 (paragraph 4)

The Government of the French Republic considers that the expression "living organisms belonging to sedentary species" must be interpreted as excluding crustaceans, with the exception of the species of crab termed "barnacle"; and it makes the following reservations:

Article 4

The Government of the French Republic accepts this article only on condition that the coastal State claiming that the measures it intends to take are "reasonable" agrees that if their reasonableness is contested it shall be determined by arbitration.

Article 5 (paragraph 1)

The Government of the French Republic accepts the provisions of article 5, paragraph 1, with the following reservations:

(a) An essential element which should serve as the basis for appreciating any "interference" with the conservation of the living resources of the sea, resulting from the exploitation of the continental shelf, particularly in breeding areas for maintenance of stocks, shall be the technical report of the international scientific bodies responsible for the conservation of the living resources of the sea in the areas specified respectively in article 1 of the Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries of 8 February 1949 and article 1 of the Convention for the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries of 24 January 1959.

(b) Any restrictions placed on the exercise of acquired fishing rights in waters above the continental shelf shall give rise to a right to compensation.

(c) It must be possible to establish by means of arbitration, if the matter is contested, whether the exploration of the continental shelf and the exploitation of its natural resources result in an interference with the other activities protected by article 5, paragraph 1, which is "unjustifiable".

Article 6 (paragraphs 1 and 2)

In the absence of a specific agreement, the Government of the French Republic will not accept that any boundary of the continental shelf determined by application of the principle of equidistance shall be invoked against it:

– if such boundary is calculated from baselines established after 29 April 1958;

– if it extends beyond the 200-metre isobath;

– if it lies in areas where, in the Government's opinion, there are "special circumstances" within the meaning of article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, that is to say: the Bay of Biscay, the Bay of Granville, and the sea areas of the Straits of Dover and of the North Sea off the French coast.

GERMANY[3]

"In signing the Convention on the Continental Shelf of 29 April 1958, the Federal Republic of Germany declares with reference to article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf that in the opinion of the Federal Government article 5, paragraph 1 guarantees the exercise of fishing rights (*Fischerei*) in the waters above the continental shelf in the manner hitherto generally in practice."

GREECE

. . . Pursuant to article 12 of the Convention, the Kingdom of Greece makes a reservation with respect to the system of delimiting the boundaries of the continental shelf appertaining to States whose coasts are adjacent or opposite each other, provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention. In such cases, the Kingdom of Greece will apply, in the absence of international agreement, the normal baseline system for the purpose of measuring the breadth of the territorial sea.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature

Reservations:

(a) Article 4: With respect to the phrase "the Coastal State may not impede the laying or maintenance of submarine cables or pipe-lines on the continental shelf", the Iranian Government reserves its right to allow or not to allow the laying or maintenance of submarine cables or pipe-lines on its continental shelf.

(b) Article 6: With respect to the phrase "and unless another boundary line is justified by special circumstances" included in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article, the Iranian Government accepts this phrase on the understanding that one method of determining the boundary line in special circumstances would be that of measurement from the high water mark."

SPAIN

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

Spain also declares, in connexion with article 1 of the Convention, that the existence of any accident of the surface, such as a depression or a channel, in a submerged zone shall not be deemed to constitute an interruption of the natural extension of the coastal territory into or under the sea.

VENEZUELA

In signing the present Convention, the Republic of Venezuela declares with reference to article 6 that there are special circumstances to be taken into consideration in the following areas: the Gulf of Paria, in so far as the boundary is not determined by existing agreements, and in zones adjacent thereto; the area between the coast of Venezuela and the island of Aruba; and the Gulf of Venezuela.

Reservation made upon ratification: . . . with express reservation in respect of article 6 of the said Convention.

YUGOSLAVIA

Reservation in respect of article 6 of the Convention:

In determining its continental shelf, Yugoslavia recognizes no "special circumstances" which should influence that delimitation.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CANADA

"The Government of Canada wishes to declare as follows:

"(i) That it does not find acceptable the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany with respect to article 5, paragraph 1.

"(ii) That it reserves its position concerning the declaration of the Government of the French Republic with respect to article 1 and article 2, paragraph 4; and further that it does not find acceptable the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic to articles 4, and 5, paragraph 1.

"(iii) That it does not find acceptable the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic to article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, insofar as that reservation relates to a boundary calculated from baselines established after 29 April 1958 or to a boundary extending beyond the 200 metre isobath.

"(iv) That it reserves its position concerning the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic to article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, insofar as that reservation relates to a boundary in areas where there are 'special circumstances' within the meaning of article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"(v) That it does not find acceptable the reservation made by the Iranian Government to article 4."

FIJI

[As under the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, see chapter XXI.1.]

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic does not accept the reservations made by the Government of Iran with respect to article 4 of the Convention.

NETHERLANDS

Objections to:

"the reservations made by the Iranian Government to article 4;

"the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic to articles 5, paragraph 1, and 6, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserve all rights regarding the reservations in respect of article 6 made by the Government of Venezuela when ratifying the present Convention."

NORWAY

"In depositing their instrument of accession regarding the said Convention, the Government of Norway declare that they do not find acceptable the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic to article 5, paragraph 1, and to article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2."

SPAIN

Spain declares the following:

1. That it reserves its position with respect to the declaration made by the Government of the French Republic in connexion with article 1;

2. That it deems unacceptable the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic to article 6, paragraph 2, especially as concerns the Bay of Biscay.

THAILAND

On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Thailand made objections to "the reservations to articles 1, 4, 5 (paragraph 1) and 6 (paragraphs 1 and 2) made by the Government of France."

TONGA[5]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

14 January 1966

"*Article 1:* The Government of the United Kingdom take note of the declaration made by the Government of the French Republic and reserve their position concerning it.

"*Article 2 (paragraph 4):* This declaration does not call for any observations on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom.

"*Article 4:* The Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the French Republic are both parties to the Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes done at Geneva on the 29th of April, 1958. The Government of the United Kingdom assume that the declaration made by the Government of the French Republic is not intended to derogate from the rights and obligations of the parties to the Optional Protocol.

"*Article 5 (paragraph 1):* Reservation *(a)* does not call for any observations on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom.

"The Government of the United Kingdom are unable to accept reservation *(b)*.

"The Government of the United Kingdom are prepared to accept reservation *(c)* on the understanding that it is not intended to derogate from the rights and obligations of parties to the Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes.

"*Article 6 (paragraphs 1 and 2):* The Government of the United Kingdom are unable to accept the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[6]

19 September 1962

"The United States does not find the following reservations acceptable:

"1. The reservation made by the Iranian Government to article 4.

"2. The reservation made by the Federal Republic of Germany to article 5, paragraph 1."

9 September 1965

"The reservations [made by France] to articles 4, 5 and 6. The declarations by France with respect to articles 1 and 2 are noted without prejudice."

16 July 1970

"The Government of the United States does not find acceptable the declaration made by the Government of Canada

with respect to article 1 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf. The United States considers that Convention to be in force and applicable between it and Canada, but that such application does not in any manner constitute any concurrence by the United States in the substance of the declaration made by Canada with respect to article 1 of that Convention."

YUGOSLAVIA

29 September 1965

"The Government of Yugoslavia does not accept the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic with respect to article 6 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf."

NOTES:

[1] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958 and 12 October 1970, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the said ratification was illegal since the so-called "Government of China" represented no one and did not have the right to speak on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State in the world, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated the following:

"The Republic of China, a sovereign state and member of the United Nations, attended the first United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958, contributed to the formulation of the Convention on the Continental Shelf, signed the said Convention on 29 April 1958 and duly deposited its instrument of ratification with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 12 October 1970. Any statement relating to the said Convention that is incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under the said Convention."

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 October 1958 and 31 August 1961, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with a declaration on 27 December 1973. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 82. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] The Secretary-General received on 1 March 1976, a communication from the Government of Senegal denouncing this Convention and specifying that the denunciation would take effect on the thirtieth day from its receipt, i.e. on 30 March 1976. The said communication was circulated by the Secretary-General to all States entitled to become parties to the Convention under its respective clauses.

The notification of denunciation was registered by the Government of Senegal on 1 March 1976 under No. 7302. (See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 997, p. 486).

In this connection, a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom was received by the Secretary-General on 1 September 1976 and registered on that same date under No. 7302. (See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1021, p. 433). The content of this communication is, in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, identical to the first paragraph of the communication by the Government of the United Kingdom reproduced in note 4 in chapter XXI.1.

[5] The Secretary-General received on 22 October 1971, a communication from the Government of Tonga to the effect that the latter wishes to maintain all objections made by the United Kingdom to the reservations or declarations made by States with respect to this Convention.

[6] See note 6 in chapter XXI.1.

5. Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes

Done at Geneva on 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 September 1962.
REGISTRATION: 3 January 1963, No. 6466.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450, p. 169.
STATUS: Signatories: 15. Parties: 37[1].

Note: See *"Note"* in the same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*[1]	*Definitive signature (s)*[1], *ratification, succession (d)*
Australia		14 May 1963 *s*
Austria	27 Oct 1958	
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 *s*
Bolivia		17 Oct 1958 *s*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Cambodia	22 Jan 1970	
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
China[2]		
Colombia[3]		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Costa Rica		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Cuba		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France		30 Oct 1958 *s*
Germany[4,5]	30 Oct 1958	26 Jul 1973
Ghana		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Holy See		30 Apr 1958 *s*
Hungary		8 Dec 1989 *s*
Indonesia[6]	8 May 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	
Liberia		27 May 1958 *s*
Madagascar		10 Aug 1962 *s*
Malawi		17 Dec 1965 *s*
Malaysia		1 May 1961 *s*
Malta		19 May 1966 *d*
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 *d*
Nepal		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Netherlands	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand		29 Oct 1958 *s*
Pakistan		6 Nov 1958 *s*
Panama		2 May 1958 *s*
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Sierra Leone		14 Feb 1963 *s*
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 *d*
Sri Lanka		30 Oct 1958 *s*
Sweden	1 Jun 1966	28 Jun 1966
Switzerland	24 May 1958	18 May 1966
Uganda		15 Sep 1964 *s*
United Kingdom		9 Sep 1958 *s*
United States of America[7]	15 Sep 1958	
Uruguay		29 Apr 1958 *s*
Yugoslavia	29 Apr 1958	28 Jan 1966

NOTES:

[1] Article V of the Protocol provides that the latter "shall remain open for signature by all States who become Parties to any Convention on the Law of the Sea and is subject to ratification, where necessary, according to the constitutional requirements of the signatory States". Consequently, the signatures listed above appear in the second or third column according to whether they have been affixed subject or not to ratification.

The States listed herein are bound by this Protocol to the extent that they have signed it definitively, ratified it or succeeded to it, and that they are bound by one at least of the four Law of the Sea Conventions.

[2] Signature affixed without reservation as to ratification on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] In signing the Optional Protocol, the delegation of Colombia reserved the obligations of Colombia arising out of conventions concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes which Colombia has ratified and out of any previous conventions concerning the same subject which Colombia may ratify.

[4] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] With the following declaration:

"The Optional Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany."

In this connection, the Secretary-General received on 5 November 1973 the following communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

The Soviet Union can take note of the declaration by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning application to Berlin (West) of ... the Optional Protocol of signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes only on the understanding that such application conforms to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and is subject to observance of the established procedures.

Communications, identical in essence, were received from the Government of Czechoslovakia (on 6 December 1973. *See also note 11 in chapter I.2.*) and the Byelorussian SSR (on 13 February 1974). See also note 4 above.

[6] In a communication received on 24 December 1958, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that according to the constitutional requirements of Indonesia, the signature affixed on its behalf to this Protocol is subject to ratification.

[7] In a communication received on 10 June 1963, the Government of the United States of America informed the Secretary-General that the Protocol "will not enter into force with respect to the United States until the Protocol has been ratified on the part of the United States and instrument of ratification has been deposited".

6. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

Concluded at Montego Bay, Jamaica, on 10 December 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 November 1994, in accordance with article 308 (1).
REGISTRATION: 16 November 1994.
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.62/122 and Corr. 1 to 11; depositary notifications C.N.236.1984.TREATIES-7 of 5 October 1984 (procès-verbal of rectification of the English and Spanish authentic texts); C.N.202.1985.TREATIES-17 of 23 August 1985 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English text); C.N.17.1986.TREATIES-1 of 7 April 1986 C.N.166.1993.TREATIES–4 of 9 August 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Spanish texts of the Final Act); and C.N.362.1995.TREATIES–7 of 27 October 1995 (proposed corrections to the original French text).
STATUS: Signatories: 158. Parties: 82.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and opened for signature, together with the Final Act of the Conference, at Montego Bay, Jamaica, on 10 December 1982. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 3067 (XXVIII)[1] adopted by the General Assembly on 16 November 1973. The Conference held eleven sessions, from 1973 to 1982, as follows:

- First session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 3 to 15 December 1973;
- Second session: Parque Central, Caracas, 20 June to 29 August 1974;
- Third session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 17 March to 9 May 1975;
- Fourth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 15 March to 7 May 1976;
- Fifth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 2 August to 17 September 1976;
- Sixth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 23 May to 15 July 1977;
- Seventh session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 28 March to 19 May 1978;
- Resumed seventh session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 21 August to 15 September 1978;
- Eighth session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 19 March to 27 April 1979;
- Resumed eighth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 19 July to 24 August 1979;
- Ninth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 3 March to 4 April 1980;
- Resumed ninth session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 28 July to 29 August 1980;
- Tenth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 9 March to 24 April 1981;
- Resumed tenth session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 3 to 28 August 1981;
- Eleventh session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 8 March to 30 April 1982;
- Resumed eleventh session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 22 to 24 September 1982;
- Final Part of the eleventh session: Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6 to 10 December 1982.

The Conference also adopted a Final Act[2] with, annexed thereto, nine resolutions and a statement of understanding. The text of the Final Act has been reproduced as document A/CONF.62/121 and Corr. 1 to 8.

Participant[3]	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (c), accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	18 Mar 1983	
Algeria	10 Dec 1982	
Angola	10 Dec 1982	5 Dec 1990
Antigua and Barbuda	7 Feb 1983	2 Feb 1989
Argentina	5 Oct 1984	1 Dec 1995
Australia	10 Dec 1982	5 Oct 1994
Austria	10 Dec 1982	14 Jul 1995
Bahamas	10 Dec 1982	29 Jul 1983
Bahrain	10 Dec 1982	30 May 1985
Bangladesh	10 Dec 1982	
Barbados	10 Dec 1982	12 Oct 1993
Belarus	10 Dec 1982	
Belgium	5 Dec 1984	
Belize	10 Dec 1982	13 Aug 1983
Benin	30 Aug 1983	
Bhutan	10 Dec 1982	
Bolivia	27 Nov 1984	28 Apr 1995
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Botswana	5 Dec 1984	2 May 1990
Brazil	10 Dec 1982	22 Dec 1988
Brunei Darussalam	5 Dec 1984	
Bulgaria	10 Dec 1982	
Burkina Faso	10 Dec 1982	
Burundi	10 Dec 1982	
Cambodia	1 Jul 1983	
Cameroon	10 Dec 1982	19 Nov 1985
Canada	10 Dec 1982	
Cape Verde	10 Dec 1982	10 Aug 1987
Central African Republic	4 Dec 1984	
Chad	10 Dec 1982	
Chile	10 Dec 1982	
China	10 Dec 1982	
Colombia	10 Dec 1982	
Comoros	6 Dec 1984	21 Jun 1994
Congo	10 Dec 1982	
Cook Islands	10 Dec 1982	15 Feb 1995
Costa Rica	10 Dec 1982	21 Sep 1992
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Dec 1982	26 Mar 1984
Croatia		5 Apr 1995 *d*
Cuba	10 Dec 1982	15 Aug 1984
Cyprus	10 Dec 1982	12 Dec 1988
Czech Republic[4]	22 Feb 1993 *d*	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	10 Dec 1982	

Participant[3]	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (c), accession (a), succession (d)*
Denmark	10 Dec 1982	
Djibouti	10 Dec 1982	8 Oct 1991
Dominica	28 Mar 1983	24 Oct 1991
Dominican Republic	10 Dec 1982	
Egypt	10 Dec 1982	26 Aug 1983
El Salvador	5 Dec 1984	
Equatorial Guinea	30 Jan 1984	
Ethiopia	10 Dec 1982	
European Community	7 Dec 1984	
Fiji	10 Dec 1982	10 Dec 1982
Finland	10 Dec 1982	
France	10 Dec 1982	
Gabon	10 Dec 1982	
Gambia	10 Dec 1982	22 May 1984
Germany		14 Oct 1994 *a*
Ghana	10 Dec 1982	7 Jun 1983
Greece	10 Dec 1982	21 Jul 1995
Grenada	10 Dec 1982	25 Apr 1991
Guatemala	8 Jul 1983	
Guinea	4 Oct 1984	6 Sep 1985
Guinea-Bissau	10 Dec 1982	25 Aug 1986
Guyana	10 Dec 1982	16 Nov 1993
Haiti	10 Dec 1982	
Honduras	10 Dec 1982	5 Oct 1993
Hungary	10 Dec 1982	
Iceland	10 Dec 1982	21 Jun 1985
India	10 Dec 1982	29 Jun 1995
Indonesia	10 Dec 1982	3 Feb 1986
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10 Dec 1982	
Iraq	10 Dec 1982	30 Jul 1985
Ireland	10 Dec 1982	
Italy	7 Dec 1984	13 Jan 1995
Jamaica	10 Dec 1982	21 Mar 1983
Japan	7 Feb 1983	
Jordan		27 Nov 1995 *a*
Kenya	10 Dec 1982	2 Mar 1989
Kuwait	10 Dec 1982	2 May 1986
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10 Dec 1982	
Lebanon	7 Dec 1984	5 Jan 1995
Lesotho	10 Dec 1982	
Liberia	10 Dec 1982	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 Dec 1984	
Liechtenstein	30 Nov 1984	
Luxembourg	5 Dec 1984	
Madagascar	25 Feb 1983	
Malawi	7 Dec 1984	
Malaysia	10 Dec 1982	
Maldives	10 Dec 1982	
Mali	19 Oct 1983	16 Jul 1985
Malta	10 Dec 1982	20 May 1993
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 *a*
Mauritania	10 Dec 1982	
Mauritius	10 Dec 1982	4 Nov 1994
Mexico	10 Dec 1982	18 Mar 1983
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 *a*
Monaco	10 Dec 1982	
Mongolia	10 Dec 1982	
Morocco	10 Dec 1982	
Mozambique	10 Dec 1982	
Myanmar	10 Dec 1982	
Namibia[5]	10 Dec 1982	18 Apr 1983
Nauru	10 Dec 1982	
Nepal	10 Dec 1982	
Netherlands	10 Dec 1982	
New Zealand	10 Dec 1982	
Nicaragua	9 Dec 1984	
Niger	10 Dec 1982	
Nigeria	10 Dec 1982	14 Aug 1986
Niue	5 Dec 1984	
Norway	10 Dec 1982	
Oman	1 Jul 1983	17 Aug 1989
Pakistan	10 Dec 1982	
Panama	10 Dec 1982	
Papua New Guinea	10 Dec 1982	
Paraguay	10 Dec 1982	26 Sep 1986
Philippines	10 Dec 1982	8 May 1984
Poland	10 Dec 1982	
Portugal	10 Dec 1982	
Qatar	27 Nov 1984	
Republic of Korea	14 Mar 1983	
Romania	10 Dec 1982	
Russian Federation	10 Dec 1982	
Rwanda	10 Dec 1982	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	7 Dec 1984	7 Jan 1993
Saint Lucia	10 Dec 1982	27 Mar 1985
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	10 Dec 1982	1 Oct 1993
Samoa	28 Sep 1984	14 Aug 1995
Sao Tome and Principe	13 Jul 1983	3 Nov 1987
Saudi Arabia	7 Dec 1984	
Senegal	10 Dec 1982	25 Oct 1984
Seychelles	10 Dec 1982	16 Sep 1991
Sierra Leone	10 Dec 1982	12 Dec 1994
Singapore	10 Dec 1982	17 Nov 1994
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 *d*	
Slovenia		16 Jun 1995 *d*
Solomon Islands	10 Dec 1982	
Somalia	10 Dec 1982	24 Jul 1989
South Africa	5 Dec 1984	
Spain	4 Dec 1984	
Sri Lanka	10 Dec 1982	19 Jul 1994
Sudan	10 Dec 1982	23 Jan 1985
Suriname	10 Dec 1982	
Swaziland	18 Jan 1984	
Sweden	10 Dec 1982	
Switzerland	17 Oct 1984	
Thailand	10 Dec 1982	
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		19 Aug 1994 *d*
Togo	10 Dec 1982	16 Apr 1985
Tonga		2 Aug 1995 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Dec 1982	25 Apr 1986
Tunisia	10 Dec 1982	24 Apr 1985
Tuvalu	10 Dec 1982	
Uganda	10 Dec 1982	9 Nov 1990
Ukraine	10 Dec 1982	
United Arab Emirates	10 Dec 1982	

Participant[3]	Signature, succession (d)	Ratification, formal confirmation (c), accession (a), succession (d)
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Dec 1982	30 Sep 1985
Uruguay	10 Dec 1982	10 Dec 1992
Vanuatu	10 Dec 1982	
Viet Nam	10 Dec 1982	25 Jul 1994
Yemen[6]	10 Dec 1982	21 Jul 1987
Yugoslavia	10 Dec 1982	5 May 1986
Zaire	22 Aug 1983	17 Feb 1989
Zambia	10 Dec 1982	7 Mar 1983
Zimbabwe	10 Dec 1982	24 Feb 1993

Declarations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, formal confirmation, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

Upon signature:

It is the view of the Government of Algeria that its signing the Final Act and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not entail any change in its position on the non-recognition of certain other signatories, nor any obligation to co-operate in any field whatsoever with those signatories.

ANGOLA

Upon signature:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Angola reserves the right to interpret any and all articles of the Convention in the context of and with due regard to Angolan Sovereignty and territorial integrity as it applies to land, space and sea. Details of these interpretations will be placed on record at the time of ratification of the Convention.

The present signature is without prejudice to the position taken by the Government of Angola or to be taken by it on the Convention at the time of ratification."

ARGENTINA

Upon signature:

The signing of the Convention by the Argentine Government does not imply acceptance of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In that regard, the Argentine Republic, as in its written statement of 8 December 1982 (A/CONF.62/WS/35), places on record its reservation to the effect that resolution III, in annex I to the final Act, in no way affects the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which is governed by the following specific resolutions of the General Assembly: 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9 and 38/12, adopted within the framework of the decolonization process.

In this connection, and bearing in mind that the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands form an integral part of Argentine territory, the Argentine Government declares that it neither recognizes nor will it recognize the title of any other State, community or entity or the exercise by it of any right of maritime jurisdiction which is claimed to be protected under any interpretation of resolution III that violates the rights of Argentina over the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands and their respective maritime zones. Consequently, it likewise neither recognizes nor will recognize and will consider null and void any activity or measure that may be carried out or adopted without its consent with regard to this question, which the Argentine Government considers to be of major importance.

The Argentine Government will accordingly interpret the occurrence of acts of the kind referred to above as contrary to the aforementioned resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the patent objective of which is the peaceful settlement of the sovereignty dispute concerning the islands by means of bilateral negotiations and through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that, whereas the Final Act states in paragraph 42 that the Convention "together with resolutions I to IV, [forms] an integral whole", it is merely describing the procedure that was followed at the Conference to avoid a series of separate votes on the Convention and the resolutions. The Convention itself clearly establishes in article 318 that only the Annexes form an integral part of the Convention; thus, any other instrument or document, even one adopted by the Conference, does not form an integral part of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Upon ratification:

(a) With regard to those provisions of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of the Argentine Republic to continue to apply the regime currently in force to the passage of foreign warships through the Argentine territorial sea, since that regime is totally compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

(b) With regard to Part III of the Convention, the Argentine Government declares that in the Treaty of Peace and Friendship signed with the Republic of Chile on 29 November 1984, which entered into force on 2 May 1985 and was registered with the United Nations Secretariat in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, both States reaffirmed the validity of article V of the Boundary Treaty of 1881 whereby the Strait of Magellan (Estrecho de Magallanes) is neutralized forever with free navigation assured for the flags of all nations. The aforementioned Treaty of Peace and Friendship includes regulations for vessels flying the flags of third countries in the Beagle Channel and other straits and channels of the Tierra del Fuego archipelago.

(c) The Argentine Republic accepts the provisions on the conservation and management of the living resources of the high seas, but considers that they are insufficient, particularly the provisions relating to straddling fish stocks or highly migratory fish stocks, and that they should be supplemented by an effective and binding multilateral regime which, *inter alia*, would facilitate cooperation to prevent and avoid over-fishing, and would permit the monitoring of the activities of fishing vessels on the high seas and of the use of fishing methods and gear.

The Argentine Government, bearing in mind its priority interest in conserving the resources of its exclusive economic zone and the area of the high seas adjacent thereto, considers that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in the area of the high seas adjacent thereto, the Argentine Republic, as the coastal State, and other States fishing for such stocks in the area adjacent to its exclusive

economic zone should agree upon the measures necessary for the conservation of those stocks or stocks of associated species in the highs seas.

Independently of this, it is the understanding of the Argentine Government, that in order to comply with the obligation laid down in the Convention concerning the conservation of the living resources in its exclusive economic zone and the area adjacent thereto, it is authorized to adopt, in accordance with international law, all the measures it may deem necessary for the purpose.

(d) The ratification of the Convention by the Argentine Republic does not imply acceptance of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In that regard, the Argentine Republic, as in its written statement of 8 December 1982 (A/CONF.62/WS/35), places on record its reservation to the effect that resolution III, in annex I to the Final Act, in no way affects the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which is governed by the following specific resolutions of the General Assembly: 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19, 43/25, 44/406, 45/424. 46/406, 47/408 and 48/408, adopted within the framework of the decolonization process. *[See paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the declaration made upon signature above.]*

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its legitimate and inalienable sovereignty over the Malvinas and the South Sandwich Islands and their respective maritime and island zones, which form an integral part of its national territory. The recovery of those territories and the full exercise of sovereignty, respecting the way of life of the inhabitants of the territories and in accordance with the principles of international law, constitute a permanent objective of the Argentine people that cannot be renounced.

Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that the Final Act, in referring in paragraph 42 to the Convention together with resolutions I to IV as forming an integral whole, is merely describing the procedure that was followed at the Conference to avoid a series of separate votes on the Convention and the resolutions. The Convention itself clearly establishes in article 318 that only the Annexes form an integral part of the Convention; thus, any other instrument or document, even one adopted by the Conference, does not form an integral part of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

(e) The Argentine Republic fully respects the right of free navigation as embodied in the Convention, however, it considers that the transit by sea of vessels carrying highly radioactive substances must be duly regulated.

The Argentine Government accepts the provisions on prevention of pollution of the marine environment contained in Part XII of the Convention, but considers that, in the light of events subsequent to the adoption of that international instrument, the measures to prevent, control and minimize the effects of the pollution of the sea by noxious and potentially dangerous substances and highly active radioactive substances must be supplemented and reinforced.

(f) In accordance with the provisions of article 287, the Argentine Government declares that it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention: (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea; (b) an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, in accordance with Annex VIII, article 1. The Argentine Government also declares that it dos not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, with respect to the disputes specified in article 298, paragraph 1 (a), (b) and (c).

AUSTRIA

Declarations:

"In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it would give preference the Government of the Republic of Austria hereby chooses one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the two Conventions in accordance with article 287 of the [said Convention], in the following order:

1. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;

2. a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;

3. the International Court of Justice.

Also in absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Republic of Austria hereby recognizes as of today the validity of special arbitration for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping."

BELARUS

Upon signature:

1. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it accepts, as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in relation to questions of the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292.

2. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions in the consideration of disputes concerned with the delimitation of marine limits, disputes relating to military activity and disputes in relation to which the United Nations Security Council performs functions entrusted to it under the United Nations Charter.

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because the Convention has a very large number of positive features and achieves a compromise on them which is acceptable to most States. Nevertheless, with regard to the status of maritime space, it regrets that the concept of equity, adopted for the delimitation of the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone, was not applied again in the provisions for delimiting the territorial sea. It welcomes, however, the distinctions established by the Convention between the nature of the rights which riparian States exercise over their territorial sea, on the one hand, and over

the continental shelf and their exclusive economic zone, on the other.

It is common knowledge that the Belgian Government cannot declare itself also satisfied with certain provisions of the international régime of the sea-bed which, though based on a principle that it would not think of challenging, seems not to have chosen the most suitable way of achieving the desired result as quickly and surely as possible, at the risk of jeopardizing the success of a generous undertaking which Belgium consistently encourages and supports. Indeed, certain provisions of Part XI and of Annexes III and IV appear to it to be marred by serious defects and shortcomings which explain why consensus was not reached on this text at the last session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in New York, in April 1982. These shortcomings and defects concern in particular the restriction of access to the Area, the limitations on production and certain procedures for the transfer of technology, not to mention the vexatious implications of the cost and financing of the future International Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. The Belgian Government sincerely hopes that these shortcomings and defects will in fact be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures which the Preparatory Commission should draw up with the twofold intent of facilitating acceptance of the new régime by the whole international community and enabling the common heritage of mankind to be properly exploited for the benefit of all and, preferably, for the benefit of the least favoured countries. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium is not alone in thinking that the success of this new régime, the effective establishment of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the economic viability of the Enterprise will depend to a large extent on the quality and seriousness of the Preparatory Commission's work: it therefore considers that all decisions of the Commission should be adopted by consensus, that being the only way of protecting the legitimate interests of all.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, the Belgian Government wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Kingdom of Belgium is not here and now determined to ratify it. It will take a separate decision on this point at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all, focusing mainly on the questions to which attention has been drawn above.

The Belgian Government also wishes to recall that Belgium is a member of the European Economic Community, to which it has transferred powers in certain areas covered by the Convention; detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

It also wishes to draw attention formally to several points which it considers particularly crucial. For example, it attaches great importance to the conditions to which Articles 21 and 23 of the Convention subject the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, and it intends to ensure that the criteria prescribed by the relevant international agreements are strictly applied, whether the flag States are parties thereto or not. The limitation of the breadth of the territorial sea, as established by Article 3 of the Convention, confirms and codifies a widely observed customary practice which it is incumbent on every State to respect, as it is the only one admitted by international law: the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium will not therefore recognize, as territorial sea, waters which are, or may be, claimed to be such beyond 12 nautical miles measured from baselines determined by the riparian State in accordance with the Convention. Having underlined the close linkage which it perceives between Article 33, paragraph 1 (a), and Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium intends to reserve the right, in emergencies and especially in cases of blatant violation, to exercise the powers accorded to the riparian State by the latter text, without notifying beforehand a diplomatic agent or consular officer of the flag State, on the understanding that such notification shall be given as soon as it is physically possible. Finally, everyone will understand that the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium chooses to emphasize those provisions of the Convention which entitle it to protect itself,beyond the limit of the territorial sea, against any threat of pollution and, *a fortiori*, against any existing pollution resulting from an accident at sea, as well as those provisions which recognize the validity of rights and obligations deriving from specific conventions and agreements concluded previously or which may be concluded subsequently in furtherance of the general principles set forth in the Convention.

In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it obviously gives priority, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium deems it expedient to choose alternatively, and in order of preference, as Article 287 of the Convention leaves it free to do, the following means of settling disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
2. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
3. the International Court of Justice.

Still in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium wishes here and now to recognize the validity of the special arbitration procedure for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the provisions of the Convention in respect of fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

For the time being, the Belgian Government does not wish to make any declaration in accordance with Article 298, confining itself to the one made above in accordance with Article 287. Finally, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other States have made, or may make, upon signing or ratifying the Convention, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time.

BOLIVIA

Upon signature:

On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Bolivia hereby makes the following declaration before the International community:

1. The Convention on the Law of the Sea is a perfectible instrument and, according to its own provisions, is subject to revision. As a party to it, Bolivia will, when the time comes, put forward proposals and revisions which are in keeping with its national interests.
2. Bolivia is confident that the Convention will ensure, in the near future, the joint development of the resources of the sea-bed, with equal opportunities and rights for all nations, especially developing countries.
3. Freedom of access to and from the sea, which the Convention grants to land-locked nations, is a right that Bolivia has been exercising by virtue of bilateral treaties and will continue to exercise by virtue of the norms of positive international law contained in the Convention.

4. Bolivia wishes to place on record that it is a country that has no maritime sovereignty as a result of a war and not of as a result of its natural geographic position and that it will assert all the rights of coastal States under the Convention once it recovers the legal status in question as a consequence of negotiations on the restoration to Bolivia of its own sovereign outlet to the Pacific Ocean.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

"I. Signature by Brazil is *ad referendum,* subject to ratification of the Convention in conformity with Brazilian constitutional procedures, which include approval by the National Congress.

II. The Brazilian Government understands that the régime which is applied in practice in maritime area adjacent to the coast of Brazil is compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

III. The Brazilian Government understands that the provision of article 301, which prohibits "any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations", apply, in particular, to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or the jurisdiction of the coastal State.

IV. The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those that imply the use of weapons or explosives, without the consent of the coastal State.

V. The Brazilian Government understands that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the coastal State has, in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and regulate the construction, operation and use of all types of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose.

VI. Brazil exercises sovereignty rights over the continental shelf, beyond the distance of two hundred nautical miles from the baselines, up to the outer edge of the continental margin, as defined in article 76.

VII. The Brazilian Government reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298, concerning the settlement of disputes."

Upon ratification:

"I. The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of article 301 prohibiting "any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State, or in other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations apply in particular to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the coastal State.

"II. The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out military exercises or manœvres, in particular those involving the use of weapons or explosives, in the Exclusive Economic Zone without the consent of the coastal State.

"III. The Brazilian Government understands that in accordance with the provisions of the Convention the coastal State has, in the Exclusive Economic Zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and to regulate the construction, operation and use of all kinds of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose".

CAPE VERDE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Cape Verde signs the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea with the following understandings:

I. This Convention recognizes the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea or archipelagic waters. This right is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it was clearly stated in the Declaration made by the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on April 26, 1982.

II. The provisions of the Convention relating to the archipelagic waters, territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf are compatible with the fundamental objectives and aims that inspire the legislation of the Republic of Cape Verde concerning its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to and within its coasts and over the seabed and subsoil thereof up to the limit of 200 miles.

III. The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights recognized therein to the coastal state leave no doubt as to its character of a *sui generis* zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and which is not a part of the high seas.

IV. The regulations of the uses or activities which are not expressly provided for in the Convention but are related to the sovereign rights and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of the said State, provided that such regulation does not hinder the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication which are recognized to other States.

V. In the exclusive economic zone, the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication, in conformity with its definition and with other relevant provisions of the Convention, excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State, such as exercises with weapons or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of the said state; and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State.

VI. This Convention does not entitle any State to construct, operate or use installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, either those provided for in the Convention or those of any other nature, without the consent of the coastal State.

VII. In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to enter into arrangements with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stock or stocks of associated species."

Upon ratification:

I. [. . .]

II. The Republic of Cape Verde declares, without prejudice of article 303 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, that any objects of an archaelogical and historical nature found within the maritime areas over which it exerts sovereignty or jurisdiction, shall not be removed without its prior notification and consent.

III. The Republic of Cape Verde declares that, in the absence of or failing any other peaceful means, it chooses, in order of preference and in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the following procedures for the settlement of disputes regarding the interpretation or application of the said Convention:

a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea;

b) the International Court of Justice.

IV. The Republic of Cape Verde, in accordance with article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, declares that it does not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, Section 2, of the said Convention for the settlement of disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government operated vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, as well as disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the aforementioned Convention."

CHILE

Upon signature:

In exercise of the right conferred by article 310 of the Convention, the delegation of Chile wishes first of all to reiterate in its entirety the statement it made at last April's meeting when the Convention was adopted. That statement is reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164. . . . in particular to the Convention's pivotal legal concept, that of the 200 mile exclusive economic zone to the elaboration of which [the Government of Chile] country made an important contribution, having been the first to declare such a concept, 35 years ago in 1947, and having subsequently helped to define and earn it international acceptance. The exclusive economic zone has a *sui generis* legal character distinct from that of the territorial sea and the high seas. It is a zone under national jurisdiction, over which the coastal State exercises economic sovereignty and in which third States enjoy freedom of navigation and overflight and the freedoms inherent in international communication. The Convention defines it as a maritime space under the jurisdiction of the coastal State, bound to the latters' territorial sovereignty and actual territory, on terms similar to those governing other maritime spaces, namely the territorial sea and the continental shelf. With regard to straits used for international navigation, the delegation of Chile wishes to reaffirm and reiterate in full the statement made last April, as reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164 referred to above, as well as the content of the supplementary written statement dated 7 April 1982 contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/19.

With regard to the international sea-bed régime, [the Government of Chile wishes] to reiterate the statement made by the Group of 77 at last April's meeting regarding the legal concept of the common heritage of mankind, the existence of which was solemnly confirmed by consensus by the General Assembly in 1970 and which the present Convention defines as a part of *jus cogens*. Any action taken in contravention of this principle and outside the framework of the sea-bed régime would, as last April's debate showed, be totally invalid and illegal.

COSTA RICA

Upon signature:

The Government of Costa Rica declares that the provisions of Costa Rican law under which foreign vessels must pay for licences to fish in its exclusive economic zone, shall apply also to fishing for highly migratory species, pursuant to the provisions of articles 62 and 64, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

CROATIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia considers that, in accordance with article 53 the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 29 May 1969, there is no peremptory norm of general international law, which would forbid a coastal state to request by its laws and regulations foreign warships to notify their intention of innocent passage through its territorial waters, and to limit the number of warships allowed to exercise the right of innocent passage at the same time (articles 17–32 of the Convention)."

CUBA

Upon signature:

"At the time of signing the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Cuban Delegation declares that, having gained possession of the definitive text of the Convention just a few hours ago, it will leave for the time of the ratification of the Convention the issuing of any statement it deems pertinent with respect to articles:

287 – on the election of the procedure for the settlement of controversies pertaining to the interpretation or implementation of the Convention;

292 – on the prompt release of ships and their crews;

298 – on the optional exceptions to the applicability of Section 2;

as well as whatever statement or declaration it might deem appropriate to make in conformity with article 310 of the Convention."

Upon ratification:

With regard to article 287 on the choice of procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and, consequently, will not accept either the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the provisions of either articles 297 and 298.

With regard to article 292, the Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that once financial security has been posted, the detaining State should proceed promptly and without delay to release the vessel and its crew and declares that where this procedure is not followed with respect to its vessels or members of their crew it will not agree to submit the matter to the International Court of Justice.

EGYPT

1. The Arab Republic of Egypt establishes the breadth of its territorial sea at 12 nautical miles, pursuant to article 5 of the Ordinance of 18 January 1951 as amended by the Decree of 17 February 1958, in line with the provisions of article 3 of the Convention:

2. The Arab Republic of Egypt will publish, at the earliest opportunity, charts showing the baselines from which the breadth of its territorial sea in the Mediterranean Sea and in the Red Sea is measured, as well as the lines marking the outer limit of the territorial sea, in accordance with usual practice.

Declaration concerning the contiguous zone

The Arab Republic of Egypt has decided that its contiguous zone (as defined in the Ordinance of 18 January 1951 as amended by the Presidential Decree of 17 February 1958) extends to 24 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured, as provided for in article 33 of the Convention.

Declaration concerning the passage of nuclear-powered and similar ships through the territorial sea of Egypt

Pursuant to the provisions of the Convention relating to the right of the coastal State to regulate the passage of ships through its territorial sea and whereas the passage of foreign nuclear-powered ships and ships carrying nuclear or other inherently dangerous and noxious substances poses a number of hazards.

Whereas article 23 of the Convention stipulates that the ships in question shall, when exercising the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, carry documents and observe special precautionary measures established for such ships by international agreements, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it will require the aforementioned ships to obtain authorization before entering the territorial sea of Egypt, until such international agreements are concluded and Egypt becomes a party to them.

Declaration concerning the passage of warships through the territorial sea of Egypt

[With reference to the provisions of the Convention relating to the right of the coastal State to regulate the passage of ships through its territorial sea] Warships shall be ensured innocent passage through the territorial sea of Egypt, subject to prior notification.

Declaration concerning passage through the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba

The provisions of the 1979 Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel concerning passage through the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba come within the framework of the general régime of waters forming straits referred to in part III of the Convention, wherein it is stipulated that the general régime shall not affect the legal status of waters forming straits and shall include certain obligations with regard to security and the maintenance of order in the State bordering the strait.

Declaration concerning the exercise by Egypt of its rights in the exclusive economic zone

The Arab Republic of Egypt will exercise as from this day the rights attributed to it by the provisions of parts V and VI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the exclusive economic zone situated beyond and adjacent to its territorial sea in the Mediterranean Sea and in the Red Sea.

The Arab Republic of Egypt will also exercise its sovereign rights in this zone for the purpose of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the natural resources, whether living or non-living, of the sea-bed and subsoil and the super-adjacent waters, and with regard to all other activities for the economic exploration and exploitation of the zone, such as the production of energy from the water, currents and winds.

The Arab Republic of Egypt will exercise its jurisdiction over the exclusive economic zone according to the modalities laid down in the Convention with regard to the establishment and use of artificial islands, installations and structures, marine scientific research, the protection and preservation of the marine environment and the other rights and duties provided for in the Convention.

The Arab Republic of Egypt proclaims that, in exercising its rights and performing its duties under the Convention in the exclusive economic zone, it will have due regard for the rights and duties of other States and will act in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

The Arab Republic of Egypt undertakes to establish the outer limits of its exclusive economic zone in accordance with the rules, criteria and modalities laid down in the Convention.

[The Arab Republic of] Egypt declares that it will take the necessary action and make the necessary arrangements to regulate all matters relating to its exclusive economic zone.

Declaration concerning the procedures chosen for the settlement of disputes in conformity with the Convention

[With reference to the provisions of article 287of the Convention] the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it accepts the arbitral procedure, the modalities of which are defined in annex VII to the Convention, as the procedure for the settlement of any dispute which might arise between Egypt and any other State relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention.

The Arab Republic of Egypt further declares that it excludes from the scope of application of this procedure those disputes contemplated in article 297 of the Convention.

Statement concerning the Arabic version of the text of the Convention

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is gratified that the Third United Nations conference on the Law of the Sea adopted the new Convention in six languages, including Arabic, with all the texts being equally authentic, thus establishing absolute equality between all the versions and preventing any one from prevailing over another.

However, when the official Arabic version of the Convention is compared with the other official versions, it becomes clear that, in some cases, the official Arabic text does not exactly correspond to the other versions, in that it fails to reflect precisely the content of certain provisions of the Convention which were found acceptable and adopted by the States in establishing a legal régime governing the seas.

For these reasons, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt takes the opportunity afforded by the deposit of the instrument of ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to declare that it will adopt the interpretation which is best corroborated by the various official texts of the Convention.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the European Economic Community declares that it considers that the Convention constitutes, within the framework of the Law of the Sea, a major effort in the codification and progressive development of international law in the fields to which its declaration pursuant to Article 2 of Annex IX of the Convention refers. The Community would like to express the hope that this development will become a useful means for promoting co-operation and stable relations between all countries in these fields.

The Community, however, considers that significant provisions of Part XI of the Convention are not conducive to the development of the activities to which that Part refers in view of the fact that several Member States of the Community have already expressed their position that this Part contains considerable deficiencies and flaws which require rectification. The Community recognises the importance of the work which remains to be done and hopes that conditions for the implementation of a sea bed mining regime, which are generally acceptable and which are therefore likely to promote activities in the international sea bed area, can be agreed. The Community,

within the limits of its competence, will play a full part in contributing to the task of finding satisfactory solutions.

A separate decision on formal confirmation(*) will have to be taken at a later stage. It will be taken in the light of the results of the efforts made to attain a universally acceptable Convention."

Competence of the European Communities with regard to matters governed by the Convention on the Law of the Sea (Declaration made pursuant to article 2 of Annex IX to the Convention)

Article 2 of Annex IX to the Convention of the Law of the Sea stipulates that the participation of an international organisation shall be subject to a declaration specifying the matters governed by the Convention in respect of which competence has been transferred to the organisation by its member states.

The European Communities were established by the Treaties of Paris and of Rome, signed on 18 April 1951 and 25 March 1957, respectively. After being ratified by the Signatory States the Treaties entered into force on 25 July 1952 and 1 January 1958(**).

In accordance with the provisions referred to above this declaration indicates the competence of the European Economic Community in matters governed by the Convention.

The Community points out that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to the conservation and management of sea fishing resources. Hence, in the field of sea fishing it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which are enforced by the Member States) and to enter into external undertakings with third states or competent international organisations.

(*) Formal confirmation is the term used in the Convention for ratification by international organisations (see Article 306 and Annex IX, Article 3).

(**) The Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community was registered at the Secretariat of the United Nations on 15.3.1957 under No. 3729; the Treaties of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) were registered on 21 April and 24 April 1958, respectively under Nos 4300 and 4301. The current members of the Communities are the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea shall apply, with regard to matters transferred to the European Economic Community to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty.

Furthermore, with regard to rules and regulations for the protection and preservation of the marine environment, the Member States have transferred to the Community competences as formulated in provisions adopted by the Community and as reflected by its participation in certain international agreements (see Annex).

With regard to the provisions of Part X, the Community has certain powers as its purpose is to bring about an economic union based on a customs union.

With regard to the provisions of Part XI, the Community enjoys competence in matters of commercial policy, including the control of unfair economic practices.

The exercise of the competence that the Member States have transferred to the Community under the Treaties is, by its very nature, subject to continuous development. As a result the Community reserves the right to make new declarations at a later date.

Annex

Community texts applicable in the sector of the protection and preservation of the marine environment and relating directly to subjects covered by the Convention

Council Decision of 3 December 1981 establishing a Community information system for the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea (81/971/EEC) (OJ No L 355, 10.12.1981, p. 52).

Council Directive of 4 May 1976 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community (76/464/EEC) (OJ No L 129, 18.5.1976, p. 23).

Council Directive of 16 June 1975 on the disposal of waste oils (75/439/EEC)(OJ No L 194, 25.7.1975, p. 23).

Council Directive of 20 February 1978 on waste from the titanium dioxide industry (78/176/EEC) (OJ No L 54, 25.2.1978, p. 19).

Council Directive of 30 October 1979 on the quality required of shellfish waters (79/923/EEC) (OJ No L 281, 10.11.1979, p. 47).

Council Directive of 22 March 1982 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (82/176/EEC) (OJ No L 81, 27.3.1982, p. 29).

Council Directive of 26 September 1983 on limit values and quality objectives for cadmium discharges (83/513/EEC) (OJ No L 291, 24.10.1983, p. 1 *et seq.*).

Council Directive of 8 March 1984 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by sectors other than the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (84/156/EEC) (OJ No L 74, 17.3.1984, p. 49 *et seq.*).

Annex

The Community has also concluded the following Conventions:

Convention for the prevention of marine pollution from land-based sources (Council Decision 75/437/EEC of 3 March 1975 published in OJ No L 194, 25.7.1975, p. 5).

Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution (Council Decision of 11 June 1981 published in OJ No L 171, 27.6.1981, p. 11).

Convention for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution and the Protocol for the prevention of pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by dumping from ships and aircraft (Council Decision 77/585/EEC of 25 July 1977 published in OJ No L 240, 19.9.1977, p. 1).

Protocol concerning co-operation in combating pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by oil and other harmful substances in cases of emergency (Council Decision 81/420/EEC of 19 May 1981 published in OJ No L 162, 19.6.1981, p. 4).

Protocol of 2 and 3 April 1983 concerning Mediterranean specially protected areas (OJ No L 68/36, 10.3.1984)."

FINLAND

Upon signature:

"It is the understanding of the Government of Finland that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in article 35 (c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Finland (the Aland Islands) and Sweden. Since in that strait the passage is regulated in part by a long-standing international convention in force, the present legal régime in that strait will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention.

As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of

the Government of Finland to continue to apply the present régime to the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Finnish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

1. The provisions of the Convention relating to the status of the different maritime spaces and to the legal régime of the uses and protection of the marine environment confirm and consolidate the general rules of the law of the sea and thus entitle the French Republic not to recognize as enforceable against it any foreign laws or regulations that are not in conformity with those general rules.

2. The provisions of the Convention relating to the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction show considerable deficiencies and flaws with respect to the exploration and exploitation of the said area which will require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of draft rules, regulations and procedures to ensure the establishment and effective functioning of the International Sea-Bed Authority.

To this end, all efforts must be made within the Preparatory Commission to reach general agreement on any matter of substance, in accordance with the procedure set out in rule 37 of the rules of procedure of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

3. With reference to article 140, the signing of the Convention by France shall not be interpreted as implying any change in its position in respect of resolution 1514 (XV).

4. The provisions of article 230, paragraph 2, of the Convention shall not preclude interim or preventive measures against the parties responsible for the operation of foreign vessels, such as immobilization of the vessel. They shall also not preclude the imposition of penalties other than monetary penalties for any willful and serious act which causes pollution.

GERMANY

Statements :

The Federal Republic of Germany recalls that, as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

For the Federal Republic of Germany the link between Part IX of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 and the Agreement of 28 July 1994 relating to the implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as foreseen in article 2 (1) of that Agreement is fundamental.

In the absence of any other peaceful means, which would be given preference by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, that Government considers it useful to choose one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the two Conventions, as it is free to do under article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the following order:

1. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
2. a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
3. the International Court of Justice.

Also in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby recognizes as of today the validity of special arbitration for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

With reference to similar declarations made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, in the light of declarations already made or yet to be made by States upon signature, ratification of or accession to the Convention on the Law of the Sea declares as follows:

Territorial Sea, Archipelagic Waters, Straits

The provisions on the territorial sea represent in general a set of rules reconciling the legitimate desire of coastal States to protect their sovereignty and that of the international community to exercise the right of passage. The right to extend the breadth of the territorial sea up to 12 nautical miles will significantly increase the importance of the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea for all ships including warships, merchant ships and fishing vessels; this is a fundamental right of the community of nations.

None of the provisions of the Convention, which in so far reflect existing international law, can be regarded as entitling the coastal State to make the innocent passage of any specific category of foreign ships dependent on prior consent or notification.

A prerequisite for the recognition of the coastal State's right to extend the territorial sea is the régime of transit passage through straits used for international navigation. Article 38 limits the right of transit passage only in cases where a route of similar convenience exists in respect of navigational and hydrographical characteristics, which include the economic aspect of shipping.

According to the provisions of the Convention, archipelagic sea-lane passage is not dependent on the designation by the archipelagic States of specific sea-lanes or air routes in so far as there are existing routes through the archipelago normally used for international navigation.

Exclusive Economic Zone

In the exclusive economic zone, which is a new concept of international law, coastal States will be granted precise resource-related rights and jurisdiction. All other States will continue to enjoy the high seas freedoms of navigation and overflight and of all other international lawful uses of the sea. These uses will be exercised in a peaceful manner, and that is, in accordance with the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

The exercise of these rights can therefore not be construed as affecting the security of the coastal State or affecting its rights and obligations under international law. Accordingly, the notion of a 200-mile zone of general rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction of the coastal State cannot be sustained either in general international law or under the relevant provisions of the Convention.

In articles 56 and 58 a careful and delicate balance has been struck between the interests of the coastal State and the freedoms and rights of all other States. This balance includes the reference contained in article 58, paragraph 2, to articles 88 to 115 which apply to the exclusive economic zone in so far as they are not incompatible with Part V. Nothing in Part V is incompatible with article 89 which invalidates claims of sovereignty.

According to the Convention, the coastal State does not enjoy residual rights in the exclusive economic zone. In particular, the rights and jurisdiction of the coastal State in such zone do not include the rights to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them.

Apart from artificial islands, the coastal State enjoys the right in the exclusive economic zone to authorize, construct, operate and use only those installations and structures which have economic purposes.

The High Seas

As geographically disadvantaged State with important interests in the traditional uses of the seas, the Federal Republic of Germany remains committed to the established principle of the freedom of the high seas. This principle, which has governed all uses of the sea for centuries, has been affirmed and in various fields, adapted to new requirements in the provisions of the Convention, which will therefore have to be interpreted to the furthest extent possible in accordance with that traditional principle.

Land–Locked States

As to the regulation of the freedom of transit enjoyed by land–locked States, transit through the territory of transit States must not interfere with the sovereignty of these States. In accordance with article 125, paragraph 3, the rights and facilities provided for in Part X in no way infringe upon the sovereignty and legitimate interests of transit States. The precise content of the freedom of transit has in each single case to be agreed upon by the transit State and the land–locked State concerned. in the absence of such agreement concerning the terms and modalities for exercising the right of access of persons and goods to transit through the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany is only regulated by national law, in particular with regard to means and ways of transport and the use of traffic infrastructure.

Marine Scientific Research

Although the traditional freedom of research suffered a considerable erosion by the Convention, this freedom will remain in force for States, international organizations and private entities in some maritime areas, e.g., the sea–bed beyond the continental shelf and the high seas. However, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf, which are of particular interest to marine scientific research, will be subject to a consent régime, a basic element of which is the obligation of the coastal State under article 246, paragraph 3, to grant its consent in normal circumstances. In this regard, promotion and creation of favourable conditions for scientific research, as postulated in the Convention, are general principles governing the application and interpretation of all relevant provisions of the Convention.

The marine scientific research régime on the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles denies the coastal State the discretion to withhold consent under article 246, paragraph 5 (a), outside areas it has publicly designated in accordance with the prerequisites stipulated in paragraph 6. Relating to the obligation, to disclose information about exploitation or exploratory operations in the process of designation is taken into account in article 246, paragraph 6, which explicitly excluded details from the information to be provided.

GREECE[7]

Interpretative declaration on the subject of straits made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The present declaration concerns the provisions of Part III 'on straits used for international navigation' and more especially the application in practice of articles 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In areas where there are numerous spread out islands that form a great number of alternative straits which serve in fact one and the same route of international navigation, it is the understanding of Greece, that the coastal state concerned has the responsibility to designate the route or routes, in the said alternative straits, through which ships and aircrafts of third countries could pass under transit passage régime, in such a way as on the one hand the requirements of international navigation and overflight are satisfied, and on the other hand the minimum security requirements of both the ships and aircrafts in transit as well as those of the coastal state are fulfilled."

Upon ratification:

1. In ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Greece secures all the rights and assumes all the obligations deriving from the Convention.

Greece shall determine when and how it shall exercise these rights, according to its national strategy. This shall not imply that Greece renounces these rights in any way.

2. Greece wishes to reiterate the interpretative declaration on straits which it deposited at the time of the Convention's adoption and at the time of its signature. *[See "**Interpretative declaration made upon signature on the subject of straits made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification**" above.]*

3. Pursuant to article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Hellenic Republic hereby chooses, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI of the Convention as the means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

4. Greece, as a State member of the European Union has given the latter jurisdiction with respect to certain issues relating to the Convention. Following the deposit by the European Union of its instrument of formal confirmation, Greece will make a special declaration specifying in detail the issues dealt with in the Convention for which it has transferred jurisdiction to the European Union.

5. Greece's ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not imply that it recognizes the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and does not, therefore, constitute the establishment of treaty relations with the latter."

GUINEA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Republic of Guinea reserves the right to interpret any article of the Convention in the context and taking due account of the sovereignty of Guinea and of its territorial integrity as it applies to the land, space and sea.

GUINEA-BISSAU

As regards article 287 on the choice of a procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, [the Government of Guinea-Bissau] does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and consequently will not accept that jurisdiction with respect to articles 297 and 298.

ICELAND

"Under article 298 of the Convention the right is reserved [by the Government of Iceland] that any interpretation of article 83 shall be submitted to conciliation under Annex V, Section 2 of the Convention."

INDIA

Declarations:

"(a) The Government of the Republic of India reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298, concerning the settlement of disputes.

(b) The Government of the Republic of India understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf military exercises or manœuvres, in particular those involving the use of weapons or explosives without the consent of the coastal State."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Interpretative declaration on the subject of straits

"In accordance with article 310 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran seizes the opportunity at this solemn moment of signing the Convention, to place on the records its "understanding" in relation to certain provisions of the Convention. The main objective for submitting these declarations is the avoidance of eventual future interpretation of the following articles in a manner incompatible with the original intention and previous positions or in disharmony with national laws and regulations of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is, . . . , the understanding of the Islamic Republic of Iran that:

1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of *quid pro quo* which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only states parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein.

The above considerations pertain specifically (but not exclusively) to the following:

- The right of Transit passage through straits used for international navigation (Part III, Section 2, article 38).
- The notion of "Exclusive Economic Zone"(Part V).
- All matters regarding the International Seabed Area and the Concept of "Common Heritage of mankind" (Part XI).

2) In the light of customary international law, the provisions of article 21, read in association with article 19 (on the Meaning of Innocent Passage) and article 25 (on the Rights of Protection of the Coastal States), recognizes (though implicitly) the rights of the Coastal States to take measures to safeguard their security interests including the adoption of laws and regulations regarding, *inter alia,* the requirements of prior authorization for warships willing to exercise the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea.

3) The right referred to in article 125 regarding access to and from the sea and freedom of transit of Land-locked States is one which is derived from mutual agreement of States concerned based on the principle of reciprocity.

4) The provisions of article 70, regarding "Right of States with Special Geographical Characteristics" are without prejudice to the *exclusive right* of the Coastal States of enclosed and semi-enclosed maritime regions (such as the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman) with large population predominantly dependent upon relatively poor stocks of living resources of the same regions.

5) Islets situated in enclosed and semi-enclosed seas which potentially can sustain human habitation or economic life of their own, but due to climatic conditions, resource restriction or other limitations, have not yet been put to development, fall within the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 121 concerning "Regime of Islands", and have, therefore, full effect in boundary delimitation of various maritime zones of the interested Coastal States.

Furthermore, with regard to "Compulsory Procedures Entailing Binding Decisions" the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, while fully endorsing the Concept of settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, and recognizing the necessity and desirability of settling, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cooperation, issues relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, at this time will not pronounce on the choice of procedures pursuant to articles 287 and 298 and reserves its positions to be declared in due time."

IRAQ[8]

Upon signature:

Pursuant to article 310 of the present Convention and with a view to harmonizing Iraqi laws and regulations with the provisions of the Convention, the Republic of Iraq has decided to issue the following statement:

1. The present signature in no way signifies recognition of Israel and implies no relationship with it.

2. Iraq interprets the provisions applying to all types of straits set forth in Part III of the Convention as applying also to navigation between islands situated near those straits if the shipping lanes leaving or entering those straits and defined by the competent international organization lie near such islands.

ITALY

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, Italy wishes to state that in its opinion part XI and annexes III and IV contain considerable flaws and deficiencies which require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea of appropriate draft rules, regulations and procedures.

Italy wishes also to confirm the following points made in its written statement dated 7 March 1983:

- according to the Convention, the Coastal State does not enjoy residual rights in the exclusive economic zone. In particular, the rights and jurisdiction of the Coastal State in such zone do not include the right to obtain notification of military exercises or manouvres or to authorize them.

Moreover, the rights of the Coastal State to build and to authorize the construction operation and the use of installations and structures in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf is limited only to the categories of such installations and structures as listed in art. 60 of the Convention.

- None of the provisions of the Convention, which corresponds on this matter to customary International Law, can be regarded as entitling the Coastal State to make innocent passage of particular categories of foreign ships dependent on prior consent or notification."

Upon ratification:

"Upon depositing its instrument of ratification Italy recalls that, as Member State of the European Community, it ha

transferred competence to the Community with respect to certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extension of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions in Annex IX of the Convention.

Italy has the honour to declare, under paragraph 1(a) of article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept any of the procedures provided for in section 2 of Part XV with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations as well as those involving historic bays or titles.

In any case, the present declarations should not be interpreted as entailing acceptance or rejection by Italy of declarations concerning matters other than those considered in it, made by other States upon signature or ratification.

Italy reserves the right to make further declarations relating to the Convention and to the Agreement."

KUWAIT[8]

Understanding:

The ratification by Kuwait of the said Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel nor that treaty relations will arise with Israel.

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because it represents, in the context of the law of the sea, a major contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law.

Nevertheless, in the view of the Government of Luxembourg, certain provisions of Part XI and Annexes III and IV of the Convention are marred by serious shortcomings and defects which, moreover, explain why it was not possible to reach a consensus on the text at the last session of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in New York in April 1982.

These shortcomings and defects concern, in particular, the mandatory transfer of technology and the cost and financing of the future Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. They will have to be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures to be drawn up by the Preparatory Commission. The Government of Luxembourg recognizes that the work remaining to be done is of great importance and hopes that it will be possible to reach agreement on the modalities for operating a sea-bed mining régime that will be generally acceptable and therefore conducive to promoting the activities of the international zone of the sea-bed.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, [the Government of Luxembourg] wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is not here and now determined to ratify it.

It will take a separate decision on this point, at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all.

[The Government of Luxembourg] also wishes to recall that Luxembourg is a member of the European Economic Community and, by virtue thereof, has transferred to the Community powers in certain areas covered by the Convention. Detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

Like other members of the Community, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg also reserves its position on all declarations made at the final session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, at Montego Bay, that may contain elements of interpretation concerning the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

MALI

Upon signature:

On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Republic of Mali remains convinced of the interdependence of the interests of all peoples and of the need to base international co-operation on, in particular, mutual respect, equality, solidarity at the international, regional and sub-regional levels, and positive good-neighbourliness between States.

It thus reiterates its statement of 30 April 1982, reaffirming that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the negotiation and adoption of which the Government of Mali participated in good faith, constitutes a perfectible international legal instrument.

Nevertheless, Mali's signature of the said Convention is without prejudice to any other instrument concluded or to be concluded by the Republic of Mali with a view to improving its status as a geographically disadvantaged and land-locked State. It is likewise without prejudice to the elements of any position which the Government of Mali may deem it necessary to take with regard to any question of the Law of the Sea pursuant to article 310.

In any case, the present signature has no effect on the course of Mali's foreign policy or on the rights it derives from its sovereignty under its Constitution or the Charter of the United Nations and any other relevant rule of international law.

MALTA[9]

Declaration:

The ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is a reflection of Malta's recognition of the many positive elements it contains, including its comprehensiveness, and its role in the application of the concept of the common heritage of mankind.

At the same time, it is realised that the effectiveness of the regime established by the Convention depends to a great extent on the attainment of its universal acceptance, not least by major maritime States and those with technology which are most affected by the regime.

The effectiveness of the provisions of Part IX on 'enclosed or semi-enclosed seas', which provide for cooperation of States bordering such seas, like the Mediterranean, depends on the acceptance of the Convention by the States concerned. To this end, the Government of Malta encourages and actively supports all efforts at achieving this universality.

The Government of Malta interprets articles 69 and 70 of the Convention as meaning that access to fishing in the exclusive economic zone of third States by vessels of developed land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States is dependent upon the prior granting of access by the coastal States in question to the nationals of other States which have habitually fished in the said zone.

The baselines as established by Maltese legislation for the delimitation of the territorial sea, and related areas, for the archipelago of the islands of Malta and which incorporate the island of Filfla as one of the points from which baselines are drawn, are fully in line with the relevant provisions of the Convention.

The Government of Malta interprets article 74 and article 83 to the effect that in the absence of agreement on the delimitation

of the exclusive economic zone or the continental shelf or other maritime zones, for an equitable solution to be achieved, the boundary shall be the median line, namely a line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial waters of Malta and of such other States is measured.

The exercise of the right of innocent passage of warships through the territorial sea of other States, should also be perceived to be a peaceful one. Effective and speedy means of communication are easily available, and make the prior notification of the exercise of the right of innocent passage of warships, reasonable and not incompatible with the Convention. Such notification is already required by some States. Malta reserves the right to legislate on this point.

Malta is also of the view that such a notification requirement is needed in respect of nuclear-powered ships or ships carrying nuclear or other inherently dangerous or noxious substances. Furthermore, no such ships shall be allowed within Maltese internal waters without the necessary authorisation.

Malta is of the view that the sovereign immunity contemplated in article 236, does not exonerate a State from such obligation, moral or otherwise, in accepting responsibility and liability for compensation and relief in respect of damage caused by pollution of the marine environment by any warship, naval auxiliary, other vessels or aircraft owned or operated by the State and used on government non-commercial service.

Legislation and regulations concerning the passage of ships through Malta's territorial sea are compatible with the provisions of the Convention. At the same time, the right is reserved to develop further this legislation in conformity with the Convention as may be required.

Malta declares itself in favour of establishing sea-lanes and special regimes for foreign fishing vessels transversing its territorial sea.

Note is taken of the statement by the European Community made at the time of signature of the Convention regarding the fact that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to certain aspects of the Convention. In view of Malta's application to join the European Community, it is understood that this will also become applicable to Malta on membership.

The Government of Malta does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other States may have made, or will make, upon signing or ratifying the Convention, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time. In particular, ratification of the Convention does not imply automatic recognition of maritime or territorial claims by any signatory or ratifying State.

NICARAGUA

Upon signature:

In accordance with article 310, Nicaragua declares that such adjustments of its domestic law as may be required in order to harmonize it with the Convention will follow from the process of constitutional change initiated by the revolutionary State of Nicaragua, it being understood that the Convention and the Resolutions adopted on 10 December 1982 and the Annexes to the Convention constitute an inseparable whole.

For the purposes of articles 287 and 298 and of other articles concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of Nicaragua shall, if and as the occasion demands, exercise the right conferred by the Convention to make further supplementary or clarificatory declarations.

OMAN

Upon signature:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman that the application of the provisions of articles 19, 25, 34, 38 and 45 of the Convention does not preclude a coastal State from taking such appropriate measures as are necessary to protect its interest of peace and security."

Declarations made upon ratification:

Pursuant to the provisions of article 310 of the Convention and further to the earlier declaration by the Sultanate of Oman dated 1 June 1982 concerning the establishment of straight baselines at any point on the coastline of the Sultanate of Oman and the lines enclosing waters within inlets and bays and waters between islands and the coast-line, in accordance with article 2(c) of Royal Decree No. 15/81 and in view of the desire of the Sultanante of Oman to bring its laws into line with the provisions of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman issues the following declarations:

Declaration No. 1, on the territorial sea

1. The Sultanate of Oman determines that its territorial sea, in accordance with article 2 of Royal Decree No. 15/81 dated 10 February 1981, extends 12 nautical miles in a seaward direction, measured from the nearest point of the baselines.

2. The Sultanate of Oman exercises full sovereignty over its territorial sea, the space above the territorial sea and its bed and subsoil, pursuant to the relevant laws and regulations of the Sultanate and in conformity with the provisions of this Convention concerning the principle of innocent passage.

Declaration No. 2, on the passage of warships throughout Omani territorial waters

Innocent passage is guaranteed to warships through Omani territorial waters, subject to prior permission. This also applies to submarines, on condition that they navigate on the surface and fly the flag of their home state.

Declaration No. 3, on the passage of nuclear-powered ships and the like through Omani territorial waters

With regard to foreign nuclear-powered ships and ships carrying nuclear or other substances that are inherently dangerous or harmful to health or the environment, the right of innocent passage, subject to prior permission, is guaranteed to the types of vessel, whether or not warships, to which the descriptions apply. This right is also guaranteed to submarines to which the descriptions apply, on condition that they navigate on the surface and fly the flag of their home State.

Declaration No. 4, on the contiguous zone

The contiguous zone extends for a distance of 12 nautical miles measured from the outer limit of the territorial waters and the Sultanate of Oman exercises the same prerogatives over it as are established by the Convention.

Declaration No. 5, on the exclusive economic zone

1. The Sultanate of Oman determines that its exclusive economic zone, in accordance with article 5 of Royal Decree No. 15/81 dated 10 February 1981, extends 200 nautical miles in a seaward direction, measured from the baselines from which the territorial sea is measured.

2. The Sultanate of Oman possesses sovereign rights over its economic zone and also exercises jurisdiction over that zone as provided for in the Convention. It further declares that, in exercising its rights and performing its duties under the Convention in the exclusive economic zone, it will have due regard to the rights and duties of other States and will act in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

Declaration No. 6, on the continental shelf

The Sultanate of Oman exercises over its continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources, as permitted by geographical conditions and in accordance with this Convention.

Declaration No. 7, on the procedure chosen for the settlement of disputes under the Convention

Pursuant to article 287 of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman declares its acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as set forth in annex VI to the Convention, and the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, with a view to the settlement of any dispute that may arise between it and another State concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

PHILIPPINES[10]

Understanding made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"1. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines under and arising from the Constitution of the Philippines;

2. Such signing shall not in any manner affect the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines as successor of the United States of America, under and arising out of the Treaty of Paris between Spain and the United States of America of December 10, 1898, and the Treaty of Washington between the United States of America and Great Britain of January 2, 1930;

3. Such signing shall not diminish or in any manner affect the rights and obligations of the contracting parties under the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of August 30, 1951, and its related interpretative instruments; nor those under any other pertinent bilateral or multilateral treaty or agreement to which the Philippines is a party;

4. Such signing shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines over any territory over which it exercises sovereign authority, such as the Kalayaan Islands, and the waters appurtenant thereto;

5. The Convention shall not be construed as amending in any manner any pertinent laws and Presidential Decrees or Proclamations of the Republic of the Philippines; the Government of the Republic of the Philippines maintains and reserves the right and authority to make any amendments to such laws, decrees or proclamations pursuant to the provisions of the Philippine Constitution;

6. The provisions of the Convention on archipelagic passage through sea lanes do not nullify or impair the sovereignty of the Philippines as an archipelagic state over the sea lanes and do not deprive it of authority to enact legislation to protect its sovereignty, independence, and security;

7. The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation;

8. The agreement of the Republic of the Philippines to the submission for peaceful resolution, under any of the procedures provided in the Convention, of disputes under Article 298 shall not be considered as a derogation of Philippine sovereignty."

QATAR[8]

Upon signature:

The State of Qatar declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or any dealing with Israel or, lead to entry with Israel into any of the relations governed by the Convention or entailed by the implementation of the provisions thereof.

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

"1. As a geographically disadvantaged country bordering a sea poor in living resources, Romania reaffirms the necessity to develop international cooperation for the exploitation of the living resources of the economic zones, on the basis of just and equitable agreements that should ensure the access of the countries from this category to the fishing resources in the economic zones of other regions or subregions.

2. The Socialist Republic of Romania reaffirms the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt national laws and regulations relating to the passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea.

The right to adopt such measures is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it is also specified in the Statement by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on April 26, 1982.

3. The Socialist Republic of Romania states that according to the requirements of equity as it results from articles 74 and 83 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea the uninhabited islands and without economic life can in no way affect the delimitation of the maritime spaces belonging to the main land coasts of the coastal States."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Upon signature:

1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, under article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. It opts for a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for the consideration of matters relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, including pollution from vessels and dumping. It recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as provided for in article 292, in matters relating to the prompt release of detained vessels and crews.

2. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept the compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities, or disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

Upon signature:

I. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe will in no way affect or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe embodied in and flowing from the Constitution of Sao Tome and Principe;

II. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through its territorial sea or its archipelagic waters and to take any other measures aimed at safeguarding its security;

III. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that the provisions of the Convention relating to archipelagic waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the legislation of the Republic of Sao Tome and Principe as regards its sovereignty and its jurisdiction over the maritime space adjacent to its coasts;

IV. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock area adjacent thereto, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are under an obligation to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of the stock or stocks of associated species;

V. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations to ensure the conservation of highly migratory species and to co-operate with the States whose nationals harvest these species in order to promote the optimum utilization thereof.

SLOVENIA

Declarations:

"Proceeding from the right that State Parties have on the basis of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Republic of Slovenia considers that its Part V Exclusive Economic Zone, including the provisions of article 70 Right of Geographhically Disadvantaged States, forms part of the general customary international law."

"The Republic of Slovenia does not consider itself to be bound by the declaratory statement on the basis of article 310 of the Convention, given by the former SFR of Yugoslavia".

SOUTH AFRICA

Upon signature:

"Pursuant to the provisions of Article 310 of the Convention the South African Government declares that the signature of this Convention by South Africa in no way implies recognition by South Africa of the United Nations Council for Namibia or its competence to act on behalf of South West Africa/Namibia."

SPAIN

Upon signature:

1. The Spanish Government, upon signing this Convention, declares that this act cannot be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations relating to the maritime spaces of Gibraltar which are not included in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht of 13 July 1713 between the Spanish and British Crowns. The Spanish Government also considers that Resolution III of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is not applicable in the case of the Colony of Gibraltar, which is undergoing a decolonization process in which only the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly apply.

2. It is the Spanish Government's interpretation that the régime established in Part III of the Convention is compatible with the right of the coastal State to issue and apply its own air regulations in the air space of the straits used for international navigation so long as this does not impede the transit passage of aircraft.

3. With regard to article 39, paragraph 3, it takes the word "normally" to mean "except in cases of *force majeure* or distress".

4. With regard to Article 42, it considers that the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) do not prevent it from issuing, in accordance with international law, laws and regulations giving effect to generally accepted international regulations.

5. The Spanish Government interprets articles 69 and 70 of the Convention as meaning that access to fishing in the economic zones of third States by the fleets of developed land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States is dependent upon the prior granting of access by the coastal States in question to the nationals of other States who have habitually fished in the economic zone concerned.

6. It interprets the provisions of Article 221 as not depriving the coastal State of a strait used for international navigation of its powers, recognized by international law, to intervene in the case of the casualties referred to in that article.

7. It considers that Article 233 must be interpreted, in any case, in conjunction with the provisions of Article 34.

8. It considers that, without prejudice to the provisions of Article 297 regarding the settlement of disputes, Articles 56, 61 and 62 of the Convention preclude considering as discretionary the powers of the coastal State to determine the allowable catch, its harvesting capacity and the allocation of surpluses to other States.

9. Its interpretation of Annex III, Article 9, is that the provisions thereof shall not obstruct participation, in the joint ventures referred to in paragraph 2, of the States Parties whose industrial potential precludes them from participating directly as contractors in the exploitation and resources of the Area.

SUDAN

Upon signature:

Declarations made in plenary meeting at the Final Part of the Eleventh Session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held at Montego Bay, Jamaica, from 6 to 10 December 1982, and reiterated upon signature

[1] In accordance with article 310 of the Convention, the Sudanese Government will make such declarations as it deems necessary in order to clarify its position regarding the content of certain provisions of this instrument.

[2] [The Sudan] wishes to reiterate [the statement by the President of the Conference] in plenary meeting during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, on 26 April 1982, concerning article 21, in which deals with the laws and regulations of the coastal State relating to innocent passage: namely, that the withdrawal of the amendment submitted at the time by a number of States did not prejudge the right of coastal States to take all necessary measures, particularly in order to protect their security, in accordance with article 19 on the meaning of the term "innocent passage" and article 25 on the rights of protection of the coastal State.

[3] The Sudan also wishes to state that, according to its interpretation, the definition of the term "geographically disadvantaged States" given in article 70, paragraph 2, applies to all the parts of the Convention in which this term appears.

[4] The fact that [the Sudan] is signing this Convention and the Final Act of the Conference in no way means that [it] recognizes any State whatsoever which it does not recognize or with which it has no relations.

SWEDEN

Upon signature:

"It is the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in Article 35 (c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Sweden and Denmark (Oresund) as well as to the strait between Sweden and Finland (the Aland islands). Since in both those straits the passage is regulated in whole or in part by long-standing international conventions in force, the present legal

régime in the two straits will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention.

As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Sweden to continue to apply the present régime for the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Swedish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention.

It is also the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the Convention does not affect the rights and duties of a neutral State provided for in the Convention concerning the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in case of Naval Warfare (XIII Convention), adopted at The Hague on 18 October 1907."

TUNISIA

Declaration 1:

The Republic of Tunisia, on the basis of resolution 4262 of the council of the League of Arab States, dated 31 March 1983, declares that its accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not imply recognition of or dealings with any States which the Republic of Tunisia does not recognize or have dealings with.

Declaration 2:

The Republic of Tunisia, in accordance with the provisions of article 311, and, in particular, paragraph 6 thereof, declares its adherence to the basic principles relating to the common heritage of mankind and that it will not be a party to any agreement in derogation thereof. The Republic of Tunisia calls upon all States to avoid any unilateral measure or legislation of this kind that would lead to disregard of the provisions of the Convention or to the exploitation of the resources of the seabed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof outside of the legal régime of the seas and oceans provided for in this convention and in the other legal instruments pertaining thereto, in particular resolution I and resolution II.

Declaration 3:

The Republic of Tunisia, in accordance with the provisions of article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, declares that it does not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, of the said Convention with respect to the following categories of disputes:

(a) (i) disputes concerning the interpretation of application of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles, provided that a State having made such a declaration shall, when such a dispute arises subsequent to the entry into force of this Convention and where no agreement within a reasonable period of time is reached in negotiations between the parties, at the request of any party to the dispute, accept submission of the matter to conciliation under Annex V, section 2; and provided further that any dispute that necessarily involves the concurrent consideration of any unsettled dispute concerning sovereignty or other rights over continental or insular land territory shall be excluded from such submission;

(ii) after the conciliation commission has presented its report, which shall state the reasons on which it is based, the parties shall negotiate an agreement on the basis of that report; if these negotiations do not result in an agreement, the parties shall, by mutual consent, submit the question to one of the procedures provided for in section 2, unless the parties otherwise agree;

(iii) this subparagraph does not apply to any sea boundary dispute finally settled by an arrangement between the parties, or to any such dispute which is to be settled in accordance with a bilateral or multilateral agreement binding upon those parties;

(b) disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, and disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraph 2 or 3;

(c) disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations, unless the Security council decides to remove the matter from its agenda or calls upon the parties to settle it by the means provided for in this Convention.

Declaration 4:

The Republic of Tunisia, in accordance with the provisions of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, declares that its legislation currently in force does not conflict with the provisions of this Convention. However, laws and regulations will be adopted as soon as possible in order to ensure closer harmony between the provisions of the Convention and the requirements for completing Tunisian legislation in the maritime sphere.

UKRAINE

Upon signature:

1. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Ukrainian SSR chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the competence, as stipulated in article 292, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews.

2. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept compulsory procedures, involving binding decisions, for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities and disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"The United Republic of Tanzania declares that is chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention."

URUGUAY

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

(A) The provisions of the Convention concerning the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with

the main purposes and principles underlying Uruguayan legislation in respect of Uruguay's sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to its coast and over its bed and sub-soil up to a limit of 200 miles.

(B) The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights which the Convention recognizes to the coastal State leave room for no doubt that it is a "*sui generis*" zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and that it is not part of the high seas.

(C) Regulation of the uses and activities not provided for expressly in the Convention (residual rights and obligations) relating to the rights of sovereignty and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of that State, provided that such regulation does not prevent enjoyment of the freedom of international communication which is recognized to other States.

(D) In the exclusive economic zone, enjoyment of the freedom of international communication in accordance with the way it is defined and in accordance with other relevant provisions of the Convention excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State for instance, military exercises or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of that State and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State.

(E) This Convention does not empower any State to build, operate or utilize installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, neither those referred to in the Convention nor any other kind, without the consent of the coastal State.

(F) In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stocks or associated species.

(G) When the Convention enters into force, Uruguay will apply, with respect to other States Parties, the provisions established by the Convention and by Uruguayan legislation, on the basis of reciprocity.

(H) Pursuant to the provisions of article 287, Uruguay declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of such disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention as are not subject to other procedures, without prejudice to its recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and of such agreements with other States as may provide for other means for peaceful settlement.

(I) Pursuant to the provisions of article 298, Uruguay declares that it will not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2 of the Convention, in respect of disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraphs 2 and 3.

(J) Reaffirms that, as stated in article 76, the continental shelf is the natural prolongation of the territory of the coastal State to the outer edge of the continental margin.

VIET NAM

Declarations:

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam, by ratifying the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, expresses its determination to join the international community in the establishment of an equitable legal order and in the promotion of maritime development and cooperation.

The National Assembly reaffirms the sovereignty of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam over its internal waters and territorial sea; the sovereign rights and jurisdiction in the contiguous zone, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf of Vietnam, based on the provisions of the Convention and principles of international law and calls on other countries to respect the above-said rights of Vietnam.

The National Assembly reiterates Vietnam's sovereignty over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa archipelagoes and its position to settle those disputes relating to territorial claims as well as other disputes in the Eastern Sea through peaceful negotiations in the spirit of equality, mutual respect and understanding, and with due respect of international law, particularly the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and of the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of the coastal states over their respective continental shelves and exclusive economic zones; the concerned parties should, while exerting active efforts to promote negotiations for a fundamental and long-term solution, maintain stability on the basis of the status-quo, refrain from any act that may further complicate the situation and from the use of force or threat of force.

The National Assembly emphasizes that it is necessary to identify between the settlement of dispute over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa archipelagoes and the defense of the continental shelf and maritime zones falling under Vietnam's sovereignty, rights and jurisdiction, based on the principles and standards and specified in the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The National Assembly entitles the National Assembly's Standing Committee and the Government to review all relevant national legislation to consider necessary amendments in conformity with the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and to safeguard the interest of Vietnam.

The National Assembly authorizes the Government to undertake effective measures for the management and defense of the continental shelf and maritime zones of Vietnam.

YEMEN[6, 8]

1. The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen will give precedence to its national laws in force which require prior permission for the entry or transit of foreign warships or of submarines or ships operated by nuclear power or carrying radioactive materials

2. With regard to the delimitation of the maritime borders between the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and any State having coasts opposite or adjacent to it, the median line basically adopted shall be drawn in a way such that every point of it is equidistant from the nearest points on the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of any State is measured. This shall be applicable to the maritime borders of the mainland territory of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and also of its islands.

YUGOSLAVIA

"1. Proceeding from the right that State Parties have on the basis of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia considers that a coastal State may, by its laws and regulations, subject the passage of foreign warships to the requirement of previous notification to the respective coastal State and limit the number of ships simultaneously passing, on the basis of the international customary law and in compliance with the right of innocent passage (articles 17-32 of the Convention).

2. The Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia also considers that it may, on the basis of article 38,

para. 1, and article 45, para. 1 (a) of the Convention, determine by its laws and regulations which of the straits used for international navigation in the territorial sea of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will retain the regime of innocent passage, as appropriate.

3. Due to the fact that the provisions of the Convention relating to the contiguous zone (article 33) do not provide rules on the delimitation of the contiguous zone between States with opposite or adjacent coasts, the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia considers that the principles of the customary international law, codified in article 24, para. 3, of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, signed in Geneva on 29 April 1958, will apply to the delimitation of the contiguous zone between the Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, formal confirmation, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA[11]

3 August 1988

"Australia considers that [the] declaration made by the Republic of the Philippines is not consistent with article 309 of the Law of the Sea Convention, which prohibits the making of reservations, nor with article 310 which permits declarations to be made "provided that such declarations or statements do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effects of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State.

The declaration of the Republic of the Philippines asserts that the Convention shall not affect the sovereign rights of the Philippines arising from its Constitution, its domestic legislation and any treaties to which the Philippines is a party. This indicates, in effect, that the Philippines does not consider that it is obliged to harmonise its law with the provisions of the Convention. By making such and assertion, the Philippines is seeking to modify the legal effect of the Convention's provisions.

This view is supported by the specific reference in the declaration to the status of archipelagic waters. The declaration states that the concept of archipelagic waters in the Convention is similar to the concept of internal waters held under former constitutions of the Philippines and recently reaffirmed in article 1 of the New Constitution of the Philippines in 1987. It is clear, however, that the Convention distinguishes the two concepts and that different obligations and rights are applicable to archipelagic waters from those which apply to internal waters. In particular, the Convention provides for the exercise by foreign ships of the rights of innocent passage and of archipelagic sea lanes passage in archipelagic waters.

Australia cannot, therefore, accept that the statement of the Philippines has any legal effect or will have any effect when the Convention comes into force and considers that the provisions of the Convention should be observed without being made subject to the restrictions asserted in the declaration of the Republic of the Philippines."

BELARUS

24 June 1985

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the statement which was made by the Government of the Philippines upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and confirmed subsequently upon ratification of that Convention in essence contains reservations and exceptions to the said Convention, contrary to the provisions of article 309 thereof. The statement by the Government of the Philippines is also inconsistent with article 310 of the Convention, under which any declarations or statements made by a State when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention are admissible only "provided that such declarations or statements do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State".

The Government of the Philippines in its statement repeatedly emphasizes its intention to continue to be governed in ocean affairs not by the Convention or by obligations thereunder, but by its national laws and previously concluded agreements, which are not in conformity with the provisions of the Convention. The Philippine side therefore declines to harmonize its national legislation with the provisions of the Convention and fails to perform one of its most fundamental obligations thereunder – to comply with the régime of archipelagic waters, which provides for the right of archipelagic passage of foreign ships and aircraft through or over such waters.

For the above reasons, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic cannot recognize the validity of the statement by the Government of the Philippines and regards it as having no legal force in the light of the provisions of the Convention.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that if the similar statements which were likewise made by certain other States when signing the Convention and which are inconsistent with the provisions thereof also occur at the stage of ratification or accession, the result could be to undermine the object and importance of the Convention and to prejudice that major instrument of international law.

In view of the foregoing, the Permanent Mission of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to the United Nations believes that it would be appropriate for the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in accordance with article 319, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, to carry out a study of a general nature relating to the universal application of the provisions of the Convention and, *inter alia,* to the issue of harmonizing the national laws of States parties with the Convention. The findings of such a study should be incorporated in the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its fortieth session under the agenda item entitled "Law of the sea".

BULGARIA

17 September 1985

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria is seriously concerned by the actions of a number of States which, upon signature or ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, have made reservations conflicting with the Convention itself or have enacted national legislation which excludes or modifies the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to those States. Such actions contravene article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and are at variance with the norms of customary international law and with the explicit provision of article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Such a tendency undermines the purport and meaning of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which establishes a universal and uniform regime for the use of the oceans and seas and their resources. In the note verbale of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the Embassy of the

Philippines in Belgrade, [...] the Bulgarian Government has rejected as devoid of legal force the statement made by the Philippines upon signature, and confirmed upon ratification, of the Convention.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria will oppose in the future as well any attempts aimed at unilaterally modifying the legal regime, established by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

ETHIOPIA

8 November 1984

"Paragraph 3 of the declaration relates to claims of sovereignty over unspecified islands in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean which clearly is outside the purview of the Convention. Although the declaration, not constituting a reservation as it is prohibited by article 309 of the Convention, is made under article 310 of same and as such is not governed by articles 19-23 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties providing for acceptance of and objections to reservations, nevertheless, the Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia, wishes to place on record that paragraph 3 of the declaration by the Yemen Arab Republic cannot in any way affect Ethiopia's sovereignty over all the islands in the Red Sea forming part of its national territory."

ISRAEL

11 December 1984

"The concerns of the Government of Israel, with regard to the law of the sea, relate principally to ensuring maximum freedom of navigation and overflight everywhere and particularly through straits used for international navigation.

In this regard, the Government of Israel states that the regime of navigation and overflight, confirmed by the 1979 Treaty of Peace between Israel and Egypt, in which the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba are considered by the Parties to be international waterways open to all nations for unimpeded and non-suspendable freedom of navigation and overflight, is applicable to the said areas. Moreover, being fully compatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the regime of the Peace Treaty will continue to prevail and to be applicable to the said areas.

It is the understanding of the Government of Israel that the declaration of the Arab Republic of Egypt in this regard, upon its ratification of the [said] Convention, is consonant with the above declaration [made by Egypt]."

ITALY

24 November 1995

With respect to the declaration made by India upon ratification, as well as for the similar ones made previously by Brazil, Cape Verde and Uruguay:

"Italy wishes to reiterate the declaration it made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification according to which 'the rights of the coastal State in such zone do not include the right to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them'. According to the declaration made by Italy upon ratification this declaration applies as a reply to all past and future declarations by other States concerning the matters covered by it".

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

25 February 1985

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the statement made by the Philippines upon signature, and then confirmed upon ratification, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in essence contains reservations and exceptions to the Convention, which is prohibited under article 309 of the Convention. At the same time, the statement of the Philippines is incompatible with article 310 of the Convention, under which a State, when signing or ratifying the Convention, may make declarations or statements only "provided that such declarations or statements do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State".

The discrepancy between the Philippine statement and the Convention can be seen, *inter alia*, from the affirmation by the Philippines that "The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation". Moreover, the statement emphasizes more than once that, despite its ratification of the Convention, the Philippines will continue to be guided in matters relating to the sea, not by the Convention and the obligations under it, but by its domestic law and by agreements it has already concluded which are not in line with the Convention. Thus, the Philippines not only is evading the harmonization of its legislation with the Convention but also is refusing to fulfil one of its most fundamental obligations under the Convention namely, to respect the régime of archipelagic waters, which provides that foreign ships enjoy the right of archipelagic passage through, and foreign aircraft the right of overflight over, such waters.

In view of the foregoing, the USSR cannot recognize as lawful the statement of the Philippines and considers it to be without legal effect in the light of the provisions of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union is gravely concerned by the fact that, upon signing the Convention, a number of other States have also made statements of a similar type conflicting with the Convention. If such statements are also made later on, at the ratification stage or upon accession to the Convention, the purport and meaning of the Convention, which establishes a universal and uniform régime for the use of the oceans and seas and their resources, could be undermined and this important instrument of international law impaired.

Taking into account the statement of the Philippines and the statements made by a number of other countries upon signing the Convention, together with the statements that might possibly be made subsequently upon ratification of and accession to the Convention, the Permanent Mission of the USSR considers that it would be appropriate for the Secretary-General of the United Nations to conduct, in accordance with article 319, paragraph 2 (a), a study of a general nature on the problem of ensuring universal application of the provisions of the Convention, including the question of the harmonization of the national legislation of States with the Convention. The results of such a study should be included in the report of the Secretary-General to the United Nations General Assembly at its fortieth session under the agenda item entitled "Law of the sea".

SLOVAKIA[4]
UKRAINE

8 July 1985

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that the statement which was made by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines when signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and subsequently confirmed upon ratification thereof contains elements which are inconsistent with articles 309 and 310 of the Convention. In accordance with those articles, statements which a State may make upon signature, ratification or accession should not purport "to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State" (art. 310). Such exceptions or reservations are legitimate only when they are "expressly permitted by other articles of this Convention" (art. 309). Article 310 also emphasizes that statements may be made by a State "with a view, *inter alia*, to the harmonization of its laws and regulations with the provisions of this Convention".

However, the statement by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines not only provides no evidence of the intention to harmonize the laws of that State with the Convention, but on the contrary has the purpose, as implied particularly in paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 of the statement, of granting precedence over the Convention to domestic legislation and international agreements to which the Republic of the Philippines is a party. For example, this applies, *inter alia*, to the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of 30 August 1951.

Furthermore, paragraph 5 of the statement not only grants priority over the Convention to the pertinent laws of the Republic of the Philippines which are currently in force, but also reserves the right to amend such laws in future pursuant only to the Constitution of the Philippines, and consequently without harmonizing them with the provisions of the Convention. Paragraph 7 of the statement draws an analogy between internal waters of the Republic of the Philippines and archipelagic waters and contains a reservation, which is inadmissible in the light of article 309 of the Convention, depriving foreign vessels of the right of transit passage for international navigation through the straits connecting the archipelagic waters with the economic zone or high sea. This reservation is evidence of the intention not to carry out the obligation under the Convention of parties thereto to comply with the régime of archipelagic waters and transit passage and to respect the rights of other States with regard to international navigation and overflight by aircraft. Failure to comply with this obligation would seriously undermine the effectiveness and significance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

It follows from the above that the statement by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines has the purpose of establishing unjustified exceptions for that State and in fact of modifying the legal effect of important provisions of the Convention as applied thereto. In view of this, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic cannot regard the [said] statement as having legal force. Such statements can only be described as harmful to the unified international legal régime for seas and oceans which is being established under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In the opinion of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the harmonization of national laws with the Convention would be facilitated by an examination within the framework of the United Nations Secretariat of the uniform and universal application of the Convention and the preparation of an appropriate study by the Secretary-General.

List of conciliators and arbitrators nominated for the purpose of constituting a conciliation commission under article 2 of annexes V and VIII to the Convention

Participant	*Nominations*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General*
Sudan	Sayed/Shawgi Hussain, Arbitrator	
	Dr. Ahmed Elmufti, Arbitraor	
	Dr. Abd Elrahman Elkhalifa, Conciliator	
	Sayed/Eltahir Hamadalla, Conciliator	8 Sept 1995

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 30* (A/9030), vol. 1, p. 13 and 14.

[2] The Final Act was signed, in each instance, on 10 December 1982:
"In the name of the following States:
Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua, New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint-Lucia, Saint-Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe;
In the name of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia as stipulated in article 305, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention;

In the name of the following self-governing associated States referred to in article 305, paragraph 1 c), of the Convention:

Cook Islands;

In the name of the following international organizations referred to in article 305, paragraph 1 f), and in article 1 of Annex IX of the Convention:

European Economic Community;

In the name of the following Observers invited to participate in the Conference as stipulated in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3334 (XXIX):

Netherlands Antilles

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Federated States of Micronesia, Republic of the Marshall Islands);

In the name of the following National Liberation Movements invited in accordance with rule 62 of the rules of procedure, as decided in resolution IV of the Conference:

African National Congress

Palestine Liberation Organization

Pan Africanist Congress

South West Africa People's Organization.

The following declarations were made in connexion with the Final Act:

Algeria

[See declaration under the Convention]

Ecuador

On 30 April 1982, in New York, the Convention on the Law of the Sea was adopted by a vote. On that occasion the delegation of Ecuador made an official declaration saying that it had decided not to participate in the vote and stating, for the record, the reasons behind that decision. [The delegation also wishes] to recall the official declarations made by the delegation of Ecuador, particularly at the tenth and eleventh sessions of the Conference, clearly setting for the position of Ecuador.

On this occasion, [the delegation of Ecuador] must state for the record that, notwithstanding the significant progress made in the negotiations carried out during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and notwithstanding the establishment in the Convention of fundamental principles and rights of developing coastal States, and of the international community in general, the Convention which is today being opened for signature by States does not fully meet Ecuador's rights and interests. Ecuador has always exercised and will continue to exercise such rights in accordance with its national legislation. That legislation was drawn up without violating any principle or norm of international law long before any of the three conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations was convened.

Recognition of the exclusive rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction over all the living and non-living resources contained in the adjacent seas up to a distance of 200 miles and their respective beds, constitutes a victory for the coastal States, one that began with the visionary Declaration of Santiago of 1952. The territorialist group, which is coordinated on a permanent basis by the delegation of Ecuador, has played an important role in this achievement.

[Ecuador] has participated actively in the negotiations of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, spanning an eight-year period, and in the preparatory meetings and, given the importance of the issue because of Ecuador's long continental and island shorelines and its rich sea-beds Ecuador will remain attached to that evolving law of the sea in the interest of better defence and promotion of national rights. In affirmation of this it is signing the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

On the occasion of the signing of the Final Act and notwithstanding the progress made in the law of the sea [the Delegation of Ecuador] wishes to reiterate its position in defence of its territorial sea of 200 miles.

Israel

"This signature of this Final Act in no way implies recognition in any manner whatsoever of the group calling itself the Palestine Liberation Organization or of any rights whatsoever conferred upon it within the framework of any of the documents attached to this Final Act, and is subject to the statements of the Delegation of Israel at the 163rd, 182and, 184th and 190th meetings of the Conference and document A/CONF.62/WS/33."

Sudan

[See declaration No. [4] under the Convention.]

Venezuela

Venezuela is signing the Final Act on the understanding that it is merely noting the work of the Conference without making any value judgement about its results. Its signing does not signify, nor can it be construed as signifying, any change in its position with regard to articles 15, 74, 83 and 121, paragraph 3, of the Convention. For the reasons stated by the delegation of Venezuela at the plenary meeting on 30 April 1982, those provisions are unacceptable to Venezuela, which is therefore not bound by them and is not prepared to agree to be bound by them in any way.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 10 December 1982 with the following declarations:

[1] "The German Democratic Republic declares that it accepts an arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1 (c), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, which cannot be settled by the States involved by recourse to other peaceful means of dispute settlement agreed between them.

The German Democratic Republic further declares that it accepts a special arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1 (d), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VIII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles of this Convention relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from ships and through dumping.

The German Democratic Republic recognizes the competence, provided for in article 292 of the Convention, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in matters relating to the prompt release of vessels and crews.

The German Democratic Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept any compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions

- in disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations,
- in disputes relating to military activities and
- in disputes concerning which the United Nations Security Council exercises the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations."

[2] "The German Democratic Republic reserves the right, in connection with the ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to make declarations and statements pursuant to article 310 of the Convention and to present its views on declarations and statements made by other States when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 10 December 1982. On 29 May 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Czechoslovakia the following objection:

"[The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic] wishes to draw the Secretary-General's attention to the concern of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic about the fact that certain States made upon signature of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea declarations which are incompatible with the Convention and which, if reaffirmed upon ratification of the Convention by those States, would constitute a violation of the obligations to be assumed by them under the Convention. Such approach would lead to a breach of the universality of the obligations embodied in the Convention, to the disruption of the legal regime established thereunder and, in the long run, even to the undermining of the Convention as such.

A concrete example of such declaration as referred to above is the understanding made upon signature and reaffirmed upon ratification of the Convention by the Philippines which was communicated to Member States by notification [...] dated 22 May 1984.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers that this understanding of the Philippines

– is inconsistent with Article 309 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea because it contains, in essence, reservations to the provisions of the Convention;

– contravenes Article 310 of the Convention which stipulates that declarations can be made by States upon signature or ratification of or accession to the Convention only provided that they 'do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention';

– indicates that in spite of having ratified the Convention, the Philippines intends to follow its national laws and previous agreements rather than the obligations under the Convention, not only taking no account of whether those laws and agreements are in harmony with the Convention but even, as proved in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Philippine understanding, deliberately contravening the obligations set forth therein.

Given the above-mentioned circumstances, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic cannot recognize the above-mentioned understanding of the Philippines as having any legal effect.

In view of the significance of the matter, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers it necessary that the problem of such declarations made upon signature or ratification of the Convention which endanger the universality of the Convention and the unified mode of its implementation be dealt with by the Secretary-General in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and that the Member States of the United Nations be informed thereof."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] See note 24 in chapter I.2.

[6] The Yemen Arab Republic had signed the Convention on 10 December 1982 with the following declarations:

1. The Yemen Arabic Republic adheres to the rules of general international law concerning rights to national sovereignty over coastal territorial waters, even in the case of the waters of a strait linking two seas.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic adheres to the concept of general international law concerning free passage as applying exclusively to merchant ships and aircraft; nuclear-powered craft, as well as warships and warplanes in general, must obtain the prior agreement of the Yemen Arab Republic before passing through its territorial waters, in accordance with the established norm of general international law relating to national sovereignty.

3. The Yemen Arab Republic confirms its national sovereignty over all the islands in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean which have been its dependencies since the period when the Yemen and the Arab countries were a Turkish administration.

4. The Yemen Arab Republic declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea is subject to the provisions of this declaration and the completion of the constitutional procedures in effect.

The fact that we have signed the said Convention in no way implies that we recognize Israel or are entering into relations with it.

See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[7] On 21 December 1995, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Turkey, the following communication:

"1. The signature and ratification of the Convention by Greece and the subsequent declaration in this regard shall neither prejudice nor affect the existing rights and legitimate interests of Turkey with respect to maritime jurisdiction areas in the Aegean. Turkey fully reserves her rights under international law.

Turkey wishes to state that she will not acquiesce in any claim or attempt designed to upset the long–standing status quo in this respect, that would deprive Turkey of her existing rights and interests. Any unilateral act in this respect that would constitute an abuse of the provisions of the Convention would entail totally unacceptable consequences. Turkey has registered her opposition in this regard actively and persistently from the very outset.

2. In view of the interpretative statement of Greece concerning the provisions of the Convention on the Law of the Sea on the 'Straits used for International Navigation', Turkey wishes to reiterate her statement of 15 November 1982, contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/34, which remains fully valid at present and reads as follows:

'In connection with the views expressed by the Greek delegation in the written statement contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/26 of May 1982 the Delegation of Turkey wishes to make the following statement:

The scope of the regime of straits used for international navigation and the rights and duties of States bordering straits are clearly defined in the provisions contained in Part III of the Convention on the Law of the Sea. With the limited exceptions provided in articles 35, 36, 38, paragraph 1 and 45, all straits used for international navigation are subject to the regime of transit passage.

In the written statement referred to above Greece is attempting to create a separate category of straits, *i.e.* 'spread out islands that form a great number of alternative straits' which is not envisaged in the Convention nor in international law. Thereby Greece wishes to retain the power to exclude some of the straits which link the Aegean Sea to the Mediterranean from the regime of transit passage. Such arbitrary action is not permissible under the Convention nor under the rules and principles of international law.

It seems that Greece, failing in the Conference in its efforts to ensure the application of the regime of archipelagic States to the islands of the continental States, is now trying to circumvent the provisions of the Convention by a unilateral and arbitrary statement of understanding.

The reference in the Greek written statement to article 36 is of particular concern as it is an indication of Greece's intention to exercise discretionary powers not only over straits, but also over high seas.

With regard to the air routes, the Greek statement is contrary to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) rules according to which air routes are established by ICAO regional meetings with the consent of all interested parties and approved by the ICAO Council.

In view of the above considerations, the Delegation of Turkey finds the Greek views expressed in the document A/CONF.62/WS/26 legally unfounded and totally unacceptable.'

3. Turkey reserves its right to make further declarations as may be required under the circumstances in the future."

[8] In a communication received on 23 May 1983, the Government of Israel stated the following:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that declarations made by Iraq and Yemen upon signing the Convention contain explicit statements of a political character in respect of Israel.

In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements.

Furthermore, the Government of the State of Israel objects to all reservations, declarations and statements of a political nature in respect of States, made in connection with the signing of the Final Act of the Convention, which are incompatible with the purposes and objects of this Convention.

Such reservations, declarations and statements cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the above-mentioned States under general international law or under particular conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Governments of the States in question, an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Subsequently, similar communications were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel, with respect to the following:

– On 10 April 1985 re: declaration by Qatar;

– On 15 August 1986 re: understanding by Kuwait.

[9] On 22 February 1994, the Secretary–General received from the Government of Tunisia the following communication with regard to the declaration concerning articles 74 and 83 of the Convention:

... In that declaration, articles 74 and 83 of the Convention are interpreted to mean that, in the absence of any agreement on delimitation of the exclusive economic zone, the continental shelf or other maritime zones, the search for an equitable solution assumes that the boundary is the median line, in other words, a line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points on the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial waters is measured.

The Tunisian Government believes that such an interpretation is not in the least consistent with the spirit and letter of the provisions of these articles, which do not provide for automatic application of the median line with regard to delimitation of the exclusive economic zone or the continental shelf.

[10] On 12 June 1985, the Secretary–General received from the Government of China, the following communication:

"The so–called Kalayaan Islands are part of the Nansha Islands, which have always been Chinese territory. the Chinese Government has stated on many occasions that china has indisputable sovereignty over the Nansha Islands and at the adjacent waters and resources."

On 23 February 1987, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Viet Nam the following communication concerning the declarations made by the Philippines and by China:

... The Republic of the Philippines, upon its signature and ratification of the 1982 U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea, has claimed sovereignty over the islands called by the Philippines as the Kalaysan [see paragraph 4 of the declaration]. The People's Republic of China has likewise claimed that the islands, called by the Philippines as the Kalaysan, constitute part of the Nansha Islands which are Chinese territory. The so-called "Kalaysan Islands" or "Nansha Islands" mentioned above are in fact the Truong Sa Archipelago which has always been under the sovereignty of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has so far published two White Books confirming the legality of its sovereignty over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa Archipelagoes.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam once again reaffirms its indisputable sovereignty over the Truong Sa Archipelago and hence its determination to defend its territorial integrity.

[11] In regard to the objection made by Australia the Secretary-General received, on 26 October 1988, from the Government of the Philippines the following declaration:

The Philippines declaration was made in conformity with article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The declaration consists of interpretative statements concerning certain provisions of the Convention.

The Philippine Government intends to harmonize its domestic legislation with the provisions of the Convention.

The necessary steps are being undertaken to enact legislation dealing with archipelagic sea lanes passage and the exercise of Philippine sovereign rights over archipelagic waters, in accordance with the Convention.

The Philippine Government, therefore, wishes to assure the Australian Government and the States Parties to the Convention that the Philippines will abide by the provisions of the said Convention."

(a) Agreement relating to the Implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 28 July 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: Provisionally, on 16 November 1994, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 16 November 1994.
TEXT: Doc. A/RES.48/263; and depositary notification C.N.1.1995.TREATIES–1 of 9 February 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original French text).
STATUS: Signatories: 79. Parties: 125.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by Resolution 48/263, on 28 July 1994, by the General Assembly of the United Nations during its resumed 48th session, held from 27 to 29 July 1994 in New York. In accordance with its article 3, the Agreement shall remain open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by the States and entities referred to in article 305, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea for 12 months from the date of its adoption *i.e.* until 28 July 1995.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), signature, adoption of the Agreement or ratification or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (C), accession (a), definitive signature (s), simplified procedure (p) or participation after deposit of an instrument of ratification, accession or succession in respect of the Convention (P)*
Afghanistan		16 Nov 1994		
Albania		16 Nov 1994		
Algeria	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Andorra		16 Nov 1994		
Argentina	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		1 Dec 1995
Armenia		16 Nov 1994		
Australia	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		5 Oct 1994
Austria	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		14 Jul 1995
Bahamas[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995
Bahrain		16 Nov 1994		
Bangladesh		16 Nov 1994		
Barbados[5]	15 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995
Belarus		16 Nov 1994		
Belgium	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Belize		16 Nov 1994		21 Oct 1994 *s*
Benin		16 Nov 1994		
Bhutan		16 Nov 1994		
Bolivia		16 Nov 1994		28 Apr 1995 *P*
Botswana		16 Nov 1994		
Brazil[2]	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), signature, adoption of the Agreement or ratification or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (C), accession (a), definitive signature (s), simplified procedure (p) or participation after deposit of an instrument of ratification, accession or succession in respect of the Convention (P)*
Brunei Darussalam ...		16 Nov 1994		
Bulgaria			15 Nov 1994	
Burkina Faso	30 Nov 1994	30 Nov 1994		
Burundi		16 Nov 1994		
Cambodia		16 Nov 1994		
Cameroon	24 May 1995	24 May 1995	15 Nov 1994	
Canada	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Cape Verde[2]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Chile		16 Nov 1994		
China	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Congo		16 Nov 1994		
Cook Islands				15 Feb 1995 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire[5]	25 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Croatia				5 Apr 1995 *P*
Cuba		16 Nov 1994		
Cyprus	1 Nov 1994		15 Nov 1994	27 Jul 1995
Czech Republic	16 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Denmark	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	
Egypt	22 Mar 1995	16 Nov 1994		
Eritrea		16 Nov 1994		
Estonia		16 Nov 1994		
Ethiopia		16 Nov 1994		
European Community[3]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995
Fiji	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Finland	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
France[3]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Gabon	4 Apr 1995	16 Nov 1994		14 Oct 1994
Germany	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Ghana		16 Nov 1994		

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), signature, adoption of the Agreement or ratification or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (C), accession (a), definitive signature (s), simplified procedure (p) or participation after deposit of an instrument of ratification, accession or succession in respect of the Convention (P)*	
Greece	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		21 Jul 1995	
Grenada[5]	14 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Guinea[5]	26 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Guyana		16 Nov 1994			
Honduras		16 Nov 1994			
Hungary		16 Nov 1994			
Iceland[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994			
India	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		29 Jun 1995	
Indonesia[2]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Iran (Islamic Republic of)			1 Nov 1994		
Iraq		16 Nov 1994			
Ireland	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994		
Italy[3,4]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994	29 Jul 1994	13 Jan 1995	
Jamaica[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Japan[3]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Jordan			14 Nov 1994	27 Nov 1995	*P*
Kenya		16 Nov 1994		29 Jul 1994	*s*
Kuwait		16 Nov 1994			
Lao People's Democratic Republic	27 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Lebanon				5 Jan 1995	*P*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 Nov 1994			
Liechtenstein		16 Nov 1994			
Luxembourg	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Madagascar		16 Nov 1994			
Malaysia	2 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Maldives	10 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994			
Malta[2]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994			

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), signature, adoption of the Agreement or ratification or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (C), accession (a), definitive signature (s), simplified procedure (p) or participation after deposit of an instrument of ratification, accession or succession in respect of the Convention (P)*
Marshall Islands		16 Nov 1994		
Mauritania	2 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Mauritius		16 Nov 1994		4 Nov 1994 *P*
Mexico			2 Nov 1994	
Micronesia (Federated States of)[2]	10 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		6 Sep 1995
Monaco	30 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Mongolia	17 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Morocco	19 Oct 1994		19 Oct 1994	
Mozambique		16 Nov 1994		
Myanmar		16 Nov 1994		
Namibia[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Nepal		16 Nov 1994		
Netherlands	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
New Zealand	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Nigeria[5]	25 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Norway		16 Nov 1994		
Oman		16 Nov 1994		
Pakistan	10 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Papua New Guinea		16 Nov 1994		
Paraguay	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		10 Jul 1995
Philippines[2]	15 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Poland[3]	29 Jul 1994	23 Feb 1995		
Portugal	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	
Qatar		16 Nov 1994		
Republic of Korea	7 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Republic of Moldova		16 Nov 1994		
Romania			4 Oct 1994	
Russian Federation		11 Jan 1995		14 Aug 1995 *P*
Samoa	7 Jul 1995	16 Nov 1994		

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), signature, adoption of the Agreement or ratification or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (C), accession (a), definitive signature (s), simplified procedure (p) or participation after deposit of an instrument of ratification, accession or succession in respect of the Convention (P)*
Saudi Arabia			9 Nov 1994	
Senegal	9 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		25 Jul 1995
Seychelles	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		15 Dec 1994
Sierra Leone		16 Nov 1994		12 Dec 1994 *P*
Singapore		16 Nov 1994		17 Nov 1994 *P*
Slovakia	14 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Slovenia	19 Jan 1995		15 Nov 1994	16 June 1995
Solomon Islands		8 Feb 1995		
South Africa	3 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Spain[3]	29 Jul 1994			
Sri Lanka[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Sudan	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Suriname		16 Nov 1994		
Swaziland	12 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Sweden	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	
Switzerland	26 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		16 Nov 1994		19 Aug 1994 *P*
Togo [5]	3 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Tonga				2 Aug 1995 *P*
Trinidad and Tobago[5]	10 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Tunisia[2]	15 May 1995	16 Nov 1994		
Uganda[5]	9 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Ukraine	28 Feb 1995	16 Nov 1994		
United Arab Emirates		16 Nov 1994		
United Kingdom	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
United Republic of Tanzania[2]	7 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
United States of America	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), signature, adoption of the Agreement or ratification or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, formal confirmation (C), accession (a), definitive signature (s), simplified procedure (p) or participation after deposit of an instrument of ratification, accession or succession in respect of the Convention (P)*
Uruguay	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	
Vanuatu	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Viet Nam		16 Nov 1994		
Yugoslavia[5]	12 May 1995			
Zambia[5]	13 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Zimbabwe[5]	28 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		

Declarations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, formal confirmation, accession, definitive signature or participation.)

AUSTRIA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Austria declares that it understands the provisions of its article 7 paragraph 2 to signify with regard to its own position that pending parliamentary approval of the Convention and of the Agreement and their subsequent ratification it will have access to the organs fo the International Sea-Bed authority."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

This signature also commits the Flemish region, the Wallone region and the region of the capital Brussels.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

According to expert opinion, industrial exploitation of deep sea-bed mineral resources will not start earlier than in ten to fifteen years. Therefore, the International body for the sea-bed will not have a subject of real activity for a long time yet, which fact highlights especially the financial aspects of activities of the newly established organization. It is important to avoid non-productive administrative and other expenditures, to abstain from establishing yet unnecessary structures and positions, and to strictly observe the agreements concerning the economy regime reflected in the Agreement.

The efforts aimed at rendering universal the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 can , in the long run, produce a positive result only if all the States act on the basis of the above-mentioned agreements without trying to seek any unilateral advantages, and if they succeed in establishing a cooperation free of discrimination and with a due account of the interests of potential investors in deep sea-bed mining.

NOTES:

[1] States and regional economic integration organizations listed under "*Participants*" include those States and regional economic integration organization having either signed or adopted the Agreement. It is recalled that according to article 7 (1) (a) of the Agreement, the Agreement shall be applied provisionally as of 16 November pending its entry into force by a) States which have consented to its adoption in the General Assembly of the United Nations, except any such State which before 16 November 1994 notifies the depositary either that it will not appy the Agreement or that it will consent to such application only upon subsequent signature or notification; b) States and entities which sign the Agreement (unless notification to the contrary at the time of signature); c) States and entities which consent to its provisional application; and/or d) States which accede to the Agreement.

[2] State which , upon signature or at a later date, notified that it is not availing itself of the simplified procedure set out in article 5 and that consequently it will establish its consent to be bound by the Agreement under the provisions of article 4, paragraph 3 (b), by subsequent ratification.

[3] State and regional economic integration organization which, upon signature, have specified that their consent to the provisional application will be subject to subsequent notification to the depositary in writing, in accordance with article 7 (1) (a).

[4] On 14 November 1994, the Government of Italy notified the Secretary-General that it would apply the Agreement provisionally.

[5] State which upon signature or at a later date, notified that it has selected the application of the simplified procedure set out in articles 4 (3) (c) and 5.

7. Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks

Adopted on 4 August 1995 by the United Nations Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 40 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.164/38; and depositary notification C.N.465.1995.TREATIES-3 of 8 January 1996 (proposed correction of the authentic arabic text).
STATUS: Signatories : 29.

Note: The above Agreement was adopted on 4 August 1995 at New York, by the United Nations Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. In accordance with its article 37, the Agreement will be open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 4 December 1995 until and including 4 December 1996 by all States and the other entities referred to in article 305 (1) (a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Argentina	4 Dec 1995		Morocco	4 Dec 1995	
Australia	4 Dec 1995		New Zealand	4 Dec 1995	
Bangladesh	4 Dec 1995		Niue	4 Dec 1995	
Belize	4 Dec 1995		Norway	4 Dec 1995	
Brazil	4 Dec 1995		Papua New Guinea	4 Dec 1995	
Canada	4 Dec 1995		Russian Federation	4 Dec 1995	
Egypt	5 Dec 1995		Saint Lucia	12 Dec 1995	
Fiji	4 Dec 1995		Samoa	4 Dec 1995	
Guinea-Bissau	4 Dec 1995		Senegal	4 Dec 1995	
Iceland	4 Dec 1995		Tonga	4 Dec 1995	
Indonesia	4 Dec 1995		Ukraine	4 Dec 1995	
Israel	4 Dec 1995		United Kingdom (on behalf of certain territories only)[1]	4 Dec 1995	
Jamaica	4 Dec 1995		United States of America	4 Dec 1995	
Marshall Islands	4 Dec 1995				
Mauritania	21 Dec 1995				
Micronesia (Federated States of)	4 Dec 1995				

Notes:

[1] On behalf of the following territories: Bermuda, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Falkland Islands, Pitcairn Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, St. Helena including Ascension Island, and Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, on 4 December 1995, the Government of Argentina made the following declaration:

> The Argentine Republic rejects the inclusion of and reference to the Malvinas, South Georgian and South Sandwich Islands by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as dependent territories in its signing of the [said] Agreement, and reaffirms its sovereignty over those islands, which form an integral part of its national territory, and over their surrounding maritime spaces.
>
> The Argentine Republic recalls that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute and requests the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspect on the future of the Malvinas Islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

CHAPTER XXII. COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

1. Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards

Done at New York on 10 June 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 June 1959, in accordance with article XII.
REGISTRATION: 7 June 1959, No. 4739.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 330, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 107.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature on 10 June 1958 by the United Nations Conference on International Commercial Arbitration, convened in accordance with resolution 604 (XXI)[1] of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations adopted on 3 May 1956. The Conference met at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 20 May to 10 June 1958. For the text of the Final Act of this Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 330, p. 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		7 Feb 1989 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		2 Feb 1989 *a*
Argentina	26 Aug 1958	14 Mar 1989
Australia		26 Mar 1975 *a*
Austria		2 May 1961 *a*
Bahrain		6 Apr 1988 *a*
Bangladesh		6 May 1992 *a*
Barbados		16 Mar 1993 *a*
Belarus	29 Dec 1958	15 Nov 1960
Belgium	10 Jun 1958	18 Aug 1975
Benin		16 May 1974 *a*
Bolivia		28 Apr 1995 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		20 Dec 1971 *a*
Bulgaria	17 Dec 1958	10 Oct 1961
Burkina Faso		23 Mar 1987 *a*
Cambodia		5 Jan 1960 *a*
Cameroon		19 Feb 1988 *a*
Canada		12 May 1986 *a*
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 *a*
Chile		4 Sep 1975 *a*
China		22 Jan 1987 *a*
Colombia		25 Sep 1979 *a*
Costa Rica	10 Jun 1958	26 Oct 1987
Côte d'Ivoire		1 Feb 1991 *a*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		30 Dec 1974 *a*
Cyprus		29 Dec 1980 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark		22 Dec 1972 *a*
Djibouti		14 Jun 1983 *d*
Dominica		28 Oct 1988 *a*
Ecuador	17 Dec 1958	3 Jan 1962
Egypt		9 Mar 1959 *a*
El Salvador	10 Jun 1958	
Estonia		30 Aug 1993 *a*
Finland	29 Dec 1958	19 Jan 1962
France	25 Nov 1958	26 Jun 1959
Georgia		2 Jun 1994 *a*
Germany[3,4]	10 Jun 1958	30 Jun 1961
Ghana		9 Apr 1968 *a*
Greece		16 Jul 1962 *a*
Guatemala		21 Mar 1984 *a*
Guinea		23 Jan 1991 *a*
Haiti		5 Dec 1983 *a*
Holy See		14 May 1975 *a*
Hungary		5 Mar 1962 *a*
India	10 Jun 1958	13 Jul 1960
Indonesia		7 Oct 1981 *a*
Ireland		12 May 1981 *a*
Israel	10 Jun 1958	5 Jan 1959
Italy		31 Jan 1969 *a*
Japan		20 Jun 1961 *a*
Jordan	10 Jun 1958	15 Nov 1979
Kazakstan		20 Nov 1995 *a*
Kenya		10 Feb 1989 *a*
Kuwait		28 Apr 1978 *a*
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lesotho		13 Jun 1989 *a*
Lithuania		14 Mar 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	11 Nov 1958	9 Sep 1983
Madagascar		16 Jul 1962 *a*
Malaysia		5 Nov 1985 *a*
Mali		8 Sep 1994 *a*
Mexico		14 Apr 1971 *a*
Monaco	31 Dec 1958	2 Jun 1982
Mongolia		24 Oct 1994 *a*
Morocco		12 Feb 1959 *a*
Netherlands	10 Jun 1958	24 Apr 1964
New Zealand		6 Jan 1983 *a*
Niger		14 Oct 1964 *a*
Nigeria		17 Mar 1970 *a*
Norway		14 Mar 1961 *a*
Pakistan	30 Dec 1958	
Panama		10 Oct 1984 *a*
Peru		7 Jul 1988 *a*
Philippines	10 Jun 1958	6 Jul 1967
Poland	10 Jun 1958	3 Oct 1961
Portugal		18 Oct 1994 *a*
Republic of Korea		8 Feb 1973 *a*
Romania		13 Sep 1961 *a*
Russian Federation	29 Dec 1958	24 Aug 1960
San Marino		17 May 1979 *a*
Saudi Arabia		19 Apr 1994 *a*
Senegal		17 Oct 1994 *a*
Singapore		21 Aug 1986 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
South Africa		3 May 1976 *a*
Spain		12 May 1977 *a*
Sri Lanka	30 Dec 1958	9 Apr 1962

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)
Sweden	23 Dec 1958	28 Jan 1972
Switzerland	29 Dec 1958	1 Jun 1965
Syrian Arab Republic[5]		9 Mar 1959 *a*
Thailand		21 Dec 1959 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Trinidad and Tobago		14 Feb 1966 *a*
Tunisia		17 Jul 1967 *a*
Turkey		2 Jul 1992 *a*
Uganda		12 Feb 1992 *a*
Ukraine	29 Dec 1958	10 Oct 1960
United Kingdom		24 Sep 1975 *a*
United Republic of Tanzania		13 Oct 1964 *a*
United States of America		30 Sep 1970 *a*
Uruguay		30 Mar 1983 *a*
Venezuela		8 Feb 1995 *a*
Viet Nam		12 Sep 1995 *a*
Yugoslavia		26 Feb 1982 *a*
Zimbabwe		29 Sep 1994 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

Declaration:

Referring to the possibility offered by article I, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that it will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State and only where such awards have been made with respect to differences arising out of legal relationships whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under algerian law.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Declarations:

"In accordance with article I, the Government of Antigua and Barbuda declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another contracting state.

The Government of Antigua and Barbuda also declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of Antigua and Barbuda."

ARGENTINA[6]

Upon signature:

Subject to the declaration contained in the Final Act.

Upon ratification:

On the basis of reciprocity, the Republic of Argentina will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. It will also apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Convention will be interpreted in accordance with the principles and clauses of the National Constitution in force or those resulting from modification made by virtue of the Constitution.

AUSTRIA[7]

BAHRAIN[8]

"1. The accession by the State of Bahrain to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 1958 shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

"2. In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the State of Bahrain will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State party to the Convention.

"3. In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the State of Bahrain will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the State of Bahrain."

BARBADOS

Declaration:

" (i) In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the Government of Barbados declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

(ii) The Government of Barbados will also apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not which are considered as commercial under the laws of Barbados."

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will apply the provisions of this Convention in respect to arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States only to the extent to which they grant reciprocal treatment.

BELGIUM

In accordance with article I, paragraph 3, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of a Contracting State.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Declaration:

"The Convention will be applied to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina only relating those arbitral awards that have been brought after entering into force of the Convention.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina."

BOTSWANA

"The Republic of Botswana will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationship, whether contractual or not, which are considered commercial under Botswana law.

"The Republic of Botswana will apply the Convention to the Recognition and Enforcement of Awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

BULGARIA

"Bulgaria will apply the Convention to recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another contracting State. With regard to awards made in the territory of non-contracting States it will apply the Convention only to the extent to which these States grant reciprocal treatment."

CANADA[9]

27 May 1987

"The Government of Canada declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of Canada, except in the case of the Province of Quebec where the law does not provide for such limitation."

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Referring to the possibility offered by paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, the Central African Republic declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; it further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

CHINA

1. The People's Republic of China will apply the Convention, only on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State;

2. The People's Republic of China will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the People's Republic of China.

CUBA

Cuba will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. With respect to arbitral awards made by other non-contracting States it will apply the Convention only in so far as those States grant reciprocal treatment as established by mutual agreement between the parties. Moreover, it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Cuban legislation.

CYPRUS

"The Republic of Cyprus will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State; furthermore it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law."

CZECH REPUBLIC[2]

DENMARK

In accordance with the terms of article I, paragraph 3, [the Convention] shall have effect only as regards the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made by another Contracting State and [it] shall be valid only with respect to commercial relationships.

ECUADOR

Ecuador, on a basis of reciprocity, will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of another contracting State only if such awards have been made with respect to differences arising out of legal relationships which are regarded as commercial under Ecuadorian law.

FRANCE[10]

Referring to the possibility offered by paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, France declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State.

Referring to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article X of the Convention, France declares that this Convention will extend to all the territories of the French Republic.

GERMANY[3]

"With respect to paragraph 1 of article I, and in accordance with paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

GREECE[11]

18 April 1980

The present Convention is approved on condition of the two limitations set forth in article I (3) of the Convention.

GUATEMALA

On the basis of reciprocity, the Republic of Guatemala will apply the above Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; and will apply it only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

HOLY SEE

The State of Vatican City will apply the said Convention on the basis of reciprocity, on the one hand, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State, and on the other hand, only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Vatican law.

HUNGARY

"The Hungarian People's Republic shall apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of such awards only as have been made in the territory of one of the other Contracting States and are dealing with differences arising in respect of a legal relationship considered by the Hungarian law as a commercial relationship."

INDIA

"In accordance with Article I of the Convention, the Government of India declare that they will apply the Convention to the

recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of a State, party to this Convention. They further declare that they will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the law of India."

INDONESIA

"Pursuant to the provision of article I (3) of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State, and that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Indonesian Law".

IRELAND

"In accordance with article I (3) of the said Convention the Government of Ireland declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State".

JAPAN

"It will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State."

JORDAN[8]

The Government of Jordan shall not be bound by any awards which are made by Israel or to which an Israeli is a party.

KENYA

Declaration:

"In accordance with article I (3) of the said Convention the Government of Kenya declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another contracting state."

KUWAIT

The State of Kuwait will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

It is understood that the accession of the State of Kuwait to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, done at New York, on the 10th of June 1958, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel or entering with it into relations governed by the Convention thereto acceded by the State of Kuwait.

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

[The Republic of Lithuania] will apply the provisions of the said Convention to the recognition of arbitral awards made in the territories of the Non-Contracting States, only on the basis of reciprocity."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

The Convention is applied on the basis of reciprocity to the recognition and enforcement of only those arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Republic declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; it further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MALAYSIA

Declaration:

The Government of Malaysia will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. Malaysia further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Malaysian law.

MONACO

Referring to the possibility offered by article I (3) of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; furthermore, it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationship, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MONGOLIA

Declaration:

"1. Mongolia will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

2. Mongolia will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of Mongolia."

MOROCCO

The Government of His Majesty the King of Morocco will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

NETHERLANDS

Referring to paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, the Government of the Kingdom declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

NEW ZEALAND

Declarations:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 1 of the Convention, the Government of New Zealand declares that it will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

"Accession to the Convention by the Government of New Zealand shall not extend for the time being, pursuant to article X of the Convention, to the Cook Islands and Niue."

NIGERIA

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, the Federal Military Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity to the recognition and enforcement of awards made

only in the territory of a State party to this Convention and to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of the Federal Republic of Nigeria."

NORWAY

"1. [The Government of Norway] will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of one of the Contracting States."

"2. [The Government of Norway] will not apply the Convention to differences where the subject matter of the proceedings is immovable property situated in Norway, or a right in or to such property."

PHILIPPINES

Upon signature:

Reservation

"The Philippine delegation signs *ad referendum* this Convention with the reservation that it does so on the basis of reciprocity."

Declaration

"The Philippines will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State pursuant to Article I, paragraph 3 of the Convention."

Declaration made upon ratification: "The Philippines, on the basis of reciprocity, will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State and only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the State making such declaration."

POLAND

"With reservations as mentioned in article I, para. 3."

PORTUGAL

Declaration:

Within the scope of the principle of reciprocity, Portugal will restrict the application of the Convention to arbitral awards pronounced in the territory of a State bound by the said Convention.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"By virtue of paragraph 3 of article I of the present Convention, the Government of the Republic of Korea declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. It further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

ROMANIA

The Romanian People's Republic will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its legislation.

The Romanian People's Republic will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. As regards awards made in the territory of certain non-contracting States, the Romanian People's Republic will apply the Convention only on the basis of reciprocity established by joint agreement between the parties.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will apply the provisions of this Convention in respect to arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States only to the extent to which they grant reciprocal treatment.

SAUDI ARABIA

Declaration:

On the Basis of reciprocity, the Kingdom declares that it shall restrict the application of the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of a Contracting State.

SINGAPORE

"The Republic of Singapore will on the basis of reciprocity apply the said Convention to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards which are made in the territory of another Contracting State."

SLOVAKIA[2]

SWITZERLAND[12]

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"In accordance with article I of the Convention, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Law of Trinidad and Tobago."

TUNISIA

With the reservations provided for in article I, paragraph 3, of the Convention, that is to say, the Tunisian State will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State and only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Tunisian law.

TURKEY

Declaration:

In accordance with the Article I, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Turkey declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State. It further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

UGANDA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Uganda will only apply the Convention to recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will apply the provisions of this Convention in respect to arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States only to the extent to which they grant reciprocal treatment.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[11]

5 May 1980

"The United Kingdom will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. This declaration is also made on behalf of Gibraltar, Hong Kong and the Isle of Man to which the Convention has been extended."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"The Government of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar will apply the Convention,in accordance with the first sentence of article I (3) thereof, only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States of America will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

"The United States of America will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the United States."

VENEZUELA

Declarations:

(a) The Republic of Venezuela will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

(b) The Republic of Venezuela will apply the present Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

VIET NAM

Declarations:

1. [The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam] considers the Convention to be applicable to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. With respect to arbitral awards made in the territories of non–contracting States, it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity.

2. The Convention will be applied only to differences arising out of legal relationships which are considered as commercial under the laws of Viet Nam.

3. Interpretation of the Convention before the Vietnamese Courts or competent authorities should be made in accordance with the Constitution and the law of Viet Nam.

YUGOSLAVIA[13]

Reservation:

"1. The Convention is applied in regard to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia only to those arbitral awards which were adopted after the coming of the Convention into effect.

"2. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention on a reciprocal basis only to those arbitral awards which were adopted on the territory of the other State Party to the Convention.

"3. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention [only] with respect to the disputes arising from the legal relations, contractual and non-contractual, which, according to its national legislation are considered as economic."

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

GERMANY[3]

29 December 1989

The Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the second paragraph of the declaration of the Argentine Republic represents a reservation and as such is not only contradictory to article I (3) of the Convention but is also vague and hence inadmissible; it therefore raises an objection to that reservation.

In all other respects this objection is not intended to prevent the entry into force of the Convention between the Argentine Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
Australia	26 Mar 1975	All the external territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible other than Papua New Guinea
Denmark[14]	10 Feb 1976	Faeroe Islands, Greenland
France	26 Jun 1959	All the territories of the French Republic
Netherlands[15]	24 Apr 1964	Netherlands Antilles, Surinam
United Kingdom[16]	24 Sep 1975	Gibraltar
	21 Jan 1977	Hong Kong
	22 Feb 1979	Isle of Man
	14 Nov 1979	Bermuda
	26 Nov 1980	Belize, Cayman Islands
	19 Apr 1985	Guernsey
United States of America	3 Nov 1970	All the territories for the international relations of which the United States of America is responsible

Declarations and reservations made upon notification of territorial application

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND
Belize, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Guernsey

[The Convention will apply] . . . "in accordance with article I, paragraph 3 thereof, only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2889), p. 5.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 3 October 1958 and 10 July 1959, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 330, p. 69. See also note 4 below and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with declarations, on 20 February 1975. For the text of the declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 959, p. 841. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] With a declaration that the Convention will also apply to *Land Berlin* as from the day on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

With reference to the above-mentioned statement,communications have been received from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the ones reproduced in note 3 in chapter III.3.

Upon accession to the Convention, on 20 February 1975, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made the following declaration in this respect:

> Pursuant to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic, that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it. The statements by the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that these Conventions also apply to "*Land Berlin*" are therefore contrary to the Quadripartite Agreement, which states further that treaties affecting matters of security and status may not be extended to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany. The statements by the Federal Republic of Germany cannot therefore have legal effects.

In regard to the latter declaration, the Secretary-General received on 26 January 1976 from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America a communication confirming their previous declarations.

Subsequently, on 24 February 1976, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany a communication which states in part:

> "The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the [Note] of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned [Convention] extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect."

See also note 3 above.

[5] Accession by the United Arab Republic, see note 5 in chapter I.1.

[6] The declaration made upon signature and contained in the Final Act read as follows:

> "If another Contracting Party extends the application of the Convention to territories which fall within the sovereignty of the Argentine Republic, the rights of the Argentine Republic shall in no way be affected by that extension."

[7] In a communication received on 25 February 1988, the Government of Austria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from that date, the reservation made upon accession to the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 395, p. 274.

[8] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 June 1980, the Government of Israel declared the following:

> "The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Jordan. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Jordan under general international law or under particular conventions.
>
> "Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Jordan an attitude of complete reciprocity."

A communication identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, was received by the Secretary-General, on 22 September 1988, from the Government of Israel in respect of the declaration made by Bahrain upon accession.

[9] The declaration by Canada received on 20 May 1987, and which originally comprised two parts, was made after accession. It was communicated by the Secretary-General to all States. None of the Contracting Parties having expressed an objection within a period of 90 days from the date of the above-mentioned communication [22 July 1987], the declaration was deemed to have been accepted and replaces the declaration made upon accession which read as follows:

> "The Government of Canada declares, with respect to the Province of Alberta, that it will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.
>
> "The Government of Canada declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of Canada."

Subsequently, on 25 November 1988, the Government of Canada notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, the second part of its revised declaration received on 20 May 1987 which read as follows:

> "The Government of Canada declares, with respect to the Province of Saskatchewan, that it will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

[10] In a communication received on 27 November 1989, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, the declaration relating to the second sentence of its declaration relating to paragraph 3 of article I made upon ratification. For the text of the declaration so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 336, p. 426.

[11] Since the declaration [by Greece] [by the United Kingdom] had been made after accession, it was communicated by the Secretary-General to all States concerned on 10 June 1980. None of the Contracting Parties having expressed an objection within a period of 90 days from the date of the above-mentioned communication, the declaration was deemed to have been accepted.

[12] On 23 April 1993, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration made upon ratification. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 536, p. 477.

[13] In a latter declaration dated 28 June 1982, the Government of Yugoslavia specified that the first reservation only constituted an affirmation of the legal principle of retroactivity and that the third reservation being essentially in accordance with article I (3) of the Convention, the word "only" was therefore to be added to the original text and note taken that the word "economic" had been used therein as a synonym for "commercial".

[14] At the time of acceding to the Convention the Government of Denmark declared, in accordance with article X (1), that it would not apply for the time being to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland.

In a communication received on 12 November 1975, the Government of Denmark declared that it had withdrawn the above-mentioned declaration, this decision to take effect on 1 January 1976.

In a further communication received on 5 January 1978, the Government of Denmark confirmed that the communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 November 1975 should be considered as having taken effect from 10 February 1976, in accordance with article X (2), it being understood that the Convention was applied *de facto* to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland from 1 January to 9 February 1976.

[15] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[16] See also under *"Declarations and Reservations"* in this chapter for the reservation made by the United Kingdom, which was also made on behalf of Gibraltar, Hong Kong and the Isle of Man.

2. European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration

Done at Geneva on 21 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 January 1964, in accordance with article X, paragraph 8, with the exception of paragraphs 3 to 7 of article IV which entered into force on 18 October 1965, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Annex to the Convention.
REGISTRATION: 7 January 1964, No. 7041.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 484, p. 349.
STATUS: Signatories: 17. Parties: 26.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature on 21 April 1961 by the Special Meeting of Plenipotentiaries for the purpose of negotiating and signing a European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration, which was convened in accordance with resolution 7 (XV)[1] of the Economic Commission for Europe, adopted on 5 May 1960. The Special Meeting was held at the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva from 10 to 21 April 1961. For the text of the Final Act of the Special Meeting, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 484, p. 349.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	21 Apr 1961	6 Mar 1964
Belarus	21 Apr 1961	14 Oct 1963
Belgium	21 Apr 1961	9 Oct 1975
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	21 Apr 1961	13 May 1964
Burkina Faso		26 Jan 1965 *a*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cuba		1 Sep 1965 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark[3]	21 Apr 1961	22 Dec 1972
Finland	21 Dec 1961	
France	21 Apr 1961	16 Dec 1966
Germany[4,5]	21 Apr 1961	27 Oct 1964
Hungary	21 Apr 1961	9 Oct 1963
Italy	21 Apr 1961	3 Aug 1970
Kazakstan		20 Nov 1995 *a*
Luxembourg		26 Mar 1982 *a*
Poland	21 Apr 1961	15 Sep 1964
Romania	21 Apr 1961	16 Aug 1963
Russian Federation	21 Apr 1961	27 Jun 1962
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain	14 Dec 1961	12 May 1975
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Turkey	21 Apr 1961	24 Jan 1992
Ukraine	21 Apr 1961	18 Mar 1963
Yugoslavia	21 Apr 1961	25 Sep 1963

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELGIUM

In accordance with article II, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Belgian Government declares that in Belgium only the State has, in the cases referred to in article I, paragraph 1, the faculty to conclude arbitration agreements.

LUXEMBOURG

Except where otherwise expressly provided for in the arbitration agreement, the presiding judges of the local courts shall assume the functions entrusted to the presidents of the chambers of commerce under article IV of the Convention. The presiding judges shall hear the disputes in chambers.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifteenth Session, Supplement No. 3* (E/3349), p. 55.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 April 1961 and 13 November 1963, respectively. See also note 5 below and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The instrument of ratification contained a declaration to the effect that the Convention for the time being would not extend to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland.

In a communication received on 12 November 1975, the Government of Denmark declared that it had withdrawn the above-mentioned reservation, the decision to take effect on 1 January 1976.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 20 February 1975. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] A note accompanying the instrument of ratification contains a statement that the Convention "shall also apply to Land Berlin as from the day on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned statement, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those reproduced in note 3 of chapter III.3.

Upon accession to the Convention, on 20 February 1975, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made the following declaration:

> Pursuant to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and the French Republic, that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it. The statements by the

Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that these Conventions also apply to *"Land Berlin"* are therefore contrary to the Quadripartite Agreement, which states further that treaties affecting matters of security and status may not be extended to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany. The statements by the Federal Republic of Germany cannot therefore have legal effects.

In regard to the latter declaration, the Secretary-General received on 26 January 1976 from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America a communication confirming their previous declarations. Subsequently, on 24 February 1976, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany a communication which states in part: "The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the [note] of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned [Convention] extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect."

See also note 4 above.

CHAPTER XXIII. LAW OF TREATIES

1. VIENNA CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF TREATIES

Concluded at Vienna on 23 May 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 January 1980, in accordance with article 84 (1).
REGISTRATION: 27 January 1980, No. 18232.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1155, p. 331.
STATUS: Signatories: 47. Parties: 77.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 May 1969 and opened for signature on 23 May 1969 by the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2166 (XXI)[1] of 5 December 1966 and 2287 (XXII)[2] of 6 December 1967. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 26 March to 24 May 1968 and the second session from 9 April to 22 May 1969. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain declarations and resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. The text of the Final Act is included in document A/CONF.39/11/Add.2.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	23 May 1969	
Algeria		8 Nov 1988 *a*
Argentina	23 May 1969	5 Dec 1972
Australia		13 Jun 1974 *a*
Austria		30 Apr 1979 *a*
Barbados	23 May 1969	24 Jun 1971
Belarus		1 May 1986 *a*
Belgium		1 Sep 1992 *a*
Bolivia	23 May 1969	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Brazil	23 May 1969	
Bulgaria		21 Apr 1987 *a*
Cambodia	23 May 1969	
Cameroon		23 Oct 1991 *a*
Canada		14 Oct 1970 *a*
Central African Republic		10 Dec 1971 *a*
Chile	23 May 1969	9 Apr 1981
China[3]		
Colombia	23 May 1969	10 Apr 1985
Congo	23 May 1969	12 Apr 1982
Costa Rica	23 May 1969	
Côte d'Ivoire	23 Jul 1969	
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 *d*
Cyprus		28 Dec 1976 *a*
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	18 Apr 1970	1 Jun 1976
Ecuador	23 May 1969	
Egypt		11 Feb 1982 *a*
El Salvador	16 Feb 1970	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia	30 Apr 1970	
Finland	23 May 1969	19 Aug 1977
Georgia		8 Jun 1995 *a*
Germany[5,6]	30 Apr 1970	21 Jul 1987
Ghana	23 May 1969	
Greece		30 Oct 1974 *a*
Guatemala	23 May 1969	
Guyana	23 May 1969	
Haiti		25 Aug 1980 *a*
Holy See	30 Sep 1969	25 Feb 1977
Honduras	23 May 1969	20 Sep 1979
Hungary		19 Jun 1987 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	23 May 1969	
Italy	22 Apr 1970	25 Jul 1974
Jamaica	23 May 1969	28 Jul 1970
Japan		2 Jul 1981 *a*
Kazakstan		5 Jan 1994 *a*
Kenya	23 May 1969	
Kuwait		11 Nov 1975 *a*
Latvia		4 May 1993 *a*
Lesotho		3 Mar 1972 *a*
Liberia	23 May 1969	29 Aug 1985
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1990 *a*
Lithuania		15 Jan 1992 *a*
Luxembourg	4 Sep 1969	
Malawi		23 Aug 1983
Malaysia		27 Jul 1994 *a*
Madagascar	23 May 1969	
Mauritius		18 Jan 1973 *a*
Mexico	23 May 1969	25 Sep 1974
Mongolia		16 May 1988 *a*
Morocco	23 May 1969	26 Sep 1972
Nauru		5 May 1978 *a*
Nepal	23 May 1969	
Netherlands[7]		9 Apr 1985 *a*
New Zealand	29 Apr 1970	4 Aug 1971
Niger		27 Oct 1971 *a*
Nigeria	23 May 1969	31 Jul 1969
Oman		18 Oct 1990 *a*
Pakistan	29 Apr 1970	
Panama		28 Jul 1980 *a*
Paraguay		3 Feb 1972 *a*
Peru	23 May 1969	
Philippines	23 May 1969	15 Nov 1972
Poland		2 Jul 1990 *a*
Republic of Korea[8]	27 Nov 1969	27 Apr 1977
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
Russian Federation		29 Apr 1986 *a*
Rwanda		3 Jan 1980 *a*
Senegal		11 Apr 1986 *a*
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		9 Aug 1989 *a*
Spain		16 May 1972 *a*

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Sudan	23 May 1969	18 Apr 1990
Suriname		31 Jan 1991 *a*
Sweden	23 Apr 1970	4 Feb 1975
Switzerland		7 May 1990 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic		2 Oct 1970 *a*
Togo		28 Dec 1979 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago	23 May 1969	
Tunisia		23 Jun 1971 *a*
Ukraine		14 May 1986 *a*
United Kingdom	20 Apr 1970	25 Jun 1971
United Republic of Tanzania		12 Apr 1976 *a*
United States of America	24 Apr 1970	
Uruguay	23 May 1969	5 Mar 1982
Uzbekistan		12 Jul 1995 *a*
Yugoslavia	23 May 1969	27 Aug 1970
Zaire		25 Jul 1977 *a*
Zambia	23 May 1969	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Upon signature:

"Afghanistan's understanding of article 62 (fundamental change of circumstances) is as follows:

"Sub-paragraph 2 (a) of this article does not cover unequal and illegal treaties, or any treaties which were contrary to the principle of self-determination. This view was also supported by the Expert Consultant in his statement of 11 May 1968 in the Committee of the Whole and on 14 May 1969 (doc. A/CONF.39/L.40) to the Conference."

ALGERIA

Declaration:

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria to the present Convention does not in any way mean recognition of Israel.

This accession shall not be interpreted as involving the establishment of relations of any kind whatever with Israel.

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that the competence of the International Court of Justice cannot be exercised with respect to a dispute such as that envisaged in article 66 (a) at the request of one of the parties alone.

It declares that, in each case, the prior agreement of all the parties concerned is necessary for the dispute to be submitted to the said Court.

ARGENTINA

(a) The Argentine Republic does not regard the rule contained in article 45 *(b)* as applicable to it inasmuch as the rule in question provides for the renunciation of rights in advance.

(b) The Argentine Republic does not accept the idea that a fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty; moreover, it objects to the reservations made by Afghanistan, Morocco and Syria with respect to article 62, paragraph 2 *(a)*, and to any reservations to the same effect as those of the States referred to which may be made in the future with respect to article 62.

The application of this Convention to territories whose sovereignty is a subject of dispute between two or more States, whether or not they are parties to it, cannot be deemed to imply a modification, renunciation or abandonment of the position heretofore maintained by each of them.

BELARUS

[Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by the Russian Federation.]*

BELGIUM[9]

21 June 1993

Reservation:

The Belgian State will not be bound by articles 53 and 64 of the Convention with regard to any party which, in formulating a reservation concerning article 66 (a), objects to the settlement procedure established by this article.

BOLIVIA

Upon signature:

1. The shortcomings of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties are such as to postpone the realization of the aspirations of mankind.

2. Nevertheless, the rules endorsed by the Convention do represent significant advances, based on the principles of international justice which Bolivia has traditionally supported.

BULGARIA[10]

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to underline that articles 81 and 83 of the Convention, which preclude a number of States from becoming parties to it, are of an unjustifiably restrictive character. These provisions are incompatible with the very nature of the Convention, which is of a universal character and should be open for accession by all States.

CANADA

"In acceding to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of Canada declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relation to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of Canada declares that it does not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of paragraph 2 (a) of the declaration of the Government of Canada accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on April 7, 1970."

CHILE

Reservation:

The Republic of Chile declares its adherence to the general principle of the immutability of treaties, without prejudice to the right of States to stipulate, in particular, rules which modify this principle, and for this reason formulates a reservation relating to the provisions of article 62, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Convention, which it considers inapplicable to Chile.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

With regard to article 25, Colombia formulates the reservation that the Political Constitution of Colombia does not recognize the provisional application of treaties; it is the responsibility of the National Congress to approve or disapprove any treaties and conventions which the Government concludes with other States or with international legal entities.

COSTA RICA

1. With regard to articles 11 and 12, the delegation of Costa Rica wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Costa Rican system of constitutional law does not authorize any form of consent which is not subject to ratification by the Legislative Assembly.

2. With regard to article 25, it wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Political Constitution of Costa Rica does not permit the provisional application of treaties, either.

3. With regard to article 27, it interprets this article as referring to secondary law and not to the provisions of the Political Constitution.

4. With regard to article 38, its interpretation is that no customary rule of general international law shall take precedence over any rule of the Inter-American System to which, in its view, this Convention is supplementary.

CZECH REPUBLIC [4]

DENMARK

As between itself and any State which formulates, wholly or in part, a reservation relating to the provisions of article 66 of the Convention concerning the compulsory settlement of certain disputes, Denmark will not consider itself bound by those provisions of part V of the Convention, according to which the procedures for settlement set forth in article 66 are not to apply in the event of reservations formulated by other States.

ECUADOR

Upon signature:

In signing this Convention, Ecuador has not considered it necessary to make any reservation in regard to article 4 of the Convention because it understands that the rules referred to in the first part of article 4 include the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is set forth in Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations and which, as *jus cogens*, has universal and mandatory force.

Ecuador also considers that the first part of article 4 is applicable to existing treaties.

It wishes to place on record, in this form, its view that the said article 4 incorporates the indisputable principle that, in cases where the Convention codifies rules of *lex lata*, these rules, as pre-existing rules, may be invoked and applied to treaties signed before the entry into force of this Convention, which is the instrument codifying the rules.

FINLAND

"Finland declares its understanding that nothing in paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention is intended to modify any provisions of internal law in force in any Contracting State concerning competence to conclude treaties. Under the Constitution of Finland the competence to conclude treaties is given to the President of the Republic, who also decides on the issuance of full powers to the Head of Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

"Finland also declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, Finland will consider itself bound neither by those procedural provisions nor by the substantive provisions of part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation."

GERMANY[5]

Upon signature:

"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to state its views on the declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

Upon ratification:

...

2. The Federal Republic of Germany assumes that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice brought about by consent of States outside the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties cannot be excluded by invoking the provisions of article 66 (b) of the Convention.

3. The Federal Republic of Germany interprets 'measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations', as referred to in article 75, to mean future decisions by the Security Council of the United Nations in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

GUATEMALA

Upon signature:

Reservations

I. Guatemala cannot accept any provision of this Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the Territory of Belize.

II. Guatemala will not apply articles 11, 12, 25 and 66 in so far as they are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic.

III. Guatemala will apply the provision contained in article 38 only in cases where it considers that it is in the national interest to do so.

HUNGARY[11]

KUWAIT

The participation of Kuwait in this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and that furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

MONGOLIA[12]

Declarations:

1. The Mongolian People's Republic declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the case of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of article 81 and 83

of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that the Convention should be open for accession by all States.

MOROCCO

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. Morocco interprets paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 (Fundamental change of circumstances) as not applying to unlawful or inequitable treaties, or to any treaty contrary to the principle of self-determination. Morocco's views on paragraph 2 (a) were supported by the Expert Consultant in his statements in the Committee of the Whole on 11 May1968 and before the Conference in plenary on 14 May 1969 (see Document A/CONF.39/L.40).

2. It shall be understood that Morocco's signature of this Convention does not in any way imply that it recognized Israel. Furthermore, no treaty relationships will be established between Morocco and Israel.

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard the provisions of Article 66 (b) of the Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of the declaration of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 August 1956."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

The Government of New Zealand declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relations to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of New Zealand declares that it will not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of this phrase where it appears in the declaration of the Government of New Zealand accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on 8 April 1940."

OMAN

Declaration:

According to the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman the implementation of paragraph (2) of article (62) of the said Convention does not include those Treaties which are contrary to the right to self-determination.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that, in order for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or for any dispute concerning the application or interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to be submitted for consideration by the Conciliation Commission, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the Conciliation Commission may only be persons appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will consider that it is not obligated by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 3 or of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

SLOVAKIA[4]

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

A—Acceptance of this Convention by the Syrian Arab Republic and ratification of it by its Government shall in no way signify recognition of Israel and cannot have as a result the establishment with the latter of any contact governed by the provisions of this Convention.

B—The Syrian Arab Republic considers that article 81 is not in conformity with the aims and purposes of the Convention in that it does not allow all States, without distinction or discrimination, to become parties to it.

C—The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic does not in any case accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, referred to in article 62, paragraph 2 (a), inasmuch as it regards this as a flagrant violation of an obligatory norm which forms part of general international law and which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination.

D—The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic interprets the provisions in article 52 as follows:

> The expression "the threat or use of force" used in this article extends also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests.

E—The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention and the ratification of it by its Government shall not apply to the Annex to the Convention, which concerns obligatory conciliation.

TUNISIA

The dispute referred to in article 66 *(a)* requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision.

UKRAINE

[Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.]

UNITED KINGDOM

Upon signature:

"In signing the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare their understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph *(b)* of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within

the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

"The Government of the United Kingdom, while reserving their position for the time being with regard to other declarations and reservations made by various States on signing the Convention, consider it necessary to state that the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim in respect of the territory of British Honduras."

Upon ratification:

It is [the United Kingdom's] understanding that nothing in Article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court, the United Kingdom will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph *(b)* of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) *(a)* of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"Article 66 of the Convention shall not be applied to the United Republic of Tanzania by any State which enters a reservation on any provision of part V or the whole of that part of the Convention."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, dedicated to the principle of the inviolability of the frontiers inherited on accession to independence, expresses an objection to the reservation entered by the Kingdom of Morocco with regard to paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 of the Convention.

CANADA

22 October 1971

"... Canada does not consider itself in treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic in respect of those provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties to which the compulsory conciliation procedures set out in the annex to that Convention are applicable."

CHILE

The Republic of Chile formulates an objection to the reservations which have been made or may be made in the future relating to article 62, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

EGYPT

The Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider itself bound by part V of the Convention vis-à-vis States which formulate reservations concerning the procedures for judicial settlement and compulsory arbitration set forth in article 66 and in the annex to the Convention, and it rejects reservations made to the provisions of part V of the Convention.

GERMANY[5]

1. The Federal Republic of Germany rejects the reservations made by Tunisia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic and with regard to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. In this connection it wishes to point out that, as stressed on numerous other occasions, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers articles 53 and 64 to be inextricably linked to article 66 (a).

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis,* were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 27 January 1988: in respect of reservations formulated by Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

(ii) 21 September 1988: in respect of the reservation made by Mongolia;

(iii) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

ISRAEL

16 March 1970

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of paragraph 2 in the declaration made by the Government of Morocco on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, that declaration cannot in any way affect the obligations of Morocco already existing under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Morocco an attitude of complete reciprocity."

16 November 1970

[With respect of declaration "A" made by the Syrian Arab Republic, same declaration, in essence, as the one above.]

JAPAN

1. "The Government of Japan objects to any reservation intended to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions of article 66 and the Annex concerning the obligatory procedures for settlement of disputes and does not consider Japan to be in treaty relations with any State which has formulated or will formulate such reservation, in respect of those provisions of Part V of the Convention regarding which the application of the obligatory procedures mentioned above are to be excluded as a result of the said reservation. Accordingly, the treaty relations between Japan and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between Japan and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan does not accept the interpretation of article 52 put forward by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, since that interpretation does not correctly reflect the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion."

3 April 1987

"[In view of its declaration made upon accession] . . . . the Government of Japan objects to the reservations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 66 and the Annex of the Convention and reaffirms the position of Japan that [it] will not be in treaty relations with the above States in respect of the provisions of Part V of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, paragraph 3.

3. The Government of Japan objects to the declarations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reserving their right to take any measures to safeguard their interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Convention."

NETHERLANDS

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66 of the Convention, are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers it necessary to object to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that their treaty relations will not include the provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of the procedures regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66, wholly or in part is excluded.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the absence of treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State with regard to all or certain provisions of Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Convention.

For the reasons set out above, the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the submission to the International Court of Justice of a dispute referred to in Article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include the provisions to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Tunisia will not include Article 53 and 64 of the Convention."

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of the Netherlands in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 25 September 1987: in respect of reservations formulated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic;

(ii) 14 July 1988: in respect of reservations made by the Government of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

(iii) 28 July 1988: in respect of one of the reservations made by Mongolia;

(iv) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

NEW ZEALAND

14 October 1971

". . . The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria to the obligatory conciliation procedures contained in the Annex to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between New Zealand and Syria."

10 August 1972

". . . The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 *(a)* of the Convention and does not consider New Zealand to be in treaty relations with Tunisia in respect of those provisions of the Convention to which the dispute settlement procedure provided for in Article 66 *(a)* is applicable."

SWEDEN

4 February 1975

"Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called *jus cogens*, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion.

"The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.

"For the reasons set out above, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the dispute referred to in article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision. In view of these reservations, the Swedish Government considers, *firstly*, that the treaty relations between Sweden and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and, *secondly*, that the treaty relations between Sweden and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

"The Swedish Government has also taken note of the declaration of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which it interprets the expression "the threat or use of force" as used in article 52 of the Convention so as to extend also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests. On this point, the Swedish Government observes that since article 52 refers to threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, it should be interpreted in the light

of the practice which has developed or will develop on the basis of the Charter."

UNITED KINGDOM

"The United Kingdom does not accept that the interpretation of Article 52 put forward by the Government of Syria correctly reflects the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion; the Conference dealt with this matter by adopting a Declaration on this subject which forms part of the Final Act;

"The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria in respect of the Annex to the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Syria;

"With reference to a reservation in relation to the territory of British Honduras made by Guatemala on signing the Convention, the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim with respect to that territory; "The United Kingdom fully reserves its position in other respects with regard to the declarations made by various States on signature, to some of which the United Kingdom would object, if they were to be confirmed on ratification."

22 June 1972

"... The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 *(a)* of the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Tunisia."

7 December 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland note that the instrument of ratification of the Government of Finland, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 19 August 1977, contains a declaration relating to paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Secretary-General that they do not regard that declaration as in any way affecting the interpretation or application of article 7."

5 June 1987

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation entered by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by which it rejects the application of article 66 of the Convention. Article 66 provides in certain circumstances for the compulsory settlement of disputes by the International Court of Justice (in the case of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of articles 53 or 64) or by a conciliation procedure (in the case of the rest of Part V of the Convention). These provisions are inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which they relate. Their inclusion was the basis on which those parts of Part V which represent progressive development of international law were accepted by the Vienna Conference. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the Soviet Union include Part V of the Convention.

With respect to any other reservation the intention of which is to exclude the application, in whole or in part, of the provisions of article 66, to which the United Kingdom has already objected or which is made after the reservation by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom will not consider its treaty relations with the State which has formulated or will formulate such a reservation as including those provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of article 66 is rejected by the reservation.

The instrument of accession deposited by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics included also a declaration that it reserves the right to take "any measures" to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Convention. The purpose and scope of this statement is unclear; but, given that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has rejected the application of article 66 of the Convention, it would seem to apply rather to acts by Parties to the Convention in respect of treaties where such acts are in breach of the Convention. In such circumstances a State would not be limited in its response to the measures in article 60: under customary international law it would be entitled to take other measures, provided always that they are reasonable and in proportion to the breach."

11 October 1989

With regard to the reservation made by Algeria:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 [in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] which in accordance with its terms applies to the reservations mentioned above, and will similarly apply to any like reservations which any other State may formulate."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

26 May 1971

The Government of the United States of America objects to reservation E of the Syrian instrument of accession:

"In the view of the United States Government that reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and undermines the principle of impartial settlement of disputes concerning the invalidity, termination, and suspension of the operation of treaties, which was the subject of extensive negotiation at the Vienna Conference.

"The United States Government intends, at such time as it may become a party to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to reaffirm its objection to the foregoing reservation and to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V of the Convention with regard to which the Syrian Arab Republic has rejected the obligatory conciliation procedures set forth in the Annex to the Convention.

"The United States Government is also concerned about Syrian reservation C declaring that the Syrian Arab Republic does not accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, as stated in Article 62, 2 *(a)*, and Syrian reservation D concerning its interpretation of the expression 'the threat or use of force' in Article 52. However, in view of the United States Government's intention to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V to which reservations C and D relate, we do not consider it necessary at this time to object formally to those reservations.

"The United States Government will consider that the absence of treaty relations between the United States of America and the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to certain provisions in Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

29 September 1972

"... The United States of America objects to the reservation by Tunisia to paragraph *(a)* of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties regarding a dispute as to the interpretation or application of Article 53 or 64. The right of a party to invoke the provisions of Article 53 or 64 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Article 42 regarding impeachment of the validity of a treaty and paragraph *(a)* of Article 66 regarding the right of any party to submit to the International Court of Justice for

decision any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of Article 53 or 64.

"Accordingly, the United States Government intends, at such time as it becomes a party to the Convention, to reaffirm its objection to the Tunisian reservation and declare that it will not consider that Article 53 or 64 of the Convention is in force between the United States of America and Tunisia."

List of conciliators nominated for the purpose of constituting a conciliation commission in accordance with paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Annex to the Convention
(For the list of conciliators whose nomination was not renewed, see footnote 13 hereinafter).

Participant	*Nominations*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General*
Austria	Dr. Karl Zemanek, Professor of International Law University of Vienna	1 Feb 1990[14]
	Dr. Helmut Tuerk, Legal Advisor Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs	1 Feb 1990
Croatia	Dr. Stanko Nick	
	Professor Dr. Budislav Vukas	14 Dec 1992
Denmark	Prof. Isi Foighel	7 Mar 1995[14]
	Ambassador Skjold Gustav Mellbin	7 Mar 1995
Paraguay	Dr. Luis María Ramírez Boettner	22 Sep 1994
	Dr. Jerónimo Irala Burgos	
Sweden	Mr. Hans Danelius	
	Mr. Love Gustav-Adolf Kellberg	17 Feb 1994[14]

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/6316), p. 95.

[2] *Ibid., Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/6716), p. 80.

[3] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 27 April 1970. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the said signature was irregular since the so-called "Government of China" represented no one and had no right to speak on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State in the world—the People's Republic of China.

The Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the United Nations later addressed to the Secretary-General a similar communication.

In two letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties in 1968 and 1969, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned and signed it, and that "any statements or reservations to the said Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said Convention".

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 July 1987, with a reservation. By a communication received on 19 October 1990, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 66 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

> The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention and declares that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to the International Court of Justice or to a conciliation procedure, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 20 October 1986 with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention.

In order to submit a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to submit a dispute on the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles of Part V of the Convention to the Conciliation Commission for consideration it shall be necessary in every single case to have the consent of all Parties to the dispute. The members of the Conciliation commission shall be appointed jointly by the Parties to the dispute.

Declarations:

The German Democratic Republic declares that it reserves itself the right to take measures to protect its interests in the case that other States would not comply with the provisions of the Convention.

The German Democratic Republic holds the view that the provisions of articles 81 and 83 of the Convention are in contradiction to the principle according to which any State, the policy of which is guided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, has the right to become a Party to Conventions affecting the interests of all States.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention shall also apply to Land Berlin, subject to the rights and responsibilities of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 5 above.

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[8] With reference to this signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stating that the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not under any circumstances speak on behalf of Korea.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations declared that the above-mentioned statement by the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was without legal foundation and therefore neither affected the legitimate act of signing the Convention by the Government of the Republic of Korea nor prejudiced the rights and obligations of the Republic of Korea under it. He further stated that "in this connexion, it should be noted that the General Assembly of the United Nations declared at its third session and has continuously reaffirmed thereafter that the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful Government in Korea".

[9] On 18 February 1993, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary–General that its instrument of accession should have specified that the said accession was made subject to the said reservation. None of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement having notified the Secretary–General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date its circulation (23 March 1993), the reservation is deemed to have been accepted.

[10] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary–General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 66 (a), which read as follows:

> The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 66, paragraph a) of the Convention, according to which any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 may, by a written application, submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision unless the parties by common consent agree to submit the dispute to arbitration. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that for the submission of such a dispute to the International Court of Justice for a decision, the preliminary consent of all parties to the dispute is needed.

[11] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw as from that date, its reservation regarding article 66 made upon accession which reservation reads as follows:

> The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall have been nominated exclusively with the common consent of the parties to the dispute.

[12] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession, which reads as follows:

> 1. The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention.
>
> The Mongolian People's Republic declares that submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 and 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision as well as submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall be appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.
>
> 2. The Mongolian People's Republic is not obligated by the provisions of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

[13] The nomination of the conciliators listed hereinafter was not renewed after five years. For the date of their nomination and their titles, see the preceding editions of the present publication:

State	*Conciliators*
Australia	Mr. Patrick Brazil
Austria	Professor Stephen Verosta
Cyprus	M. Criton Tornaritis
	Mr. Michalakis Triantafillides
	Mrs. Stella Soulioti
Denmark	Ambassador Paul Fischer
	Professor Isi Foighel
Finland	Professor Erik Castrén
Germany*	Professor Thomas Oppermann
	Professor Günther Jaenicke
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr. Morteza Kalantarian
Italy	Professor Riccardo Monaco
	Professor Luigi Ferrari-Bravo
Japan	Professor Shigejiro Tabata
	Judge Masato Fujisaki
Kenya	Mr. John Maximian Nazareth
	Mr. S. Amos Wako
Mexico	Mr. Antonio Gomez Robledo
	Mr. César Sepúlveda
	Ambassador Alfonso de Rosenzweig-Diáz
Morocco	Mr. Abdelaziz Amine Filali
	Mr. Ibrahim Keddara
	Mr. Abdelaziz Benjhelloun
Netherlands	Professor W. Riphagen Professor A.M. Stuyt
Panama	Mr. Jorge E. Illueca
	Mr. Nanader A. Pitty Velasquez
Spain	Professor Manuel Diez de Velasco Vallejo
	Professor Julio Diego González Campos
Sweden	Mr. Gunnar Lagergren
	Mr. Ivan Wallenberg
United Kingdom	Professor R.Y. Jennings
	Sir Ian Sinclaire
Yugoslavia	Dr. Milan Bulajic Dr. Milivoj Despot
	Dr. Budislav Vukas
	Dr. Borut Bohte

* See note 5 above.

[14] Designation renewed on that date for a term of five years.

2. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties

Concluded at Vienna on 23 August 1978

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 49 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. *United Nations Conference on the Succession of States in respect of treaties-Official Documents-Volume III-Conference Documents* (United Nations publications, Sales No. F.79.V.10).
STATUS: Signatories: 20. Parties: 14.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 August 1978 by the United Nations Conference on the Succession of States in respect of Treaties and was opened for signature at Vienna from 23 August 1978 to 28 February 1979, then at the Headquarters of the United Nations, in New York until 31 August 1979. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3496 (XXX)[1] of 15 December 1975. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 4 April to 6 May 1977 and the second session from 31 July to 23 August 1978. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decisions of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria.

Participant[2]	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Angola	23 Aug 1978	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		22 Jul 1993 *d*
Brazil	23 Aug 1978	
Chile	23 Aug 1978	
Côte d'Ivoire	23 Aug 1978	
Croatia		22 Oct 1992 *d*
Czech Republic[3]	22 Feb 1993 *d*	
Dominica		24 Jun 1988 *a*
Egypt		17 Jul 1986 *a*
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Ethiopia	23 Aug 1978	28 May 1980
Holy See	23 Aug 1978	
Iraq	23 May 1979	5 Dec 1979
Madagascar	23 Aug 1978	
Morocco		31 Mar 1983 *a*
Niger	23 Aug 1978	
Pakistan	10 Jan 1979	
Paraguay	31 Aug 1979	
Peru	30 Aug 1978	
Poland	16 Aug 1979	
Senegal	23 Aug 1978	
Seychelles		22 Feb 1980 *a*
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 *d*	24 Apr 1995
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Sudan	23 Aug 1978	
Tunisia		16 Sep 1981 *a*
Ukraine		26 Oct 1992 *a*
Uruguay	23 Aug 1978	
Yugoslavia	6 Feb 1979	28 Apr 1980
Zaire	23 Aug 1978	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

IRAQ[4]

"Entry into the above Convention by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any agreement therewith."

MOROCCO[4]

Reservation:

The accession of Morocco to this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco and that furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Morocco and Israel.

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

The Slovak Republic declares, under article 7, paragraphs 2 and 3 of [the said] Convention, that it will apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of its own succession which has occurred before the entry into force of the Convention in relation to any signatory State (paragraph 3), contracting State or State Party (paragraphs 2 and 3) which makes a declaration accepting the declaration of the successor State.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 10* (A/9610/Rev.1).

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 22 August 1979. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 30 August 1979. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The Secretary-General received on 23 June 1980 from the Government of Israel the following communication concerning this declaration:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Iraq. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq under general international law or under particular conventions. Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Subsequently, on 23 May 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel a declaration concerning the declaration made by Morocco, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made regarding the declaration made by Iraq.

3. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations

Concluded at Vienna on 21 March 1986

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 85 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.129/15.
STATUS: Signatories: 38. Parties: 23.

Note: The Convention was open for signature by all States, Namibia and international organizations invited to the Conference, until 31 December 1986 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria, and subsequently, until 30 June 1987, at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d), formal confirmation (c)*
Argentina	30 Jan 1987	17 Aug 1990
Australia		16 Jun 1993 *a*
Austria	21 Mar 1986	26 Aug 1987
Belgium	9 Jun 1987	1 Sep 1992
Benin	24 Jun 1987	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Jan 1994 *d*	
Brazil	21 Mar 1986	
Bulgaria		10 Mar 1988 *a*
Burkina Faso	21 Mar 1986	
Côte d'Ivoire	21 Mar 1986	
Council of Europe	11 May 1987	
Croatia		11 Apr 1994 *a*
Cyprus	29 Jun 1987	5 Nov 1991
Czech Republic[1]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	8 Jun 1987	26 Jul 1994
Egypt	21 Mar 1986	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 *a*
Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations	29 Jun 1987	
Germany[2]	27 Apr 1987	20 Jun 1991
Greece	15 Jul 1986	28 Jan 1992
Hungary		17 Aug 1988 *a*
International Civil Aviation Organization	29 Jun 1987	
International Labour Organisation	31 Mar 1987	
International Maritime Organization	30 Jun 1987	
International Telecommunication Union	29 Jun 1987	
Italy	17 Dec 1986	20 Jun 1991
Japan	24 Apr 1987	
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1990 *a*
Malawi	30 Jun 1987	
Mexico	21 Mar 1986	10 Mar 1988
Morocco	21 Mar 1986	
Netherlands	12 Jun 1987	
Senegal	9 Jul 1986	6 Aug 1987
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain		24 Jul 1990 *a*
Sudan	21 Mar 1986	
Sweden	18 Jun 1987	10 Feb 1988
Switzerland		7 May 1990 *a*
Republic of Korea	29 Jun 1987	
Republic of Moldova		26 Jan 1993 *a*
United Kingdom	24 Feb 1987	20 Jun 1991
United Nations	12 Feb 1987	
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation	23 Jun 1987	
United States of America	26 Jun 1987	
World Health Organisation	30 Apr 1987	
World Meteorological Organization	30 Jun 1987	
Yugoslavia	21 Mar 1986	
Zaire	21 Mar 1986	
Zambia	21 Mar 1986	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or formal confirmation. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BELGIUM[3]

21 June 1993

Reservation:

The Belgian State will not be bound by articles 53 and 64 of the Convention with regard to any party which, in formulating a reservation concerning article 66 (2), objects to the settlement procedure established by this article.

BULGARIA[4]

Declaration on article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph j:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the practice of an individual International Organization may be considered as established according to article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph j, only when it has been adopted as such by all Member States of this Organization.

Declaration on article 62, paragraph 2:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the term "Boundary" as it is used in the text of article 62, paragraph 2, means State Boundary and it may be established only by States.

Declaration on article 74, paragraph 3:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that a treaty which an International Organization is a party to, may establish obligations for Members States of this Organization only if the Member States have expressed their consent in advance in each individual case.

DENMARK

Reservation:

... Where parties formulate reservations or partial reservations with respect to the provisions of article 66 of the Convention concerning the obligatory settlement of certain disputes, Denmark does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Part V of the Convention whereby the procedures for settlement set forth in article 66 shall not be applied if reservations have been formulated by other parties.

GERMANY

Declarations:

1. The Federal Republic of Germany presumes that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice brought about by consent of States outside the [said] Convention cannot be excluded by invoking the provisions of article 66, paragraph 4 of the Convention.

2. The Federal Republic of Germany interprets "measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations" as referred to in article 76 of the [said] Convention to mean decisions taken in future by the United Nations Security Council in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter on the maintenance of international peace and security.

HUNGARY[5]

SENEGAL

Upon signature:

In signing this Convention, [the Government of Senegal declares] that the completion of this formality shall not be interpreted in so far as Senegal is concerned as a recognition of the right of international organizations to appear as parties before the International Court of Justice.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or formal confirmation.)

GERMANY

The Federal Republic of Germany rejects the reservation made by the Republic of Bulgaria with regard to article 66, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. In this connection it wishes to point out that the Federal Republic of Germany considers articles 53 and 64 of the Convention, on the one hand, and article 66, paragraph 2, on the other, to be inextricably linked.

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 19 October 1990. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] On 18 February 1993, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General that its instrument of ratification should have specified that the said ratification was made subject to the said reservation. None of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement having notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date its circulation (23 March 1993), the reservation is deemed to have been accepted.

[4] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 66, which read as follows:

> The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations under the terms of which each party to a dispute concerning the interpretation and application of article 53 and 64 may submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that submission of such dispute to the International Court of Justice requires the preliminary consent of all parties to it in each individual case.

[5] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to the Convention with regard to article 66 which reads as follows:

> The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations and declares that submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute and the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall have been nominated exclusively with the common consent of the parties to the dispute.

CHAPTER XXIV. OUTER SPACE

1. Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 12 November 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 September 1976, in accordance with article VIII, paragraph 3.
REGISTRATION: 15 September 1976, No. 15020.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1023, p. 15.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 39.

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 3235 (XXIX)[1] of the General Assembly dated 12 November 1974, pursuant to resolution 3182 (XXVIII)[2] dated 18 December 1973 and taking into account the report of the Committee on the Pacific Uses of Outer Space. The Convention was opened for signature on 14 January 1975.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Dec 1988 *d*
Argentina	26 Mar 1975	5 May 1993
Australia		11 Mar 1986 *a*
Austria	14 Oct 1975	6 Mar 1980
Belarus	30 Jun 1975	26 Jan 1978
Belgium	19 Mar 1975	24 Feb 1977
Bulgaria	4 Feb 1976	11 May 1976
Burundi	13 Nov 1975	
Canada	14 Feb 1975	4 Aug 1976
Chile		17 Sep 1981 *a*
China		12 Dec 1988 *a*
Cuba		10 Apr 1978 *a*
Cyprus		6 Jul 1978 *a*
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Denmark	12 Dec 1975	1 Apr 1977
France	14 Jan 1975	17 Dec 1975
Germany[4,5]	2 Mar 1976	16 Oct 1979
Hungary	13 Oct 1975	26 Oct 1977
India		18 Jan 1982 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1975	
Japan		20 Jun 1983 *a*
Mexico	19 Dec 1975	1 Mar 1977
Mongolia	30 Oct 1975	10 Apr 1985
Netherlands[6]		26 Jan 1981 *a*
Nicaragua	13 May 1975	
Niger	5 Aug 1976	22 Dec 1976
Norway		28 Jun 1995 *a*
Pakistan	1 Dec 1975	27 Feb 1986
Peru		21 Mar 1979 *a*
Poland	4 Dec 1975	22 Nov 1978
Republic of Korea		14 Oct 1981 *a*
Russian Federation	17 Jun 1975	13 Jan 1978
Seychelles		28 Dec 1977 *a*
Singapore	31 Aug 1976	
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain		20 Dec 1978 *a*
Sweden	9 Jun 1976	9 Jun 1976
Switzerland	14 Apr 1975	15 Feb 1978
Ukraine	11 Jul 1975	14 Sep 1977
United Kingdom	6 May 1975	30 Mar 1978
United States of America	24 Jan 1975	15 Sep 1976
Uruguay		18 Aug 1977 *a*
Yugoslavia		24 Feb 1978 *a*

Organizations having declared acceptance of the rights and obligations of the Convention (article VII)

Organization	*Date of receipt of the notification*
European Space Agency	2 Jan 1979

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	30 Mar 1978	Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, St. Kitts Nevis–Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent). Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, Solomon Islands, the State of Brunei

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 31* (A/9631), p. 16.

[2] *Idem, Supplement No. 30* (A/9030), p. 19.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 5 April 1976 and 26 July 1977, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 27August 1975 and 12 May 1977, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a communication accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

See also note 4 above.

6 For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

2. Agreement governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 5 December 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 July 1984, in accordance with article 19 (3).
REGISTRATION: 11 July 1984, No. 23002.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1363, p. 3, and C.N.107.1981.TREATIES-2 of 27 May 1981 [procès-verbal of rectification of the English authentic text of article 5 (1)].
STATUS: Signatories: 11. Parties: 9.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by resolution 34/68[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 5 December 1979. It was opened for signature on 18 December 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Australia		7 Jul 1986 *a*	Morocco	25 Jul 1980	21 Jan 1993
Austria	21 May 1980	11 Jun 1984	Netherlands[2]	27 Jan 1981	17 Feb 1983
Chile	3 Jan 1980	12 Nov 1981	Pakistan		27 Feb 1986 *a*
France	29 Jan 1980		Peru	23 Jun 1981	
Guatemala	20 Nov 1980		Philippines	23 Apr 1980	26 May 1981
India	18 Jan 1982		Romania	17 Apr 1980	
Mexico		11 Oct 1991 *a*	Uruguay	1 Jun 1981	9 Nov 1981

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

FRANCE

Upon signature:
Interpretative statement:

France is of the view that the provisions of article 3, paragraph 2, of the Agreement relating to the use or threat of force cannot be construed as anything other than a reaffirmation, for the purposes of the field of endeavour covered by the Agreement, of the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force, which States are obliged to observe in their international relations, as set forth in the United Nations Charter.

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46* (A/34/46), p. 77.

[2] For the Kingdom of Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

CHAPTER XXV. TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAMME-CARRYING SIGNALS TRANSMITTED BY SATELLITE

Concluded at Brussels on 21 May 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 August 1979, in accordance with article 10 (1).
REGISTRATION: 25 August 1979, No. 17949.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1144, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 20.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the International Conference of States on the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals, transmitted by Satellite, convened jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization. The Conference held discussions on the basis of the Draft Convention drawn up by the Committee of Governmental Experts on Problems in the Field of Copyright and of the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations Raised by Transmission via Space Satellites held at Nairobi (Kenya) from 2 to 11 July 1973.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Argentina	26 Mar 1975	
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 *a*
Australia		26 Jul 1990 *a*
Austria	26 Mar 1975	6 May 1982
Belgium	21 May 1974	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		12 Jan 1994 *d*
Brazil	21 May 1974	
Côte d'Ivoire	21 May 1974	
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Cyprus	21 May 1974	
France	27 Mar 1975	
Germany[1,2]	21 May 1974	25 May 1979
Greece		22 Jul 1991 *a*
Israel	21 May 1974	
Italy	21 May 1974	7 Apr 1981
Kenya	21 May 1974	6 Jan 1976
Lebanon	21 May 1974	
Mexico	21 May 1974	18 Mar 1976
Morocco	21 May 1974	31 Mar 1983
Nicaragua		1 Dec 1975 *a*
Panama		25 Jun 1985 *a*
Peru		7 May 1985 *a*
Portugal		11 Dec 1995 *a*
Russian Federation		20 Oct 1988 *a*
Senegal	21 May 1974	
Slovenia		3 Nov 1992 *d*
Spain	21 May 1974	
Switzerland	21 May 1974	24 Jun 1993
United States of America	21 May 1974	7 Dec 1984
Yugoslavia	31 Mar 1975	29 Dec 1976

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Upon signature:

With reference to article 8 (2) the Government of the Argentine Republic states that the words "where the originating organization is a national of another Contracting State" appearing in article 2 (1) are to be considered as if they were replaced by the words "where the signal is emitted from the territory of another Contracting State".

GERMANY[1]

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany herewith declares in pursuance of article 2 (2) of the Convention that the protection accorded pursuant to article 2 (1) is restricted in its territory to a period of 25 years after the expiry of the calendar year in which the transmission by satellite has occurred.

ITALY

The Italian Government declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 2 (2) of the Convention, that the protection accorded pursuant to article 2 (1) shall be limited in its territory to a period of 25 years following the end of the year in which the satellite transmission took place.

NOTES:

[1] See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[2] In a declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 1 above.

2. Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity

Adopted by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific on 27 March 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 February 1979, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 25 February 1979, No. 17583.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1129, p. 3.
STATUS: Signatories: 18. Parties: 32.

Note: The Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity was adopted on 27 March 1976 by resolution 163 (XXXII)[1] of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific at its thirty-second session, which took place at Bangkok, Thailand, from 24 March 1976 to 2 April 1976. The Constitution was open for signature at Bangkok from 1 April 1976 to 31 October 1976 and at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 1 November 1976 to 24 February 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a)*
Afghanistan	12 Jan 1977	17 May 1977
Australia	26 Jul 1977	26 Jul 1977
Bangladesh	1 Apr 1976	22 Oct 1976
Brunei Darussalam[2]		27 Mar 1986 *a*
Cook Islands		21 Jul 1987 *a*
China	25 Oct 1976	2 Jun 1977 *A*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		22 Feb 1994 *a*
India	28 Oct 1976	26 Nov 1976
Indonesia		29 Apr 1985 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Sep 1976	3 Mar 1980
Japan	22 Mar 1977	25 Nov 1977 *A*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		20 Oct 1989 *a*
Macau[3]		9 Feb 1993 *a*
Malaysia	23 Jun 1977	23 Jun 1977
Maldives		17 Mar 1980 *a*
Micronesia (Federated States of)		28 Dec 1993 *a*
Mongolia		14 Aug 1991 *a*
Myanmar	20 Oct 1976	9 Dec 1976
Nauru	1 Apr 1976	22 Nov 1976
Nepal	15 Sep 1976	12 May 1977
New Zealand[4]		13 Jan 1993 *a*
Niue[5]		14 Nov 1994 *a*
Pakistan	25 Jan 1977	1 Jul 1977
Papua New Guinea	29 Sep 1976	17 Dec 1992
Philippines	28 Oct 1976	17 Jun 1977
Republic of Korea	8 Jul 1977	8 Jul 1977
Singapore	23 Jun 1977	6 Oct 1977
Sri Lanka		3 Oct 1979 *a*
Thailand	15 Sep 1976	26 Jan 1979
Tonga		14 Feb 1992 *a*
United Kingdom (on behalf of Hong Kong)	31 Aug 1977	31 Aug 1977
Viet Nam		11 Sep 1979 *a*

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Sixty-first Session, Supplement No. 9* (E/5786) p. 40.

[2] Brunei Darussalam had been admitted as an associate Member from 2 March 1981. Upon becoming an associate Member, it had declared that it wished to be regarded as having been an associate member of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity with effect from 1 January 1980, the date upon which it became a financial contributor.

[3] As an associate Member. The deposit was accompanied by a declaration made by the Government of Portugal made in accordance with article 20 of the Constitution to the effect that:

> ...The Government of the Portuguese Republic confirms that Macau, as an associate member of ESCAP, is authorized to be a party to the Constitution of the Asia Pacific Telecommunity and to assume the rights and obligations contained therein. ... In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed in Beijing on April 13, 1987, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau from December 20 1999, while the Government of the Portuguese Republic remains responsible for the external relations of Macau until December 19, 1999.

Also, on 9 February 1993, and in relation to the said deposit, the Secretary–General received from the Government of the Republic of China, the following communication:

> In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau as of 20 December 1999. Macau, as a part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, will thereupon become a special administrative region of the People's Republic of China and its foreign affairs will be the responsibility of the People's Republic of China.
>
> The People's Republic of China is one of the founding members of the Asia Pacific Telecommunity.
>
> The Government of the People's Republic of China hereby declares that as of 20 December 1999, the Macau Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China may continue to stay in the Asia Pacific Telecommunity as an associate member in the name of "Macau, China" as it still meets the essential requirements for such a membership."

[4] With a declaration of non–application to Niue and Tokelau.

[5] As an associate member.

(*a*) Amendment to article 11, paragraph 2 (a), of the Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity

Adopted by the General Assembly of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity at Bangkok on 13 November 1981

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 January 1985, for all Members of the Telecommunity in accordance with article 22 (3) of the Constitution.
REGISTRATION: 2 January 1985, No.17583.
TEXT: Doc. APT/GA-2/81, paragraph 72.
STATUS: Parties: 16.

Participant	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan	22 Jul 1983	Myanmar	27 Sep 1984
Australia	16 Aug 1983 *A*	Nepal	3 Dec 1984
Bangladesh	9 Feb 1988 *A*	Pakistan	24 Aug 1984 *A*
China	26 Jul 1982 *A*	Republic of Korea	2 Jul 1982 *A*
India	15 Jul 1983	Singapore	22 Jul 1982 *A*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10 Apr 1986	Sri Lanka	26 Mar 1982 *A*
Malaysia	7 Jan 1986 *A*	Thailand	1 Nov 1982
Maldives	28 May 1982 *A*	Viet Nam	28 Dec 1983 *A*

(*b*) Amendments to articles 3 (5) and 9 (8) of the Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity

Adopted by the General Assembly of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity at Colombo (Sri Lanka) on 29 November 1991

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 22(3) of the Constitution].
TEXT: Doc. APT/LE/2 of 17 April 1992.
STATUS: Parties: 6.

Participant	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, acceptance (A)*
Brunei Darussalam	4 Feb 1994	Maldives	3 Feb 1993 *A*
China	25 May 1993 *A*	Republic of Korea	18 Feb 1993
Indonesia	26 Sep 1994	Thailand	14 Jan 1994

3. Agreement establishing the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development

Concluded at Kuala Lumpur on 12 August 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 March 1981, in accordance with article 16.
REGISTRATION: 6 March 1981, No. 19609.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1216, p. 81[1] and depositary notification C.N.130.1986.TREATIES-1 of 13 June 1986 (amended authentic text in Chinese, English, French and Russian)[2]
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 18.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 12 August 1977 by the Intergovernmental Meeting on the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development convened by the United Nations Development Programme at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 10 to 12 August 1977.

According to paragraph 3 of its article 14, the Agreement was to remain open for signature at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris until 31 March 1978 and would then be transmitted for deposit to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Instead, signatures on behalf of 11 States were affixed individually during the period 12 September 1977 - 11 October 1978 on separate copies of the text of the Agreement established by the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development which were transmitted to the Secretary-General in June 1979. By depositary notification of 3 August 1979, the Secretary-General, in his capacity as the designated depositary, submitted for approval by all States having participated in the adoption of the Agreement or having signed the separate copies, the original text of the Agreement, similar to the text adopted at Kuala Lumpur on 12 August 1977 except for minor changes in the formal clauses as were warranted by the circumstances. No objection having been received from the States concerned within ninety days from the notification, the original of the Agreement was deposited with the Secretary-General on 2 November 1979.

Participant	*Signature*[1]	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*	*Participant*	*Signature*[1]	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan	23 Aug 1978		Maldives		25 Jun 1985 *a*
Bangladesh	14 Sep 1977	11 Aug 1981	Micronesia (Federated States of)		28 Dec 1993 *a*
Brunei Darussalam		6 Dec 1988 *a*	Nepal	15 May 1980	11 Sep 1980
China		5 Feb 1988 *a*	Pakistan	10 Apr 1978	7 Jul 1981
Fiji	2 Jun 1978	26 Mar 1981	Papua New Guinea	9 Mar 1978	1 May 1980
France		14 Dec 1988 *a*	Philippines	12 Sep 1977	
India	20 May 1980	25 Feb 1986	Republic of Korea	11 Oct 1978	6 Mar 1981
Indonesia	12 Aug 1978	31 Aug 1989	Singapore		29 Jun 1982 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic		12 Sep 1986 *a*	Sri Lanka	15 Sep 1978	7 Nov 1988
Malaysia	11 Oct 1978	10 Nov 1980	Thailand	25 Apr 1981	
			Viet Nam	8 Sep 1978	23 Feb 1981 *A*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

FRANCE[3]

With regard to paragraph 2 (a) (iv) of article 11:

1. Whether the remuneration of employees of the Institute is exempted from the tax levied in France shall depend on the establishment by the Institute of an internal tax on such remuneration;

2. This exemption shall not apply to pensions and like income;

3. Salaries and emoluments may be taken into account for purposes of calculating the tax due on income from other sources.

NOTES:

[1] Published as a UNESCO and WIPO document, (vol. 19609). The signatures were affixed on separate copies of the Agreement (see "*Note:*" above). In accordance with the provision of article 14 (3) of the Agreement in the text established by the Secretary-General and accepted by the signatory States, these signatures were considered, in the absence of notification to the contrary, as tantamount to signatures under paragraph 1 of the same article 14.

[2] In accordance with a request made by the Governing Council of the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development the Secretary-General circulated on 13 June 1986 a proposed amended text of the Agreement (drawn up in Chinese, English, French and Russian) which was deemed adopted in the absence within 90 days of objections to the proposed amended text or to the amendment procedure thus adopted.

[3] In connection with "the question of imposition of taxes on the income earned by the French nationals and the Permanent residents in France while working at AIDB, the Council noted the position that in view of the articles 12.2 (a) (ii) and (iv) of the Agreement establishing AIBD and the article V.1. (B) of the supplementary Agreement signed by AIBD and the Government of Malaysia, the French nationals and the Permanent residents of France will enjoy tax free benefits on the emoluments earned while working at AIBD and further recognised the right of the Government of France to levy taxes on such incomes derived by the French nationals and permanent residents in France during their secondment to, or employment at the AIBDSZ".

CHAPTER XXVI. DISARMAMENT

1. Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques

Adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 October 1978, in accordance with article IX (3).
REGISTRATION: 5 October 1978, No. 17119.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1108, p. 151 and depositary notification C.N.263.1978.TREATIES-12 of 27 October 1978 (rectification of the English text).
STATUS: Signatories: 48. Parties: 63.

Note: The Convention was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 31/72[1] of 10 December 1976. In application of paragraph 2 of the said resolution, the Secretary-General decided to open the Convention for signature and ratification by States from 18 to 31 May 1977 at Geneva, Switzerland. Subsequently, the Convention was transmitted to the Headquarters of the Organization of the United Nations, where it was open for signature by States until 4 October 1978.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan		22 Oct 1985 *a*
Algeria		19 Dec 1991 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Argentina		20 Mar 1987 *a*
Australia	31 May 1978	7 Sep 1984
Austria		17 Jan 1990 *a*
Bangladesh		3 Oct 1979 *a*
Belarus	18 May 1977	7 Jun 1988
Belgium	18 May 1977	12 Jul 1982
Benin	10 Jun 1977	30 Jun 1986
Bolivia	18 May 1977	
Brazil	9 Nov 1977	12 Oct 1984
Bulgaria	18 May 1977	31 May 1978
Canada	18 May 1977	11 Jun 1981
Cape Verde		3 Oct 1979 *a*
Chile		26 Apr 1994 *a*
Cuba	23 Sep 1977	10 Apr 1978
Cyprus	7 Oct 1977	12 Apr 1978
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Nov 1984 *a*
Denmark	18 May 1977	19 Apr 1978
Dominica		9 Nov 1992 *d*
Egypt		1 Apr 1982 *a*
Ethiopia	18 May 1977	
Finland	18 May 1977	12 May 1978
Germany[3,4]	18 May 1977	24 May 1983
Ghana	21 Mar 1978	22 Jun 1978
Greece		23 Aug 1983 *a*
Guatemala		21 Mar 1988 *a*
Holy See	27 May 1977	
Hungary	18 May 1977	19 Apr 1978
Iceland	18 May 1977	
India	15 Dec 1977	15 Dec 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	18 May 1977	
Iraq	15 Aug 1977	
Ireland	18 May 1977	16 Dec 1982
Italy	18 May 1977	27 Nov 1981
Japan		9 Jun 1982 *a*
Kuwait		2 Jan 1980 *a*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	13 Apr 1978	5 Oct 1978
Lebanon	18 May 1977	
Liberia	18 May 1977	
Luxembourg	18 May 1977	
Malawi		5 Oct 1978 *a*
Mauritius		9 Dec 1992 *a*
Mongolia	18 May 1977	19 May 1978
Morocco	18 May 1977	
Netherlands[5]	18 May 1977	15 Apr 1983
New Zealand[6]		7 Sep 1984 *a*
Nicaragua	11 Aug 1977	
Niger		17 Feb 1993 *a*
Norway	18 May 1977	15 Feb 1979
Pakistan		27 Feb 1986 *a*
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 *a*
Poland	18 May 1977	8 Jun 1978
Portugal	18 May 1977	
Republic of Korea		2 Dec 1986 *a*
Romania	18 May 1977	6 May 1983
Russian Federation	18 May 1977	30 May 1978
Saint Lucia		27 May 1993 *d*
Sao Tome and Principe		5 Oct 1979 *a*
Sierra Leone	12 Apr 1978	
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands		19 Jun 1981 *d*
Spain	18 May 1977	19 Jul 1978
Sri Lanka	8 Jun 1977	25 Apr 1978
Sweden		27 Apr 1984 *a*
Switzerland		5 Aug 1988 *a*
Syrian Arab Republic	4 Aug 1977	
Tunisia	11 May 1978	11 May 1978
Turkey	18 May 1977	
Uganda	18 May 1977	
Ukraine	18 May 1977	13 Jun 1978
United Kingdom	18 May 1977	16 May 1978
United States of America	18 May 1977	17 Jan 1980
Uruguay		16 Sep 1993 *a*
Uzbekistan		26 May 1993 *a*
Viet Nam		26 Aug 1980 *a*
Yemen[7]	18 May 1977	20 Jul 1977
Zaire	28 Feb 1978	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA[8]

The Argentine Republic interprets the terms "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects" in article I, paragraph 1, of the Convention in accordance with the definitions agreed upon in the understanding on that article. It likewise interprets articles II, III and VIII in accordance with the relevant understandings.

AUSTRIA

Reservation:

"Considering the obligations resulting from its status as a permanently neutral state, the Republic of Austria declares a reservation to the effect that its co-operation within the framework of this Convention cannot exceed the limits determined by the Status of permanent neutrality and membership with the United Nations."

GERMANY[3]

Upon signature:

"With the proviso that the correct designation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the Russian language is 'Federativnuju Respubliku Germaniju'."

16 June 1977

"The correct designation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the Russian language following the preposition 'sa' in the Russian text was spelled out in the afore-mentioned proviso as 'Federativnuju Respubliku Germaniju'."

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

Guatemala accepts the text of article III, on condition that the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes does not adversely affect its territory or the use of its natural resources.

KUWAIT[9]

Reservation:

This Convention binds the State of Kuwait only towards States Parties thereto. Its obligatory character shall *ipso facto* terminate with respect to any hostile state which does not abide by the prohibition contained therein.

Understanding:

"It is understood that accession to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other hostile use of Environmental Modification Techniques, done in Geneva, 1977, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the obligations laid down in article 1 of the said Convention as extending to states which are not a party to the Convention and which act in conformity with article 1 of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand hereby declares its interpretation that nothing in the Convention detracts from or limits the obligations of States to refrain from military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques which are contrary to international law".

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of Korea that any technique for deliberately changing the natural state of rivers falls within the meaning of the term 'environmental modification techniques' as defined in article II of the Convention.

"It is further understood that military or any other hostile use of such techniques, which could cause flooding, inundation, reduction in the water-level, drying up, destruction of hydrotechnical installations or other harmful consequences, comes within the scope of the Convention, provided it meets the criteria set out in article I therefore."

SWITZERLAND

Because of the obligation incumbent upon it by virtue of its status of perpetual neutrality, Switzerland must make a general reservation specifying that its co-operation in the framework of this Convention cannot go beyond the limits imposed by this status. This reservation refers, in particular, to article V, paragraph 5, of the Convention, and to any similar clause which may replace or supplement this provision in the Convention (or in any other arrangement).

TURKEY

Upon signature:

Interpretative statement:

"In the opinion of the Turkish Government the terms 'widespread', 'long lasting' and 'severe effects' contained in the Convention need to be clearly defined. So long as this clarification is not made the Government of Turkey will be compelled to interpret itself the terms in question and consequently it reserves the right to do so as and when required.

"Furthermore, the Government of Turkey believes that the difference between 'military or any other hostile purposes' and 'peaceful purposes' should be more clearly defined so as to prevent subjective evaluations."

Territorial Application

Participant	*Date of receipt of the notification*	*Territories*
United Kingdom	16 May 1978	Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, St. Kitts Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent), Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, the Solomon Islands, State of Brunei, United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 39* (A/31/39), p. 36.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 May 1977 and 12 May 1978, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 May 1977 and 25 May 1978, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] With effect from the day on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany it shall also apply to Berlin (West) subject to the rights and responsibilities of the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America including those relating to disarmament and demilitarization.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on the dates indicated, the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (5 December 1983):

The declaration by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that the application of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques extends to Berlin (West) is illegal. The aforesaid Convention, in all of its substance, directly affects agreements and arrangements whose application the Federal Republic of Germany, in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, has no right to extend to Berlin (West).

The stipulation contained in the declaration of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West), subject to the rights and responsibilities of the French Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, including those relating to disarmament and demilitarization is pointless, since all the main provisions of the Convention relate to questions of disarmament and demilitarization. This stipulation is intended merely to mask the illegality of the declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which is nothing but a flagrant violation of the Quadripartite Agreement and cannot, of course, have any legal force.

As is known, the relevant Allied provisions relating to demilitarization, which were confirmed upon the signature of the Quadripartite Agreement and the responsibility for whose practical observance lies with the authorities of France, United Kingdom and the United States, still remain in force in Berlin (West). This, of course, inevitably includes questions relating to the prohibition of the military use of environmental modification techniques.

A communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, was received on 23 January 1984 by the Secretary-General from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (2 July 1984):

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States, without prejudice to the maintenance of their rights and responsibilities relating to the representation abroad of the interests of the western sectors of Berlin, confirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected and provided that the extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of the three powers which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement, affirmed that it would raise no objections to such extension.

The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed *inter alia* to afford the authorities of the three powers the opportunity to ensure that international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany which are to be extended to the western sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status are not affected.

When authorizing the extension of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques to the western sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the three powers took such steps as were necessary to ensure that matters of security and status were not affected. Accordingly, the Berlin declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with established procedures is valid and the Convention applies to the western sectors of Berlin, subject to Allied Rights and Responsibilities, including those in the Area of Disarmament and Demilitarization.

The three Governments wish further to recall that Quadripartite Legislation on Demilitarization applies to the whole of Greater Berlin.

With reference to the communication received on 23 January 1984 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (. . .), the three Governments wish to point out that States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions. They do not consider it necessary, and do not intend, to respond to further communication on this matter from States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change in the position of the three Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (5 June 1985):

"By their note of 2 July 1984, disseminated [. . .] on 20 July 1984, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America answered the assertions made in the communication referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to confirm the position as set out by the three Powers in the above-mentioned note."

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (2 December 1985):

The extension of the application of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques of 10 December 1976 to Berlin (West) is a gross violation of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and therefore cannot have any legal effect.

At the same time, the Soviet side would like to draw attention to the fact that the Powers party to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 have formulated decisions in respect of Berlin (West) which have universal effect under international law. The extension of the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany naturally affects the interests of the other parties to it, which have the right to express their opinion on this matter. That right cannot be disputed by anyone.

In this connection, the Soviet side rejects as unfounded the communication from France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America with respect to the declaration of the German Democratic Republic. The view set forth in that declaration by the Government of the German Democratic Republic as a party to the above-mentioned Convention is entirely in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971.

As to the assertions about "Greater Berlin" in the same communication from the three Powers, they are pointless in that there has been no "Greater Berlin" for a long time. There is Berlin, capital of the German Democratic Republic, which is an inseparable component of the Republic and has the same status as any other territory of the German Democratic Republic, and there is Berlin (West) a city with a special status where the occupation régime still remains. It is from these *de jure* and *de facto* realities that the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 stems.

France, United Kingdom and United States of America (6 October 1986)

"The Government of the three powers reaffirm the statement in the note from the Permanent Representative of France of 28 June 1984 that the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the application of the Convention on the Prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques of 10 December 1976 to the western sectors of Berlin is valid and that the Convention applies to the western sectors of Berlin, subject to allied rights and responsibilities, including those in the area of disarmament and demilitarization.

The Government of France, the United Kingdom and the United States further reaffirm the statement in the same note of 28 June 1984 that States which are not parties to the quadripartite agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions.

The quadripartite agreement of 3 September 1971 is an international agreement concluded between the four contracting parties and not open to participation by any other State. In concluding this agreement, the four powers acted on the basis of their quadripartite rights and responsibilities, and the corresponding wartime and post-war agreements and decisions of the four powers, which are not affected. The quadripartite agreement is a part of conventional and not customary international law.

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States cannot accept the assertions by the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that greater Berlin no longer exists and that Berlin is the capital of the German Democratic Republic.

The position of the Three governments on the continuing quadripartite status of greater Berlin is well known and was set out for example in a letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations of 14 April 1975."

See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[6] The accession shall also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue.

[7] Democratic Yemen had acceded to the Convention on 12 June 1979. See also note 32 in chapter I.2.

[8] The Government of Argentina has specified that the understandings referred to in the declaration are the Understandings adopted as part of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, published under the symbol A/31/27. [Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly (Volume I, Annex I).]

[9] On 23 June 1980, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following communication concerning the above-mentioned understanding:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Kuwait. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait, under general international law or under particular conventions. Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

2. Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (and Protocols)

Concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 December 1983, in accordance with article 5, paragraphs 1 and 3.
REGISTRATION: 2 December 1983, No. 22495.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1342, p. 7; depositary notifications C.N.356.1981. TREATIES-7 of 14 January 1982 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Chinese authentic text) and C.N.320.1982. TREATIES-11 of 21 January 1983 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Final Act).
STATUS: Signatories: 51. Parties: 57.
Note:

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*	*Acceptance pursuant to article 4, paragraphs 3 and 4*[1] *Protocols* I	II	III
Afghanistan	10 Apr 1981				
Argentina	2 Dec 1981	2 Oct 1995	x	x	x
Australia	8 Apr 1982	29 Sep 1983	x	x	x
Austria	10 Apr 1981	14 Mar 1983	x	x	x
Belarus	10 Apr 1981	23 Jun 1982	x	x	x
Belgium	10 Apr 1981	7 Feb 1995	x	x	x
Benin		27 Mar 1989 *a*	x		x
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	x	x	x
Brazil		3 Oct 1995 *a*	x	x	x
Bulgaria	10 Apr 1981	15 Oct 1982	x	x	x
Canada	10 Apr 1981	24 Jun 1994	x	x	x
China	14 Sep 1981	7 Apr 1982	x	x	x
Croatia		2 Dec 1993 *d*	x	x	x
Cuba	10 Apr 1981	2 Mar 1987	x	x	x
Cyprus		12 Dec 1988 *a*	x	x	x
Czech Republic[2]		22 Feb 1993 *d*	x	x	x
Denmark	10 Apr 1981	7 Jul 1982	x	x	x
Ecuador	9 Sep 1981	4 May 1982	x	x	x
Egypt	10 Apr 1981				
Finland	10 Apr 1981	8 May 1982	x	x	x
France	10 Apr 1981	4 Mar 1988	x	x	
Germany[3]	10 Apr 1981	25 Nov 1992	x	x	x
Greece	10 Apr 1981	28 Jan 1992	x	x	x
Guatemala		21 Jul 1983 *a*	x	x	x
Hungary	10 Apr 1981	14 Jun 1982	x	x	x
Iceland	10 Apr 1981				
India	15 May 1981	1 Mar 1984	x	x	x
Ireland	10 Apr 1981	13 Mar 1995	x	x	x
Israel		22 Mar 1995 *a*	x	x	
Italy	10 Apr 1981	20 Jan 1995	x	x	x
Japan	22 Sep 1981	9 Jun 1982 *A*	x	x	x
Jordan		19 Oct 1995 *a*	x		x
Lao People's Democratic Republic[4]	[2 Nov 1982]	3 Jan 1983 *a*	x	x	x
Latvia		4 Jan 1993 *a*	x	x	x
Liechtenstein	11 Feb 1982	16 Aug 1989	x	x	x
Luxembourg	10 Apr 1981				
Malta		26 Jun 1995 *a*	x	x	x

Participant	Signature	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)	Acceptance pursuant to article 4, paragraphs 3 and 4[1] Protocols		
			I	II	III
Mexico	10 Apr 1981	11 Feb 1982	x	x	x
Mongolia	10 Apr 1981	8 Jun 1982	x	x	x
Morocco	10 Apr 1981				
Netherlands[5]	10 Apr 1981	18 Jun 1987 *A*	x	x	x
New Zealand	10 Apr 1981	18 Oct 1993	x	x	x
Nicaragua	20 May 1981				
Niger		10 Nov 1992 *a*	x	x	x
Nigeria	26 Jan 1982				
Norway	10 Apr 1981	7 Jun 1983	x	x	x
Pakistan	26 Jan 1982	1 Apr 1985	x	x	x
Philippines	15 May 1981				
Poland	10 Apr 1981	2 Jun 1983	x	x	x
Portugal	10 Apr 1981				
Romania	8 Apr 1982	26 Jul 1995	x	x	x
Russian Federation	10 Apr 1981	10 Jun 1982	x	x	x
Sierra Leone	1 May 1981				
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*	x	x	x
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*	x	x	x
South Africa		13 Sep 1995 *a*	x	x	x
Spain	10 Apr 1981	29 Dec 1993	x	x	x
Sudan	10 Apr 1981				
Sweden	10 Apr 1981	7 Jul 1982	x	x	x
Switzerland	18 Jun 1981	20 Aug 1982	x	x	x
Togo	15 Sep 1981	4 Dec 1995 *A*	x	x	x
Tunisia		15 May 1987 *a*	x	x	x
Turkey	26 Mar 1982				
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 *a*	x	x	x
Ukraine	10 Apr 1981	23 Jun 1982	x	x	x
United Kingdom	10 Apr 1981	13 Feb 1995	x	x	x
United States of America	8 Apr 1982	24 Mar 1995	x	x	
Uruguay		6 Oct 1994 *a*	x	x	x
Viet Nam	10 Apr 1981				
Yugoslavia	5 May 1981	24 May 1983	x	x	x

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Reservation:

The Argentine Republic makes the express reservation that any references to the 1977 Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 that are contained in the [said Convention and its Protocols I, II and III] shall be interpreted in the light of the interpretative declarations in the instrument of accession of the Argentine Republic to the aforementioned additional Protocols of 1977.

CANADA

Declarations:

"1. It is the understanding of the Government of Canada that:

(a) The compliance of commanders and others responsible for planning, deciding upon, or executing attacks to which the Convention and its Protocols apply cannot be judged on the basis of information which subsequently comes to light but must be assessed on the basis

of the information available to them at the time that such actions were taken; and

(b) Where terms are not defined in the present Convention and its Protocols they shall, so far as is relevant, be construed in the same sense as terms contained in additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949.

2. With respect to Protocol I, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that the use of plastics or similar materials for detonators or other weapons parts not designed to cause injury is not prohibited.

3. With respect to Protocol II, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that:

(a) Any obligation to record the location of remotely delivered mines pursuant to sub–paragraph 1 (a) of article 5 refers to the location of mine fields and not to the location of individual remotely delivered mines;

(b) The term 'pre–planned', as used in sub–paragraph 1 (a) of article 7 means that the position of the minefield in question should have been determined in advance so that an accurate record of the location of the minefield, when laid, can be made.;

(c) The phrase 'similar functions' used in article 8, includes the concepts of 'peace–making, preventive peace–keeping and peace enforcement' as defined in an agenda for peace (United Nations document A/47/277 S/2411 of 17 June 1992).

4. With respect to Protocol III, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that the expression 'clearly separated' in paragraph 3 of article 2 includes both spatial separation or separation by means of an effective physical barrier between the military objective and the concentration of civilians."

CHINA

Upon signature:

Statement

1. The Government of the People's Republic of China has decided to sign the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects adopted at the United Nations Conference held in Geneva on 10 October 1980.

2. The Government of the People's Republic of China deems that the basic spirit of the Convention reflects the reasonable demand and good intention of numerous countries and peoples of the world regarding prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which are excessively injurious or have indiscriminate effects. This basic spirit conforms to China's consistent position and serves the interest of opposing aggression and maintaining peace.

3. However, it should be pointed out that the Convention fails to provide for supervision or verification of any violation of its clauses, thus weakening its binding force. The Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices fails to lay down strict restrictions on the use of such weapons by the aggressor on the territory of his victim and to provide adequately for the right of a state victim of an aggression to defend itself by all necessary means. The Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons does not stipulate restrictions on the use of such weapons against combat personnel. Furthermore, the Chinese texts of the Convention and Protocol are not accurate or satisfactory enough. It is the hope of the Chinese Government that these inadequacies can be remedied in due course.

CYPRUS

Declaration:

"The provisions of article 7 of paragraph (3b) and article 8 of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) will be interpreted in such a way that neither the status of peace-keeping forces or missions of the United Nations in Cyprus will be affected nor will additional rights be, *ipso jure*, granted to them."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

After signing the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, the French Government, as it has already had occasion to state

– through its representative to the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons in Geneva, during the discussion of the proposal concerning verification arrangements submitted by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and of which the French Government became a sponsor, and at the final meeting on 10 October 1980;

– on 20 November 1980 through the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community in the First Committee at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly;

Regrets that thus far it has not been possible for the States which participated in the negotiation of the Convention to reach agreement on the provisions concerning the verification of facts which might be alleged and which might constitute violations of the undertakings subscribed to.

It therefore reserves the right to submit, possibly in association with other States, proposals aimed at filling that gap at the first conference to be held pursuant to article 8 of the Convention and to utilize, as appropriate, procedures that would make it possible to bring before the international community facts and information which, if verified, could constitute violations of the provisions of the Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto.

Interpretative statement

The application of this Convention will have no effect on the legal status of the parties to a conflict.

Reservation:

France, which is not bound by Additional Protocol I of 10 June 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949;

Considers that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, which reproduces the provisions of article 35, paragraph 3, of Additional Protocol I, applies only to States parties to that Protocol;

States, with reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, that it will apply the provisions of the Convention and its three Protocols to all the armed conflicts referred to in articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949;

States that as regards the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, the declaration of acceptance and application provided for

in article 7, paragraph 4 (b), of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons will have no effects other than those provided for in article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions, in so far as that article is applicable.

ISRAEL

Declarations:

"(a) With reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Israel will apply the provisions of the Convention and those annexed Protocols to which Israel has agreed become bound to all armed conflicts involving regular armed forces of States referred to in article 2 common to the General Conventions of 12 August 1949, as well as to all armed conflicts referred to in article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949.

(b) Article 7, paragraph 4 of the Convention will have no effect.

(c) The application of this Convention will have no effect on the legal status of the parties to a conflict.

Understandings:

(a) It is the understanding of the Government of the State of Israel that the compliance of commanders and others responsible for planning, deciding upon, or executing attacks to which the Convention and its Protocols apply, cannot be judged on the basis of information which subsequently comes to light, but must be assessed on the basis of the information available to them at the time that such actions were taken.

(b) With respect to Protocol I, it is the understanding of the Government of Israel that the use of plastics or similar materials for detonators or other weapon parts not designed to cause injury is not prohibited.

(c) With respect to Protocol I, it is the understanding of the Government of Israel that:

(i) Any obligation to record the location of remotely delivered mines pursuant to sub-paragraph 1 (a) of article 5 refers to the location of mine fields and not to the location of individual remotely delivered mines;

(ii) the term pre-planned, as used in sub-paragraph 1 (a) of article 7 means that the position of the minefield in question should have been determined in advance so that an accurate record of the location of the minefield, when laid, can be made."

ITALY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

On 10 October 1980 in Geneva, the representative of Italy at the Conference speaking at the closing meeting, emphasized that the Conference, in an effort to reach a compromise between what was desirable and what was possible, had probably achieved the maximum results feasible in the circumstances prevailing at that time.

However, he observed in his statement that one of the objectives which had not been achieved at the Conference, to his Government's great regret, was the inclusion in the text of the Convention, in accordance with a proposal originated by the Federal Republic of Germany, of an article on the establishment of a consultative committee of experts competent to verify facts which might be alleged and which might constitute violations of the undertakings subscribed to.

On the same occasion, the representative of Italy expressed the wish that that proposal, which was aimed at strengthening the credibility and effectiveness of the Convention, should be reconsidered at the earliest opportunity within the framework of the mechanisms for the amendment of the Convention expressly provided for in that instrument.

Subsequently, through the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of nine States members of the European Community in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on 20 November 1980, when it adopted draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.15 (subsequently adopted as General Assembly Resolution 35/153), Italy once again expressed regret that the States which had participated in the preparation of the texts of the Convention and its Protocols had been unable to reach agreement on provisions that would ensure respect for the obligations deriving from those texts.

In the same spirit, Italy – which has just signed the Convention in accordance with the wishes expressed by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/153 – wishes to confirm solemnly that it intends to undertake active efforts to ensure that the problem of the establishment of a mechanism that would make it possible to fill a gap in the Convention and thus ensure that it achieves maximum effectiveness and maximum credibility vis-à-vis the international community is taken up again at the earliest opportunity in every competent forum.

NETHERLANDS

"1. With regard to article 2, paragraph 4, of Protocol II: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that a specific area of land may also be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in paragraph 4, its total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definitive military advantage;

"2. With regard to article 3, paragraph 3, under c, of Protocol II: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that military advantage refers to the advantage anticipated from the attack considered as a whole and not only from isolated or particular parts of the attack;

"3. With regard to article 8, paragraph 1, of Protocol II: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the words 'as far as it is able' mean 'as far as it is technically able'.

"4. With regard to article 1, paragraph 3, of Protocol III: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that a specific area of land may also be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in paragraph 3, its total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definitive military advantage."

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

2. Romania considers that the Convention and the three Protocols annexed thereto constitute a positive step within the framework of the efforts which have been made for the gradual development of international humanitarian law applicable during armed conflicts and which aim at providing very broad and reliable protection for the civilian population and the combatants.

3. At the same time, Romania would like to emphasize that the provisions of the Convention and its Protocols have a restricted character and do not ensure adequate protection either to the civilian population or to the combatants as the fundamental principles of international humanitarian law require.

4. The Romanian Government wishes to state on this occasion also that real and effective protection for each individual and for peoples and assurance of their right to a free

and independent life necessarily presuppose the elimination of all acts of aggression and the renunciation once and for all of the use of force and the threat of the use of force, of intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and of the policy of domination and diktat and strict observation of the sovereignty and independence of peoples and their legitimate right to self-determination.

In the present circumstances, when a vast quantity of nuclear weapons has been accumulated in the world, the protection of each individual and of all peoples is closely linked with the struggle for peace and disarmament and with the adoption of authentic measures to halt the arms race and ensure the gradual reduction of nuclear weapons until they are totally eliminated.

5. The Romanian Government States once again its decision to act, together with other States, to ensure the prohibition or restriction of all conventional weapons which are excessively injurious or have indiscriminate effects, and the adoption of urgent and effective measures for nuclear disarmament which would protect peoples from the nuclear war which seriously threatens their right to life – a fundamental condition for the protection which international humanitarian law must ensure for the individual, the civilian population and the combatants.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will give further consideration to certain provisions of the Convention, particularly in relation to the provisions of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and may wish to make formal declarations in relation to these provisions at the time of ratification."

Upon ratification:

(a) *Generally*

(i) The term "armed conflict" of itself and in its context denotes a situation of a kind which is not constituted by the commission of ordinary crimes, including acts of terrorism, whether concerted or in isolation.

(ii) The United Kingdom will not, in relation to any situation in which it is involved, consider itself bound in consequence of any declaration purporting to be made for the purposes of article 7 (4), unless the United Kingdom shall have expressly recognised that it has been made by a body which is genuinely an authority representing a people engaged in an armed conflict of the type to which that paragraph applies.

(iii) The terms "civilian" and "civilian population" have the same meaning as in article 50 of the 1st Additional Protocol of 1977 to the 1949 Geneva Conventions. Civilians shall enjoy the protection afforded by this Convention unless and for such time as they take a direct part in hostilities.

(iv) Military commanders and others responsible for planning, deciding upon, or executing attacks necessarily have to reach decisions on the basis of their assessment of the information from all sources which is reasonably available to them at the relevant time.

(b) *Re: Protocol II, article 2; and Protocol III, article 1*

A specific area of land may be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in this article, its total or partial destruction, capture or neutralisation in the circumstances ruling at the time offers a definite military advantage.

(c) *Re: Protocol II, article 3*

In the view of the United Kingdom, the military advantage anticipated from an attack is intended to refer to the advantage anticipated from the attack considered as a whole and not only from isolated or particular parts of the attack.

(d) *Re: Protocol III, article 2*

The United Kingdom accepts the provisions of article 2 (2) and (3) on the understanding that the terms of those paragraphs of that article do not imply that the air-delivery of incendiary weapons, or of any other weapons, projectiles or munitions, is less accurate or less capable of being carried out discriminately than all or any other means of delivery.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

"The United States Government welcomes the adoption of this Convention, and hopes that all States will give the most serious consideration to ratification or accession. We believe that the Convention represents a positive step forward in efforts to minimize injury or damage to the civilian population in time of armed conflict. Our signature of this Convention reflects the general willingness of the United States to adopt practical and reasonable provisions concerning the conduct of military operations, for the purpose of protecting noncombatants.

"At the same time, we want to emphasize that formal adherence by States to agreements restricting the use of weapons in armed conflict would be of little purpose if the parties were not firmly committed to taking every appropriate step to ensure compliance with those restrictions after their entry into force. It would be the firm intention of the United States and, we trust, all other parties to utilize the procedures and remedies provided by this Convention, and by the general laws of war, to see to it that all parties to the Convention meet their obligations under it. The United States strongly supported proposals by other countries during the Conference to include special procedures for dealing with compliance matters, and reserves the right to propose at a later date additional procedures and remedies, should this prove necessary, to deal with such problems.

"In addition, the United States of course reserves the right, at the time of ratification, to exercise the option provided by article 4 (3) of the Convention, and to make statements of understanding and/or reservations, to the extent that it may deem that to be necessary to ensure that the Convention and its Protocols conform to humanitarian and military requirements. As indicated in the negotiating record of the 1980 Conference, the prohibitions and restrictions contained in the Convention and its Protocols are of course new contractual rules (with the exception of certain provisions which restate existing international law) which will only bind States upon their ratification of, or accession to, the Convention and their consent to be bound by the Protocols in question."

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

"Article 7 (4) (b) of the Convention shall not apply with respect to the United States.

Declaration:

The United States declares, with reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention, that the United States will apply the provisions of the Convention, Protocol I, and Protocol II to all armed conflicts referred to in

articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949.

Understandings:

The United States understands that article 6 (1) of the Protocol II does not prohibit the adaptation for use as booby-traps of portable objects created for a purpose other than as a booby-trap if the adaptation does not violate paragraph (1)(b) of the article.

The United States considers that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Convention, which refers to the substance of provisions of article 35 (3) and article 55 (1) of additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, applies only to States which have accepted those provisions.

NOTES:

[1] The protocols concerned are:
— Protocol on non-detectable fragments (Protocol I);
— Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of mines, booby-traps and other devices (Protocol II);
— Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons (Protocol III).
Each participant must consent to be bound by any two or more of the Protocols. Acceptance of a Protocol is denoted by an "X". Unless otherwise indicated, acceptance was notified upon ratification, acceptance, approval of, accession or succession to the Convention.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention accepting Protocols I, II and III, on 10 April 1981 and 31 August 1982, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 10 April 1981 and 20 July 1982, respectively, accepting all three Protocols. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] A signature was affixed on behalf of the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 2 November 1982, i.e. after the time-limit of 10 April 1982 prescribed by article 3 of the Convention, as a result of an administrative oversight. The signature was cancelled; the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic subsequently acceded (on 3 January 1983) to the Convention, accepting the three Protocols.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

a) Additional Protocol to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemded to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects

Adopted by the 8th Plenary Meeting of the State Parties on 13 October 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 2 of the Additional Protocol).
TEXT: Doc. CCW/CONF.I/7.
STATUS: Signatories: . Parties: .

Note: At its 8th plenary meeting on 13 October 1995, the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects adopted pursuant to article 8.3 (b) of the Convention an additional Protocol entitled "Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons (Protocol IV)".

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*

3. Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction

Opened for signature at Paris on 13 January 1993

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article XVIII).

TEXT: Doc. CD/CW/WP.400/Rev.1: and depositary notifications C.N.95.1994.TREATIES–1 of 10 May 1994 (correction to the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts) and C.N.201.1994.TREATIES–4 of 12 July 1994 and C.N.359.1994.TREATIES–8 of 27 January 1995 (addenda); and C.N.454.1995.TREATIES–12 of 2 February 1996 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic and Russian texts).

STATUS: Signatories: 160. Parties: 47.

Note: At its 47th session, the General Assembly, by resolution A/RES/47/39[1], adopted on 30 November 1992, commended the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, as contained in the report of the Conference on Disarmament, dated 3 September 1993. In the same resolution, the General Assembly also welcomed the invitation of the President of the French Republic to participate in a ceremony to sign the Convention in Paris on 13 January 1993 and requested the Secretary–General, as Depositary of the Convention, to open it for signature in Paris on that date. The Convention was opened for signature in Paris, from 13 January to 15 January 1993. Thereafter, it will remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York, until its entry into force, in accordance with article XVIII.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Afghanistan	14 Jan 1993	
Albania	14 Jan 1993	11 May 1994
Algeria	13 Jan 1993	14 Aug 1995
Argentina	13 Jan 1993	2 Oct 1995
Armenia	19 Mar 1993	27 Jan 1995
Australia	13 Jan 1993	6 May 1994
Austria	13 Jan 1993	17 Aug 1995
Azerbaijan	13 Jan 1993	
Bahamas	2 Mar 1994	
Bahrain	24 Feb 1993	
Bangladesh	14 Jan 1993	
Belarus	14 Jan 1993	
Belgium	13 Jan 1993	
Benin	14 Jan 1993	
Bolivia	14 Jan 1993	
Brazil	13 Jan 1993	
Brunei Darussalam	13 Jan 1993	
Bulgaria	13 Jan 1993	10 Aug 1994
Burkina Faso	14 Jan 1993	
Burundi	15 Jan 1993	
Cambodia	15 Jan 1993	
Cameroon	14 Jan 1993	
Canada	13 Jan 1993	26 Sep 1995
Cape Verde	15 Jan 1993	
Central African Republic	14 Jan 1993	
Chad	11 Oct 1994	
Chile	14 Jan 1993	
China	13 Jan 1993	
Colombia	13 Jan 1993	
Comoros	13 Jan 1993	
Congo	15 Jan 1993	
Cook Islands	14 Jan 1993	15 Jul 1994
Costa Rica	14 Jan 1993	
Côte d'Ivoire	13 Jan 1993	18 Dec 1995
Croatia	13 Jan 1993	23 May 1995
Cuba	13 Jan 1993	
Cyprus	13 Jan 1993	
Czech Republic	14 Jan 1993	
Denmark	14 Jan 1993	13 Jul 1995
Djibouti	28 Sep 1993	
Dominica	2 Aug 1993	
Dominican Republic	13 Jan 1993	
Ecuador	14 Jan 1993	6 Sep 1995
El Salvador	14 Jan 1993	30 Oct 1995
Equatorial Guinea	14 Jan 1993	
Estonia	14 Jan 1993	
Ethiopia	14 Jan 1993	
Fiji	14 Jan 1993	20 Jan 1993
Finland	14 Jan 1993	7 Feb 1995
France	13 Jan 1993	2 Mar 1995
Gabon	13 Jan 1993	
Gambia	13 Jan 1993	
Georgia	14 Jan 1993	27 Nov 1995
Germany	13 Jan 1993	12 Aug 1994
Ghana	14 Jan 1993	
Greece	13 Jan 1993	22 Dec 1994
Guatemala	14 Jan 1993	
Guinea	14 Jan 1993	
Guinea–Bissau	14 Jan 1993	
Guyana	6 Oct 1993	
Haiti	14 Jan 1993	
Holy See	14 Jan 1993	
Honduras	13 Jan 1993	
Hungary	13 Jan 1993	
Iceland	13 Jan 1993	
India	14 Jan 1993	
Indonesia	13 Jan 1993	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13 Jan 1993	
Ireland	14 Jan 1993	
Israel	13 Jan 1993	
Italy	13 Jan 1993	8 Dec 1995
Japan	13 Jan 1993	15 Sep 1995
Kazakstan	14 Jan 1993	
Kenya	15 Jan 1993	
Kuwait	27 Jan 1993	
Kyrgyzstan	22 Feb 1993	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	13 May 1993	
Latvia	6 May 1993	
Lesotho	7 Dec 1994	7 Dec 1994
Liberia	15 Jan 1993	
Liechtenstein	21 Jul 1993	
Lithuania	13 Jan 1993	

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Luxembourg	13 Jan 1993	
Madagascar	15 Jan 1993	
Malawi	14 Jan 1993	
Malaysia	13 Jan 1993	
Maldives	4 Oct 1993	31 May 1994
Mali	13 Jan 1993	
Malta	13 Jan 1993	
Marshall Islands	13 Jan 1993	
Mauritania	13 Jan 1993	
Mauritius	14 Jan 1993	9 Feb 1993
Mexico	13 Jan 1993	29 Aug 1994
Micronesia (Federated States of)	13 Jan 1993	
Monaco	13 Jan 1993	1 Jun 1995
Mongolia	14 Jan 1993	17 Jan 1995
Morocco	13 Jan 1993	28 Dec 1995
Myanmar	14 Jan 1993	
Namibia	13 Jan 1993	24 Nov 1995
Nauru	13 Jan 1993	
Nepal	19 Jan 1993	
Netherlands[2]	14 Jan 1993	30 Jun 1995
New Zealand	14 Jan 1993	
Nicaragua	9 Mar 1993	
Niger	14 Jan 1993	
Nigeria	13 Jan 1993	
Norway	13 Jan 1993	7 Apr 1994
Oman	2 Feb 1993	8 Feb 1995
Pakistan	13 Jan 1993	
Panama	16 Jun 1993	
Papua New Guinea	14 Jan 1993	
Paraguay	14 Jan 1993	1 Dec 1994
Peru	14 Jan 1993	20 Jul 1995
Philippines	13 Jan 1993	
Poland	13 Jan 1993	23 Aug 1995
Portugal	13 Jan 1993	
Qatar	1 Feb 1993	
Republic of Korea	14 Jan 1993	
Republic of Moldova	13 Jan 1993	
Romania	13 Jan 1993	15 Feb 1995
Russian Federation	13 Jan 1993	
Rwanda	17 May 1993	
Samoa	14 Jan 1993	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	16 Mar 1994	
Saint Lucia	29 Mar 1993	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	20 Sep 1993	
San Marino	13 Jan 1993	
Saudi Arabia	20 Jan 1993	
Senegal	13 Jan 1993	
Seychelles	15 Jan 1993	7 Apr 1993
Sierra Leone	15 Jan 1993	
Singapore	14 Jan 1993	
Slovakia	14 Jan 1993	27 Oct 1995
Slovenia	14 Jan 1993	
South Africa	14 Jan 1993	13 Sept 1995
Spain	13 Jan 1993	3 Aug 1994
Sri Lanka	14 Jan 1993	19 Aug 1994
Swaziland	23 Sep 1993	
Sweden	13 Jan 1993	17 Jun 1993
Switzerland	14 Jan 1993	10 Mar 1995
Tajikistan	14 Jan 1993	11 Jan 1995
Thailand	14 Jan 1993	
Togo	13 Jan 1993	
Tunisia	13 Jan 1993	
Turkey	14 Jan 1993	
Turkmenistan	12 Oct 1993	29 Sep 1994
Ukraine	13 Jan 1993	
Uganda	14 Jan 1993	
United Arab Emirates	2 Feb 1993	
United Kingdom	13 Jan 1993	
United Republic of Tanzania	25 Feb 1994	
United States of America	13 Jan 1993	
Uruguay	15 Jan 1993	6 Oct 1994
Uzbekistan	24 Nov 1995	
Venezuela	14 Jan 1993	
Viet Nam	13 Jan 1993	
Yemen	8 Feb 1993	
Zaire	14 Jan 1993	
Zambia	13 Jan 1993	
Zimbabwe	13 Jan 1993	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

BELGIUM

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"As a Member State of the European Community, the Government of Belgium will implement the provisions of the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, in accordance with its obligations arising from the rules of the Treaties establishing the European Communities to the extent that such rules are applicable."

CHINA

Upon signature:
Declaration:

" 1. China has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all chemical weapons and their production facilities. The Convention constitutes the legal basis for the realization of this goal. China therefore supports the object and purpose and principles of the Convention.

II. The object and purpose and principles of the Convention should be strictly abided by. The relevant provisions on challenge inspection should not be abused to the detriment of the security interests of States Parties unrelated to chemical weapons. Otherwise, the universality of the Convention is bound to be adversely affected.

III. States Parties that have abandoned chemical weapons on the territories of other States parties should implement in earnest the relevant provisions of the Convention and undertake the obligation to destroy the abandoned chemical weapons.

IV. The Convention should effectively facilitate trade, scientific and technological exchanges and cooperation in the field of chemistry for peaceful purposes. All export controls inconsistent with the Convention should be abolished."

DENMARK

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

FRANCE

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

GERMANY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

GREECE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

IRELAND

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

PORTUGAL

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

SPAIN

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

UNITED KINGDOM

Upon signature:
Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-seventh session, Supplement No. 49* (A/47/49), p. 54.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

CHAPTER XXVII. ENVIRONMENT

1. CONVENTION ON LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION

Concluded at Geneva on 13 November 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 March 1983, in accordance with article 16 (1).[1]
REGISTRATION: 16 March 1983, No. 21623.
TEXT: Doc. E/ECE (XXXIV)/L-18.
STATUS: Signatories: 33. Parties: 40.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 13 November 1979 by a high-level meeting within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe on the Protection of the Environment. It was open for signature until 16 November 1979 at the United Nations Office in Geneva.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	13 Nov 1979	16 Dec 1982
Belarus	14 Nov 1979	13 Jun 1980
Belgium	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Bulgaria	14 Nov 1979	9 Jun 1981
Canada	13 Nov 1979	15 Dec 1981
Croatia		21 Sep 1992 *d*
Cyprus		20 Nov 1991 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark	14 Nov 1979	18 Jun 1982
European Community	14 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982 *AA*
Finland	13 Nov 1979	15 Apr 1981
France	13 Nov 1979	3 Nov 1981 *AA*
Germany[3,4]	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Greece	14 Nov 1979	30 Aug 1983
Holy See	14 Nov 1979	
Hungary	13 Nov 1979	22 Sep 1980
Iceland	13 Nov 1979	5 May 1983
Ireland	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Italy	14 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Latvia		15 Jul 1994 *a*
Liechtenstein	14 Nov 1979	22 Nov 1983
Lithuania		25 Jan 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Netherlands[5]	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982 *A*
Norway	13 Nov 1979	13 Feb 1981
Poland	13 Nov 1979	19 Jul 1985
Portugal	14 Nov 1979	29 Sep 1980
Republic of Moldova		9 Jun 1995 *a*
Romania	14 Nov 1979	27 Feb 1991
Russian Federation	13 Nov 1979	22 May 1980
San Marino	14 Nov 1979	
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Spain	14 Nov 1979	15 Jun 1982
Sweden	13 Nov 1979	12 Feb 1981
Switzerland	13 Nov 1979	6 May 1983
Turkey	13 Nov 1979	18 Apr 1983
Ukraine	14 Nov 1979	5 Jun 1980
United Kingdom[6]	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
United States of America	13 Nov 1979	30 Nov 1981 *A*
Yugoslavia	13 Nov 1979	18 Mar 1987

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

Romania interprets article 14 of this Convention, concerning the participation of regional economic integration organizations constituted by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe, to mean that it refers exclusively to international organizations to which States members have transferred their competence in respect of the signature, conclusion and application on their behalf of international agreements and in respect of the exercise of their rights and responsibilities in the field of transboundary pollution.

NOTES:

[1] The date of 16 March 1983 has been retained on the basis of the English and Russian authentic texts of article 16 (1) (". . . on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the twenty-fourth instrument."), which differ in that respect from the French text (". . . le quatre-vingt-dixième jour *à compter de la date de dépôt* . . .") but are more in accordance with the computation method generally used for multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 November 1979 and 23 December 1983, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 November 1979 and 7 June 1982, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] With the following declaration:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that the Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 20 April 1983, from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the following communication:

In connection with the declaration of 15 July 1982 by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension to West Berlin of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution of 13 November 1979, the Soviet Union declares that it does not object to the application of the Convention to West Berlin in such measure and to such an extent as is permissible from the standpoint of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, according to which West Berlin is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and will not be governed by it in the future.

On the same subject, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

German Democratic Republic (28 July 1983):

With regard to the application of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution of 13 November 1979 to Berlin (West) it is the understanding of the German Democratic Republic that the application of the provisions of the Convention to Berlin (West) is in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, according to which Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not to be governed by it.

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (27 April 1984):

"The Governments of France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America wish to point out that the Soviet declaration referred to above contains an incomplete and therefore misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. The provision of the Quadripartite Agreement to which reference is made states that 'the ties between the Western Sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany will be maintained and developed taking into account that these Sectors continue not to be a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it'.

With regard to the declaration of the German Democratic Republic contained in [. . .] of 25 August 1983, the three Governments reaffirm that States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions."

Federal Republic of Germany (13 June 1984):

"With reference to depositary notification [. . .] of May 16, 1984 concerning a communication by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America in reply to communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the German Democratic Republic, disseminated by depositary notifications [. . .] of May 13, 1983 and [. . .] of August 25, 1983, relating to the application to Berlin (West) of the Convention of November 13, 1979 on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution, [the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany] states that [it] supports the position set forth in the communication by the Three Powers."

Poland (19 July 1985)

"In connexion with the declaration of 15 July 1982 by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning the extension of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution of 13 November 1979 to Berlin (West), the Polish People's Republic declares that it does not object to the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) in such measure and to such an extent as it is in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, according to which Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and will not be governed by it."

France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (18 October 1985):

"With regard to that declaration [by Poland] the Governments of the United Kingdom, the United States and France wish to recall their statement of 4 April 1984 contained in Document [communication received on 27 April 1984] of 16 May 1984.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (2 December 1985):

The Soviet side does not object to the application of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution of 13 November 1979 to Berlin (West) in such measure and to such an extent as is permissible from the standpoint of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, according to which Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and will not be governed by it in the future.

At the same time, the Soviet side would like to draw attention to the fact that the Powers party to the Quadripartite Agreement have formulated decisions in respect of Berlin (West) which have universal effect under international law. The extension of the above-mentioned Convention to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany naturally affects the interests of the other parties to it, which have the right to express their opinion on that matter. That right cannot be disputed by anyone.

In this connection, the Soviet side rejects as unfounded the communication by France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America with respect to the declaration by the German Democratic Republic as a party to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution is entirely in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971.

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (28 July 1986):

"The Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 is an international agreement concluded between the four Contracting Parties and not open to participation by any other State. In concluding this Agreement, the Four Powers acted on the basis of their quadripartite rights and responsibilities, and the corresponding wartime and post-war agreements and decisions of the Four Powers, which are not affected. The Quadripartite Agreement is part of conventional, not customary international law.

The Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States therefore reaffirm the statement in the Note from the Permanent Representative of France of 4 April 1984 [. . .] that States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions.

Finally, [it is to be point out] that the Soviet Note of 29 November 1985 [circulated by depositary notification . . .] of 6 February 1986, like the Soviet Note of 18 April 1983 [. . .], contains an incomplete and consequently misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement. The relevant passage of that Agreement to which the Soviet Note referred provides that the ties between the Western sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany will be maintained and developed, taking into account that these Sectors continue not to be constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it."

See also note 3 above.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[6] Including the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man, Gibraltar, the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekhelia in the island of Cyprus.

(a) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Long-Term Financing of the Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-Range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP)

Concluded at Geneva on 28 September 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 January 1988, in accordance with articles 10 (a) and (b).
REGISTRATION: 28 January 1988, No. 25638.
TEXT: Doc. EB.AIR/AC.1/4, Annex, and EB.AIR/CRP.1/Add.4.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 35.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and adopted by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on 27 September 1984. It was opened for signature at Geneva from 28 September to 5 October 1984, and it remained open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 4 April 1985.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria		4 Jun 1987 *a*	Liechtenstein		1 May 1985 *a*
Belarus	28 Sep 1984	4 Oct 1985 *A*	Luxembourg	21 Nov 1984	24 Aug 1987
Belgium	25 Feb 1985	5 Aug 1987	Netherlands[4]	28 Sep 1984	22 Oct 1985 *A*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*	Norway	28 Sep 1984	12 Mar 1985 *A*
Bulgaria	4 Apr 1985	26 Sep 1986 *AA*	Poland		14 Sep 1988 *a*
Canada	3 Oct 1984	4 Dec 1985	Portugal		19 Jan 1989 *a*
Croatia		21 Sep 1992 *d*	Russian Federation	28 Sep 1984	21 Aug 1985 *A*
Cyprus		20 Nov 1991 *a*	Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*	Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Denmark	28 Sep 1984	29 Apr 1986	Spain		11 Aug 1987 *a*
European Community	28 Sep 1984	17 Jul 1986 *AA*	Sweden	28 Sep 1984	12 Aug 1985
Finland	7 Dec 1984	24 Jun 1986	Switzerland	3 Oct 1984	26 Jul 1985
France	22 Feb 1985	30 Oct 1987 *AA*	Turkey	3 Oct 1984	20 Dec 1985
Germany[2,3]	26 Feb 1985	7 Oct 1986	Ukraine	28 Sep 1984	30 Aug 1985 *A*
Greece		24 Jun 1988 *a*	United Kingdom	20 Nov 1984	12 Aug 1985
Hungary	27 Mar 1985	8 May 1985 *AA*	United States of America	28 Sep 1984	29 Oct 1984 *A*
Ireland	4 Apr 1985	26 Jun 1987	Yugoslavia		28 Oct 1987 *a*
Italy	28 Sep 1984	12 Jan 1989			

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 26 November 1986. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 17 December 1986 with the following declaration:

... In accordance with article 3, paragraph 1 of the Protocol, the German Democratic Republic declares that the contributions of the German Democratic Republic will be made in national currency which can exclusively be used for deliveries and services by the German Democratic Republic.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

(*b*) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 per cent

Concluded at Helsinki on 8 July 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 September 1987, in accordance with article 11 (1).
REGISTRATION: 2 September 1987, No. 25247.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.193.1985.TREATIES-2 of 23 August 1985.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 21.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and was adopted on 8 July 1985 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. It was open for signature at Helsinki from 8 to 12 July 1985.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	9 Jul 1985	4 Jun 1987	Italy	9 Jul 1985	5 Feb 1990
Belarus	9 Jul 1985	10 Sep 1986 *A*	Liechtenstein	9 Jul 1985	13 Feb 1986
Belgium	9 Jul 1985	9 Jun 1989	Luxembourg	9 Jul 1985	24 Aug 1987
Bulgaria	9 Jul 1985	26 Sep 1986 *AA*	Netherlands[4]	9 Jul 1985	30 Apr 1986 *A*
Canada	9 Jul 1985	4 Dec 1985	Norway	9 Jul 1985	4 Nov 1986
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*	Russian Federation	9 Jul 1985	10 Sep 1986 *A*
Denmark	9 Jul 1985	29 Apr 1986	Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Finland	9 Jul 1985	24 Jun 1986	Sweden	9 Jul 1985	31 Mar 1986
France	9 Jul 1985	13 Mar 1986 *AA*	Switzerland	9 Jul 1985	21 Sep 1987
Germany[2,3]	9 Jul 1985	3 Mar 1987	Ukraine	9 Jul 1985	2 Oct 1986 *A*
Hungary	9 Jul 1985	11 Sep 1986			

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Protocol on 9 July 1985 and 26 November 1986, respectively. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed and approved the Protocol on 9 July 1985 and 26 November 1986, respectively. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

(c) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution concerning the Control of Emissions of Nitrogen Oxides or their Transboundary Fluxes

Concluded at Sofia on 31 October 1988

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 February 1991, in accordance with article 15 (1).
REGISTRATION: 14 February 1991, No.27874.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.252.1988.TREATIES-1 of 6 December 1988.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 25.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and was adopted on 31 October 1988 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. It was open for signature at Sofia from 1 to 4 November 1988 and subsequently, at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 5 May 1989.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	1 Nov 1988	15 Jan 1990
Belarus	1 Nov 1988	8 Jun 1989 *A*
Belgium	1 Nov 1988	
Bulgaria	1 Nov 1988	30 Mar 1989
Canada	1 Nov 1988	25 Jan 1991
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Denmark[2]	1 Nov 1988	1 Mar 1993 *A*
European Community		17 Dec 1993 *a*
Finland	1 Nov 1988	1 Feb 1990
France	1 Nov 1988	20 Jul 1989 *AA*
Germany[3]	1 Nov 1988	16 Nov 1990
Greece	1 Nov 1988	
Hungary	3 May 1989	12 Nov 1991 *AA*
Ireland	1 May 1989	17 Oct 1994
Italy	1 Nov 1988	19 May 1992
Liechtenstein	1 Nov 1988	24 Mar 1994
Luxembourg	1 Nov 1988	4 Oct 1990
Netherlands[4]	1 Nov 1988	11 Oct 1989 *A*
Norway	1 Nov 1988	11 Oct 1989
Poland	1 Nov 1988	
Russian Federation	1 Nov 1988	21 Jun 1989 *A*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Spain	1 Nov 1988	4 Dec 1990
Sweden	1 Nov 1988	27 Jul 1990
Switzerland	1 Nov 1988	18 Sep 1990
Ukraine	1 Nov 1988	24 Jul 1989 *A*
United Kingdom[5]	1 Nov 1988	15 Oct 1990
United States of America	1 Nov 1988	13 Jul 1989 *A*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:
Statement:

"In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 1 of the protocol, the Government of the United States of America specifies 1978 as the applicable calendar year for determining measures to control and/or reduce its national annual emissions of nitrogen oxides or their transboundary fluxes.

The Government of the United States of America believes that there must be a follow-on protocol to establish a control obligation based on scientific, technical and economic factors, including consideration of the protocol's effect on the innovative control technologies program of the United States. If such a protocol is not adopted by 1996, the United States of America will consider withdrawal from this protocol.

The Government of the United States of America understands that nations will have the flexibility to meet the overall requirements of the protocol through the most effective means."

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Protocol on 1 November 1988 and 17 August 1990, respectivley. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] With a declaration of non-application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Protocol on 1 November 1988. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] The instrument specifies that the said Protocol is ratified in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man and the Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus.

(d) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes

Concluded at Geneva on 18 November 1991

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 16 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ECE/EB.AIR/30.
STATUS: Signatories: 23. Parties: 13.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and was adopted on 18 November 1991 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. It was opened for signature at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 18 to 19 November 1991 and thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 22 May 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Austria	19 Nov 1991	23 Aug 1994	Liechtenstein	19 Nov 1991	24 Mar 1994
Belgium	19 Nov 1991		Luxembourg	19 Nov 1991	11 Nov 1993
Bulgaria	19 Nov 1991		Netherlands[2]	19 Nov 1991	29 Sep 1993 *A*
Canada	19 Nov 1991		Norway	19 Nov 1991	7 Jan 1993
Denmark[1]	19 Nov 1991		Portugal	2 Apr 1992	
European Community	2 Apr 1992		Spain	19 Nov 1991	1 Feb 1994
Finland	19 Nov 1991	11 Jan 1994 *A*	Sweden	19 Nov 1991	8 Jan 1993
France	19 Nov 1991		Switzerland	19 Nov 1991	21 Mar 1994
Germany	19 Nov 1991	8 Dec 1994	Ukraine	19 Nov 1991	
Greece	19 Nov 1991		United Kingdom[3]	19 Nov 1991	14 Jun 1994
Hungary	19 Nov 1991	10 Nov 1995	United States of America	19 Nov 1991	
Italy	19 Nov 1991	30 Jun 1995			

Declarations made in accordance with article 2 (2) of the Protocol
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"With regard to article 2 (basic obligations) Austria declares to be bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 (a). Furthermore, Austria chooses the year 1988 as a base year with respect to paragraph 2 (a)."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Belgium undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis (article 2, paragraph 2 (a)).

BULGARIA

Upon signature:

"Bulgaria declares under article 2, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph c) that it shall, as soon as possible and as a first step, take effective measures to ensure at least that at the latest by the year 1999 its national annual emissions of VOCs do not exceed the 1988 levels."

CANADA

Upon signature:

"Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, Canada is pleased to inform other Parties to the present Protocol that it selects option (b) from among the three options available. Base year: 1988."

DENMARK

Upon signature:

"Denmark hereby declares that it will reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, using 1985 as a basis.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"The European Economic community, taking account in particular of the alternatives available to its Member States in application of Article 2 (2) of the Protocol, hereby declares that its obligations under the Protocol with regard to the objectives for reducing VOC emissions may not be greater than the sum of the obligations entered into by its Member States which have ratified the Protocol."

FINLAND

Upon signature:

"Finland declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30%, using 1988 levels as a basis."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

The French Republic undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis (article 2, paragraph 2 (a)).

GERMANY

Upon signature:

"Germany specifies that it shall reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999 using 1988 levels as a basis according to article 2, paragraph 2 (a)."

GREECE

Upon signature:

"Greece declares under article 2, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph c) that it shall, as soon as possible and as a first step, take effective measures to ensure at least that at the latest by the year 1999 its national annual emissions of VOCs do not exceed the 1988 levels."

HUNGARY

Upon signature:

"The Republic of Hungary shall control and reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs or their transboundary fluxes in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (c) of article 2 of the Protocol."

ITALY

Upon signature:

"Italy declares its intention to meet the requirements of article 2.1 of the Protocol in the way specified at article 2, paragraph 2, letter (a) and its intention to indicate as reference year as a basis for reduction: 1990."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Upon signature:

"As a basis to reduce its annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, Liechtenstein will use 1984 levels."

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

Luxembourg undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1990 levels as a basis (article 2, paragraph 2 (a)).

NETHERLANDS

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

"The Netherlands declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30% using 1988 levels as a basis."

NORWAY

Upon signature:

"The Government of Norway intends to fulfil the obligations of the VOC Protocol as specified in article 2, paragraph 2 (b). Norway will use the year 1989 as the base year for reductions.

Based on present prognosis of VOC emissions the total Norwegian reduction of VOC will be in the order of 20% by the year 1999.

"Norway will apply equivalent measures based on the best available technologies which are economically feasible, outside the TOMA as inside.

"The Government of Norway will fulfil its obligations in the Exclusive Economic Zone of Norway under the Protocol in conformity with international law."

PORTUGAL

Upon signature:

"Portugal declares under its article 2, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph a), that is shall control and reduce its national annual emissions of VOC's or their transboundary fluxes in accordance with the way specified at that article."

SPAIN

Upon signature:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain declares that it accepts the commitment set forth in article 2 [(2)] (a) to reduce national annual emissions by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis.

SWEDEN

Upon signature:

"Sweden declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30%, using 1988 levels as a basis."

Upon ratification:

"Sweden declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis."

SWITZERLAND

Upon signature:

"As a basis to reduce its annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, Switzerland will use 1984 levels."

UKRAINE

Upon signature:

[The Government of Ukraine] signs [the said Protocol] on the conditions set out in paragraph 2 (b) of article 2 of the Protocol.

In so doing the Government of Ukraine stipulates that the following designated tropospheric ozone management areas (TOMAs) situated in Ukraine should be included in Annex I to the Protocol:

TOMA No. 1: the Poltavian, Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhian, Donetsk, Lugantsk, Nikolaivian, Khersonian regions (194.3 thousand square kilometres);

TOMA No. 2: Lvovian, Ternopol, Ivano-Frankovsk, Zakarpatian regions (62.3 thousand square kilometres).

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declares] that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30%, using 1988 levels as a basis."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

"In accordance with article 2, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, the Government of the United States of America specifies 1984 emission levels as the basis for its VOC reductions under this Protocol [article 2, paragraph 2 (a)]".

NOTES:

[1] Decision reserved as concerns the application of the Protocol to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] Application to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey and the Isle of Man.

(e) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions

Concluded at Oslo on 14 June 1994

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 15 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. EB.AIR/R.84.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 3.

Note: The Protocol, adopted on 13 June 1994 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution at its special session held in Oslo on 13 and 14 June 1994, was open for signature at Oslo until 14 June 1994, and thereafter, at United Nations Headquarters, New York, until 12 December 1994, in accordance with its article 12 (1). The Protocol is open to signature by States members of the Economic commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Comission, pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and social Council Resolution 36 (IV)[1] of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations, constituted by sovereign Sates members of the Commission, which have competence in respect of the negotiation, conclusion and application of international agreements in matters covered by the Protocol, provided that the States and organizations concerned are Parties to the 1979 Convention.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Austria	14 Jun 1994		Italy	14 Jun 1994	
Belgium[2]	14 Jun 1994		Liechtenstein	14 Jun 1994	
Bulgaria	14 Jun 1994		Luxembourg	14 Jun 1994	
Canada	14 Jun 1994		Netherlands[3]	14 Jun 1994	30 May 1995 *A*
Croatia	14 Jun 1994		Norway	14 Jun 1994	3 Jul 1995
Czech Republic	14 Jun 1994		Poland	14 Jun 1994	
Denmark	14 Jun 1994		Russian Federation	14 Jun 1994	
European Community	14 Jun 1994		Slovakia	14 Jun 1994	
Finland	14 Jun 1994		Slovenia	14 Jun 1994	
France	14 Jun 1994		Spain	14 Jun 1994	
Germany	14 Jun 1994		Sweden	14 Jun 1994	19 Jul 1995
Greece	14 Jun 1994		Switzerland	14 Jun 1994	
Hungary	9 Dec 1994		Ukraine	14 Jun 1994	
Ireland	17 Oct 1994		United Kingdom	14 Jun 1994	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 9 of the [said Protocol], that it accepts both means of dispute settlement referred to in that paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

NOTES:

1 United Nations, *Resolutions of the Economic and Social Council*, 4th session, 28–29 March 1942 (E/437), p. 10.

2 With a declaration to the effect that this signature also commits the Flemish region, the Wallone region and the region of the capital Brussels.

3 For the Kingdom in Europe.

2. Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer

Concluded at Vienna on 22 March 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 September 1988, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 22 September 1988, No. 26164.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1513,
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 152.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Conference on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and open for signature at Vienna from 22 March 1985 to 21 September 1985, and at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 22 September 1985 until 21 March 1986.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		20 Oct 1992 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		3 Dec 1992 *a*
Argentina	22 Mar 1985	18 Jan 1990
Australia		16 Sep 1987 *a*
Austria	16 Sep 1985	19 Aug 1987
Bahamas		1 Apr 1993 *a*
Bahrain		27 Apr 1990 *a*
Bangladesh		2 Aug 1990 *a*
Barbados		16 Oct 1992 *a*
Belarus	22 Mar 1985	20 Jun 1986 *A*
Belgium	22 Mar 1985	17 Oct 1988
Benin		1 Jul 1993 *a*
Bolivia		3 Oct 1994 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		4 Dec 1991 *a*
Brazil		19 Mar 1990 *a*
Brunei Darussalam		26 Jul 1990 *a*
Bulgaria		20 Nov 1990 *a*
Burkina Faso	12 Dec 1985	30 Mar 1989
Cameroon		30 Aug 1989 *a*
Canada	22 Mar 1985	4 Jun 1986
Central African Republic		29 Mar 1993 *a*
Chad		18 May 1989 *a*
Chile	22 Mar 1985	6 Mar 1990
China		11 Sep 1989 *a*
Colombia		16 Jul 1990 *a*
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 *a*
Congo		16 Nov 1994 *a*
Costa Rica		30 Jul 1991 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Croatia		21 Sep 1992 *d*
Cuba		14 Jul 1992 *a*
Cyprus		28 May 1992 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		24 Jan 1995 *a*
Denmark	22 Mar 1985	29 Sep 1988
Dominica		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		18 May 1993 *a*
Ecuador		10 Apr 1990 *a*
Egypt	22 Mar 1985	9 May 1988
El Salvador		2 Oct 1992 *a*
Equatorial Guinea		17 Aug 1988 *a*
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 *a*
European Community	22 Mar 1985	17 Oct 1988 *AA*
Fiji		23 Oct 1989 *a*
Finland	22 Mar 1985	26 Sep 1986
France	22 Mar 1985	4 Dec 1987 *AA*
Gabon		9 Feb 1994 *a*
Gambia		25 Jul 1990 *a*
Germany[2,3]	22 Mar 1985	30 Sep 1988
Ghana		24 Jul 1989 *a*
Greece	22 Mar 1985	29 Dec 1988
Grenada		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Guatemala		11 Sep 1987 *a*
Guinea		25 Jun 1992 *a*
Guyana		12 Aug 1993 *a*
Honduras		14 Oct 1993 *a*
Hungary		4 May 1988 *a*
Iceland		29 Aug 1989 *a*
India		18 Mar 1991 *a*
Indonesia		26 Jun 1992 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Oct 1990 *a*
Ireland		15 Sep 1988 *a*
Israel		30 Jun 1992 *a*
Italy	22 Mar 1985	19 Sep 1988
Jamaica		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Japan		30 Sep 1988 *a*
Jordan		31 May 1989 *a*
Kenya		9 Nov 1988 *a*
Kiribati		7 Jan 1993 *a*
Kuwait		23 Nov 1992 *a*
Latvia		28 Apr 1995 *a*
Lebanon		30 Mar 1993 *a*
Lesotho		25 Mar 1994 *a*
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1989 *a*
Lithuania		18 Jan 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	17 Apr 1985	17 Oct 1988
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		11 Jul 1990 *a*
Lithuania		18 Jan 1995 *a*
Malawi		9 Jan 1991 *a*
Malaysia		29 Aug 1989 *a*
Maldives		26 Apr 1988 *a*
Mali		28 Oct 1994 *a*
Malta		15 Sep 1988 *a*
Marshall Islands		11 Mar 1993 *a*
Mauritania		26 May 1994 *a*
Mauritius		18 Aug 1992 *a*
Mexico	1 Apr 1985	14 Sep 1987
Micronesia (Federated States of)		3 Aug 1994 *a*
Monaco		12 Mar 1993 *a*
Morocco	7 Feb 1986	28 Dec 1995
Mozambique		9 Sep 1994 *a*
Myanmar		24 Nov 1993 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)
Namibia		20 Sep 1993 *a*
Nepal		6 Jul 1994 *a*
Netherlands[4]	22 Mar 1985	28 Sep 1988 *A*
New Zealand[5]	21 Mar 1986	2 Jun 1987
Nicaragua		5 Mar 1993 *a*
Niger		9 Oct 1992 *a*
Nigeria		31 Oct 1988 *a*
Norway	22 Mar 1985	23 Sep 1986
Pakistan		18 Dec 1992 *a*
Panama		13 Feb 1989 *a*
Papua New Guinea		27 oct 1992 *a*
Paraguay		3 Dec 1992 *a*
Peru	22 Mar 1985	7 Apr 1989
Philippines		17 Jul 1991 *a*
Poland		13 Jul 1990 *a*
Portugal[6]		17 Oct 1988 *a*
Republic of Korea		27 Feb 1992 *a*
Romania		27 Jan 1993 *a*
Russian Federation	22 Mar 1985	18 Jun 1986 *A*
Saint Kitts and Nevis		10 Aug 1992 *a*
Saint Lucia		28 Jul 1993 *a*
Samoa		21 Dec 1992 *a*
Saudi Arabia		1 Mar 1993 *a*
Senegal		19 Mar 1993 *a*
Seychelles		6 Jan 1993 *a*
Singapore		5 Jan 1989 *a*
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		17 Jun 1993 *a*
South Africa		15 Jan 1990 *a*
Spain		25 Jul 1988 *a*
Sri Lanka		15 Dec 1989 *a*
Sudan		29 Jan 1993 *a*
Swaziland		10 Nov 1992 *a*
Sweden	22 Mar 1985	26 Nov 1986
Switzerland	22 Mar 1985	17 Dec 1987
Syrian Arab Republic		12 Dec 1989 *a*
Thailand		7 Jul 1989 *a*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Togo		25 Feb 1991 *a*
Trinidad and Tobago		28 Aug 1989 *a*
Tunisia		25 Sep 1989 *a*
Turkey		20 Sep 1991 *a*
Turkmenistan		18 Nov 1993 *a*
Tuvalu		15 Jul 1993 *a*
Uganda		24 Jun 1988 *a*
Ukraine	22 Mar 1985	18 Jun 1986 *A*
United Arab Emirates		22 Dec 1989 *a*
United Kingdom[7]	20 May 1985	15 May 1987
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Apr 1993 *a*
United States of America	22 Mar 1985	27 Aug 1986
Uruguay		27 Feb 1989 *a*
Uzbekistan		18 May 1993 *a*
Vanuatu		21 Nov 1994 *a*
Venezuela		1 Sep 1988 *a*
Viet Nam		26 Jan 1994 *a*
Yugoslavia		16 Apr 1990 *a*
Zaire		30 Nov 1994 *a*
Zambia		24 Jan 1990 *a*
Zimbabwe		3 Nov 1992 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN[8]

Declaration:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

23 May 1989

"1. On behalf of the European Community, it is hereby declared that the said Community can accept arbitration as a means of dispute settlement within the terms of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer.

It cannot accept submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice."

"2. According to the customary procedures within the European Community, the Community's financial participation in the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and in the Montreal Protocol on substances that deplete the Ozone Layer may not involve the Community in expenditure other than administrative costs which may not exceed 2.5% of the total administrative costs."

FINLAND

"With respect to article 11, paragraph 3 of the Convention Finland declares that it accepts both of the said means of dispute settlement as compulsory."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 11, paragraph 3, of the Convention the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 of article 11 of the above-mentioned Convention, both of the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

(a) arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting;

(b) submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

NORWAY

"Norway accepts the means of dispute settlement as described in art. 11, para 3 (a) and (b) of the Convention as compulsory, that is a) arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by

the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting, or b) submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

SWEDEN

"Sweden accepts the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice [article 11, paragraph 3 (b)]

It is however, the intention of the Swedish Government to accept also the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

Arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting [article 11, paragraph 3 (a)].

A declaration in this latter respect will, however, not be given until the procedures for arbitration have been adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting."

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 1 October 1990. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 25 January 1989. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 23 February 1989, from the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the following declaration:

As regards the application to Berlin (West) of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer of 22 March 1985 it is the understanding of the German Democratic Republic that the provisions of that Convention are applied to Berlin (West) in accordance with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 under which Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and must not be governed by it.

See also note 2 above.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[5] The instrument of ratification indicates that in accordance with the special relationship which exists between New Zealand and the Cook Islands and between New Zealand and Niue, there have been consultations regarding the Convention between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Cook Islands and between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Niue; that the Government of the Cook Islands, which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in the Cook Islands, has requested that the Convention should extend to the Cook Islands; that the Government of Niue which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in Niue, has requested that the Convention should extend to Niue. The said instrument specifies that accordingly the Convention shall apply also to the Cook Islands and Niue.

[6] On 15 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal a notification to the effect that it shall extend the Convention to Macau.

[7] The instrument of ratification specifies that the said Convention is ratified in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Monserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, and United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 11 September 1987, from the Government of Argentina the following objection, which was reiterated upon its ratification of the Convention:

The Argentine Republic rejects the ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and reaffirms its sovereignty over those Islands, which form a part of its national territory.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12 and 39/6 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute concerning the question of the Malvinas and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute and to their remaining differences relating to the question, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made. The United Nations General Assembly also adopted resolution 40/21 and 41/40, which again urge the two parties to resume the negotiations.

The Argentine Republic also rejects the ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to what that country calls "British Antarctic Territory".

At the same time, it reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Argentine Antarctic Sector located between longitudes 25° and 74° W and latitude 60° S and the South Pole, including its maritime spaces.

It is appropriate to recall, in this connection, the provisions concerning rights of or claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica contained in article IV of the Antarctic Treaty.

Subsequently, on 1 August 1988, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication concerning the said objection by Argentina:

"The Government of the United Kingdom reject the objection made regarding the application of the Convention by the United Kingdom to the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and their consequent right to extend treaties to those territories.

With respect to the objection by the Argentine Republic to the application of the Convention to the British Antarctic Territory, the Government of the United Kingdom have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Antarctic Territory, and note the Argentine reference to article IV of the Antarctic Treaty to which both the Government of Argentina and the Government of the United Kingdom are parties."

Upon its ratification of the Convention, the Government of Argentina objected anew to the declaration of territorial applications in question by the Government of the United Kingdom, which in turn reiterated its position in an additional communication received on 6 July 1990.

Subsequently, the Government of Chile, upon ratification, declared the following:

The Government of Chile [. . .] states that it rejects the declarations made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland upon ratification of the Convention and by the Argentine Republic in objecting to that declaration, inasmuch as both declarations affect Chilean Antarctic territory, including the corresponding maritime jurisdictions. It once again reaffirms its sovereignty over that territory, including its sovereign maritime spaces, in accordance with the definition established by Supreme Decree 1, 747, of 6 November 1940.

By a communication received on 30 August 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified

the Secretary-General that the Convention and the Protocol shall extend to the Bailiwick of Guernsey for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of Mauritius, upon acceding to the Convention, made the following declaration:

"The Republic of Mauritius rejects the ratification of [the Convention] effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 15 May 1987 in respect of the British Indian Ocean Territory namely Chagos Archipelago and reaffirms its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, which form an integral part of its national territory."

Subsequently, on 27 January 1993, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication with respect to the declaration made by the Government of Mauritius:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Indian Ocean Territory and their consequent right to extend the application of the [said] Convention and Protocol to it. Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept or regard as having any legal effect the declarations made by the Government of the Republic of Mauritius.

[8] In this regard, the Government of Israel notified the Secretary-General, on 18 July 1990, of the following:

In the view of the Government of the State of Israel such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Convention and Protocol and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain under general international law or under particular conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity."

(*a*) Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Concluded at Montreal on 16 September 1987

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1989, in accordance with article 16 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1989, No. 26369.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 1522; and depositary notifications C.N.285.1988.TREATIES-15 of 20 January 1989 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Spanish text); C.N.181.1989.TREATIES-9 of 28 August 1989 (modification of Annex A); C.N.225.1990.TREATIES-7 of 7 September 1990 (adoption of adjustments); C.N.246.1990.TREATIES-9 of 14 November 1990 (amendment); C.N.133.1991.TREATIES-3/2 of 27 August 1991 (rectification of the Spanish text of the adjustments and amendment); C.N.227.1991.TREATIES-7 of 27 November 1991 (adoption of Annex D.)[1]; C.N.428.1992.TREATIES–12 of 22 March 1993 (adoption of adjustments and amendment of 1993); C.N.200.1993.TREATIES–2 of 17 September 1992 (procès–verbal of rectification of the original English text of the 1992 amendment); and C.N.484.1995.TREATIES–5 of 5 February 1996 (adoption of adjustments).
STATUS: Signatories: 46. Parties: 151.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Protocol on Chlorofluorocarbons to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, held in Montreal from14 to 16 September 1987. Open for signature in Montreal on 16 September 1987, in Ottawa from17 September 1987 to 16 January 1988 and at United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 17 January 1988 to 15 September 1988, in accordance with article 15.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria		20 Oct 1992 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda		3 Dec 1992 *a*
Argentina	29 Jun 1988	18 Sep 1990
Australia	8 Jun 1988	19 May 1989
Austria	29 Aug 1988	3 May 1989
Bahamas		4 May 1993 *a*
Bahrain		27 Apr 1990 *a*
Bangladesh		2 Aug 1990 *a*
Barbados		16 Oct 1992 *a*
Belarus	22 Jan 1988	31 Oct 1988 *A*
Belgium	16 Sep 1987	30 Dec 1988
Benin		1 Jul 1993 *a*
Bolivia		3 Oct 1994 *a*
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 *d*
Botswana		4 Dec 1991 *a*
Brazil		19 Mar 1990 *a*
Brunei Darussalam		27 May 1993 *a*
Bulgaria		20 Nov 1990 *a*
Burkina Faso	14 Sep 1988	20 Jul 1989
Cameroon		30 Aug 1989 *a*
Canada	16 Sep 1987	30 Jun 1988
Central African Republic		29 Mar 1993 *a*
Chad		7 Jun 1994 *a*
Chile	14 Jun 1988	26 Mar 1990
China		14 Jun 1991 *a*
Colombia		6 Dec 1993 *a*
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 *a*
Congo	15 Sep 1988	16 Nov 1994
Costa Rica		30 Jul 1991 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Croatia		21 Sep 1992 *d*
Cuba		14 Jul 1992 *a*
Cyprus		28 May 1992 *a*
Czech Republic[2]		30 Sep 1993 *d*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		24 Jan 1995 *a*
Denmark[3]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988
Dominica		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic		18 May 1993 *a*
Ecuador		30 Apr 1990 *a*
Egypt	16 Sep 1987	2 Aug 1988
El Salvador		2 Oct 1992 *a*
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 *a*
European Community	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988 *AA*
Fiji		23 Oct 1989 *a*
Finland	16 Sep 1987	23 Dec 1988 *A*
France	16 Sep 1987	28 Dec 1988 *AA*
Gabon		9 Feb 1994 *a*
Gambia		25 Jul 1990 *a*
Germany[4,5]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988
Ghana	16 Sep 1987	24 Jul 1989
Greece	29 Oct 1987	29 Dec 1988
Grenada		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Guatemala		7 Nov 1989 *a*
Guinea		25 Jun 1992 *a*
Guyana		12 Aug 1993 *a*
Honduras		14 Oct 1993 *a*
Hungary		20 Apr 1989 *a*
Iceland		29 Aug 1989 *a*
India		19 Jun 1992 *a*
Indonesia	21 Jul 1988	26 Jun 1992
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Oct 1990 *a*
Ireland	15 Sep 1988	16 Dec 1988
Israel	14 Jan 1988	30 Jun 1992
Italy	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988
Jamaica		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Japan	16 Sep 1987	30 Sep 1988 *A*
Jordan		31 May 1989 *a*
Kenya	16 Sep 1987	9 Nov 1988
Kiribati		7 Jan 1993 *a*
Kuwait		23 Nov 1992 *a*
Latvia		28 Apr 1995 *a*
Lebanon		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Lesotho		25 Mar 1994 *a*
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		11 Jul 1990 *a*

Participant	Signature	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1989 *a*
Lithuania		18 Jan 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	29 Jan 1988	17 Oct 1988
Malawi		9 Jan 1991 *a*
Malaysia		29 Aug 1989 *a*
Maldives	12 Jul 1988	16 May 1989
Mali		28 Oct 1994 *a*
Malta	15 Sep 1988	29 Dec 1988
Marshall Islands		11 Mar 1993 *a*
Mauritania		26 May 1994 *a*
Mauritius		18 Aug 1992 *a*
Mexico	16 Sep 1987	31 Mar 1988 *A*
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Sept 1995 *a*
Monaco		12 Mar 1993 *a*
Morocco	7 Jan 1988	28 Dec 1995
Mozambique		9 Sep 1994 *a*
Myanmar		24 Nov 1993 *a*
Namibia		20 Sep 1993 *a*
Nepal		6 Jul 1994 *a*
Netherlands[6]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988 *A*
New Zealand[7]	16 Sep 1987	21 Jul 1988
Nicaragua		5 Mar 1993 *a*
Niger		9 Oct 1992 *a*
Nigeria		31 Oct 1988 *a*
Norway	16 Sep 1987	24 Jun 1988
Pakistan		18 Dec 1992 *a*
Panama	16 Sep 1987	3 Mar 1989
Papua New Guinea		27 Oct 1992 *a*
Paraguay		3 Dec 1992 *a*
Peru		31 Mar 1993 *a*
Philippines	14 Sep 1988	17 Jul 1991
Poland		13 Jul 1990 *a*
Portugal[8]	16 Sep 1987	17 Oct 1988
Republic of Korea		27 Feb 1992 *a*
Romania		27 Jan 1993 *a*
Russian Federation	29 Dec 1987	10 Nov 1988 *A*
Saint Kitts and Nevis		10 Aug 1992 *a*
Saint Lucia		28 Jul 1993 *a*
Samoa		21 Dec 1992 *a*
Saudi Arabia		1 Mar 1993 *a*
Senegal	16 Sep 1987	6 May 1993
Seychelles		6 Jan 1993 *a*
Singapore		5 Jan 1989 *a*
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 *d*
Solomon Islands		17 Jun 1993 *a*
South Africa		15 Jan 1990 *a*
Spain	21 Jul 1988	16 Dec 1988
Sri Lanka		15 Dec 1989 *a*
Sudan		29 Jan 1993 *a*
Swaziland		10 Nov 1992 *a*
Sweden	16 Sep 1987	29 Jun 1988
Switzerland	16 Sep 1987	28 Dec 1988
Syrian Arab Republic		12 Dec 1989 *a*
Thailand	15 Sep 1988	7 Jul 1989
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Togo	16 Sep 1987	25 Feb 1991
Trinidad and Tobago		28 Aug 1989 *a*
Tunisia		25 Sep 1989 *a*
Turkey		20 Sep 1991 *a*
Turkmenistan		18 Nov 1993 *a*
Tuvalu		15 Jul 1993 *a*
Uganda	15 Sep 1988	15 Sep 1988
Ukraine	18 Feb 1988	20 Sep 1988 *A*
United Arab Emirates		22 Dec 1989 *a*
United Kingdom[9]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988
United Republic of Tanzania		16 Apr 1993 *a*
United States of America	16 Sep 1987	21 Apr 1988
Uruguay		8 Jan 1991 *a*
Uzbekistan		18 May 1993 *a*
Vanuatu		21 Nov 1994 *a*
Venezuela	16 Sep 1987	6 Feb 1989
Viet Nam		26 Jan 1994 *a*
Yugoslavia		3 Jan 1991 *a*
Zaire		30 Nov 1994 *a*
Zambia		24 Jan 1990 *a*
Zimbabwe		3 Nov 1992 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

[See under chapter XXVII.2.]

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"In the light of article 2.8 of the Protocol, the Community wishes to state that its signature Takes place on the assumption that all its member states will take the necessary steps to adhere to the Convention and to conclude the Protocol."

23 May 1989

[See under chapter XXVII.2.]

NOTES:

[1] On 27 May 1992, the Government of Singapore notified the Secretary–General, in accordance with article 10 (2) (b) of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, of the following:

"Singapore is still in the process of evaluating the feasibility of imposing controls on all the products listed in Annex D. In the interim, Singapore can only approve the intention to ban import of the following:

(a) All products classified under item 2 of Annex D except domestic refrigerators and freezers; and

(b) All products classified under item 3 of Annex D."

Consequently, on the expiry of six months from the date of its circulation, i.e. 27 May 1992, in accordance with the provisions of article 10 (2) (c) of the Vienna Convention, Annex D became effective in its entirety for all Parties to the Montreal Protocol, with the exception

of Singapore, for which the Annex became effective only with respect of the products described above.

Subsequently, on 20 April 1993, the Government of Singapore informed the Secretary-General that "the Republic of Singapore is now in a position to approve the full list of products under Annex D... with immediate effect."

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 1 October 1990. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] Decision reserved as concerns the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

On 20 December 1991, the Government Denmark informed the Secretary-General that the reservation for the application to Greenland was lifted, whereas the reservation for the application to the Faroe Islands still applies.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 25 January 1989. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a letter accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany. See also note 4 above.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[7] Upon ratification the Government of New Zealand specified that the Protocol shall not apply to the Cook Islands and Niue.

[8] On 15 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal a notification to the effect that it shall extend the Protocol and 1990 Amendment to Macau.

[9] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina upon its ratification, an objection, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one it made on this subject with respect of the Convention (see note 2 in chapter XXVII.2).

Further, upon ratification, the Government of Chile declared the following:

> [Chile] rejects the declaration made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland upon ratification, as it concerns the Chilean Antarctic Territory, including the corresponding maritime zones: [Chile] reaffirms once more its sovereignty over the said territory including its maritime areas, as defined by Supreme Decree No. 1747 of 6 November 1940.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 August 1990, from the Government of the United Kingdom, the following objection:

> "The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Antarctic Territory. In this respect, the Government of the United Kingdom would draw attention to the provisions of Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty of 1 December 1959, to which both Chile and the United Kingdom are parties.
>
> For the above reasons, the Government of the United Kingdom reject the Chilean declaration."

In a communication received on 30 August 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General that the Protocol shall extend to the Bailiwick of Guernsey for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of Mauritius, upon acceding to the Convention, made the following declaration:

> "The Republic of Mauritius rejects the ratification of [the Protocol] effected by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 16 December 1988 in respect of the British Indian Ocean Territory namely Chagos Archipelago and reaffirms its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, which form an integral part of its national territory."

Subsequently, on 27 January 1993, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication with respect to the declaration made by the Government of Mauritius:

[For the text of the communication, see note 7 in chapter XXVII.2.]

(*b*) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Adopted at the Second Meeting of the Parties at London on 29 June 1990

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 August 1992, in accordance with article 2 (1) of the amendment.
REGISTRATION: 10 August 1992, No. 23639.
TEXT: Annex II of the Report of the Second Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.2/3); and depositary notification C.N.133.1991.TREATIES-3/2 of 27 August 1991 (rectification of the Spanish authentic text of the adjustments and amendment).
STATUS: Parties: 104.

Note: The amendment was adopted by Decision II/2 of 29 June 1990 at the Second Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, which was held at the Headquarters of the International Maritime Organization, in London, from 27 to 29 June 1990.

Participant	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Algeria	20 Oct 1992 *a*
Antigua and Barbuda	23 Feb 1993 *a*
Argentina	4 Dec 1992 *a*
Australia	11 Aug 1992 *A*
Austria	11 Dec 1992
Bahamas	4 May 1993 *A*
Bahrain	23 Dec 1992 *A*
Bangladesh	18 Mar 1994
Barbados	20 Jul 1994 *A*
Belgium	5 Oct 1993
Bolivia	3 Oct 1994 *a*
Brazil	1 Oct 1992 *A*
Burkina Faso	10 Jun 1994
Cameroon	8 Jun 1992 *A*
Canada	5 Jul 1990 *A*
Chile	9 Apr 1992 *A*
China	14 Jun 1991 *a*
Colombia	6 Dec 1993 *a*
Comoros	31 Oct 1994 *a*
Congo	16 Nov 1994
Côte d'Ivoire	18 May 1994
Croatia	15 Oct 1993
Cyprus	11 Oct 1994 *A*
Denmark[1]	20 Dec 1991 *A*
Dominica	31 Mar 1993 *a*
Ecuador	23 Feb 1993
Egypt	13 Jan 1993
European Community	20 Dec 1991 *AA*
Fiji	9 Dec 1994 *a*
Finland	20 Dec 1991 *A*
France	12 Feb 1992 *AA*
Gambia	13 Mar 1995
Germany	27 Dec 1991
Ghana	24 Jul 1992
Greece	11 May 1993
Grenada	7 Dec 1993 *a*
Guinea	25 Jun 1992 *a*
Hungary	9 Nov 1993 *AA*
Iceland	16 Jun 1993
India	19 Jun 1992 *a*
Indonesia	26 Jun 1992
Ireland	20 Dec 1991 *A*
Israel	30 Jun 1992
Italy	21 Feb 1992 *AA*
Jamaica	31 Mar 1993 *a*
Japan	4 Sep 1991 *A*
Jordan	12 Nov 1993
Kenya	27 Sep 1994
Kuwait	22 Jul 1994 *a*
Lebanon	31 Mar 1993 *a*
Liechtenstein	24 Mar 1994
Luxembourg	20 May 1992
Malawi	8 Feb 1994 *A*
Malaysia	16 Jun 1993 *a*
Maldives	31 Jul 1991
Mali	28 Oct 1994 *a*
Malta	4 Feb 1994 *A*
Marshall Islands	11 Mar 1993 *a*
Mauritius	20 Oct 1992 *a*
Mexico	11 Oct 1991 *A*
Monaco	12 Mar 1993 *a*
Morocco	28 Dec 1995 *a*
Mozambique	9 Sep 1994 *a*
Myanmar	24 Nov 1993 *a*
Nepal	6 Jul 1994 *a*
Netherlands[2]	20 Dec 1991 *A*
New Zealand	1 Oct 1990 *A*
Norway	18 Nov 1991
Pakistan	18 Dec 1992 *a*
Panama	10 Feb 1994
Papua New Guinea	4 May 1993 *A*
Paraguay	3 Dec 1992 *a*
Peru	31 Mar 1993 *a*
Philippines	9 Aug 1993
Portugal[3]	24 Nov 1992
Republic of Korea	10 Dec 1992 *a*
Romania	27 Jan 1993 *a*
Russian Federation	13 Jan 1992 *A*
Saudi Arabia	1 Mar 1993 *a*
Senegal	6 May 1993
Seychelles	6 Jan 1993 *a*
Singapore	2 Mar 1993 *a*
Slovakia	15 Apr 1994 *AA*
Slovenia	8 Dec 1992 *A*
South Africa	12 May 1992 *A*
Spain	19 May 1992 *A*
Sri Lanka	16 Jun 1993 *a*
Sweden	2 Aug 1991
Switzerland	16 Sep 1992
Thailand	25 Jun 1992
Tunisia	15 Jul 1993 *a*
Turkey	13 Apr 1995
Turkmenistan	15 Mar 1994 *a*
Uganda	20 Jan 1994
United Kingdom[4]	20 Dec 1991
United Republic of Tanzania	16 Apr 1993 *a*

Participant	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)	Participant	Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)
United States of America	18 Dec 1991	Viet Nam	26 Jan 1994 *a*
Uruguay	16 Nov 1993 *a*	Zaire	30 Nov 1994 *a*
Vanuatu	21 Nov 1994 *A*	Zambia	15 Apr 1994
Venezuela	29 Jul 1993	Zimbabwe	3 Jun 1994

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The acceptance by the State of Bahrain of the said Amendments shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

JAPAN

Declaration:

It is hereby declared that the Government of Japan accepts the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, in accordance with the provisions of article 9 of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer.

NOTES:

[1] Decision reserved as to the application to the Faroe Islands.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

In a communication received on 16 March 1992, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that "the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the Amendment . . . for Aruba, and [declares] that the provisions so accepted shall be observed in their entirety."

[3] See note 8 in chapter XXVII.2 *a)*.

[4] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Gibraltar.

Subsequently, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the amendment shall extend to the following territories on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Date of the notification:	*Territorial application:*
8 September 1993	Hong Kong, British Antarctic Territory and the Bailiwick of Guernsey
4 January 1995	The Bailiwick of Jersey
30 October 1995	The British Virgin Islands

(c) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Adopted at the Fourth Meeting of the Parties at Copenhagen on 25 November 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 June 1994, in accordance with article 3 (1) of the Amendment.
REGISTRATION: 14 June 1994, No. 26369.
TEXT: Annex III of the Report of the Fourth Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.4/15); depositary notifications C.N.200.1993.TREATIES–2 of 17 September 1993 (procès–verbal of rectification of the English authentic text of the amendment); C.N.96.1994.TREATIES–3 of 16 August 1994 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts); and C.N.279.1994.TREATIES–8 of 14 December 1994 (procès–verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts).
STATUS: Parties: 51.

Note: The amendment was adopted by Decision IV/4 (amendment) at the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, which was held in Copenhagen from 23 to 25 November 1992.

Participant	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Antigua and Barbuda	19 Jul 1993 *a*	Malaysia	5 Aug 1993 *a*
Argentina	20 Apr 1995 *a*	Marshall Islands	24 May 1993 *A*
Australia	30 Jun 1994 *A*	Mauritius	30 Nov 1993
Bahamas	4 May 1993 *A*	Mexico	16 Sep 1994 *A*
Barbados	20 Jul 1994 *A*	Morocco	28 Dec 1995 *a*
Bolivia	3 Oct 1994 *a*	Mozambique	9 Sep 1994 *a*
Burkina Faso	12 Dec 1995	Netherlands	25 Apr 1994 *A*
Canada	16 Mar 1994	New Zealand[2]	4 Jun 1993
Chile	14 Jan 1994	Norway	3 Sep 1993
Denmark[1]	21 Dec 1993 *A*	Pakistan	17 Feb 1995
Egypt	28 Jun 1994	Republic of Korea	2 Dec 1994 *A*
Ecuador	24 Nov 1993 *a*	Saint Kitts and Nevis	19 May 1994 *a*
European Community	20 Nov 1995 *AA*	Saudi Arabia	1 Mar 1993 *a*
Finland	16 Nov 1993 *A*	Seychelles	27 May 1993
Germany	28 Dec 1993	Spain	5 Jun 1995 *A*
Greece	30 Jan 1995	Sweden	9 Aug 1993
Hungary	17 May 1994 *a*	Thailand	1 Dec 1995
Iceland	15 Mar 1994	Tunisia	2 Feb 1995 *a*
Israel	5 Apr 1995	Turkey	10 Nov 1995
Italy	4 Jan 1995	United Kingdom[3]	4 Jan 1995
Japan	20 Dec 1994 *A*	United States of America	2 Mar 1994
Jordan	30 Jun 1995	Vanuatu	21 Nov 1994 A
Kenya	27 Sep 1994	Viet Nam	26 Jan 1994 *a*
Kuwait	22 Jul 1994 *a*	Zaire	30 Nov 1994 *a*
Luxembourg	9 May 1994	Zimbabwe	3 Jun 1994
Malawi	28 Feb 1994 *A*		

NOTES:

[1] With reservation of application to the Faroe Ilands.

[2] With extension to Tokelaou.

[3] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Guernsey and the Bailiwick of Jersey.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 30 October 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary–General that the amendment shall apply to the British Virgin Islands and Hong Kong, for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

3. Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

Concluded at Basel on 22 March 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 May 1992, in accordance with article 25 (1) of the Convention.
REGISTRATION: 5 May 1992, No. 28911.
TEXT: Doc. UNEP/WG.190/4; and depositary notifications C.N.302.1992.TREATIES-9 of 25 November 1992 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English text)[1]; C.N.248.1993.TREATIES-7 of 7 September 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic French text); and C.N.144.1994.TREATIES-4 of 27 June 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English and Spanish texts).
STATUS: Signatories: 53. Parties: 97.

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted on 22 March 1989 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries which was convened at Basel from 20 to 22 March 1989. In accordance with its article 21, the Convention which was open for signature at the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland in Berne from 23 March 1989 to 30 June 1989, was open thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 22 March 1990, by all States, Namibia, and by political and/or economic integration organizations[2].

Participant	*Signature*	*Formal confirmation (c), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)*
Afghanistan	22 Mar 1989	
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 *a*
Argentina	28 Jun 1989	27 Jun 1991
Australia		5 Feb 1992 *a*
Austria	19 Mar 1990	12 Jan 1993
Bahamas		12 Aug 1992 *a*
Bahrain	22 Mar 1989	15 Oct 1992
Bangladesh		1 Apr 1993 *a*
Barbados		24 Aug 1995 *a*
Belgium	22 Mar 1989	1 Nov 1993
Bolivia	22 Mar 1989	
Brazil		1 Oct 1992 *a*
Canada	22 Mar 1989	28 Aug 1992
Chile	19 Jan 1990	11 Aug 1992
China	22 Mar 1990	17 Dec 1991
Colombia	22 Mar 1989	
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 *a*
Costa Rica		7 Mar 1995 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire		1 Dec 1994 *a*
Croatia		9 May 1994 *a*
Cuba		3 Oct 1994 *a*
Cyprus	22 Mar 1989	17 Sep 1992
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sept 1993 *d*
Denmark	22 Mar 1989	6 Feb 1994 *AA*
Ecuador	22 Mar 1989	23 Feb 1993
Egypt[4]		8 Jan 1993 *a*
El Salvador	22 Mar 1990	13 Dec 1991
Estonia		21 Jul 1992 *a*
European Community	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994 *AA*
Finland	22 Mar 1989	19 Nov 1991 *A*
France	22 Mar 1989	7 Jan 1991 *AA*
Germany[5]	23 Oct 1989	21 Apr 1995
Greece	22 Mar 1989	4 Aug 1994
Guatemala	22 Mar 1989	15 May 1995
Guinea		26 Apr 1995 *a*
Haiti	22 Mar 1989	
Honduras		27 Dec 1995 *a*
Hungary	22 Mar 1989	21 May 1990 *AA*
Iceland		28 Jun 1995 *a*
India	15 Mar 1990	24 Jun 1992
Indonesia		20 Sep 1993 *a*
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jan 1993 *a*
Ireland	31 Jan 1990	7 Feb 1994
Israel	22 Mar 1989	14 Dec 1994
Italy	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994
Japan		17 Sep 1993 *a*
Jordan	22 Mar 1989	22 Jun 1989 *AA*
Kuwait	22 Mar 1989	11 Oct 1993
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 *a*
Lebanon	22 Mar 1989	21 Dec 1994
Liechtenstein	22 Mar 1989	27 Jan 1992
Luxembourg	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994
Malawi		21 Apr 1994 *a*
Malaysia		8 Oct 1993 *a*
Maldives		28 Apr 1992 *a*
Mauritius		24 Nov 1992 *a*
Mexico	22 Mar 1989	22 Feb 1991
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Sep 1995 *a*
Monaco		31 Aug 1992 *a*
Morocco		28 Dec 1995 *a*
Namibia		15 May 1995 *a*
Netherlands[6]	22 Mar 1989	16 Apr 1993 *A*
New Zealand[7]	18 Dec 1989	20 Dec 1994
Nigeria	15 Mar 1990	13 Mar 1991
Norway	22 Mar 1989	2 Jul 1990
Oman		8 Feb 1995 *a*
Pakistan		26 Jul 1994 *a*
Panama	22 Mar 1989	22 Feb 1991
Papua New Guinea		1 Sep 1995 *a*
Paraguay		28 Sep 1995 *a*
Peru		23 Nov 1993 *a*
Philippines	22 Mar 1989	21 Oct 1993
Poland	22 Mar 1990	20 Mar 1992
Portugal	26 Jun 1989	26 Jan 1994
Qatar		9 Aug 1995 *a*
Republic of Korea		28 Feb 1994 *a*
Romania		27 Feb 1991 *a*
Russian Federation	22 Mar 1990	31 Jan 1995
Saudi Arabia	22 Mar 1989	7 Mar 1990
Senegal		10 Nov 1992 *a*

Participant	Signature	Formal confirmation (c), ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a), succession (d)
Seychelles		11 May 1993 *a*
Saint Kitts and Nevis		7 Sep 1994 *a*
Saint Lucia		9 Dec 1993 *a*
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Slovenia		7 Oct 1993 *a*
South Africa		5 May 1994 *a*
Spain	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994
Sri Lanka		28 Aug 1992 *a*
Sweden	22 Mar 1989	2 Aug 1991
Switzerland	22 Mar 1989	31 Jan 1990
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Oct 1989	22 Jan 1992
Thailand	22 Mar 1990	
Trinidad and Tobago		18 Feb 1994 *a*
Tunisia		11 Oct 1995 *a*
Turkey	22 Mar 1989	22 Jun 1994
United Arab Emirates	22 Mar 1989	17 Nov 1992
United Kingdom[8]	6 Oct 1989	7 Feb 1994
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Apr 1993 *a*
United States of America	22 Mar 1990	
Uruguay	22 Mar 1989	20 Dec 1991
Venezuela	22 Mar 1989	
Viet Nam		13 Mar 1995 *a*
Zaire		6 Oct 1994 *a*
Zambia		15 Nov 1994 *a*

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon formal confirmation, ratification, acceptance,approval, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

CHILE

Declaration:

The Government of Chile considers that the provisions of this Convention [...] help to consolidate and expand the legal regime that Chile has established through various international instruments on the control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and their disposal, whose scope of application covers both the continental territory of the Republic and its area of jurisdiction situated south of latitude 60° S, in accordance with the provisions of article 4, paragraph 6, of the present Convention.

COLOMBIA

Upon signature:

It is the understanding of Colombia that the implementation of the present Convention shall in no case restrict, but rather shall strengthen, the application of the juridical and political principles which, as [was] made clear in the statement [made on 21 March to the Basel Conference], govern the actions taken by the Colombian State in matters covered by the Convention – in other words, *inter alia*, the latter may in no case be interpreted or applied in a manner inconsistent with the competence of the Colombian State to apply those principles and other norms of its internal rule to its land area (including the subsoil), air space, territorial sea, submarine continental shelf and exclusive economic maritime zone, in accordance with international law.

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, with regard to article 20 of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, that any disputes between Parties as to the interpretation or application of, or compliance with, this Convention or any protocol thereto, shall be settled through negotiation through the diplomatic channel or submitted to arbitration under the conditions set out in Annex VI on arbitration.

DENMARK

Upon signature:

"Denmark's signature of the Global Convention of the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal does not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands."

ECUADOR

Upon signature:

The elements contained in the Convention which has been signed may in no way be interpreted in a manner inconsistent with the domestic legal norms of the Ecuadorian State, or with the exercise of its national sovereignty.

GERMANY[5]

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that the provisions in article 4, paragraph 12 of this Convention shall in no way affect the exercise of navigation rights and freedoms as provided for in international law. Accordingly, it is the view of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to require the giving of notice to or the consent of any State for the passage of hazardous wastes on a vessel under the flag of a party exercising its right of innocent passage through the territorial sea or the freedom of navigation in an exclusive economic zone under international law."

INDONESIA

Declaration:

Mindful of the need to adjust the existing national laws and regulations, the provisions of article 3 (1) of this Convention shall only be implemented by Indonesia after the new revised laws and regulations have been enacted and entered into force.

ITALY

Declaration made on 30 March 1990 and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of Italy declares ... that it is in favour of the establishment of a global control system for the environmentally

sound management of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes.

JAPAN

Declaration:

The Government of Japan declares that nothing in the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal be interpreted as requiring notice to or consent of any State for the mere passage of hazardous wastes or other wastes on a vessel exercising navigational rights and freedoms, as paragraph 12 of article 4 of the said Convention stipulates that nothing in the Convention shall affect in any way the exercise of navigational rights and freedoms as provided for in international law and as reflected in relevant international instruments.

LEBANON

Upon signature:

"[Lebanon] declares that [it] can under no circumstances permit burial of toxic and other wastes in any of the areas subject to its legal authority which they have entered illegally. In 1988, Lebanon announced a total ban on the import of such wastes and adopted Act No. 64/88 of 12 August 1988 to that end. In all such situations, Lebanon will endeavour to co-operate with the States concerned, and with the other States parties, in accordance with the provisions of this treaty."

MEXICO

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Mexico is signing *ad referendum* the Basel Convention on the Control of the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their disposal because it duly protects its rights as a coastal State in the areas subject to its national jurisdiction, including the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf and, in so far as it is relevant, its airspace, and the exercise in those areas of its legislative and administrative competence in relation to the protection and preservation of the environment, as recognized by international law and, in particular, the law of the sea.

Mexico considers that, by means of this Convention, important progress has been made in protection of the environment through the legal regulation of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes. A framework of general obligations for States parties has been established, fundamentally with a view to reducing to a minimum the generation and transboundary movement of dangerous wastes and ensuring their environmentally rational management, promoting international co–operation for those purposes, establishing co–ordination and follow–up machinery and regulating the implementation of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Mexico further hopes that, as an essential supplement to the standard–setting character of the Convention, a protocol will be adopted as soon as possible, establishing, in accordance with the principles and provisions of international law, appropriate procedures in the matter of responsibility and compensation for damage resulting from the transboundary movement and management of dangerous wastes.

NORWAY

"Norway accepts the binding means of settling disputes set out in Article 20, paragraphs 3 (a) and (b), of the Convention, by (a) submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice and/or (b) arbitration in accordance with the procedures set out in Annex VI."

POLAND

Declaration:

With respect to article 20, paragraph2, of the Convention, the Polish Republic declares that it recognizes submission to arbitration in accordance with the procedures and under the conditions set out in Annex VI to the Convention, as compulsory *ipso facto*.

ROMANIA

Declaration:

In conformity with article 26, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Romania declares that the import and the disposal on its national territory of hazardous wastes and other wastes can take place only with the prior approval of the competent Romanian authorities.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Understanding:

The definition of "Territory" in the Cairo Guidelines and Principles for the Environmentally Sound Management of Hazardous Wastes (UNEP Governing Council decision 14/30 of 17 June 1987) to which reference is made in the preamble to the Convention is a special formulation and cannot be used for purposes of interpreting the present Convention or any of its provisions in the light of article 31, paragraph 2, or article 32 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties or on any other basis.

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS

Declaration:

"With respect to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis declares that it recognizes submission to arbitration in accordance with the procedures and the conditions set out in Annex VI to the Convention, as compulsory *ipso facto*."

SPAIN

Declaration:

The Spanish Government declares, in accordance with article 26.2 of the Convention, that the criminal characterization of illegal traffic in hazardous wastes or other wastes, established as an obligation of States Parties under article 4.3, will in future take place within the general framework of reform of the substantive criminal legal order.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that, in accordance with article 4 (12), the provisions of the Convention do not affect in any way the exercise of navigational rights and freedoms as provided for in international law. Accordingly, nothing in this Convention requires notice to or consent of any state for the passage of hazardous wastes on a vessel under the flag of a party, exercising rights of passage through the territorial sea or freedom of navigation in an exclusive economic zone under international law."

URUGUAY

Upon signature:

Uruguay is signing *ad referendum* the Convention on the Control of the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal because it is duly protecting its rights as a par-

ian State in the areas subject to its national jurisdiction, including the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf and, as appropriate, the superjacent air space as well as the exercise in such areas of its standard–setting and administrative competence in connection with the protection and preservation of the environment as recognized by international law and, in particular by the law of the sea.

VENEZUELA

Upon signature:

Venezuela considers that the Convention [as] adopted properly protects its sovereign rights as a riparian State over the areas under its national jurisdiction, including its territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf, and, as appropriate, its air space. The Convention also safeguards the exercise in such areas of its standard-setting and administrative jurisdiction for the purpose of protecting and preserving the environment and its natural resources in accordance with international law, and in particular the law of the sea.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon formal confirmation, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ITALY

The Government of Italy, in expressing its objections *vis-à-vis* the declarations made, upon signature, by the Governments of Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela, as well as other declarations of similar tenor that might be made in the future, considers that no provision of this Convention should be interpreted as restricting navigational rights recognized by international law. Consequently, a State party is not obliged to notify any other State or obtain authorization from it for simple passage through the territorial sea or the exercise of freedom of navigation in the exclusive economic zone by a vessel showing its flag and carrying a cargo of hazardous wastes.

NOTES:

[1] On 16 September 1992, i.e., after the expiry of the 90-day period from the date of its circulation (i.e., 10 June 1992), the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland communicated the following with respect to the corrections proposed by the Government of Japan to article 7 of the Convention:

"The United Kingdom Government has no objection to the first of the ... suggested amendments since this represents the correction of a typographical error rather than a substantive change. With regard to the second proposed change, however, the UK Government would wish to lodge an objection on the following grounds:

i) since the Convention was negotiated predominantly through the English language version of the draft Convention, to amend the text of this version to accord with the text of the other language versions would be to align the original version with translations, rather than vice-versa, which would appear to be more appropriate;

ii) there is a general presumption that a legislative provision should be construed, if at all possible, so as to give it meaning and substance. If the amendment proposed by the Japanese Government was to be accepted, article 7 would confirm what is already explicit in article 6.1 of the Convention (as read in conjunction with article 2.13 which defines the term 'the states concerned'). If, however, article 7 remains un-amended, it will continue to add to the scope of article 6.2 and therefore retain a specific meaning;

iii) the United Kingdom is of the view that the Basel Convention should require of Parties the maximum level of prior notification possible. In the case of a proposed movement of a consignment of hazardous waste from the Basel Party to a second Basel Party via a non-Party, we would wish the second Basel Party to send a copy of its final response regarding movement to the non-Party. Article 7, as presently worded, ensures that this takes place. The amendment proposed by the Government of Japan would, however, have the effect of limiting, albeit to a small extent, the amount of prior notification by Parties to the agreement in question.

In view of these objections the government of the United Kingdom agrees to the first of the proposed adjustments of the English text, but not to the second."

On 11 January 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary–General of its decision to withdraw the objection to the second modification proposed by the Government of Japan to article 7 of the Convention.

[2] Such an organization is defined under article 2, paragraph 20, of the said Convention as "an organization constituted by sovereign States to which its member States have transferred competence in respect of matters governed by this Convention and which has been duly authorized, in accordance with its internal procedures, to sign, ratify accept, approve, formally confirm or accede to it".

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 24 July 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] On 31 January 1995, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary–General that its instrument of accession should have been accompanied by the following declarations:

First declaration: passage of ships carrying hazardous wastes through the Egyptian territorial sea:

The Arab Republic of Egypt, upon acceding to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, which was done on 22 March 1989 and is referred to hereafter as "the Convention", and,

In accordance with article 26 of the Convention, declares that:

In accordance with the provisions of the Convention and the rules of international law regarding the sovereign right of the State over its territorial sea and its obligation to protect and preserve the marine environment, since the passage of foreign ships carrying hazardous or other wastes entails many risks which constitute a fundamental threat to human health and the environment; and

In conformity with Egypt's position on the passage of ships carrying inherently dangerous or noxious substances through its territorial sea (United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1983), the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that

1. Foreign ships carrying hazardous or other wastes will be required to obtain prior permission from the Egyptian authorities for passage through its territorial sea.

2. Prior notification must be given of the movement of any hazardous wastes through areas under its national jurisdiction, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 9, of the Convention.

Second declaration: imposition of a complete ban on the import of hazardous wastes:

The Arab Republic of Egypt, upon acceding to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, which was signed on 22 March 1989 and is referred to below as the "the Convention", and in accordance with article 26 of the Convention, declares that

In accordance with its sovereign rights and with article 4, paragraph 1(a), of the Convention, a complete ban is imposed on the

import of all hazardous or other wastes and on their disposal on the territory of the Arab Republic of Egypt. This confirms Egypt's position that the transportation of such wastes constitutes a fundamental threat to the health of people, animals and plants and to the environment.

Third declaration:

The Governments of Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Namibia, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as well as the Commission of the European Union, which will sign the Convention and/or the final document referring to the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, (referred to hereinafter as "the Convention"),

Concerned that the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes constitutes a great danger to the health of both humans and the environment,

Considering that the developing countries have a limited ability to manage wastes, especially hazardous wastes, in an environmentally sound manner,

Believing that a reduction in the production of hazardous wastes and their disposal in environmentally sound conditions in the country which exports them must be the goal of waste management policy,

Convinced that the gradual cessation of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes will undoubtedly be a major incentive to the development of appropriate national facilities for the disposal of wastes,

Recognizing the right of every State to ban the import to or export from its territory of hazardous wastes,

Welcoming the signature of the Convention,

Believing it necessary, before applying the provisions of the Convention to impose immediate and effective control on transboundary movement operations, especially to developing countries, and to reduce them,

Declare the following:

1. The signatories to this Convention affirm their strong determination that wastes should be disposed of in the country of production.

2. The signatories to this Convention request States which accede to the Convention to do so, by making every possible effort to effect a gradual cessation of the import and export of wastes for reasons other than their disposal in facilities which will be set up within the framework of regional cooperation.

3. The signatories to this Convention will not permit wastes to be imported to or exported from countries deficient in the technical, administrative and legal expertise in administering wastes and disposing of them in an environmentally sound manner.

4. The signatories to this Convention affirm the importance of assistance to develop appropriate facilities intended for the final disposal of wastes produced by countries referred to in paragraph 3 above.

5. The signatories to this Convention stress the need to take effective measures within the framework of the Convention to enable wastes to be reduced to the lowest possible level and to be recycled.

Note:

Belgium considers that its declaration does not prejudice the import to its territory of wastes classified as primary or secondary materials.

These declarations, were not transmitted to the Secretary–General at the time the instrument of accession was deposited. In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary–General proposed to receive the declarations in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting Sates, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of their circulation (i.e. 17 July 1995).

In this connexion, the Secretary–General received the following objections on the dates indicated hereinafter:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (9 October 1995):

... "The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot accept the first declaration of Egypt (passage of ships carrying hazardous wastes through the Egyptian territorial sea) [...]. Not only was this declaration out of time, but like all other declarations to similar effect, it is unacceptable in substance. In this connection the United Kingdom Government recalls its own statement upon signature confirmed upon ratification:

[For the text of the statement, see under "Reservations and Declarations" in this chapter.]

Finland (13 October 1995):

... "In the view of the Government of Finland the declarations of Egypt raise certain legal questions. Article 26.1 of the Basel Convention prohibits any reservation or exception to the Convention. However, according to article 26.2 a State can, when acceding to the Convention, make declarations or statements 'with a view, *inter alia*, to the harmonization of its laws and regulations with the provisions of this Convention ...'.

Without taking any stand to the content of the declarations, which appear to be reservations in nature, the Government of Finland refers to article 26.2 of the Basel Convention and notes that the declarations of Egypt have been made too late. For this reason the Government of Finland objects to the declarations and considers them devoid of legal effect."

Italy (13 October 1995):

... The Italian Government objects to the deposit of the aforementioned declarations since, in its opinion, they should be considered as reservations to the Basel Convention and the possibility of making reservations is excluded under article 26, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

In any event, article 26, paragraph 2, stipulates that a State may, within certain limits, formulate declarations only 'when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving, ... confirming or acceding to this Convention'.

For these reasons, the deposit of the aforementioned declarations cannot be allowed, regardless of their content.

Netherlands (13 October 1995):

... The Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declarations made by Egypt on 31 January 1995 concerning the [said Convention]. While the second and the third declarations do not call for observations by the Kingdom, the first declaration establishing the requirement of prior permission for passage through the Egyptian territorial sea is not acceptable.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the first declaration to be a reservation to the (Basel) Convention. The Convention explicitly prohibits the making of reservations in article 26 par. 1. Moreover, this reservation has been made two years after the accession of Egypt to the (Basel) Convention, and therefore too late.

Consequently the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the declaration on the requirement of prior permission for passage through the territorial sea made by Egypt a reservation which is null and void.

Sweden (16 October 1995):

The Government of Sweden cannot accept the declarations made by the Government of Egypt [...].

First, these declarations were made almost two years after the accession by Egypt contrary to the rule laid down in article 26, paragraph 2 of the Basel Convention.

Second, the content of the first of these declarations must be understood to constitute a reservation to the Convention, whereas the Basel Convention explicitly prohibits reservations (article 26, paragraph 1).

Thus, the Government of Sweden considers these declarations null and void.

In view of the above and in keeping with the depositary practice followed in such cases, the Secretary–general has taken the view that he is not in a position to accept these declarations for deposit.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 19 March 1989. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[7] With a declaration of non-application to Tokelau "until the date of notification by the Government of New Zealand that the Convention shall so extend to Tokelau".

[8] In respect of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the British Antarctic Territory.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 30 October 1995, the Government of the the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention shall apply to Hong Kong, being a territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

(*a*) Amendment to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movments of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, concluded at Basel on 22 March 1989

Adopted at the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties at Geneva on 22 September 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 17 (5) of the Convention].
TEXT: Doc. UNEP/CHW.3/35.
STATUS:

Note: By decision III/1, of 22 September 1995, the Third meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the above Convention, which took place in Geneva from 18 to 22 September 1995, adopted an Amendment to the Convention.

Participant	*Acceptance*	*Participant*	*Acceptance*

4. Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context

Concluded at Espoo (Finland) on 25 February 1991

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 18 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. E.ECE.1250.
STATUS: Signatories: 30. Parties: 11.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Environmental and Water Problems of the Economic Commission for Europe at their fourth session held in Espoo, Finland, from 25 February to 1 March 1991. The Convention was open for signature at Espoo, Finland, during the said period and thereafter at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 2 September 1991.

Participant	*Signature, succession (d)*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), approval (AA), accession (a)*
Albania	26 Feb 1991	4 Oct 1991
Austria	26 Feb 1991	27 Jul 1994
Belarus	26 Feb 1991	
Belgium	26 Feb 1991	
Bulgaria	26 Feb 1991	12 May 1995
Canada	26 Feb 1991	
Czech Republic[1]	30 Sep 1993 *d*	
Denmark[2]	26 Feb 1991	
European Community	26 Feb 1991	
Finland	26 Feb 1991	10 Aug 1995 *A*
France	26 Feb 1991	
Germany	26 Feb 1991	
Greece	26 Feb 1991	
Hungary	26 Feb 1991	
Iceland	26 Feb 1991	
Ireland	27 Feb 1991	
Italy	26 Feb 1991	19 Jan 1995
Luxembourg	26 Feb 1991	29 Aug 1995
Netherlands[3]	25 Feb 1991	28 Feb 1995 *A*
Norway	25 Feb 1991	23 Jun 1993
Poland	26 Feb 1991	
Portugal	26 Feb 1991	
Republic of Moldova		4 Jan 1994 *a*
Romania	26 Feb 1991	
Russian Federation	6 Jun 1991	
Slovakia[1]	28 May 1993 *d*	
Spain	26 Feb 1991	10 Sep 1992
Sweden	26 Feb 1991	24 Jan 1992
Ukraine	26 Feb 1991	
United Kingdom	26 Feb 1991	
United States of America	26 Feb 1991	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 15 paragraph 2 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

BULGARIA

Declaration:

The Republic of Bulgaria declares that for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 15, it accepts both of the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

a) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice;

b) Arbitration in accordance with the procedure set out in Appendix VII.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"1. *The Community* states that it is signing this Convention on the understanding that, in their mutual relation, the Community Member States will apply the Convention in accordance with the Community's internal rules, including those of the EURATOM Treaty, and without prejudice to appropriate amendments being made to those rules.

"2. *The Community* considers that, if the information of the public of the Party of origin takes place when the environmental impact assessment documentation is available, the information of the affected Party by the Party of origin must be implemented simultaneously at the latest.

"The Community considers that the Convention implies that each Party must assure, on its territory, that the public is provided with the environmental impact assessment documentation, that it is informed and that its observations are collected."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 15 of [the said Convention], that it accepts both means of dispute settlement referred to in that paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom considers the Convention is incomplete. Annex I of the Convention lists offshore hydrocarbon production. The United Kingdom considers there is no reason to exclude onshore hydrocarbon production from Annex I, and therefore intends to seek an early amendment to the Convention to remedy this omission."

NOTES:

1 Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 30 August 1991. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

2 Decision reserved as concerns the application of the Convention to the Faroese Islands and Greenland.

3 For the Kingdom in Europe.

5. Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes

Concluded at Helsinki on 17 March 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 26 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ENVWA/R.53 and Add.1.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 14.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Senior Advisers to Economic Commission for Europe Governments on Environmental and Water Problems at their Resumed Fifth Session held at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992. The Convention was opened for signature at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992 and was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 18 September 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Albania	18 Mar 1992	5 Jan 1994
Austria	18 Mar 1992	
Belgium	18 Mar 1992	
Bulgaria	18 Mar 1992	
Denmark[1]	18 Mar 1992	
Estonia	18 Mar 1992	16 Jun 1995
European Community	18 Mar 1992	14 Sep 1995 *AA*
Finland	18 Mar 1992	
France	18 Mar 1992	
Germany	18 Mar 1992	30 Jan 1995
Greece	18 Mar 1992	
Hungary	18 Mar 1992	2 Sep 1994 *AA*
Italy	18 Mar 1992	
Latvia	18 Mar 1992	
Lithuania	18 Mar 1992	
Luxembourg	20 May 1992	7 Jun 1994
Netherlands[2]	18 Mar 1992	14 Mar 1995 *A*
Norway	18 Sep 1992	1 Apr 1993 *AA*
Poland	18 Mar 1992	
Portugal	9 Jun 1992	9 Dec 1994
Republic of Moldova		4 Jan 1994 *a*
Romania	18 Mar 1992	31 May 1995
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1992	2 Nov 1993 *A*
Spain	18 Mar 1992	
Sweden	18 Mar 1992	5 Aug 1993
Switzerland	18 Mar 1992	23 May 1995
United Kingdom	18 Mar 1992	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

GERMANY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Federal Republic of Germany, in order to protect information related to personal data according to its national law, reserves the right to supply personal data only under the condition that the part receiving such protected information shall respect the confidentiality of the information received and the conditions under which it is supplied, and shall only use that information for the purposes for which it was supplied".

NETHERLANDS

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 22 of the Convention both the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

(a) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice;
(b) Arbitration in accordance with the procedure set out in annex IV."

Notes:

[1] With reservation of application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

6. Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

Concluded at Helsinki on 17 March 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 30 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. ENVWA/R.54 and Add.1.
STATUS: Signatories: 27. Parties: 7.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Senior Advisers to Economic Commission for Europe Governments on Environmental and Water Problems at their Resumed Fifth Session held at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992. The Convention was opened for signature at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992 and was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 18 September 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Albania	18 Mar 1992	5 Jan 1994	Latvia	18 Mar 1992	
Austria	18 Mar 1992		Lithuania	18 Mar 1992	
Belgium	18 Mar 1992		Luxembourg	20 May 1992	8 Aug 1994
Bulgaria	18 Mar 1992	12 May 1995	Netherlands	18 Mar 1992	
Canada	18 Mar 1992		Norway	18 Sep 1992	1 Apr 1993 *AA*
Denmark[1]	18 Mar 1992		Poland	18 Mar 1992	
Estonia	18 Mar 1992		Portugal	9 Jun 1992	
European Community	18 Mar 1992		Republic of Moldova		4 Jan 1994 *a*
Finland	18 Mar 1992		Russian Federation	18 Mar 1992	1 Feb 1994 *A*
France	18 Mar 1992		Spain	18 Mar 1992	
Germany	18 Mar 1992		Sweden	18 Mar 1992	
Greece	18 Mar 1992		Switzerland	18 Mar 1992	
Hungary	18 Mar 1992	2 Jun 1994 *AA*	United Kingdom	18 Mar 1992	
Italy	18 Mar 1992		United States of America	18 Mar 1992	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

HUNGARY

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary accepts both means of dispute settlement as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation."

Notes:

1 With reservation of application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

7. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Concluded at New York on 9 May 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 March 1994, in accordance with article 23 (1).
REGISTRATION: 21 March 1994, No. 30822.
TEXT: Doc. A/AC.237/18 (Part II)/Add.1 and Corr.1; and depositary notifications C.N.148.1993. TREATIES–4 of 12 July 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original texts of the Convention); C.N.436.1993.TREATIES–12 of 15 December 1993 (corrigendum to C.N.148.1993.TREATIES–4 of 12 July 1993); C.N.247.1993.TREATIES–6 of 24 November 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic French text); and C.N.462.1993.TREATIES–13 of 30 December 1993 (corrigendum to C.N.247.1993.TREATIES–6 of 24 November 1993).
STATUS: Signatures: 166. Parties: 151.

Note: The Convention was agreed upon and adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Framework Convention on Climate Change, during its Fifth session, second part, held at New York from 30 April to 9 May 1992. In accordance with its article 20, the Convention was open for signature by States Members of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies or that are Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and by regional economic integration organizations, at Rio de Janeiro during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, from 4 to 14 June 1992, and remained thereafter open at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 19 June 1993.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Afghanistan	12 Jun 1992	
Albania		3 Oct 1994 *a*
Algeria	13 Jun 1992	9 Jun 1993
Angola	14 Jun 1992	
Antigua and Barbuda	4 Jun 1992	2 Feb 1993
Argentina	12 Jun 1992	11 Mar 1994
Armenia	13 Jun 1992	14 May 1993 *A*
Australia	4 Jun 1992	30 Dec 1992
Austria	8 Jun 1992	28 Feb 1994
Azerbaijan	12 Jun 1992	16 May 1995
Bahamas	12 Jun 1992	29 Mar 1994
Bahrain	8 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994
Bangladesh	9 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1994
Barbados	12 Jun 1992	23 Mar 1994
Belarus	11 Jun 1992	
Belgium	4 Jun 1992	
Belize	13 Jun 1992	31 Oct 1994
Benin	13 Jun 1992	30 Jun 1994
Bhutan	11 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Bolivia	10 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1994
Botswana	12 Jun 1992	27 Jan 1994
Brazil	4 Jun 1992	28 Feb 1994
Bulgaria	5 Jun 1992	12 May 1995
Burkina Faso	12 Jun 1992	2 Sep 1993
Burundi	11 Jun 1992	
Cambodia		18 Dec 1995 *a*
Cameroon	14 Jun 1992	19 Oct 1994
Canada	12 Jun 1992	4 Dec 1992
Cape Verde	12 Jun 1992	29 Mar 1995
Central African Republic	13 Jun 1992	10 Mar 1995
Chad	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1994
Chile	13 Jun 1992	22 Dec 1994
China	11 Jun 1992	5 Jan 1993
Colombia	13 Jun 1992	22 Mar 1995
Comoros	11 Jun 1992	31 Oct 1994
Congo	12 Jun 1992	
Cook Islands	12 Jun 1992	20 Apr 1993
Costa Rica	13 Jun 1992	26 Aug 1994
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Jun 1992	29 Nov 1994
Croatia	11 Jun 1992	
Cuba	13 Jun 1992	5 Jan 1994
Cyprus	12 Jun 1992	
Czech Republic	18 Jun 1993	7 Oct 1993 *AA*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 Jun 1992	5 Dec 1994 *AA*
Denmark	9 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Djibouti	12 Jun 1992	27 Aug 1995
Dominica		21 Jun 1993 *a*
Dominican Republic	12 Jun 1992	
Ecuador	9 Jun 1992	23 Feb 1993
Egypt	9 Jun 1992	5 Dec 1994
El Salvador	13 Jun 1992	4 Dec 1995
Eritrea		24 Apr 1995 *a*
Estonia	12 Jun 1992	27 Jul 1994
Ethiopia	10 Jun 1992	5 Apr 1994
European Community	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993 *AA*
Fiji	9 Oct 1992	25 Feb 1993
Finland	4 Jun 1992	3 May 1994 *A*
France	13 Jun 1992	25 Mar 1994
Gabon	12 Jun 1992	
Gambia	12 Jun 1992	10 Jun 1994
Germany	12 Jun 1992	9 Dec 1993
Georgia		29 Jul 1994 *a*
Ghana	12 Jun 1992	6 Sep 1995
Greece	12 Jun 1992	4 Aug 1994
Grenada	3 Dec 1992	11 Aug 1994
Guatemala	13 Jun 1992	15 Dec 1995
Guinea	12 Jun 1992	7 May 1993
Guinea-Bissau	12 Jun 1992	27 Oct 1995
Guyana	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Haiti	13 Jun 1992	
Honduras	13 Jun 1992	19 Oct 1995
Hungary	13 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Iceland	4 Jun 1992	16 Jun 1993
India	10 Jun 1992	1 Nov 1993
Indonesia	5 Jun 1992	23 Aug 1994
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	14 Jun 1992	
Ireland	13 Jun 1992	20 Apr 1994
Israel	4 Jun 1992	
Italy	5 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1994
Jamaica	12 Jun 1992	6 Jan 1995
Japan	13 Jun 1992	28 May 1993 *A*
Jordan	11 Jun 1992	12 Nov 1993

Participant	Signature	Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)	
Kazakstan	8 Jun 1992	17 May 1995	
Kenya	12 Jun 1992	30 Aug 1994	
Kiribati	13 Jun 1992	7 Feb 1995	
Kuwait		28 Dec 1994	a
Latvia	11 Jun 1992	23 Mar 1995	
Lao People's Democratic Republic		4 Jan 1995	a
Lebanon	12 Jun 1992	15 Dec 1994	
Lesotho	11 Jun 1992	7 Feb 1995	
Liberia	12 Jun 1992		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	29 Jun 1992		
Liechtenstein	4 Jun 1992	22 Jun 1994	
Lithuania	11 Jun 1992	24 Mar 1995	
Luxembourg	9 Jun 1992	9 May 1994	
Madagascar	10 Jun 1992		
Malawi	10 Jun 1992	21 Apr 1994	
Malaysia	9 Jun 1993	13 Jul 1994	
Maldives	12 Jun 1992	9 Nov 1992	
Mali	30 Sep 1992	28 Dec 1994	
Malta	12 Jun 1992	17 Mar 1994	
Marshall Islands	12 Jun 1992	8 Oct 1992	
Mauritania	12 Jun 1992	20 Jan 1994	
Mauritius	10 Jun 1992	4 Sep 1992	
Mexico	13 Jun 1992	11 Mar 1993	
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Jun 1992	18 Nov 1993	
Monaco	11 Jun 1992	20 Nov 1992	
Mongolia	12 Jun 1992	30 Sep 1993	
Morocco	13 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1995	
Mozambique	12 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995	
Myanmar	11 Jun 1992	25 Nov 1994	
Namibia	12 Jun 1992	16 May 1995	
Nauru	8 Jun 1992	11 Nov 1993	
Nepal	12 Jun 1992	2 May 1994	
Netherlands[1]	4 Jun 1992	20 Dec 1993	A
New Zealand	4 Jun 1992	16 Sep 1993	
Nicaragua	13 Jun 1992	31 Oct 1995	
Niger	11 Jun 1992	25 Jul 1995	
Nigeria	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994	
Norway	4 Jun 1992	9 Jul 1993	
Oman	11 Jun 1992	8 Feb 1995	
Pakistan	13 Jun 1992	1 Jun 1994	
Panama	18 Mar 1993	23 May 1995	
Papua New Guinea	13 Jun 1992	16 Mar 1993	
Paraguay	12 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994	
Peru	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1993	
Philippines	12 Jun 1992	2 Aug 1994	
Poland	5 Jun 1992	28 Jul 1994	
Portugal	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993	
Republic of Korea	13 Jun 1992	14 Dec 1993	
Republic of Moldova	12 Jun 1992	9 Jun 1995	
Romania	5 Jun 1992	8 Jun 1994	
Russian Federation	13 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994	
Rwanda	10 Jun 1992		
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12 Jun 1992	7 Jan 1993	
Saint Lucia	14 Jun 1993	14 Jun 1993	
Samoa	12 Jun 1992	29 Nov 1994	
San Marino	10 Jun 1992	28 Oct 1994	
Sao Tome and Principe	12 Jun 1992		
Saudi Arabia		28 Dec 1994	a
Senegal	13 Jun 1992	17 Oct 1994	
Seychelles	10 Jun 1992	22 Sep 1992	
Sierra Leone	11 Feb 1993	22 Jun 1995	
Singapore	13 Jun 1992		
Slovakia	19 May 1993	25 Aug 1994	AA
Slovenia	13 Jun 1992	1 Dec 1995	
Solomon Islands	13 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994	
South Africa	15 Jun 1993		
Spain	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993	
Sri Lanka	10 Jun 1992	23 Nov 1993	
Sudan	9 Jun 1992	19 Nov 1993	
Suriname	13 Jun 1992		
Swaziland	12 Jun 1992		
Sweden	8 Jun 1992	23 Jun 1993	
Switzerland	12 Jun 1992	10 Dec 1993	
Thailand	12 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994	
Togo	12 Jun 1992	8 Mar 1995	A
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Jun 1992	24 Jun 1994	
Tunisia	13 Jun 1992	15 Jul 1993	
Turkmenistan		5 Jun 1995	a
Tuvalu	8 Jun 1992	26 Oct 1993	
Uganda	13 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1993	
Ukraine	11 Jun 1992		
United Arab Emirates		29 Dec 1995	a
United Kingdom[2]	12 Jun 1992	8 Dec 1993	
United Republic of Tanzania	12 Jun 1992		
United States of America	12 Jun 1992	15 Oct 1992	
Uruguay	4 Jun 1992	18 Aug 1994	
Uzbekistan		20 Jun 1993	a
Vanuatu	9 Jun 1992	25 Mar 1993	
Venezuela	12 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994	
Viet Nam	11 Jun 1992	16 Nov 1994	
Yemen	12 Jun 1992		
Yugoslavia	8 Jun 1992		
Zaire	11 Jun 1992	9 Jan 1995	
Zambia	11 Jun 1992	28 May 1993	
Zimbabwe	12 Jun 1992	3 Nov 1992	

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

BULGARIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that in accordance with article 4, paragraph 6, and with respect to paragraph 2 (b) of the said article, it accepts as a basis of the anthropogenic emissions in Bulgaria of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, the 1988 levels of the said emissions in the country and not their 1990 levels, keeping

records of and comparing the emission rates during the subsequent years."

CUBA

Declaration:

With reference to article 14 of the United Nations Convention Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that, insofar as concerns the Republic of Cuba, any dispute that may arise between the Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be settled through negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"The European Economic Community and its Member States declare, for the purposes of clarity, that the inclusion of the European Community as well as its Member States in the lists in the Annexes to the Convention is without prejudice to the division of competence and responsibilities between the Community and its Member States, which is to be declared in accordance with article 21 (3) of the Convention."

Upon approval:
Declaration:

"The European Economic Community and its Member States declare that the commitment to limit anthropogenic CO_2 emissions set out in article 4(2) of the Convention will be fulfilled in the Community as a whole through action by the Community and its Member States, within the respective competence of each.

In this perspective, the Community and its Member States reaffirm the objectives set out in the Council conclusions of 29 October 1990, and in particular the objective of stabilization of CO_2 emission by 2000 and 1990 level in the Community as a whole.

The European Economic Community and its Member States are elaborating a coherent strategy in order to attain this objective."

FIJI

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"The Government of Fiji declares its understanding that signature of the Convention shall, in no way, constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

HUNGARY

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary attributes great significance to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and it reiterates its position in accordance with the provisions of article 4.6 of the Convention on certain degree of flexibility that the average level of anthropogenic carbon–dioxide emissions for the period of 1985–1987 will be considered as reference level in context of the commitments under article 4.2 of the Convention. This understanding is closely related to the 'process of transition' as it is given in article 4.6 of the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Hungary declares that it will do all efforts to contribute to the objective of the Convention."

KIRIBATI

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Kiribati declares its understanding that signature and /or ratification of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

MONACO

Declaration:

In accordance with sub–paragraph g of article 4.2 of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that it intends to be bound by the provisions of sub–paragraphs a and b of said article.

NAURU

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"The Government of Nauru declares its understanding that signature of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea declares its understanding that ratification of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under International Law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of Climate Change as derogating from the principles of general International Law."

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Declaration:

"In pursuance of article 14 (2) of the said Convention [the Government of the Solomon Islands] shall recognise as compulsory, arbitration, in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties as soon as practicable, in an annex on arbitration."

TUVALU

Upon signature:
Declaration:

"The Government of Tuvalu declares its understanding that signature of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

NOTES:

1 For the Kingdom in Europe.

2 In respect of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey and the Isle of Man.

8. Convention on Biological Diversity

Opened for signature at Rio de Janeiro on 5 June 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 December 1993, in accordance with article 36 (1).
REGISTRATION: 29 December 1993, No. 30619.
TEXT: Doc. UNEP/Bio.Div/N7–INC.5/4 and depositary notification C.N.393.1993.TREATIES–11 of 7 February 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic English text); and C.N.302.1995.TREATIES–7 of 20 October 1995 (proposed corrections of the authentic arabic text).
STATUS: Signatories: 168. Parties: 137.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Convention on Biological Diversity, during its Fifth session, held at Nairobi from 11 to 22 May 1992. The Convention was open for signature at Rio de Janeiro by all States and regional economic integration organizations from 5 June 1992 until 14 June 1992, and remained open at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 4 June 1993.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Afghanistan	12 Jun 1992	
Albania		5 Jan 1994 *a*
Algeria	13 Jun 1992	14 Aug 1995
Angola	12 Jun 1992	
Antigua and Barbuda	5 Jun 1992	9 Mar 1993
Argentina	12 Jun 1992	22 Nov 1994
Armenia	13 Jun 1992	14 May 1993 *A*
Australia	5 Jun 1992	18 Jun 1993
Austria	13 Jun 1992	18 Aug 1994
Azerbaijan	12 Jun 1992	
Bahamas	12 Jun 1992	2 Sep 1993
Bahrain	9 Jun 1992	
Bangladesh	5 Jun 1992	3 May 1994
Barbados	12 Jun 1992	10 Dec 1993
Belarus	11 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1993
Belgium	5 Jun 1992	
Belize	13 Jun 1992	30 Dec 1993
Benin	13 Jun 1992	30 Jun 1994
Bhutan	11 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Bolivia	13 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1994
Botswana	8 Jun 1992	12 Oct 1995
Brazil	5 Jun 1992	28 Feb 1994
Bulgaria	12 Jun 1992	
Burkina Faso	12 Jun 1992	2 Sep 1993
Burundi	11 Jun 1992	
Cambodia		9 Feb 1995 *a*
Cameroon	14 Jun 1992	19 Oct 1994
Canada	11 Jun 1992	4 Dec 1992
Cape Verde	12 Jun 1992	29 Mar 1995
Central African Republic	13 Jun 1992	15 Mar 1995
Chad	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1994
Chile	13 Jun 1992	9 Sep 1994
China	11 Jun 1992	5 Jan 1993
Colombia	12 Jun 1992	28 Nov 1994
Comoros	11 Jun 1992	29 Sep 1994
Congo	11 Jun 1992	
Cook Islands	12 Jun 1992	20 Apr 1993
Costa Rica	13 Jun 1992	26 Aug 1994
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Jun 1992	29 Nov 1994
Croatia	11 Jun 1992	
Cuba	12 Jun 1992	8 Mar 1994
Cyprus	12 Jun 1992	
Czech Republic	4 Jun 1993	3 Dec 1993 *AA*
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 Jun 1992	26 Oct 1994 *AA*
Denmark	12 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Djibouti	13 Jun 1992	1 Sep 1994
Dominica		6 Apr 1994 *a*
Dominican Republic	13 Jun 1992	
Ecuador	9 Jun 1992	23 Feb 1993
Egypt	9 Jun 1992	2 Jun 1994
El Salvador	13 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1994
Equatorial Guinea		6 Dec 1994 *a*
Estonia	12 Jun 1992	27 Jul 1994
Ethiopia	10 Jun 1992	5 Apr 1994
European Community	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993 *AA*
Fiji	9 Oct 1992	25 Feb 1993
Finland	5 Jun 1992	27 Jul 1994 *A*
France	13 Jun 1992	1 Jul 1994
Gabon	12 Jun 1992	
Gambia	12 Jun 1992	10 Jun 1994
Georgia		2 Jun 1994 *a*
Germany	12 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Ghana	12 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Greece	12 Jun 1992	4 Aug 1994
Grenada	3 Dec 1992	11 Aug 1994
Guatemala	13 Jun 1992	10 Jul 1995
Guinea	12 Jun 1992	7 May 1993
Guinea-Bissau	12 Jun 1992	27 Oct 1995
Guyana	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Haiti	13 Jun 1992	
Honduras	13 Jun 1992	31 Jul 1995
Hungary	13 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Iceland	10 Jun 1992	12 Sep 1994
India	5 Jun 1992	18 Feb 1994
Indonesia	5 Jun 1992	23 Aug 1994
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	14 Jun 1992	
Ireland	13 Jun 1992	
Israel	11 Jun 1992	7 Aug 1995
Italy	5 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1994
Jamaica	11 Jun 1992	6 Jan 1995
Japan	13 Jun 1992	28 May 1993 *A*
Jordan	11 Jun 1992	12 Nov 1993
Kazakstan	9 Jun 1992	6 Sep 1994
Kenya	11 Jun 1992	26 Jul 1994
Kiribati		16 Aug 1994 *a*
Kuwait	9 Jun 1992	
Latvia	11 Jun 1992	14 Dec 1995
Lebanon	12 Jun 1992	15 Dec 1994
Lesotho	11 Jun 1992	10 Jan 1995

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Liberia	12 Jun 1992	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	29 Jun 1992	
Liechtenstein	5 Jun 1992	
Lithuania	11 Jun 1992	
Luxembourg	9 Jun 1992	9 May 1994
Madagascar	8 Jun 1992	
Malawi	10 Jun 1992	2 Feb 1994
Malaysia	12 Jun 1992	24 Jun 1994
Maldives	12 Jun 1992	9 Nov 1992
Mali	30 Sep 1992	29 Mar 1995
Malta	12 Jun 1992	
Marshall Islands	12 Jun 1992	8 Oct 1992
Mauritania	12 Jun 1992	
Mauritius	10 Jun 1992	4 Sep 1992
Mexico	13 Jun 1992	11 Mar 1993
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Jun 1992	20 Jun 1994
Monaco	11 Jun 1992	20 Nov 1992
Mongolia	12 Jun 1992	30 Sep 1993
Morocco	13 Jun 1992	21 Aug 1995
Mozambique	12 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Myanmar	11 Jun 1992	25 Nov 1994
Namibia	12 Jun 1992	
Nauru	5 Jun 1992	11 Nov 1993
Nepal	12 Jun 1992	23 Nov 1993
Netherlands	5 Jun 1992	12 Jul 1994 A
New Zealand	12 Jun 1992	16 Sep 1993
Nicaragua	13 Jun 1992	20 Nov 1995
Niger	11 Jun 1992	25 Jul 1995
Nigeria	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Norway	9 Jun 1992	9 Jul 1993
Oman	10 Jun 1992	8 Feb 1995
Pakistan	5 Jun 1992	26 Jul 1994
Panama	13 Jun 1992	17 Jan 1995
Papua New Guinea	13 Jun 1992	16 Mar 1993
Paraguay	12 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Peru	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1993
Philippines	12 Jun 1992	8 Oct 1993
Poland	5 Jun 1992	
Portugal	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Qatar	11 Jun 1992	
Republic of Korea	13 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1994
Republic of Moldova	5 Jun 1992	20 Oct 1995
Romania	5 Jun 1992	17 Aug 1994
Russian Federation	13 Jun 1992	5 Apr 1995
Rwanda	10 Jun 1992	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12 Jun 1992	7 Jan 1993
Saint Lucia		28 Jul 1993 a
Samoa	12 Jun 1992	9 Feb 1994
San Marino	10 Jun 1992	28 Oct 1994
Sao Tome and Principe	12 Jun 1992	
Senegal	13 Jun 1992	17 Oct 1994
Seychelles	10 Jun 1992	22 Sep 1992
Sierra Leone		12 Dec 1994 a
Singapore	10 Mar 1993	21 Dec 1995
Slovakia	19 May 1993	25 Aug 1994 AA
Slovenia	13 Jun 1992	
Solomon Islands	13 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1995
South Africa	4 Jun 1993	2 Nov 1995
Spain	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Sri Lanka	10 Jun 1992	23 Mar 1994
Sudan	9 Jun 1992	30 Oct 1995
Suriname	13 Jun 1992	
Swaziland	12 Jun 1992	9 Nov 1994
Sweden	8 Jun 1992	16 Dec 1993
Switzerland	12 Jun 1992	21 Nov 1994
Syrian Arab Republic	3 May 1993	
Thailand	12 Jun 1992	
Togo	12 Jun 1992	4 Oct 1995 A
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Jun 1992	
Tunisia	13 Jun 1992	15 Jul 1993
Turkey	11 Jun 1992	
Tuvalu	8 Jun 1992	
Uganda	12 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1993
Ukraine	11 Jun 1992	7 Feb 1995
United Arab Emirates	11 Jun 1992	
United Kingdom[1]	12 Jun 1992	3 Jun 1994
United Republic of Tanzania	12 Jun 1992	
United States of America	4 Jun 1993	
Uruguay	9 Jun 1992	5 Nov 1993
Uzbekistan		19 Jul 1995 a
Vanuatu	9 Jun 1992	25 Mar 1993
Venezuela	12 Jun 1992	13 Sep 1994
Viet Nam	28 May 1993	16 Nov 1994
Yemen	12 Jun 1992	
Yugoslavia	8 Jun 1992	
Zaire	11 Jun 1992	3 Dec 1994
Zambia	11 Jun 1992	28 May 1993
Zimbabwe	12 Jun 1992	11 Nov 1994

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

The Argentine Government considers that this Convention represents a step forward in that it establishes among its objectives the sustainable use of biological diversity. Likewise, the definitions contained in article 2 and other provisions of the Convention indicate that the terms "genetic resources", "biological resources" and "biological material" do not include the human genome. In accordance with the commitments entered into in the Convention, the Argentine Nation will pass legislation on the conditions of access to biological resources and the ownership of future rights and benefits arising from them. The Convention is fully consistent with the principles established in the "Agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights", including trade in counterfeit goods, contained in the Final Act of the Uruguay Round of GATT.

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 27, paragraph 3 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as

compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

CHILE

Declaration:

The Government of Chile, on ratifying the Convention on Biological Diversity of 1992, wishes to place on record that the pine tree and other species that the country exploits as one of its forestry resources are considered exotic and are not taken to fall within the scope of the Convention.

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, with respect to article 27 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, that as far as the Republic of Cuba is concerned, disputes that arise between Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this international legal instrument shall be settled by negotiation through the diplomatic channel or, failing that, by arbitration in accordance with the procedure laid down in Annex II on arbitration of the Convention."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"Within their respective competence, the European Community and its Member States wish to reaffirm the importance they attach to transfers of technology and to biotechnology in order to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The compliance with intellectual property rights constitutes an essential element for the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co–investment.

For the European Community and its member States, transfers of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity, will be carried out in accordance with article 16 of the said Convention and in compliance with the principles and rules of protection of intellectual property, in particular multilateral and bilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting Parties to this Convention.

The European Community and its Member States will encourage the use of the financial mechanism established by the Convention to promote the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights held by European operators, in particular as regards the granting of licences, through normal commercial mechanisms and decisions, while ensuring adequate and effective protection of property rights."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

With reference to article 3, that it interprets that article as a guiding principle to be taken into account in the implementation of the Convention;

With reference to article 21, paragraph 1, that the decision taken periodically by the Conference of the Parties concerns the "amount of resources needed" and that no provision of the Convention authorizes the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature or frequency of the contributions from Parties to the Convention.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

With reference to article 3, that it interprets that article as a guiding principle to be taken into account in the implementation of the Convention;

The French Republic reaffirms its belief in the importance of the transfer of technology and biotechnology in guaranteeing the protection and long–term utilization of biological diversity. Respect for intellectual property rights is an essential element of the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co–investment.

The French Republic affirms that the transfer of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the Convention on Biological Diversity, will be implemented according to article 16 of that Convention and with respect for the principles and rules concerning the protection of intellectual property, including multilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting parties to the present Convention.

The French Republic will encourage recourse to the financial mechanism established by the Convention for the purpose of promoting the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights under French ownership, *inter alia*, as regards the granting of licences, by traditional commercial decisions and mechanisms while ensuring the appropriate and effective protection of property rights.

With reference to article 21, paragraph 1, the French Republic considers that the decision taken periodically by the Conference of the Parties concerns the "amount of resources needed" and that no provision of the Convention authorizes the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature or frequency of the contributions from Parties to the Convention.

GEORGIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Georgia will use both means for dispute settlement referred to in the Convention:

1. Arbitral consideration in accordance with the procedure given in the enclosure II, Part I.
2. Submitting of disputes to the International Court."

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Italian Government [. . .] declares its understanding that the decision to be taken by the the Conference of the Parties under article 21.1 of the Convention refers to the 'amount of resources needed' by the financial mechanism, not to the extent or nature and form of the contributions of the Contracting Parties."

LATVIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Latvia declares in accordance with article 27 paragraph 3 of the Convention that it accepts both the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea declares its understanding that ratification of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under International Law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of Biological Diversity as derogating from the principles of general International Law."

SUDAN

Understanding:

"With respect to the principle stipulated in article 3, the Government of the Sudan agrees with the spirit of the article and

interprets it to mean that no state is responsible for acts that take place outside its control event if they fall within its judicial jurisdiction and may cause damage to the environment of other states or of areas beyond the limits of national judicial jurisdiction."

"The Sudan also sees as regards article 14 (2), that the issue of liability and redresss for damage to biological diversity should not form a priority to be tackled by the Agreement as there is ambiguity regarding the essence and scope of the studies to be carried out, in accordance with the above-mentioned article. The Sudan further believes that any such studies on liability and redress should shift towards effects of areas such as biotechnology products, environmental impacts, genetically modified organisms and acid rains."

SWITZERLAND

Upon signature:
Declaration:

The Swiss Government wishes to emphasize particularly the progress made in establishing standard terms for cooperation between States in a very important field: research activities and activities for the transfer of technology relevant to resources from third countries.

The important provisions in question create a platform for even closer cooperation with public research bodies or institutions in Switzerland and for the transfer of technologies available to governmental or public bodies, particularly universities and various publicly-funded research and development centres.

It is our understanding that genetic resources acquired under the procedure specified in article 15 and developed by private research institutions will be the subject of programmes of cooperation, joint research and the transfer of technology which will respect the principles and rules for the protection of intellectualproperty.

These principles and rules are essential for research and private investment, in particular in the latest technologies, such as modern biotechnology which requires substantial financial outlays. On the basis of this interpretation, the Swiss Government wishes to indicate that it is ready, at the opportune time, to take the appropriate general policy measures, particularly under articles 16 and 19, with a view to promoting and encouraging cooperation, on a contractual basis, between Swiss firms and the private firms and governmental bodies of other Contracting Parties.

With regard to financial cooperation, Switzerland interprets the provisions of articles 20 and 21 as follows: the resources to be committed and the management system will have regard, in an equitable manner, to the needs and interests of the developing countries and to the possibilities and interests of the developed countries.

Upon ratification:
Declaration:

Switzerland wishes to reaffirm the importance it attaches to transfers of technology and to biotechnology in order to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity The compliance with intellectual property rights constitutes and essential element for the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co-investment.

For Switzerland, transfers of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity, will be carried out in accordance with article 16 of the said Convention and in compliance with the principles and rules of protection of intellectual property, in particular multilateral and bilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting Parties to this Convention.

Switzerland will encourage the use of the financial mechanism established by the Convention to promote the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights held by Swiss operators, in particular as regards the granting of licences, through normal commercial mechanisms and decisions, while ensuring adequate and effective protection of property rights.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Upon signature:
Declaration:

It is being understood that the signing of this Convention shall not constitute recognition of Israel or leading to any intercourse with it.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare their understanding that article 3 of the Convention sets out a guiding principle to be taken into account in the implementation of the Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland also declare their understanding that the decisions to be taken by the Conference of the Parties under paragraph 1 of article 21 concern "the amount of resources needed" by the financial mechanism, and that nothing in article 20 or 21 authorises the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature, frequency or size of the contributions of the Parties under the Convention.

NOTES:

[1] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, St. Helena and St. Helena Dependencies.

9. Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas

Opened for signature at New York on 17 March 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 March 1994, in accordance with article 8.5.
REGISTRATION: 29 March 1994.
TEXT: Depositary notifications C.N.86.1992.TREATIES–2 of 2 July 1992; and C.N.338.1995.TREATIES–2 of 21 November 1995 (procès–verbal of rectification of the French authentic text).
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 6.

Note: The Agreement, was approved at Geneva on 13 September 1991, during the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals pursuant to article IV (4) of the said Convention, which was done at Bonn on 23 June 1979 ("Bonn Convention"). The Agreement was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York on 17 March 1992 and will remain open for signature at United Nations Headquarters until its entry into force.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Belgium	6 Nov 1992	14 May 1993	Netherlands[1]	29 Jul 1992	29 Dec 1992 *AA*
Denmark	19 Aug 1992	29 Dec 1993 *AA*	Sweden		31 Mar 1992 *s*
European Community	7 Oct 1992		United Kingdom[2]	16 Apr 1992	13 Jul 1993
Germany	9 Apr 1992	6 Oct 1993			

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[2] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Bailiwick of Guernsey.

10. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

Opened for signature at Paris on 14 October 1994

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 36 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. A/AC.241/15/Rev.3; and depositary notification C.N.176.1995.TREATIES-6 of 27 July 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Chinese text).
STATUS: Signatures : 115. Parties: 19.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 17 June 1994 by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for the elaboration of an international convention to combat desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa (established paursuant to resolution 47/188[1] of the General Assembly dated 22 December 1992), during its Fifth session held at Paris. The Convention was open for signature at Paris by all States and regional economic integration organizations on 14 and 15 October 1994. Thereafter, it shall remain open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 13 October 1995.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan		1 Nov 1995 *a*
Algeria	14 Oct 1994	
Angola	14 Oct 1994	
Antigua and Barbuda	4 Apr 1995	
Argentina	15 Oct 1994	
Armenia	14 Oct 1994	
Australia	14 Oct 1994	
Bangladesh	14 Oct 1994	
Benin	14 Oct 1994	
Bolivia	14 Oct 1994	
Botswana	12 Oct 1995	
Brazil	14 Oct 1994	
Burkina Faso	14 Oct 1994	
Burundi	14 Oct 1994	
Cambodia	15 Oct 1994	
Cameroon	14 Oct 1994	
Canada	14 Oct 1994	1 Dec 1995
Cape Verde	14 Oct 1994	8 May 1995
Central African Republic	14 Oct 1994	
Chad	14 Oct 1994	
Chile	3 Mar 1995	
China	14 Oct 1994	
Colombia	14 Oct 1994	
Comoros	14 Oct 1994	
Congo	15 Oct 1994	
Costa Rica	15 Oct 1994	
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Oct 1994	
Croatia	15 Oct 1994	
Cuba	15 Oct 1994	
Denmark	15 Oct 1994	22 Dec 1995
Djibouti	15 Oct 1994	
Ecuador	19 Jan 1995	6 Sep 1995
Egypt	14 Oct 1994	7 Jul 1995
Equatorial Guinea	14 Oct 1994	
Eritrea	14 Oct 1994	
Ethiopia	15 Oct 1994	
European Community	14 Oct 1994	
Finland	15 Oct 1994	20 Sep 1995 *A*
France	14 Oct 1994	
Gambia	14 Oct 1994	
Georgia	15 Oct 1994	
Germany	14 Oct 1994	
Ghana	15 Oct 1994	
Greece	14 Oct 1994	
Guinea	14 Oct 1994	
Guinea-Bissau	15 Oct 1994	27 Oct 1995
Haiti	15 Oct 1994	
Honduras	22 Feb 1995	
India	14 Oct 1994	
Indonesia	15 Oct 1994	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	14 Oct 1994	
Ireland	15 Oct 1994	
Israel	14 Oct 1994	
Italy	14 Oct 1994	
Japan	14 Oct 1994	
Jordan	13 Apr 1995	
Kazakstan	14 Oct 1994	
Kenya	14 Oct 1994	
Kuwait	22 Sep 1995	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	30 Aug 1995	
Lebanon	14 Oct 1994	
Lesotho	15 Oct 1994	12 Sep 1995
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	15 Oct 1994	
Luxembourg	14 Oct 1994	
Malaysia	6 Oct 1995	
Madagascar	14 Oct 1994	
Malawi	17 Jan 1995	
Mali	15 Oct 1994	31 Oct 1995
Malta	15 Oct 1994	
Mauritania	14 Oct 1994	
Mauritius	17 Mar 1995	
Mexico	15 Oct 1994	3 Apr 1995
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Dec 1994	
Mongolia	15 Oct 1994	
Morocco	15 Oct 1994	
Mozambique	28 Sep 1995	
Namibia	24 Oct 1994	
Nepal	12 Oct 1995	
Netherlands[2]	15 Oct 1994	27 Jun 1995 *A*
Nicaragua	21 Nov 1994	
Niger	14 Oct 1994	
Nigeria	31 Oct 1994	
Norway	15 Oct 1994	
Pakistan	15 Oct 1994	
Panama	22 Feb 1995	
Paraguay	1 Dec 1994	
Peru	15 Oct 1994	9 Nov 1995
Philippines	8 Dec 1994	

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A)*
Portugal	14 Oct 1994	
Republic of Korea	14 Oct 1994	
Rwanda	22 Jun 1995	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	15 Oct 1994	
Sao Tome and Principe	4 Oct 1995	
Senegal	14 Oct 1994	26 Jul 1995
Seychelles	14 Oct 1994	
Sierra Leone	11 Nov 1994	
South Africa	9 Jan 1995	
Spain	14 Oct 1994	
Sudan	15 Oct 1994	24 Nov 1995
Swaziland	27 Jul 1995	
Sweden	15 Oct 1994	12 Dec 1995
Switzerland	14 Oct 1994	
Syrian Arab Republic	15 Oct 1994	
Togo	15 Oct 1994	4 Oct 1995 *A*
Tunisia	14 Oct 1994	11 Oct 1995
Turkey	14 Oct 1994	
Turkmenistan	27 Mar 1995	
Uganda	21 Nov 1994	
United Kingdom	14 Oct 1994	
United Republic of Tanzania	14 Oct 1994	
United States of America	14 Oct 1994	
Uzbekistan	7 Dec 1994	31 Oct 1995
Vanuatu	28 Sep 1995	
Zaire	14 Oct 1994	
Zambia	15 Oct 1994	
Zimbabwe	15 Oct 1994	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 28 of [the said Convention] that it accepts both means of dispute settlement referred to in that paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

NOTES:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/47/49) (Vol.I), p. 137.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

11. Lusaka Agreement on Co-operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora

Adopted at the Ministerial Meeting at Lusaka on 8 September 1994

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 13 (1)].
TEXT: UNEP doc. No. 94/7929.
STATUS: Signatures: 7. Parties: 2.

Note: The Agreement was adopted at the Ministerial Meeting for the Adoption of the Agreed Text of the Lusaka Agreement on Co-operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal trade in Wild Fauna and Flora held at Lusaka on 8-9 September 1994. In accordance with its article 12 (1), the Agreement was open for signature on 9 September 1994 by all African States at Lusaka and thereafter from 12 September 1994 at the Headquarters of the United Nations Environment Programme in Nairobi, and from 13 December 1994 to 13 March 1995 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), acceptance (A), approval (AA)*
Ethiopia	1 Feb 1995	
Kenya	9 Sept 1994	
Lesotho		20 Jun 1995 *a*
South Africa	9 Sept 1994	
Swaziland	9 Sept 1994	
Uganda	9 Sept 1994	
United Republic of Tanzania	9 Sept 1994	
Zambia	9 Sept 1994	9 Nov 1995

CHAPTER XXVIII. FISCAL MATTERS

1. (a) Multilateral Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties

Concluded at Madrid on 13 December 1979

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article 13 (1)].
TEXT: Doc. of UNESCO and WIPO.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 7.

Note: The Convention *(a)*, and the Additional Protocol *(b)* were established by the International Conference of States on the Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties Remitted from One Country to Another, held in Madrid from 26 November to 13 December 1979. The Conference was convened jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), in accordance with resolution 5/9.2/1, section II, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its twentieth session, and with the decisions taken by the General Assembly of WIPO and by the Assembly and the Conference of Representatives of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (Berne Union) during their ordinary sessions held in September 1978.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a), succession (d)*
Cameroon	13 Dec 1979		India		31 Jan 1983 *a*
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*	Iraq		15 Jul 1981 *a*
Ecuador		26 Oct 1994 *a*	Israel	13 Dec 1979	
Egypt		11 Feb 1982 *a*	Peru		15 Apr 1988 *a*
Holy See	13 Dec 1979		Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC [1]

INDIA

Reservation:

The Government of India does not consider itself bound by articles 1 to 4 and 17 of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA[1]

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 October 1980 and 24 September 1981, respectively, with the following reservation:

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, according to which all disputes between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or in the matter of application of this Convention, not settled by negotiation, shall, unless the States concerned agree on some other method of settlement, be brought before the International Court of Justice for determination by it, and it declares that in every case an agreement of all the parties to the dispute is needed for bringing that dispute before the International Court of Justice."

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

(*b*) Additional Protocol

Concluded at Madrid on 13 December 1979

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see paragraph 2 (*b*)].
TEXT: Doc. of UNESCO and WIPO.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 2.

Note: See *"Note:"* at the beginning of chapter XXVIII.1 (*a*).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, acceptance (A), accession (a), succession (d)*
Cameroon	13 Dec 1979		Israel	13 Dec 1979	
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 *d*	Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 *d*
Holy See	13 Dec 1979				

NOTES:

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 24 September 1981. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

Part II

League of Nations Multilateral Treaties

1. Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace

Geneva, September 23rd, 1936[1]

IN FORCE since April 2nd, 1938 (article 11).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (February 11th, 1938)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (August 18th, 1937)
Burma (October 13th, 1937 *a*)
Southern Rhodesia (November 1st, 1937 *a*)
Aden Colony, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong Kong, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembiland, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei], Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], North Borneo (State of), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena and Ascension, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland Protectorate, Straits Settlements, Swaziland, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trans-Jordan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar Protectorate (July 14th, 1939 a)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Australia (June 25th, 1937 *a*)
Including the Territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the Mandated Territories of *New Guinea and Nauru.*
New Zealand (January 27th, 1938)
Union of South Africa (February 1st, 1938 *a*)
Including the Mandated Territory of *South West Africa.*
India (August 11th, 1937)
Ireland (May 25th, 1938 *a*)
Chile (February 20th, 1940)
Denmark (October 11th, 1937)
Egypt (July 29th, 1938)
Estonia (August 18th, 1938)
Finland (November 29th, 1938 *a*)
France (March 8th, 1938)
French Colonies and Protectorates and Territories under French Mandate *(January 14th, 1939 a)*
Guatemala (November 18th, 1938 *a*)
Latvia (April 25th, 1939 *a*)
Luxembourg (February 8th, 1938)
The Netherlands (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (February 15th, 1939)
New Hebrides (July 14th, 1939 *a*)
Norway (May 5th, 1938)
Salvador (August 18th, 1938 *a*)
Sweden (June 22nd, 1938 *a*)
Switzerland (December 30th, 1938)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
Argentine Republic
Austria
Belgium
Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.[2]
Colombia
Dominican Republic
Greece
Lithuania
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Under reservation of the declaration mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.[3]
Turkey
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4,5]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Afghanistan[6]	8 Feb 1985 *a*	17 May 1985
Australia	17 May 1972 *a*	
Bulgaria[7]	19 Jun 1967 *d*	
Cameroon		13 Apr 1984
France[8]	5 Jan 1967 *a*	
Holy See	20 Sep 1984 *a*	
Hungary[9]		
Lao People's Democratic Republic	23 Mar 1966 *a*	
Malta	1 Aug 1966 *d*	
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*	
Mongolia[10]	10 Jul 1985 *a*	
Netherlands[11]		
Russian Federation[12]	3 Feb 1983	
United Kingdom[13]		24 Jul 1985

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 4319. See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 186, p. 301; vol. 197, p. 394, and vol. 200, p. 557.

[2] These declarations are worded as follows:

"The Delegation of Belgium declares its opinion that the right of a country to jam by its own means improper transmissions emanating from another country, in so far as such a right exists in conformity with the general provisions of international law and with the Conventions in force, is in no way affected by the Convention."

[3] This declaration is worded as follows:

"The Spanish Delegation declares that its Government reserves the right to put a stop by all possible means to propaganda liable adversely to affect internal order in Spain and involving a breach of the Convention, in the event of the procedure proposed by the Convention not permitting of immediate steps to put a stop to such breach."

[4] The instrument of accession had been received on 30 August 1984 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic, with the following reservation and declaration:

Reservation

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention, according to which disputes regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention in the absence of a settlement by way of negotiation shall be submitted, at the request of one of the Parties to the dispute, to arbitration or to judicial settlement. The German Democratic Republic holds the view that in every single case the consent of all Parties to the dispute shall be necessary to refer a particular dispute to arbitration or to judicial settlement.

Declaration

The position of the German Democratic Republic on Article 14 of the International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace of 23 September 1936, as far as the application of the Convention to colonial and other dependent territories is concerned, is governed by the provisions of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960) proclaiming the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. The German Democratic Republic expresses its conviction that the purpose of the Convention would be served if all member States of the United Nations Organization were granted the possibility to become parties to the Convention. The German Democratic Republic declares that it reserves itself the right to take measures to protect its interests in the case that other States would not comply with the provisions of the Convention or in the case of other activities which affect the interests of the German Democratic Republic.

Since the Convention concerned is one of those in respect of which the Secretary-General, under resolution 24 (I) of the United Nations General Assembly, exercises the functions previously carried out by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and taking into account the practice followed by the latter in the case of reservations made in respect of multilateral treaties which do not contain provision in that regard, the Secretary-General had requested the States concerned, by circular letter dated 19 September 1984, to notify him within 90 days of any objection to the reservation quoted above.

In this regard, the Secretary-General had received on 5 December 1984 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following objection:

"1. [The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] do not accept the reservation to article 7 of the Convention contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"2. [The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] do not accept the declaration concerning article 14 contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"3. [The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] do not consider either of the foregoing statements as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for the German Democratic Republic."

This above-quoted objection being the only one received by the Secretary-General within the 90 day period, and it not precluding the entry into force of the Convention for the German Democratic Republic, the Secretary-General proceeded with the deposit of the instrument (19 December 1984) with reservation and declaration.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[5] The instrument of ratification was received on 18 September 1984 from the Government of Czechoslovakia accompanied with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

"Having seen and considered the International Convention aforesaid and knowing that the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic agrees to it, we approve and confirm it in accordance with its article 9, while stipulating that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not feel to be bound by the provisions of its article 7 concerning the submission of disputes over the interpretation or implementation of the Convention to arbitration or judicial settlement."

Declarations:

"The provision of article 14 is in contradiction to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which was adopted at the XVth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1960 and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regards it therefore as superseded".

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic retains the right to adopt any measures in protection of its interests, both in case of failure by other States to comply with the Convention and in case of other actions harmful to its interests".

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 4 above), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and declarations on 30 October 1984 and, in the absence of objection within the period of 90 days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of ratification with reservation and declarations.

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 7 made upon ratification.

See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] The instrument of accession was received on 31 July 1984 from the Government of Afghanistan, with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

(i) The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, by acceding to the International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace, does not bound herself to the provision of article 7 of the said Convention, because, in accordance with this article, in the case of dispute arising between two or several High Contracting Parties regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, only at the request of one of the concerned parties, the case can be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice for judgement.

Therefore, concerning this matter, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares that in the case of dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, the case should be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice with the agreement of all concerned parties.

Interpretative declaration:

(ii) Likewise, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares that the provision of article 14 of this Convention runs counter to the Declaration, adopted in the year 1960, on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the interpretation of which indirectly confirms the continuation of the existence of the colonies and protectorates.

Therefore, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not deem necessary the existence of article 14 in the said Convention and does not bound herself to it.

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 4 above), the

Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and interpretative declaration on 9 November 1984 and, in the absence of objection within the period of 90 days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of accession with reservation and interpretative declaration.

[7] The instrument of accession was received on 4 November 1971, from the Government of Bulgaria, and accompanied with the following reservation:

1. The People's Republic of Bulgaria will not consider itself bound by the provisions of the section of article 7 of the Convention which provided for consideration of disputes between Parties by the International Court of Justice at the request of one of the Parties. Any decision by the Court concerning a dispute between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and another Party to the Convention rendered on a basis of a request made to the Court without the consent of the People's Republic of Bulgaria will be considered null and void.

2. The People's Republic of Bulgaria will apply the principles of the Convention in respect of all States Parties to the Convention on the basis of reciprocity. However, the Convention will not be deemed to create formal commitments between countries which do not maintain diplomatic relations.

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 4 above), the Secretary-General had requested the States concerned, by circular letter dated 17 February 1972, to notify him within 90 days of any objection to the reservation quoted above.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 May 1972 with respect to the above reservation, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations stated the following:

"The United Kingdom Government wish to put on record that they are unable to accept the reservation contained in paragraph 1 of this statement. They are also unable to accept the reservation contained in the second sentence of paragraph 2 because, in their view, treaties create rights and obligations between contracting States irrespective of whether those States maintain diplomatic relations. They do not, however, consider these objections as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for Bulgaria."

This above-quoted objection being the only one received by the Secretary-General within the 90 day period, and it not precluding the entry into force of the Convention for Bulgaria, the Secretary-General proceeded with the deposit of the instrument with reservation and declaration.

[8] The notification specifies that the denunciation is being effected since the French broadcasting régime resulting from the Law of 29 July 1982 on audio-visual communications does not appear to be compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

[9] The instrument of accession was received on 17 May 1984 from the Government of Hungary, with the following declaration and reservation:

Declaration:

"The Hungarian People's Republic declares [. . .] that the provisions of article 14 of the Convention are at variance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and as such have lost their topicality."

Reservation:

"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 7 of the Convention that should a dispute arise between the Parties regarding the interpretation or application of the present Convention for which it has been found impossible to arrive at a satisfactory settlement through the diplomatic channel, it shall, at the request of one of the Parties, be submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement, and declares that submission of any such dispute to arbitration or to judicial settlement shall be subject to the common consent of the Parties."

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 4 above), the Secretary-General had requested by circular letter dated 21 June 1984, to notify him within 90 days of any objection to the reservation quoted above.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 24 September 1984, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following objection:

[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland]:

"1. do not accept the reservation to article 7 of the Convention contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"2. do not accept the declaration concerning article 14 contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"3. do not consider either of the foregoing statements as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for Hungary."

[10] The instrument of accession was received on 10 July 1985 from the Government of Mongolia and accompanied with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 7 of the Convention under which disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention and which has not been settled by means of negotiations shall be submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement at the request of one of the Parties to the dispute. The Mongolian People's Republic considers that for the submission of a dispute to any judicial settlement, the consent of all Parties to the dispute shall be essential in every individual case.

Declarations:

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that it retains the right to take any measures to preserve its interests both in the event of failure by other states to observe the provisions of the Convention and in the event of encroachment on the interests of the Mongolian People's Republic;

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 14 of this Convention are obsolete and contradict the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514/XV of 14 December 1960.

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 4 above), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and declarations on 6 September 1985 and, in the absence of objection within the period of ninety days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of accession with the said reservation and declaration.

Subsequently, on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification with respect to article 7.

[11] Notification of denunciation received on 11 October 1982, with effect from 11 October 1983.

[12] The signature was effected on 23 September 1936 under the reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting to the Conference (for the text of the declarations, see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXXXVI, p. 317. The instrument of ratification, received by the depositary on 28 October 1982, was accompanied by the following reservation and declaration, which supersede those made upon signature:

[1.] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 7 of the Convention under which any dispute that may arise regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention which has not been settled by means of negotiations shall be submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement at the request of one of the Parties, and declares that, for the submission of such a dispute to arbitration or to judicial settlement,the agreement of all Parties to the dispute shall be essential in every separate case;

[2.] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it retains the right to take any measures to preserve its interests both in the event of failure by other States to observe the provisions of the Convention and in the event of any other actions that encroach on the interests of the USSR;

[3.] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of article 14 of the Convention are obsolete and contradict the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960).

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 4 above), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and declarations on 5 November 1982 and, in the absence of objection within the period of 90 days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of ratification with reservation and declarations.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 9 December 1983 from the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record the following:

"1. They do not accept the reservation to article 7 of the Convention reproduced under (1) of [the reservation and declarations made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics].

"2. They note [the Secretary-General's] understanding that the declaration reproduced under (2) of [the said reservation and declarations] does not purport to modify the legal effect of any provision of the Convention. If, contrary to this understanding, the declaration were intended to modify the legal effect of any provision of the Convention, they would consider it incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, particularly when taken together with the purported reservation to article 7.

"3. They do not accept the declaration concerning article 14 reproduced under (3) of [the said reservation and declarations].

"4. They do not consider any of the foregoing statements as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

13 The notification specifies that the denunciation shall apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and those dependent territories to which the Convention was applied and for whose international relations the United Kingdom is still responsible.

2. Special Protocol concerning Statelessness

The Hague, April 12th, 1930[1]

NOT YET IN FORCE (articles 9 and 10).[2]

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (April 4th, 1939)
With the reservation that the application of this Protocol will not be extended to the Colony of the Belgian Congo or to the Territories under mandate.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations* (January 14th, 1932)

Burma[3]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.

Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China[4] (February 14th, 1935)

Salvador (October 14th, 1935)
The Republic of Salvador does not assume the obligation laid down by the Protocol where the Salvadorian nationality possessed by the person and ultimately lost by him was acquired by naturalisation.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Canada
Colombia
Cuba
Egypt
Greece
Ireland
Luxembourg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Succession*
China[4]	
Fiji	25 May 1973
Pakistan[5]	29 Jul 1953

NOTES:

[1] See document C.27.M.16.1931.V.

[2] The Protocol shall enter into force ninety days after having received ten ratifications or accessions (Articles 9 and 10).

[3] As mentioned in the latest official list of the League of Nations, Burma, which was formerly a part of India, was separated from the latter on 1 April 1937 and had possessed since that time the status of an overseas territory of the United Kingdom. It was as such that Burma continued to be bound by a ratification or accession recorded on behalf of India before the date above mentioned.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

On 12 September 1973, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of China to the effect that it had decided not to recognize as binding on China the Special Protocol concerning Statelessness of April 12th, 1930, signed and ratified by the defunct Government of China. That notification was treated as a withdrawal of the instrument.

[5] In a communication received on 29 July 1953, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary-General that by reason of Article 4 of the Schedule to the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947, the rights and obligations under the Special Protocol devolve upon Pakistan, and that the Government of Pakistan, "therefore, considers itself a party to that Protocol".

3. Protocol relating to a Certain Case of Statelessness

The Hague, April 12th, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since July 1st, 1937 (articles 9 and 10).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations* (January 14th, 1932)
Burma[2]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.
Australia (July 8th, 1935)
(Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru.*)
Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the Provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under his suzerainty or the population of the said territories.
Chile (March 20th, 1935)
China[3] (February 14th, 1935)
The Netherlands[4] (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curacao.*
Poland (June 15th, 1934)
Salvador (October 14th, 1935 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Belgium
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
Canada
Colombia
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[5]
Denmark
Egypt
Estonia
France
Greece
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Luxembourg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), succession (d)*			*Participant*	*Accession (a), succession (d)*		
Cyprus	3	Apr	1978 *d*	Mauritius	18	Jul	1969 *d*
Fiji	12	Jun	1972 *d*	Niger	18	Jul	1968 *a*
Jamaica	12	Jun	1968 *a*	Pakistan	29	Jul	1953 *d*
Kiribati	29	Nov	1983 *d*	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18	Jan	1994 *d*
Lesotho	4	Nov	1974 *d*	Yugoslavia	15	Dec	1959 *a*
Malawi[6]	11	Jul	1967 *a*				
Malta[7]	16	Aug	1966 *d*				

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 4138. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 179, p. 115.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.2.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[5] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] The instrument of accession contains the following reservation made in accordance with article 4 of the Protocol:
"Article 1 shall only be binding upon the Government of Malawi in cases where the mother of a person referred to therein is both a citizen of Malawi and of African race. However, no such person who is denied citizenship of Malawi because his mother is not of African race shall be precluded from applying for citizenship of Malawi on the grounds of close connection with Malawi, birth in Malawi being regarded as a close connection for this purpose."

[7] The notification of succession contains the following declaration:
"In accordance with article 4 of the Protocol, the Government of Malta declares that:
"(i) article 1 shall apply unconditionally to any person born in Malta on or after the 21st September 1964;
"(ii) in regard to a person born in Malta before the 21st September 1964, article 1 shall only apply, where such person was on 20 September 1964, a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies and one of his parents was born in Malta."

4. Convention on Certain Questions relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws

The Hague, April 12th, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since July 1st, 1937 (articles 25 and 26).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (April 4th, 1939)
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
Excluding Article 16 of the Convention.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
With reservations as regards Articles 5, 6, 7, 16 and 17, which Brazil will not adopt owing to difficulties with which it has to contend in connection with principles forming the basis of its internal legislation.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations* (April 6th, 1934)

Burma[2]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.

Canada (April 6th, 1934)

Australia (November 10th, 1937)
Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk* Island.

India (October 7th, 1935)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under his suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China[3] (February 14th, 1935)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.

Monaco (April 27th, 1931 *a*)

The Netherlands[4] (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*.
Excluding the provisions of Articles 8, 9 and 10 of the Convention.

Norway (March 16th, 1931 *a*)

Poland (June 15th, 1934)

Sweden (July 6th, 1933)
The Swedish Government declares that it does not accept to be bound by the provisions of the second sentence of Article 11, in the case where the wife referred to in the article, after recovering the nationality of her country of origin, fails to establish her ordinary residence in that country.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Union of South Africa
China
Colombia
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
Cuba
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 9 10 and 11.
Czechoslovakia[5]
Denmark
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 5 and 11.
Egypt
Estonia
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 4 and 10 and as regards the words "according to its law" of Article 13.
Latvia
Luxembourg
Mexico
Subject to reservation as regards paragraph 2 of Article 1.
Peru
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.
Portugal
Salvador
Spain
Switzerland
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
Uruguay
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), succession (d)*
Cyprus	27 Mar 1970 *d*
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 *d*
Kiribati	29 Nov 1983 *d*
Lesotho[6]	
Malta[7]	16 Aug 1966 *d*
Mauritius[8]	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Pakistan	29 Jul 1953 *d*
Swaziland	18 Sep 1970 *a*

NOTES:

1 Registered No. 4137. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 179, p. 89.

2 See note 3 in Part II.2.

3 See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

4 See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[5] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[6] The notification of succession contains the following reservation:

"In accordance with article 20 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that the second paragraph of article 6 of the Convention shall not apply so as to give effect to a declaration of renunciation of the citizenship of Lesotho if such declaration is made during any war in which Lesotho is engaged, or if the Government of Lesotho considers such declaration otherwise not conducive to the public good."

The above reservation not having been originally formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom in respect of Basutoland, it has become effective for Lesotho on the date on which it would have done so under the provisions of article 26 of the Convention, had it been formulated upon accession, that is to say, on 2 February 1975.

[7] The notification of succession contains the following declaration:

"In accordance with article 20 of the Convention, the Government of Malta declares that:

"*(a)* The second paragraph of article 6 of the Convention shall not apply in Malta so as to give immediate effect to a declaration of renunciation of citizenship of Malta, if such declaration is made during any war in which Malta may be engaged or if in the opinion of the Government of Malta such declaration is otherwise contrary to the public policy;

"*(b)* Article 16 of the Convention shall not apply to an illegitimate child born outside Malta."

[8] The notification of succession contains the following reservattion:

"In accordance with article 20 of the Convention the Government of Mauritius declares that the second paragraph of article 6 of the Convention shall not apply in Mauritius so as to give effect to a declaration of renunciation of the citizenship of Mauritius, if such declaration is made during any war in which Mauritius is engaged."

5. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality

The Hague, April 12th, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since May 25th, 1937 (articles 11 and 12).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

United States of America (August 3rd, 1932)
Belgium (April 4th, 1939)
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
Brazil (September 19th, 1931 *a*)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations* (January 14th, 1932)
Burma[2]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.
Australia (July 8th, 1935 *a*)
Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.
Union of South Africa (October 9th, 1935 *a*)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 2.
India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 15, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under his suzerainty or the population of the said territories.
Colombia (February 24th, 1937)
Cuba (October 22nd, 1936)
The Government of Cuba declares that it does not accept the obligation imposed by Article 2 of the Protocol when the minor referred to in that Article, although he has the right, on attaining his majority, to renounce or decline Cuban nationality, habitually resides in the territory of the State and is in fact more closely connected with the latter than with any other State whose nationality he may also possess.
The Netherlands[3] (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curacao*.
Salvador (October 14th, 1935)
Sweden (July 6th, 1933)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Canada
Chile
Denmark
Egypt
France
Germany
Greece
Ireland
Luxembourg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	28 Jul 1958	Malta	16 Aug 1966 *d*
Cyprus	27 Mar 1970 *d*	Mauritania	2 Mar 1966 *a*
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 *d*	Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Kiribati	29 Nov 1983 *d*	Niger	25 Jul 1966 *a*
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974 *d*	Nigeria	17 Mar 1967 *a*
Malawi	13 Oct 1966 *a*	Swaziland	18 Sep 1970 *a*

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 4117. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 178, p. 227.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.2.

[3] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

6. Protocol on Arbitration Clauses

Geneva, September 24th, 1923[1]

IN FORCE since July 28th, 1924 (article 6).

Ratifications

Albania (August 29th, 1924)
Austria (January 25th, 1928)
Belgium (September 23rd, 1924)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Brazil (February 5th, 1932)
Subject to the condition that the arbitral agreement or the arbitration clause mentioned in Article 1 of this Protocol should be limited to contracts which are considered as commercial by the Brazilian legislation.
British Empire (September 27th, 1924)
Applies only to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and consequently does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority or any territory in respect of which His Majesty's Government exercises a mandate.
Southern Rhodesia (December 18th, 1924 *a*)
Newfoundland (June 22nd, 1925 *a*)
British Guiana, British Honduras, Ceylon, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gold Coast (including Ashanti and the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast and Togoland), Gibraltar, Jamaica (Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Northern Rhodesia, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Trans-Jordan, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar (March 12th, 1926 *a*)
Tanganyika (June 17th, 1926 *a*)
St. Helena (July 29th, 1926 *a*)
Uganda (June 28th, 1929 *a*)
Bahamas (January 23rd, 1931 *a*)
Burma (excluding the Karenni States under His Majesty's suzerainty) (October 19th, 1938 *a*)
His Majesty reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under the law of Burma.
New Zealand (June 9th, 1926)
India (October 23rd, 1937)
Is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Protocol upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Czechoslovakia[2] (September 18th, 1931)
The Czechoslovak Republic will regard itself as being bound only in relation to States which will have ratified the Convention of September 26th, 1927, on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, and the Czechoslovak Republic does not intend by this signature to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it which regulate the questions referred to in the present Protocol by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Protocol.

Ratifications

Denmark (April 6th, 1925)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary courts of law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.
Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Limits, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2 of this Protocol, the obligation mentioned in paragraph 1 of the said article to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Finland (July 10th, 1924)
France (June 7th, 1928)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates or Territories in respect of which France exercises a mandate.
Germany (November 5th, 1924)
Greece (May 26th, 1926)
Iraq (March 12th, 1926 *a*)
Italy (excluding Colonies) (July 28th, 1924)
Japan (June 4th, 1928)
Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the leased territory of Kwantung, and the territories in respect of which Japan exercises a mandate (February 26th, 1929 *a*)
Luxembourg (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Monaco (February 8th, 1927)
Reserves the right to limit its obligation to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
The Netherlands[3] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (August 6th, 1925)
The Government of the Netherlands declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.[3]
Norway (September 2nd, 1927)
Poland (June 26th, 1931)
Under reservation that, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 1, the undertaking contemplated in the said Article will apply only to contracts which are declared as commercial in accordance with national Polish law.
Portugal (December 10th, 1930)
(1) In accordance with the second paragraph of Article 1, the Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
(2) According to the terms of the first paragraph of Article 8, the Portuguese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include its Colonies.

Ratifications

Romania (March 12th, 1925)
Subject to the reservation that the Royal Government may in all circumstances limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Spain (July 29th, 1926)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Ratifications

Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa, or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)
Switzerland (May 14th, 1928)
Thailand (September 3rd, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratifications

Bolivia
Chile
Latvia
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Liechtenstein[4]
Subject to the following reservation:
Agreements which are the subject of a special contract, or of clauses embodied in other contracts, attributing competence to a foreign tribunal, if they are concluded between nationals and foreigners or between nationals in the country, shall henceforth be valid only when they have been drawn up in due legal form.
This provision shall apply also to stipulations in articles of association, deeds of partnership and similar instruments and also to agreements for the submission of a dispute to an arbitral tribunal sitting in a foreign country.
Any agreement which submits to a foreign tribunal or to an arbitral tribunal a dispute relating to insurance contracts shall be null and void if the person insured is domiciled in the country or if the interest insured is situated in the country.
It shall be the duty of the tribunal to ensure as a matter of routine that this provision is observed even during procedure for distraint or during bankruptcy proceedings.

Lithuania
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Salvador
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[5]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 *d*
Bahamas		16 Feb 1977 *d*
Bangladesh	27 Jun 1979	27 Jun 1979
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*
Ireland	29 Nov 1956	11 Mar 1957
Israel	24 Oct 1951	13 Dec 1951
Malta		16 Aug 1966 *d*
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*
Republic of Korea	4 Mar 1968	
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 *d*
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Uganda	5 May 1965	
United Kingdom (on behalf of *Hong Kong*)		10 Feb 1965 *a*
Yugoslavia	13 Mar 1959	13 Mar 1959

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 678. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 27, p. 157.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] Further, when signing and ratifying, the Netherlands Government made a reservation which it withdrew, in respect of the Kingdom of Europe, on February 22nd, 1938 (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 185, p. 372) and, as regards the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, on April 16th, 1940 (see *ibid.*, vol. 200, p. 500). See also note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] This reservation has been submitted to the States parties to the Protocol for acceptance.

[5] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Protocol as from 4 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application as from 4 April 1958, of the Protocol of 24 September 1923 on Arbitration Clauses, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date

of the reapplication of the Protocol on Arbitration Clauses of 24 September 1923 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."
See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

7. Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards

Geneva, September 26th, 1927[1]

IN FORCE since July 25th, 1929 (article 8).

Ratifications

Austria (July 18th, 1930)

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Belgian Congo, Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (June 5th, 1930 *a*)

Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2] (July 2nd, 1930)

Newfoundland (January 7th, 1931 *a*)

Bahamas, British Guiana, British Honduras, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) *Colony*, (b) *Ashanti*, (c) *Northern Territories*, (d) *Togoland under British Mandate*], *Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Tanganyika Territory, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar* (May 26th, 1931 *a*)

Mauritius (July 13th, 1931 *a*)

Northern Rhodesia (July 13th, 1931 *a*)

Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis, Virgin Islands) (March 9th, 1932 *a*)

Malta (October 11th, 1934 *a*)

Burma (excluding the Karenni States under His Majesty's suzerainty) (October 19th, 1938 *a*)

His Majesty reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under the law of Burma.

New Zealand (*Western Samoa* included) (April 9th, 1929)

India (October 23rd, 1937)

Is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Czechoslovakia[3] (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic does not intend to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it with various States, which regulate the questions referred to in the present Convention by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Convention.

Denmark (April 25th, 1929)

Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary Courts of Law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.

Estonia (May 16th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Finland (July 30th, 1931)

France (May 13th, 1931)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Germany (September 1st, 1930)

Greece (January 15th, 1932)

The Hellenic Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Italy (November 12th, 1930)

Luxembourg (September 15th, 1930)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Netherlands[4] (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 12th, 1931)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and *Curaçao* (January 28th, 1933 *a*)

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)

(1) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

(2) The Portuguese Government declares, according to the terms of Article 10, that the present Convention does not apply to its Colonies.

Romania (June 22nd, 1931)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Spain (January 15th, 1930)

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (September 25th, 1930)

Thailand (July 7th, 1931)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia Nicaragua Peru

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[5]	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda .		25 Oct 1988 *d*	Republic of Korea ...	4 Mar 1968	
Bahamas		16 Feb 1977 *d*	Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 *d*
Bangladesh	27 Jun 1979	27 Jun 1979	the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		10 Mar 1994 *d*
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 *d*	Uganda	5 May 1965	
Ireland	29 Nov 1956	10 Jun 1957	United Kingdom (on behalf of		
Israel	24 Oct 1951	27 Feb 1952	*Hong Kong*)		10 Feb 1965 *a*
Japan	4 Feb 1952	11 Jul 1952	Yugoslavia	13 Mar 1959	13 Mar 1959
Malta		16 Aug 1966 *d*			
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 *d*			

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 2096. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 92, p. 301.

[2] In a notification received on 16 December 1985, the Government of the United Kingdom recalled the following:

At the time of accession, Anguilla was part of the territory of St. Christopher and Nevis. By 1978, Anguilla had a separate constitutional status, as part of the St. Christopher and Nevis/Anguilla group. St. Christopher and Nevis became independent on 19 September 1983 and Anguilla then reverted to being a dependant territory of the United Kingdom. Therefore, the Convention continues to apply to Anguilla.

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[5] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 22 January 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 22 January 1958, of the Convention of 26 September 1927 on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 26 September 1927 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

8. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes

Geneva, June 7th, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since January 1st, 1934 (article 13).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(August 31st, 1932)
Belgium	(August 31st, 1932)
Brazil	(August 26th, 1942 *a*)
Denmark	(July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	
Finland	(August 31st, 1932)
France	(April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Germany[2]	(October 3rd, 1933)
Greece	(August 31st, 1931)
Italy	(August 31st, 1932)
Japan	(August 31st, 1932)
Monaco	(January 25th, 1934 *a*)
The Netherlands[3] (for the Kingdom in Europe)	(August 20th, 1932)
Netherlands Indies and *Curacao*	(July 16th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam	(August 7th, 1936 *a*)
Norway	(July 27th, 1932)
Poland	(December 19th, 1936 *a*)
Portugal[2, 4]	(June 8th, 1934)
Sweden	(July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[5]	(August 26th, 1932)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(November 25th, 1936 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Colombia
Czechoslovakia[6]
Ecuador
Peru
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (See also note 4)

Participant[7]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 *a*	Luxembourg	5 Mar 1963
Kazakstan	20 Nov 1995 *a*	Portugal[4]	

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3314. League of Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 143, p. 317.

[2] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[3] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 143, p. 319). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of that reservation.

[5] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect for Switzerland, as from that date.

[6] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 7 June 1930 for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 7 June 1930 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

9. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques

Geneva, March 19th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since January 1st, 1934 (article 14).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil	(August 26th, 1942 *a*)
Denmark	(July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	
Finland	(August 31st, 1932)
France	(April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Germany[2]	(October 3rd, 1933)
Greece[2]	(June 1st, 1934)
Italy	(August 31st, 1933)
Japan	(August 25th, 1933)
Monaco	(February 9th, 1933)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

The Netherlands[2,3] (For the Kingdom in Europe)	(April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and *Curaçao*	(September 30th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam	(August 7th, 1936 *a*)
Nicaragua	(March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway	(July 27th, 1932)
Poland	(December 19th, 1936 *a*)
Portugal[2,4]	(June 8th, 1934)
Sweden	(July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[5]	(August 26th, 1932)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Czechoslovakia[6] Romania Turkey
Ecuador Spain Yugoslavia
Mexico

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (See also note 4)

Participant[7]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	1 Dec 1958	Indonesia	9 Mar 1959 *d*
Belgium[8]	18 Dec 1961	Luxembourg	1 Aug 1968 *a*
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 *a*		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3317. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 407.

[2] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[3] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 409). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

[5] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect for Switzerland, as from that date.

[6] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 19 March 1931 for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with cheques, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the Declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 18 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in Connection with Cheques of 19 March 1931 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[8] With a declaration that, in accordance with article 18 of the Convention, the Government of Belgium does not intend to assume any obligations in respect of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

10. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes

Geneva, June 7th, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since January 1st, 1934 (article VI).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria[2] (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Article 6, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

Belgium (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the utilization of the rights provided in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention. As regards the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government intends to reserve all the rights provided in the Annex in question, with the exception of the right mentioned in Article 21 of that Annex.

Brazil (August 26th, 1942 *a*)
This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

Denmark[3] (July 27th, 1932)
The undertaking by the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 of Annex II to the said Convention.
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

Finland[4] (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

France[5] (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Declares that Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

Germany[6] (October 3rd, 1933)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10 , 1 3, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

Greece (August 31st, 1931)
Subject to the following reservations with regard to Annex II:
Article 8: Paragraphs 1 and 3.
Article 9: As regards bills payable at a fixed date, or at a fixed period after date or after sight.
Article 13.
Article 15: *(a)* Proceedings against a drawer or endorser who has made an inequitable gain; *(b)* Same proceedings against an acceptor who has made an inequitable gain. "These proceedings shall be taken within a period of five years counting from the date of the bill of exchange."

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Article 17: The provisions of Greek law relating to short-term limitations shall apply.
Article 20: The above-mentioned reservations apply equally to promissory notes.

Italy (August 31st, 1932)
The Italian Government reserves the right to avail itself of the right granted in Articles 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

Japan (August 31st, 1932)
This ratification is given subject to the right referred to in the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention, in virtue of Article 1, paragraph 2.

Monaco (January 25th, 1934 *a*)

Netherlands[7] (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservation mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.
Netherlands Indies and *Curaçao* (July 16th, 1935 *a*)
Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Norway[8] (July 27th, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)
This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, paragraph 2, and 22 of Annex II to the Convention.

Portugal[6,9] (June 8th, 1934)

Sweden[10] (July 27th, 1932)
This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15 and 17 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Switzerland[11] (August 26th, 1932)
This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 14 , 1 5, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Annex II.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 *a*)
Subject to the reservation mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Colombia	Peru	Turkey
Czechoslovakia[12]	Spain	Yugoslavia
Ecuador		

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (see also notes 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10)

Participant[13]	*Ratification, accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a)*
Hungary[14]	28 Oct 1964 *a*	Luxembourg[15]	5 Mar 1963
Kazakstan	20 Nov 1995 *a*		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3313. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 257.

[2] In a communication received on 13 May 1963, the Government of Austria notified the Secretary-General that, in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention, it "has decided to make reservations referred to in article 18 of Annex II to the Convention, to the effect that certain business days shall be assimilated to legal holidays as regards presentment for acceptance of payment and all other acts relating to bills of exchange".

In a communication received on 26 November 1968, the Government of Austria, with reference to the above-mentioned reservations, notified the Secretary-General that "according to Austrian Law in force since July 26, 1967, no payment, acceptance or other acts may be demanded in respect of bills of exchange and promissory notes on the following legal holidays or days assimilated to such holidays: 1 January (New Year's Day), 6 January (Epiphany), Good Friday, Easter Monday, 1 May (Legal Holiday), Ascension, Whit-Monday, Corpus Christi, 15 August (Assumption), 26 October (National Day), 1 November (All Saints' Day), 8 December (Immaculate Conception), 25 December and 26 December (Christmas), Saturdays and Sundays".

[3] In a communication received on 31 January 1966, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General of the following: "As from December 1, 1965, the Danish laws giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the Convention were amended to provide that Saturdays shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention."

In the same communication, the Government of Denmark also notified the Secretary-General that the declaration made on its behalf under article X, paragraph 1, of the Convention upon its ratification to the effect that it "does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland", should be considered as withdrawn as from 1 July 1965.

[4] In a communication received on 29 July 1966, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of the following: "As from 1 June 1966, the First of May and Saturdays of June, July and August shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention."

In a communication received on 6 June 1977, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

> "As from I April 1968, the Finnish laws giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the two Conventions were amended to provide that Saturdays throughout the year shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I [of the Convention]."

[5] The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic informed the Secretary-General by a communication received at the Secretariat on October 20th, 1937, that, in consequence of certain changes introduced into French legislation regarding the maturity of commercial bills by the Decree-Law of August 31st, 1937, the holder of a bill of exchange may, in accordance with Article 38 of the Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Annex I to the Convention), present it, not only on the day on which it is payable, but either on that day or on one of the two following business days.

Consequently, the reservation made in this respect by France, on her accession to the Convention, concerning Article 5 of Annex II to the said instrument ceases to apply.

[6] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[8] In a communication received on 15 April 1970, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General that as from 1 June 1970, legislation would be promulgated in Norway assimilating Saturdays and the first day of the month of May to legal holidays.

[9] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 261). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

[10] In a communication received on 16 May 1961, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General that the Swedish Government, after having obtained the approval of the Parliament, promulgated on 7 April 1961 the law under which Saturdays from 1 June to 30 September of each year shall be assimilated to legal holidays for the purposes including the presentation for acceptance or payment and all other acts relating to bills of exchange. The Government of Sweden further requested that this communication be considered as a notification of reservations made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention.

In a communication received on 18 June 1965, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General of the following: on 26 May 1965, the Swedish Government, with the approval of the Parliament, promulgated legal provisions under which the Swedish law giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the Convention was amended to provide that Saturdays shall be assimilated to legal holidays, as is already the case with the Saturdays of April, May, June, July, August and September. These provisions will enter into force on 1 October 1965.

[11] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[12] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[13] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 7 June 1930 providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention Providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 7 June 1930 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[14] In a communication received on 5 January 1966, the Government of Hungary, with reference to the third paragraph of article I of the Convention and article 18 of Annex II thereof, notified the Secretary-General of the following: "In respect of bills of exchange and promissory notes, no payment may be demanded in Hungary on legal holidays, namely: 1 January (New Year's Day), 4 April (Liberation Day), 1 May (Labour Day), 20 August (Constitution Day), 7 November (Anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution), 25 December (Christmas Day), 26 December (Boxing Day), Easter Monday, and weekly rest days (usually Sundays)."

[15] The instrument of ratification stipulates that the Government of Luxembourg, in accordance with article 1 of the Convention, avails itself of all the reservations provided in articles 1, 4, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

Subsequently, on 25 March 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Hungary the following notification:

"In the circulation of bills of exchange between inlanders the protest may be replaced by a dated statement, written on the bill of exchange itself and signed by the drawee and the third person making the payment /Article 8,/ Annex 2, respectively, unless an authentic protest is required by the drawer in the wording of the bill of exchange.

In the case mentioned in the above paragraph it is deemed that an undated negotiation of bill is dated as before the date of the protest."

In a further communication received on 21 June 1985, the Government of Hungary provided the following additional comments with respect to the above-mentioned notification:

"1/ As regards conformity with Article 8 of Annex II, the wording "signed by the drawee and the third person making the payment, respectively" is intended by the competent Hungarian financial organs to express that the statement of the person to whom the bill of exchange is payable is required. If the bill of exchange is not domiciled with a named person for payment, the drawee's statement is required. In the case of an instrument domiciled with a named person payment, the statement signed by that named person is required.

2/ The wording in regard to bills of exchange domiciled with a named person for payment had to be expanded for two reasons:

/a/ As the third person named for payment can be considered as the drawee's "cashier", it is logical to authorize him to make the statement in case of non-payment.

/b/ A domiciled bill of exchange is to be presented for payment at maturity at the domicile. If the statement of the third person named for payment could not be accepted in lieu of protest and the statement of the drawee should therefore be obtained, it would often cause practically insurmountable difficulties in reaching the drawee within two and a half business days of frustrated payment.

Attention is called in this respect to the fact that the same solution is adopted by Art. 56, para. /3/, of the Draft Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes /A/CN9/211/ prepared by the Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments."

11. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques

Geneva, March 19th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since January 1st, 1934 (article VI).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (August 26th, 1942 *a*)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

Denmark[2] (July 27th, 1932)

The undertaking of the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, para. 1, 16 *(a)*, 18, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of Annex II to the said Convention.

The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

Finland[3] (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 *(a)*, 18 and 27 of Annex II to this Convention, and has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

France[4,5] (April 27th, 1936 *a*)

Declares that Articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

Germany[6] (October 3rd, 1933)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to the Convention.

Greece[6] (June 1st, 1934)

Subject to the following conditions:

A. The Hellenic Government does not avail itself of the reservations provided in Articles 1, 2, 5-8, 10-14, 16, paragraph 1 *(a)* and *(b)*, 18, paragraph 1, 19-22, 24 and 26, paragraph 2, of Annex II.

B. The Hellenic Government avails itself of the following reservations provided in Annex II:

(1) The reservation in Article 3, paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the Uniform Law being replaced by the words: "A cheque which does not specify the place of payment shall be regarded as payable at the place where it was drawn".

(2) The reservation in Article 4, the following paragraph being added to Article 3: "A cheque issued and payable in Greece shall not be valid as a cheque unless it is drawn on a banking Company or Greek legal person having the status of an institution of public law, engaging in banking business".

(3) The reservation in Article 9, the following provision being added to paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Uniform Law: "But in such exceptional case the issue of the cheque to bearer is prohibited."

(4) The reservation in Article 15, the following paragraph being added to Article 31 of the Uniform Law: "By presidential decree, promulgated at the instance of the Ministers of Justice and National Economy, it may be decided what institutions in Greece are to be regarded as clearing-houses."

(5) The reservation in the second paragraph of Article 16, it being laid down that "provisions with regard to the loss or theft of cheques shall be embodied in Greek law".

Ratifications or definitive accessions

(6) The reservation in Article 17, the following paragraph being added at the end of Article 35: "In exceptional circumstances connected with the rate of exchange of Greek currency, the effects of the stipulation contained in paragraph 3 of the present Article may be abrogated in each case by special legislation as regards cheques payable in Greece. The above provision may also be applied as regards cheques issued in Greece."

(7) The reservation in Article 23, the following being added to No. 2 in Article 45 of the Uniform Law: "which, however, in the case of cheques issued and payable in Greece, shall be calculated in each case at the legal rate of interest in force in Greece". Similarly, the following is added to No. 2 of Article 46 of the Uniform Law: "except in the special case dealt with in No. 2 of the preceding Article".

(8) The reservation in Article 25, the following Article being added to the National Law: "In the event of forfeiture of the bearer's rights or limitation of the right of action, proceedings may be taken against the drawer or endorser on the ground of his having made an inequitable gain. The right to take such proceedings lapses after three years from the date of the issue of the cheque."

(9) The reservation in the first paragraph of Article 26, a provision being enacted to the following effect: "The causes of interruption or suspension of limitation of actions enacted in the present law shall be governed by the rules regarding limitation and short-term limitation of actions."

(10) The reservation in Article 27, a separate Article being appended in the following terms: "Legal holidays within the meaning of the present law shall be all Sundays and all full days of rest observed by public offices."

(11) The reservation in Article 28 and the reservation in Article 29.

(12) The reservation in Article 30.

Italy (August 31st, 1933)

In accordance with Article 1 of this Convention, the Royal Italian Government intends to avail itself of the rights provided in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, para. 2, 19, 20, 21, para. 2, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

In connection with Article 15 of Annex II to this Convention, the institutions referred to in the said article are, in Italy, solely the "Stanze di compensazione".

Japan (August 25th, 1933)

By application of Article I, paragraph 2, of the Convention, this ratification is subject to the benefit of the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention.

Monaco (February 9th, 1933)

The Netherlands[6,7] (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and *Curaçao* (September 30th, 1935 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)

Norway[8] (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 *(a)* and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 15, 16, paragraph 1 *(a)*, 16, paragraph 2, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Portugal[6,9] (June 8th, 1934)

Sweden[10] (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 *(a)* and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Switzerland[11] (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 4, 8, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Czechoslovakia[12]
Ecuador
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (See also notes 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10)

Participant[13]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria[14]	1 Dec 1958	Indonesia	9 Mar 1959 *d*
Belgium[15]	18 Dec 1961	Luxembourg	1 Aug 1968 *a*
Hungary[16]	28 Oct 1964 *a*	Malawi[17]	[3 Nov 1965 *a*]

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3316. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 355.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties for the notification by Denmark, which also applies to this Convention.

[3] See note 4 in Part II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties for the notifications by Finland, which also apply to this Convention.

[4] The Secretary-General received, on 7 February 1979, from the Government of France the following communication:

The French Government is at present conducting a campaign against tax fraud. To this end, it has, *inter alia*, taken measures to impose restrictions on the endorsing of cheques; these measures are embodied in the French Finance Act of 1979.

These measures may well be deemed to conflict with the Convention of 19 March 1931 providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, for which the United Nations has assumed depositary functions. France has been a party to that Convention since 27 April 1936.

Accordingly, in order to avoid any conflict between French domestic legislation and the provisions of the Convention, the French Government intends to make, with respect to articles 5 and 14 of annex I, the reservation provided for in annex II, article 7, of the Convention of 19 March 1931.

Since no objections by the Contracting States were received within 90 days from the date of circulation of this communication by the Secretary-General (effected on 10 February 1979), the reservation was deemed accepted and took effect on 11 May 1979.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 20 February 1980, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has taken note of the communication of the French Government on the Convention of 19 March 1931 providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, which was received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 7 February 1979 and distributed with circular note C.N.29.1979.Treaties-1 of 10 February 1979 of the Acting Director of the General Legal Division and which informed about the modification of France's membership of the Convention effected by the said communication, and raises no objections thereto."

[5] The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic informed the Secretariat on October 20th, 1937, that, in consequence of certain changes introduced into French legislation regarding the maturity of commercial bills by the Decree-Law of August 31st, 1937, and in application of Article 27 of Annex II to the Convention and Article II of the Final Act of the Conference by which it was adopted, no payment whatsoever, in respect of a bill, draft cheque, current account, deposit of funds or securities or otherwise, may be demanded and no protest may be drawn up on Saturdays or Mondays, which for these purposes only, are assimilated to legal holidays.

[6] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[7] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[8] See note 8 in Part II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties for the notification by Norway which also applies to this Convention.

[9] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 361). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

[10] See note 10 in Part II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties for the notification by Sweden which also applies to this Convention.

[11] According to the declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[12] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[13] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 19 March 1931 providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention providing a Uniform Law for cheques of 19 March 1931 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[14] The ratification by the Government of Austria is made subject to the reservations contained in articles 6, 14, 15, 16 (paragraph 2), 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

In a communication received on 26 November 1968, the Government of Austria, with reference to the reservations provided for in article 27 of Annex II to the Convention, specified legal holidays or days assimilated to such holidays as regards the limit of time for presentment and all acts relating to cheques. For the list of holidays, see the second paragraph of note 2 in Part II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties.

[15] With a declaration that, in accordance with article X of the Convention, the Government of Belgium does not intend to assume any obligations in respect of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Moreover the Government of Belgium reserves its right to avail itself of all the provisions of Annex II to the Convention.

[16] The instrument of accession contains the following reservation:

> "In accordance with article 30 of Annex II to the Convention, the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the Uniform Law for Cheques shall not be applicable to the special kinds of cheques used in inland trade between Socialist economic organizations."

In a communication received on 5 January 1966, the Government of Hungary, with reference to the third paragraph of article 1 of the Convention and article 27 of Annex II to the Convention, notified the Secretary-General that "in respect of cheques, no payment may be demanded in Hungary on legal holidays". For list of holidays, see note 2 in chapter II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties.

[17] In a communication received on 30 July 1968, the Government of Malawi informed the Secretary-General that it denounced the Convention under the procedure provided in the third paragraph of article 8 of the Convention, which read as follows:

> "In urgent cases a High Contracting Party which denounces the Convention shall immediately notify direct all other High Contracting Parties, and the denunciation shall take effect two days after the receipt of such notification by the said High Contracting Parties. A High Contracting Party denouncing the Convention in these circumstances shall also inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its decision."

And that, in accordance with the above-mentioned provisions, the denunciation took effect on 5 October 1967 in respect of France; on 8 October 1967 in respect of Austria, Denmark, Italy and Norway; on 9 October 1968 in respect of Portugal and Sweden; on 13 October 1967 in respect of Finland; on 14 October 1967 in respect of Poland; on 15 October 1967 in respect of Brazil, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia and Monaco; on 18 October 1967 in respect of Belgium and Switzerland; and on 24 April 1968 in respect of Japan.

The Government of Malawi further informed the Secretary-General that it no longer considered itself bound by the Convention in respect of Nicaragua, the Government of that State having not acknowledged, in spite of several requests, the notification of denunciation addressed to it by the Government of Malawi, and that it had so notified the Government of Nicaragua. Subsequently, in a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 19 March 1969, the Government of Malawi informed him that the latter notification had been received by the Government of Nicaragua on 17 January 1969.

12. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes

Geneva, June 7th, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since January 1st, 1934 (article 5).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (August 31st, 1932)
Belgium (August 31st, 1932)
Brazil (August 26th, 1942 *a*)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 18th, 1934 *a*)
His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of his Colonies or Protectorates or any territories under mandate exercised by his Government in the United Kingdom.
Newfoundland (May 7th, 1934 *a*)
Subject to the provision D.I. in the Protocol of the Convention
Barbados (with limitation)[2], *Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda* (with limitation), *British Guiana* (with limitation), *British Honduras, Ceylon* (with limitation), *Cyprus* (with limitation), *Fiji* (with limitation), *Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar* (with limitation), *Gold Coast* [(a) *Colony,* (b) *Ashanti,* (c) *Northern Territories,* (d) *Togoland under British Mandate*], *Kenya (Colony and Protectorate)* (with limitation), *Malay States* [(a) *Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor;* (b) *Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei* (with limitation)], *Malta, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate)* (with limitation), *Straits Settlements* (with limitation), *Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago* (with limitation), *Uganda Protectorate* (with limitation), *Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent)* (with limitation) (July 18th, 1936 *a*)
Bahamas (with limitation), *British Solomon Islands Protectorate* (with limitation), *Falkland Islands and Dependencies* (with limitation), *Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony* (with limitation), *Mauritius, Saint Helena and Ascension* (with limitation), *Tanganyika Territory* (with limitation), *Tonga* (with limitation), *Trans-Jordan* (with limitation), *Zanzibar* (with limitation) September 7th, 1938 *a*)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Jamaica, including the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands (with limitation), *Somaliland Protectorate* (with limitation) (August 3rd, 1939 *a*)
Australia[3] (September 3rd, 1939 *a*)
Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru.*
It is agreed that, insofar as concerns the Commonwealth of Australia, the only instruments to which the provisions of this Convention shall apply are bills of exchange presented for acceptance or accepted or payable elsewhere than in the Commonwealth of Australia.
A similar limitation shall apply in the case of Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.
Ireland[4] (July 10th, 1936 *a*)
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
Finland (August 31st, 1932)
France (April 27th, 1936 *a*)
Germany[5] (October 3rd, 1933)
Italy (August 31st, 1932)
Japan (August 31st, 1932)
Monaco (January 25th, 1934 *a*)
The Netherlands[6] (for the Kingdom in Europe) (August 20th, 1932)
Netherlands Indies and *Curaçao* (July 16th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
New Hebrides (with limitation) (March 16th, 1939 *a*)
Norway (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)
Portugal[5,7] (June 8th, 1934)
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[8] (August 26th, 1932)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Colombia
Czechoslovakia[9]
Ecuador
Peru
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[10]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Bahamas[11]	19 May 1976 *d*
Cyprus[12]	5 Mar 1968 *d*
Fiji[12]	25 Mar 1971 *d*
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 *a*
Kazakstan	20 Nov 1995 *a*
Luxembourg	5 Mar 1963
Malaysia	14 Jan 1960 *d*
Malta	6 Dec 1966 *d*
Papua New Guinea	12 Feb 1981 *a*
Portugal[7]	
Tonga[12]	2 Feb 1972 *d*
Uganda	15 Apr 1965 *a*

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

"It is agreed that, insofar as concerns Papua New Guinea, the only instruments to which the provisions of the Convention shall apply are bills of exchange presented for acceptance or accepted or payable elsewhere than in Papua New Guinea."

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3315. League of Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 143, p. 337.

[2] The words "with limitation" placed after the names of certain territories indicate that the limitation contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention applies to these territories.

[3] This limitation was accepted by the States parties to the Convention, which were consulted in accordance with Section D, paragraph 4, of the Protocol of the said Convention.

[4] The Government of Ireland having informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its desire to be allowed the limitation specified in paragraph 1 of Section D of the Protocol to this Convention, the Secretary-General has transmitted this desire to the interested States in application of paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned Section. No objection having been raised on the part of the said States, this limitation should be considered as accepted.

[5] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[6] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 143, p. 339). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

[8] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[9] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[10] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

> With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 7 June 1930 on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

> "The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention on the Stamp Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 7 June 1930 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See note 13 in chapter I.2.

[11] Maintaining the limitations contained in Section D of the Protocol to the Convention, subject to which the Convention was made applicable to its territory.

[12] Maintaining the limitations contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention subject to which the Convention was made applicable to its territory before the attainment of independence.

13. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques

Geneva, March 19th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since November 29th, 1933 (article 5).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (August 26th, 1942 *a*)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (January 13th, 1932)
This ratification does not include any British Colony or Protectorate or any mandated territory in respect of which the mandate is exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.
Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana , British Honduras, Ceylon, Cyprus, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) *Colony,* (b) *Ashanti,* (c) *Northern Territories,* (d) *Togoland under British Mandate*], *Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Malay States* [(a) *Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor;* (b) *Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei*], *Malta, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Straits Settlements, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent)* (July 18th, 1936 a)
Bahamas, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Mauritius, Saint Helena and Ascencion, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trans-Jordan, Zanzibar (September 7th, 1938 *a*)
Jamaica, including the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands (August 3rd, 1939 *a*)
Somaliland Protectorate (August 3rd, 1939 *a*)
Australia (September 3rd, 1938 *a*)
Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*
Ireland (July 10th, 1936 *a*)
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
Finland (August 31st, 1932)
France (April 27, 1936 *a*)
Germany[2] (October 3rd, 1933)
Greece[2] (June 1st, 1934)
Italy (August 31st, 1933)
Japan (August 25th, 1933)
Monaco (February 9th, 1933)
The Netherlands[2,3] (for the Kingdom in Europe) (April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and *Curacao* (September 30th, 1935 *a*)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 *a*)
New Hebrides (March 16th, 1939 *a*)
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 *a*)
Norway (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936 *a*)
Portugal[2, 4] (June 8th, 1934)
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[5] (August 26th, 1932)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Czechoslovakia[6]
Ecuador
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Austria	1 Dec 1958
Bahamas	19 May 1976 *d*
Belgium[8]	18 Dec 1961
Cyprus	5 Mar 1968 *d*
Fiji	25 Mar 1971 *d*
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 *a*
Indonesia	9 Mar 1959 *d*
Luxembourg	1 Aug 1968 *a*
Malaysia	14 Jan 1960 *d*
Malta	6 Dec 1966 *d*
Papua New Guinea	12 Feb 1981 *a*
Portugal[4]	
Tonga	2 Feb 1972 *d*

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3301. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 7.

[2] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[3] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see *ibid.*, vol. 143, p. 9). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

[5] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of

a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[6] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 19 March 1931 on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention on the Stamp Laws in Connection with Cheques of 19 March 1931 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[8] With a declaration that, in accordance with article 9 of the Convention, the Government of Belgium does not intend to assume any obligations in respect of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

14. *(a)* International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency

Geneva, April 20th, 1929[1]

IN FORCE since February 22nd, 1931 (article 25).

(a) Convention

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(June 25th, 1931)
Belgium	(June 6th, 1932)
Brazil	(July 1st, 1938 *a*)
Bulgaria	(May 22nd, 1930)
Colombia	(May 9th, 1932)
Cuba	(June 13th, 1933)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 12th, 1931)
Denmark[3]	(February 19th, 1931)
Ecuador	(September 25th, 1937 *a*)
Estonia	(August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 *a*)
Germany	(October 3rd, 1933)
Greece	(May 19th, 1931)
Hungary	(June 14th, 1933)
Ireland	(July 24th, 1934 *a*)
Italy	(December 27th, 1935)
Latvia	(July 22nd, 1939 *a*)
Mexico	(March 30th, 1936 *a*)
Monaco	(October 21st, 1931)
The Netherlands	(April 30th, 1932)
Norway[4]	(March 16th, 1931)

In view of the provisions of Article 176, paragraph 2, of the Norwegian Ordinary Criminal Code and Article 2 of the Norwegian Law on the Extradition of Criminals, the extradition provided for in Article 10 of the present Convention may not be granted for the offence referred to in Article 3, No. 2, where the person uttering the counterfeit currency himself accepted it *bona fide* as genuine.

Poland	(June 15th, 1934)
Portugal	(September 18th, 1930)
Romania	(March 7th, 1939)
Spain	(April 28th, 1930)
Turkey	(January 21st, 1937 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics[5]	(July 13th, 1931)
Yugoslavia	(November 24th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
United States of America
India

As provided in Article 24 of the Convention, this signature does not include the territories of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

China[6]
Japan
Luxembourg
Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7,8]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria[9]	17 Mar 1965 *a*	Malaysia[11]	4 Jul 1972 *a*
Australia	5 Jan 1982 *a*	Mali	6 Jan 1970 *a*
Bahamas	9 Jul 1975 *d*	Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Benin	17 Mar 1966 *a*	Morocco[12]	4 May 1976 *a*
Burkina Faso	8 Dec 1964 *a*	Niger	5 May 1969 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire	25 May 1964 *a*	Peru	11 May 1970 *a*
Cyprus	10 Jun 1965 *a*	Philippines[13]	5 May 1971 *a*
Egypt	15 Jul 1957 *a*	San Marino	18 Oct 1967 *a*
Fiji	25 Mar 1971 *d*	Senegal	25 Aug 1965 *a*
France	28 Mar 1958	Singapore	12 Feb 1979 *d*
Gabon	11 Aug 1964 *a*	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Ghana	9 Jul 1964 *a*	Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*
Holy See	1 Mar 1965 *a*	South Africa	29 Aug 1967 *a*
Indonesia[10]	3 Aug 1982 *a*	Sri Lanka	2 Jun 1967 *a*
Iraq	14 May 1965 *a*	Switzerland	30 Dec 1958
Israel	10 Feb 1965 *a*	Syrian Arab Republic[14]	14 Aug 1964
Kenya	10 Nov 1977 *a*	Thailand	6 Jun 1963 *a*
Kuwait	9 Dec 1968 *a*	Togo	3 Oct 1978 *a*
Lebanon	6 Oct 1966 *a*	Uganda	15 Apr 1965 *a*
Malawi	18 Nov 1965 *a*	United Kingdom	28 Jul 1959

Accessions in respect of territories

Netherlands	22 Mar 1954	Netherlands Antilles and Surinam
United Kingdom[16]	13 Oct 1960	Antigua, Bahamas, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Falkland Island, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Montserrat, North Borneo, St. Christopher-Nevis and Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Sarawak, Sierra Leone, State of Singapore, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Trinidad, Uganda, Zanzibar
	7 Mar 1963	Barbados and its dependencies

(*b*) Protocol

Note: The Protocol came into force at the same time as the Convention, of which it forms an integral part, and was registered under the same number.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(June 25th, 1931)
Belgium	(June 6th, 1932)
Brazil	(July 1st, 1938 *a*)
Bulgaria	(May 22nd, 1930)
Colombia	(May 9th, 1932)
Cuba	(June 13th, 1933)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 12th, 1931)
Denmark[3]	(February 19th, 1931)
Ecuador	(September 25th, 1937 *a*)
Estonia	(August 30th, 1930 *a*)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 *a*)
Germany	(October 3rd, 1933)
Greece	(May 19th, 1931)
Hungary	(June 14th, 1933)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Ireland	(July 24th, 1934 *a*)
Italy	(December 27th, 1935)
Latvia	(July 22nd, 1939 *a*)
Mexico	(March 30th, 1936 *a*)
Monaco	(October 21st, 1931)
The Netherlands	(April 30th, 1932)
Norway	(March 16th, 1931)
Poland	(June 15th, 1934)
Portugal	(September 18th, 1930)
Romania	(March 7th, 1939)
Spain	(April 28th, 1930)
Turkey	(January 21st, 1937 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics[5]	(July 13th, 1931)
Yugoslavia	(November 24th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
United States of America
China[6]
Japan
India
Luxembourg
Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7,8]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Algeria[9]	17 Mar 1965 *a*
Australia	5 Jan 1982 *a*
Bahamas	9 Jul 1975 *a*
Benin	17 Mar 1966 *a*
Burkina Faso	8 Dec 1964 *a*
Côte d'Ivoire	25 May 1964 *a*
Cyprus	10 Jun 1965 *a*
Egypt	15 Jul 1957 *a*
Fiji	25 Mar 1971 *d*
France	28 Mar 1958
Gabon	11 Aug 1964 *a*
Ghana	9 Jul 1964 *a*
Holy See	1 Mar 1965 *a*
Indonesia[10]	3 Aug 1982 *a*
Iraq	14 May 1965 *a*
Israel	10 Feb 1965 *a*
Kuwait	9 Dec 1968 *a*
Lebanon	6 Oct 1966 *a*
Malawi	18 Nov 1965 *a*

Participant	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*
Malaysia	4 Jul 1972 *a*
Mali	6 Jan 1970 *a*
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Niger	5 May 1969 *a*
Peru	11 May 1970 *a*
Philippines	5 May 1971 *a*
San Marino	18 Oct 1967 *a*
Senegal	25 Aug 1965 *a*
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*
South Africa	29 Aug 1967 *a*
Sri Lanka	2 Jun 1967 *a*
Switzerland	30 Dec 1958
Syrian Arab Republic[14]	14 Aug 1964
Thailand	6 Jun 1963 *a*
Togo	3 Oct 1978 *a*
Uganda	15 Apr 1965 *a*
United Kingdom	28 Jul 1959

Accessions in respect of territories

Netherlands[15]	22 Mar 1954	Netherlands Antilles and Surinam
United Kingdom[16]	13 Oct 1960	Antigua, Bahamas, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Falkland Island, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Montserrat, North Borneo, St. Christopher-Nevis and Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Sarawak, Sierra Leone, State of Singapore, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Trinidad, Uganda, Zanzibar
	7 Mar 1963	Barbados and its dependencies

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 2623. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 112, p. 371.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[4] The reservation by Norway has not given rise to any objection on the part of the States to which it was communicated in accordance with Article 22, it may be considered as accepted.

[5] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

[6] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the International Convention of 20 April 1929 for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, April 20th, 1929 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See note 13 in chapter I.2

[8] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention and the Protocol on 3 December 1964. See also note 1 in chapter III.6.

[9] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article 19 of the Convention, which confers upon the International Court of Justice jurisdiction with respect to any disputes concerning the Convention.

The jurisdiction of international tribunals may be accepted, by way of exception, in cases with respect to which the Algerian Government shall have expressly given its consent.

[10] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19 of this Convention but takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice for decision, only with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

[11] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"The Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19 of the Convention."

[12] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention: The Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by article 19 of the Convention which provides that any disputes which might arise relating to the said Convention shall be settled by the Permanent Court of International Justice.

However, it may accept the jurisdiction of the International Court, by way of exception, in cases where the Moroccan Government expressly states that it accepts such jurisdiction.

[13] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"Articles 5 and 8 of the Convention shall be inoperative with respect to the Philippines unless and until Article 163 of the Revised Penal Code and Section 14 *(a)*, Rule 110, of the Rules of the Court in the Philippines, shall have been amended to conform to the said provisions of the Convention."

[14] In a communication received on 14 August 1964, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, referring to Presidential decree No. 1147 of 20 June 1959, pursuant to which the application of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency and Protocol, done at Geneva on 30 April 1929, was extended to the Syrian Province of the United Arab Republic, and to *décret-loi* No. 25 promulgated on 13 June 1962 by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic (see note 5 in chapter I.1.) has informed the Secretary-General that the Syrian Arab Republic considers itself a party to the said Convention and Protocol as from 20 June 1959.

[15] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[16] See note 27 in chapter V.2.

15. Optional Protocol concerning the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency

Geneva, April 20th, 1929

IN FORCE since August 30th, 1930.[1]

Ratifications or definitive accessions		*Ratifications or definitive accessions*	
Austria	(June 25th, 1931)	Greece	(May 19th, 1931)
Brazil	(July 1st, 1938 *a*)	Latvia	(July 22nd, 1939 *a*)
Bulgaria	(May 22nd, 1930)	Poland	(June 15th, 1934)
Colombia	(May 9th, 1932)	Portugal	(September 18th, 1930)
Cuba	(June 13th, 1933)	Romania	(November 10th, 1930)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 12th, 1931)	Spain	(April 28th, 1930)
Estonia	(August 30th, 1930 *a*)	Yugoslavia	(November 24th, 1930)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 *a*)		

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[3]	*Accession, succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession, succession (d)*
Algeria	17 Mar 1965	Israel	10 Feb 1965
Burkina Faso	8 Dec 1964	Malawi	18 Nov 1965
Côte d'Ivoire	25 May 1964	Niger	5 May 1969
Cyprus	10 Jun 1965	Senegal	25 Aug 1965
Gabon	11 Aug 1964	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Ghana	9 Jul 1964	Sri Lanka	2 Jun 1967
Iraq	14 May 1965		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 2624. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 112, p. 395.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Protocol on 3 December 1964. See also note 1 in chapter III.6.

16. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit

Barcelona, April 20th, 1921[1]

IN FORCE since October 31st, 1922 (article 6).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania	(October 8th, 1921)
Austria	(November 15th, 1923)
Belgium	(May 16th, 1927)
British Empire, including *Newfoundland*	(August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.	
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang	(August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu	(August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Palestine	(January 28th, 1924 *a*)
New Zealand	(August 2nd, 1922)
India	(August 2nd, 1922)
Bulgaria	(July 11th, 1922)
Chile	(March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(October 29th, 1923)
Denmark	(November 13th, 1922)
Estonia	(June 6th, 1925)
Finland	(January 29th, 1923)
France	(September 19th, 1924)
Syria and *Lebanon*	(February 7th, 1929 *a*)
Germany	(April 9th, 1924 *a*)
Greece	(February 18th, 1924)
Hungary	(May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Iran	(January 29th, 1931)
Iraq	(March 1st, 1930 *a*)
Italy	(August 5th, 1922)
Japan	(February 20th, 1924)
Latvia	(September 29th, 1923)
Luxembourg	(March 19th, 1930)
The Netherlands[3] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curacao*)	(April 17th, 1924)
Norway	(September 4th, 1923)
Poland	(October 8th, 1924)
Romania	(September 5th, 1923)
Spain	(December 17th, 1929)
Sweden	(January 19th, 1925)
Switzerland	(July 14th, 1924)
Thailand	(November 29, 1922 *a*)
Turkey	(June 27th, 1933 *a*)
Yugoslavia	(May 7th, 1930)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia	Guatemala	Peru *(a)*
China[4]	Lithuania	Portugal
Ethiopia *(a)*	Panama	Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 *d*	Malta	13 May 1966 *d*
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Sep 1993 *d*	Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
Cambodia	12 Apr 1971 *d*	Nepal	22 Aug 1966 *a*
Croatia	3 Aug 1992 *d*	Nigeria	3 Nov 1967 *a*
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 *d*	Rwanda	10 Feb 1965 *d*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	24 Nov 1956 *d*	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Lesotho	23 Oct 1973 *d*	Slovenia	6 Jul 1992 *d*
Malawi[5]		Swaziland	24 Nov 1969 *a*

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 171. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 11.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 3 September 1968, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, done at Barcelona on 20 April 1921, stated the following:

"As I mentioned in my previous letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government regards all multilateral treaties validly applied to the former Nyasaland, including this Convention and Statute, as remaining in force on a reciprocal basis as between Malawi and any other party to the treaty, pending our notification to the depositary of the treaty confirming Malawi's succession, acceding in her own right, or terminating all legal connection therewith.

"On behalf of the Government of Malawi, I would now inform you, as depositary for this Convention and Statute, that my Government considers that as from this date any legal obligations and rights which may have devolved upon Malawi from the previous ratification by the United Kingdom are terminated. Accordingly, Malawi considers herself to have no further legal connection with the Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, signed at Barcelona on 20th April 1921. The Government of Malawi wishes, however,

to reserve the right to accede to this Convention and Statute at a later date should this become necessary."

17. Convention and Statute on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern

Barcelona, April 20th, 1921[1]

IN FORCE since October 31st, 1922 (article 6).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
Austria (November 15th, 1923)
British Empire, including *Newfoundland* (August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 a)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Palestine (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
India[2] [August 2nd, 1922]
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia[3] (September 8th, 1924)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (December 31st, 1926)
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Luxembourg (March 19th, 1930)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Romania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
In so far as its provisions are not in conflict with the principles of the new Danube Statute drawn up by the International Commission which was appointed in accordance with Articles 349 of the Treaty of Versailles, 304 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, 232 of the Treaty of Neuilly and 288 of the Treaty of Trianon.
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Thailand (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Belgium
Bolivia
China
Colombia *(a)*
Estonia
Guatemala
Lithuania
Panama
Peru *(a)*
Poland
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*	*Participant*	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 *d*		Malta	13 May 1966 *d*	
Cambodia	12 Apr 1971 *d*		Morocco	10 Oct 1972 *a*	
China[4]			Nigeria	3 Nov 1967 *a*	
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 *d*		Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 *d*	
India[2]		26 Mar 1956	Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*	
Malawi[5]			Swaziland	16 Oct 1970 *a*	

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 172. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 35.

[2] With effect from 26 March 1957.

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[5] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 21 March 1969, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention and Statute on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, done at Barcelona on 20 April 1921, stated the following:

"In my letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning the disposition of Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government declared that with respect to any multilateral treaty which was applied or extended to the former Nyasaland Protectorate, any Party to such a treaty could on the basis of reciprocity rely as against Malawi on the terms of that treaty until Malawi notified its depositary of what action it wished to take by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession, or accession.

"I am to inform you as depositary of this Convention that the Government of Malawi now wishes to terminate any connection with this Convention which it might have inherited. The Government of Malawi considers that any legal relationship with the aforementioned Convention and Statute on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, Barcelona, 1921 which might have devolved upon it by way of succession from the ratification of the United Kingdom, is terminated as of this date."

18. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern

Barcelona, April 20th, 1921[1]

IN FORCE since October 31st, 1922.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (October 8th, 1921)

Austria (November 15th, 1923)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph *(a)* of the Protocol.

British Empire (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of the United Kingdom only accepting paragraph *(a)*.

Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph *(a)*.

Nyasaland Protectorate and *Tanganyika Territory* (August 2nd, 1922)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(b)*.

Bahamas, Barbados, British Guiana, British Solomon Islands, Ceylon, Cyprus, Fiji, Gambia Colony and Protectorate, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Gold Coast (Ashanti and Northern Territories), Hong-Kong, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya Colony and Protectorate, Leeward Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria Colony and Protectorate, Seychelles, Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate, St. Helena, Straits Settlements, Tonga Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent), Zanzibar (August 2nd, 1922 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph *(a)*.

Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph *(a)*.

Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph *(a)*.

Palestine (January 28th, 1924 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)* of the Protocol.

Bermuda (December 27th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
Accepting paragraph *(a)*.

India [August 2nd, 1922]
In respect of India only accepting paragraph *(a)*.

Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Accepting paragraph *(b)*.

Czechoslovakia[2] (September 8th, 1924)
Accepting paragraph *(b)*.

Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Accepting paragraph *(a)*.

Finland (January 29th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph *(b)*.

Greece (January 3rd, 1928)

Hungary (May 18th, 1928 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.

Luxembourg (March 19th, 1930)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.

Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph *(a)*.

Romania (May 9th, 1924 *a*)
Is unable to accept any restriction of her liberty in administrative matters on the waterways which are not of international concern, that is to say, on purely national rivers, while at the same time accepting the principles of liberty in accordance with the laws of the country.

Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Accepting paragraph *(b)*.

Thailand (November 29th, 1922 *a*)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph *(a)*.

Turkey (June 27th, 1933 *a*)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Belgium
Accepting paragraph *(a)*

Peru

Portugal

Spain
Accepting paragraph *(a)*

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Antigua and Barbuda ... To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.	25 Oct 1988 *d*	
Fiji ... To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.	15 Mar 1972 *d*	
India[3] ...		26 Mar 1956
Malta ... To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.	13 May 1966 *d*	
Morocco ... To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*, "on all navigable waterways".	10 Oct 1972 *a*	
Nigeria ... To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*, namely, on condition of reciprocity on all navigable waterways.	3 Nov 1967 *a*	
Slovakia[2] ...	28 May 1993 *d*	
Solomon Islands ... To the full extent indicated in paragraph *(a)*.	3 Sep 1981 *d*	

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 173. League of Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 7, p. 65.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] With effect from 26 March 1957.

19. Declaration recognising the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast

Barcelona, April 20th, 1921[1]

IN FORCE since 20 April 1921.

Ratifications or definitive accessions		*Ratifications or definitive accessions*	
Albania	(October 8th, 1921)	Hungary	(May 18th, 1928 *a*)
Austria	(July 10th, 1924)	Iraq	(April 17th, 1935 *a*)
Belgium	(May 16th, 1927)	Italy[3]	
British Empire, including *Newfoundland*	(October 9th, 1922)	Japan	(February 20th, 1924)
Canada	(October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Latvia	(February 12th, 1924)
Australia	(October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Mexico	(October 17th, 1935 *a*)
New Zealand	(October 9th, 1922)	The Netherlands[3,4] (including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*)	(November 28th, 1921)
Union of South Africa	(October 31st, 1922 *a*)	Norway	(September 4th, 1923)
India	(October 9th, 1922)	Poland	(December 20th, 1924)
Bulgaria	(July 11th, 1922)	Romania	(February 22nd, 1923 *a*)
Chile	(March 19th 1928)	Spain	(July 1st, 1929)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 8th, 1924)	Sweden	(January 19th, 1925)
Denmark	(November 13th, 1922)	Switzerland[3]	
Estonia[3]		Thailand	(November 29th, 1922 *a*)
Finland	(September 22nd, 1922 *a*)	Turkey	(June 27th, 1933 *a*)
France[3]		Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(May 16th, 1935 *a*)
Germany	(November 10th, 1931 *a*)	Yugoslavia	(May 7th, 1930)
Greece	(January 3rd, 1928)		

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia	Iran	Peru *(a)*
China[5]	Lithuania	Portugal
Guatemala	Panama	Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[6]	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Accession (a), succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 *d*	Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*
China[5]		Mongolia	15 Oct 1976 *a*
Croatia	3 Aug 1992 *d*	Rwanda	10 Feb 1965 *d*
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 *d*	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*
Lesotho	23 Oct 1973 *d*	Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*
Malawi	11 Jun 1969 *d*	Swaziland	16 Oct 1970 *a*
Malta	21 Sep 1966 *d*		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 174. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 73.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

[4] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[5] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[6] In a notification received on 31 January 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 4 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 23 February 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application, as from 4 June 1958, of the Declaration of 20 April 1921 recognizing the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Declaration recognizing the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast, April 20th, 1921 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

20. Convention and Statute on the International Régime of Maritime Ports

Geneva, December 9th, 1923[1]

IN FORCE since July 26th, 1926 (article 6).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (January 20th, 1927 *a*)

Belgium (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
With regard to Article 12 of the Statute, the Belgian Government declares that legislation exists in Belgium on the transport of emigrants, and that this legislation, whilst it does not distinguish between flags and consequently does not affect the principle of equality of treatment of flags, imposes special obligations on all vessels engaged in the transport of emigrants.

British Empire (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and that, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)

Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Brunei, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Gold Coast, Grenada, Hong-Kong, Jamaica (excluding Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis, Virgin Islands), Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang; (b) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu], Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trans-Jordan, Trinidad and Tobago, Zanzibar (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)

Malta (November 7th, 1925 *a*)

Australia (June 29th, 1925 *a*)
Does not apply in the case of Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of *Western Samoa*.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Czechoslovakia[2] (July 10th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Excluding Greenland, the maritime ports of which are subject to a separate regime.

Estonia (November 4th, 1931)
The Estonian Government reserves the right regarding emigration provided for in Article 12 of the Statute.

France (August 2nd, 1932)
Shall have the power, in conformity with Article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.
Does not include any of the Protectorates, Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany (May 1st, 1928)
In conformity with Article 12 of the Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, the German Government declares that it reserves the right of limiting the transport of emigrants, in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, to vessels which have been granted special authorization as fulfilling the requirements of the said legislation.
In exercising this right, the German Government will continue to be guided as far as possible by the principles of this Statute.

Greece (January 24th, 1927)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Hungary (March 21st, 1929)
With reservation as to the right regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

Iraq (May 1st, 1929 *a*)
With reservation as to the rights regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

Italy (October 16th, 1933)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
This ratification cannot be interpreted as implying the admission or the recognition of any reservation or declaration made with a view to limiting in any way the rights granted by Article 12 of the Statute to the High Contracting Parties.

Japan (September 30th, 1926)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Mexico (March 5th, 1934 *a*)

The Netherlands[3] (February 22nd, 1928)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and *Curacao* (February 22nd, 1928 *a*)
The Netherlands Government reserves the right mentioned in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Statute annexed to the Convention, it being understood that no discrimination shall be made against the flag of any contracting State which in regard to the transport of emigrants does not discriminate against the Netherlands flag.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Norway (June 21st, 1928)
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Switzerland (October 23rd, 1926)
Thailand (January 9th, 1925)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Yugoslavia (November 20th, 1931)
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil
Bulgaria
Chile
Lithuania
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute
Panama *(a)*
El Salvador
Spain
With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*	*Participant*	*Accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Antigua and Barbuda	27 Feb 1989 *d*		Marshall Islands	2 Feb 1994 *a*	
Burkina Faso	18 Jul 1966 *a*		Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 *d*	
Croatia	3 Aug 1992 *d*		Monaco	20 Feb 1976 *a*	
Cyprus	9 Nov 1964 *d*		Morocco	19 Oct 1972 *a*	
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 *d*		Nigeria	3 Nov 1967 *a*	
Ivory Coast	22 Jun 1966 *a*		Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 *d*	
Madagascar[4]	4 Oct 1967 *a*		Thailand		2 Oct 1973
Malaysia	31 Aug 1966 *a*		Trinidad and Tobago	14 Jun 1966 *a*	
Malta	18 Apr 1966 *d*		Vanuatu	8 May 1991 *a*	

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 1379. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 58, p. 285.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[4] The Government of Madagascar shall have the power, in conformity with article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.

21. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles

Geneva, March 30th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since May 9th, 1933 (Article 14).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (November 9th, 1932)
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
Great Britain and Northern Ireland [April 20th, 1932]
Does not include any colonies, protectorates or overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Southern Rhodesia (August 6th, 1932 *a*)
Newfoundland (January 9th, 1933 *a*)
Ceylon, Cyprus, Gold Coast [(a) *Colony*, (b) *Ashanti*, (c) *Northern Territories*, (d) *Togoland under British Mandate*], *Hong-Kong, Jamaica, Malta, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent)* (January 3rd, 1935 *a*)
Nigeria [(a) *Colony*, (b) *Protectorate*, (c) *Cameroons under British Mandate*], *Sierra Leone (Colony under Protectorate)* (March 11th, 1936 *a*)
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (April 29th, 1936 *a*)
Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu], Straits Settlements (November 6th, 1937 *a*)
Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Tanganyika Territory, Uganda, Zanzibar (May 3rd, 1938 *a*)
Trinidad (May 21st, 1940 *a*)

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Ireland [November 27th, 1933 *a*]
Bulgaria (March 5th, 1932 *a*)
Denmark (December 4th, 1931)
Egypt (May 20th, 1939 *a*)
Finland [May 23rd, 1934 *a*]
Greece (June 6th, 1939 *a*)
Iraq (September 20th, 1938 *a*)
Italy (September 25th, 1933)
Latvia (January 10th, 1939 *a*)
Luxembourg [March 31st, 1933]
The Netherlands[2] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (January 16th, 1934)
Poland (June 15th, 1934)
Portugal (January 23rd, 1932)
Does not assume any obligation as regards its Colonies.
Romania [June 19th, 1935 *a*]
Spain (June 3rd, 1933)
Sweden (November 9th, 1933)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Turkey (September 25th, 1936)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)
Yugoslavia (May 9th, 1933 *a*)

Signature not yet perfected by ratification

Czecho-Slovakia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations[3]

Participant	*Denunciation*[4]	*Participant*	*Denunciation*[4]
Denmark	7 Mar 1968	Netherlands[6]	
Finland[5]	10 Sep 1956	Poland	26 May 1971
Ireland	18 Mar 1963	Romania	10 Jul 1967
Luxembourg	2 Jun 1965	United Kingdom	14 Jan 1963

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3185. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 138, p. 149.

[2] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[3] A new convention on the subject of the taxation of foreign motor vehicles was drawn up within the framework of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and opened for signature at Geneva on 18 May 1956, namely, the Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic. Its article 4 provides as follows:

"As soon as a country which is a Contracting Party to the Convention of 30 March 1931 on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles becomes a Contracting Party to the present Convention, it shall take the measures laid down in article 17 of the 1931 Convention to denounce that Convention."

For the list of signatures, ratifications and accessions to the Convention of 18 May 1956, see chapter XI.B–10.

[4] In accordance with article 17, denunciation takes effect one year after date of its receipt by the Secretary-General.

[5] In a communication of 31 July 1957, the Government of Finland, with reference to its notification of denunciation, has informed the Secretary-General that the said notification has been intended to take effect in respect of Finland on 10 September 1957, i.e., one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General, only "if the Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic of 18 May 1956, to which Finland is a party, has entered into force by that date. If the Convention has not entered into force on 10 September 1957, it is the intention of the Government of Finland that the denunciation should take effect on such date thereafter as the Convention shall enter into force."

[6] In a communication received on 1 March 1960, the Government of the Netherlands has informed the Secretary-General that it "will no longer consider itself bound, for the Realm as a whole, by the provisions of the 1931 Convention in its relations with those Parties to the said Convention for whom the Convention of 1956 [on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic] has come into force, this as from the date on which the Convention of 1956 enters into force between those States and the Kingdom of the Netherlands but not before one year after the day on which you will have received this declaration".

22. International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities

Geneva, November 3rd, 1923[1]

IN FORCE since November 27th, 1924 (article 26).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (September 11th, 1924)
Belgium (October 4th, 1924)
Brazil (July 10th, 1929)
British Empire (August 29th, 1924)
It is stated in the instrument of ratification that this ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia (or any territory under its authority) or the Irish Free State or in the case of India, and that in pursuance of the power reserved in Article XXIX of the Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Island of Newfoundland or of the territories of Iraq and Nauru, in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate. It does not apply to the Sudan.
Burma[2]
Australia (March 13th, 1925)
Excluding Papua, Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea
New Zealand (August 29th, 1924)
Includes the mandated territory of *Western Samoa*.
Union of South Africa (August 29th, 1924)
India (March 13th, 1925)
Bulgaria (December 10th, 1926)
China[3] (February 23rd, 1926)
Czechoslovakia[4] (February 10th, 1927)
Denmark (May 17th, 1924)
Egypt (March 23rd, 1925)
Estonia (February 28th, 1930 *a*)
Finland (May 23rd, 1928)
France (September 13th, 1926)
Does not apply to the Colonies under its sovereignty.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Morocco (French Protectorate) (November 8th, 1926)
Tunis (November 8th, 1926)
Syria and Lebanon (March 9th, 1933 *a*)
Germany (August 1st, 1925)
Greece (July 6th, 1927)
Hungary (February 23rd, 1926)
Iran (May 8th, 1925 *a*)
Iraq (May 3rd, 1934 *a*)
Italy (June 13th, 1924)
Latvia (September 28th, 1931 *a*)
Luxembourg (June 10th, 1927)
The Netherlands[5] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (May 30th, 1925)
Norway (September 7th, 1926)
Poland (September 4th, 1931)
Romania (December 23rd, 1925)
Under the same reservations as those formulated by the other Governments and inserted in Article 6 of the Protocol, the Royal Government understands that Article 22 of the Convention confers the right to have recourse to the procedure provided for in this Article for questions of a general nature solely on the High Contracting Parties, private persons being only entitled to appeal to their own judicial authorities in case any dispute arises with the authorities of the Kingdom.
Sweden (February 12th, 1926)
Switzerland (January 3rd, 1927)
Thailand (May 19th, 1925)
Yugoslavia (May 2nd, 1929)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Chile, Lithuania, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[6]	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*	*Participant*	*Ratification, accession (a), succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Cyprus	6 May 1964 *d*		Nigeria	14 Sep 1964 *d*	
Fiji	31 Oct 1972 *d*	31 Oct 1972	Pakistan	27 Jan 1951 *d*	
Israel	29 Aug 1966 *a*		Singapore	22 Dec 1967 *a*	
Japan	29 Jul 1952		Slovakia[4]	28 may 1993 *d*	
Lesotho	12 Jan 1970 *a*		Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 *d*	
Malawi	16 Feb 1967 *a*		Tonga	11 Nov 1977 *d*	
Niger	14 Mar 1966 *a*				

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 775. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 30, p. 371. The Convention and Protocol came into force on the same day.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.2.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

5 See note 8 in chapter I.1.

6 In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 10 June 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that the notification by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the International Convention of 3 November 1923 relating to the Simplification of Custom Formalities cannot, either for the past or for the future by itself have the effect of establishing contractual relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

23. International Convention for the Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals

Geneva, February 20th, 1935[1]

IN FORCE since March 23rd, 1938 (articles 13 and 14).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (July 21st, 1937)

The Belgian Government does not regard the mere fact that in Belgium the inspection of meat, while carried out by Government veterinary surgeons or by veterinary surgeons approved by the Government, is placed under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior (Inspection of Foodstuffs), as being contrary to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 5, of the present Convention; particularly since all the requirements of the said Article are observed in Belgium.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Bulgaria	(August 28th, 1936)
Iraq	(December 24th, 1937 *a*)
Latvia	(May 4th, 1937)
Poland	(January 3rd, 1939)
Romania	(December 23rd, 1937)
Turkey	(March 19th, 1941)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Austria	France	The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Chile *(a)*	Greece	Spain
Czechoslovakia[2]	Italy	Switzerland

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession*
Yugoslavia	8 Feb 1967

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 4310. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 186, p. 173.

[2] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

24. Convention concerning the Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin

Geneva, February 20th, 1935[1]

IN FORCE since December 6th, 1938 (articles 20 and 21).

Ratifications		*Ratifications*	
Belgium	(July 21st, 1937)	Romania	(December 23rd, 1937)
Bulgaria	(September 7th, 1938)	Turkey	(March 19th, 1941)
Latvia	(May 4th, 1937)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Chile *(a)*
Czechoslovakia[2]
The Czechoslovak Government does not consider that it can waive the right to make the transit of animals across its territory subject to a previous authorization. It intends, in practice, to exercise the right so reserved in as liberal a spirit as possible, in conformity with the principles which are at the basis of the present Convention, the object of which is to facilitate the transit of animals and of animal products.
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Spain
Switzerland

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession*
Yugoslavia	8 Feb 1967

NOTES:

1 Registered No. 4486. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 37.

2 See note 11 in chapter I.2.

25. International Convention concerning the Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products)

Geneva, February 20th, 1935[1]

IN FORCE since December 6th, 1938 (articles 14 and 15).

Ratifications		*Ratifications*	
Belgium	(July 21st, 1937)	Romania	(December 23rd, 1937)
Bulgaria	(September 7th, 1938)	Turkey	(March 19th, 1941)
Latvia	(May 4th, 1937)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Chile *(a)*
Czechoslovakia[2]
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Spain
Switzerland

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession*
Yugoslavia	8 Feb 1967

NOTES:

1 Registered No. 4487. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 59.
2 See note 11 in chapter I.2.

26. Convention establishing an International Relief Union

Geneva, July 12th, 1927[1]

IN FORCE since December 27th, 1932 (article 18).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (August 31st, 1929)
Belgium (May 9th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland [January 9th, 1929 *a*]
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Burma[2]
New Zealand [December 22nd, 1928 *a*]
On the understanding that no contribution to the initial fund of the Union will fall due by New Zealand before the commencement of the next financial year in that country, viz., April 1st, 1929.
India [April 2nd, 1929]
Bulgaria (May 22nd, 1931)
China[3] (May 29th, 1935 *a*)
Cuba [June 18th, 1934]
Czechoslovakia[4] (August 20th, 1931)
Ecuador (July 30th, 1928)
Egypt [August 7th, 1928]
Subject to later acceptance by the Egyptian Government of the decisions of the Executive Committee fixing its contribution.
Finland (April 10th, 1929)
France (April 27th, 1932)
Germany (July 22nd, 1929)
Greece [January 16th, 1931]
Hungary[5] (April 17th, 1929)
It being understood that "the most extensive immunities, facilities and exemptions" mentioned in Article 10 of the present Convention shall not include exterritoriality or the other rights and immunities enjoyed in Hungary by duly accredited diplomatic agents.
Iran (September 28th, 1932 *a*)
Iraq[5] (June 12th, 1934 *a*)
Italy (August 2nd, 1928)
Applies also to the *Italian Colonies*.
Luxembourg [June 27th, 1929 *a*]
Monaco (May 21st, 1929)
Poland (July 11th, 1930)
Romania [September 11th, 1928]
San Marino (August 12th, 1929)
Sudan (May 11th, 1928 *a*)
Switzerland (January 2nd, 1930 *a*)
Turkey (March 10th, 1932)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929)
Yugoslavia [August 28th, 1931 *a*]

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil
Colombia
Guatemala
Latvia
Nicaragua
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Notice of withdrawal from the International Relief Union*[5, 6]
Burma	1 Oct 1951
Cuba	8 Oct 1956
Egypt	1 Aug 1955
France	20 Feb 1973
Greece	6 Nov 1963
Hungary[4]	
India	9 Nov 1950
Iraq[5]	
Luxembourg	20 Apr 1964
New Zealand	2 Aug 1950
Romania[7]	24 Dec 1963
United Kingdom	4 May 1948
Yugoslavia	5 Jul 1951

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3115. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 135, p. 247.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.2.

[3] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[4] See note 5 below and note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] In a letter of 6 December 1968, the Executive Secretary of the International Relief Union informed the Secretary-General that the Governments of the following States had withdrawn from the said Union by notifying it directly of their withdrawal on the dates indicated:

Czechoslovakia*	30	June	1951
Hungary	13	November	1951
Iraq	10	April	1961

* See also note 4 above.

[6] In accordance with article 19, the provisions of the Convention cease to be applicable to the territory of the withdrawing Member one year after the receipt of the notice of withdrawal by the Secretary-General

[7] The notice of withdrawal contains the following statement:

The Romanian People's Republic hereby gives notice of its decision [of withdrawal] and accordingly considers itself free from any obligations deriving from the Convention establishing an International Relief Union.

As regards the question of dealing with the consequences of national disasters the Government of the Romanian People's Republic will continue as heretofore to give assistance to countries which suffer such disasters in the manner it considers appropriate.

27. Convention on the International Régime of Railways

Geneva, December 9th, 1923[1]

IN FORCE since March 23rd, 1926 (article 6).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (January 20th, 1927)
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)
Does not apply to the Belgium Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.
British Empire (August 29th, 1924)
This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or territories.
Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 *a*)
British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Federated Malay States [(a) *Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, Pahang;* (b) *Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu*] (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gold Coast (a) *Colony,* (b) *Ashanti,* (c) *Northern Territories,* (d) *Togoland under British Mandate*] (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Hong-Kong (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Nigeria [(a) *Colony,* (b) *Protectorate,* (c) *Cameroons under British Mandate*], *Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland* (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Straits Settlements September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
Tanganyika Territory, Trans-Jordan (September 22nd, 1925 *a*)
New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)
Including the mandated territory of *Western Samoa.*
India (April 1st, 1925)
Denmark (April 27th, 1926)
Estonia (September 21st, 1929)
Ethiopia (September 20th, 1928 *a*)
Finland (February 11th, 1937)
France (August 28th, 1935)
Subject to the reservation contained in Article 9 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.
Germany (December 5th, 1927)
Greece (March 6th, 1929)
Hungary (March 21st, 1929)
Italy (December 10th, 1934)
This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.
Japan (September 30th, 1926)
Latvia (October 8th, 1934)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (February 22nd, 1928)
Norway (February 24th, 1926)
Poland (January 7th, 1928)
Romania (December 23rd, 1925)
Spain (January 15th, 1930)
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Switzerland (October 23rd, 1926)
Thailand (January 9th, 1925)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil
Bulgaria
Chile
China *(a)*[2]
The Chinese Government, subject to the declarations made in its name by the delegates whom it instructed to take part in the discussions on this Convention, confirms the said declarations regarding:
(1) The whole of Part III: "Relations between the railway and its users", Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17;
(2) In Part VI: "General Regulations", Article 37, relating to the conclusion of special agreements for the purpose of putting the provisions of the Statute into force in cases where existing agreements are not adequate for this purpose.
Colombia *(a)*
Czechoslovakia[3]
Lithuania
Panama *(a)*
Portugal
El Salvador
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Succession*
Malawi	7 Jan 1969

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 1129. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 47, p. 55.

[2] See note concerning signatures, ratification, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 4 in chapter I.1).

[3] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication received on 4 October 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 26 September 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 24 February 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 30 September 1974, concerning the application, as from 26 September 1958, of the Convention and Statute of 9 December 1923 on the International Régime of Railways, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention and Statute on the International Régime of Railways, December 9th, 1923 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

28. Convention regarding the Measurement of Vessels Employed in Inland Navigation

Paris, November 27th, 1925[1]

IN FORCE since October 1st, 1927 (article 12).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (July 2nd, 1927)
Albania
British Empire (for Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (July 14th, 1927)
Denmark
Estonia
Bulgaria (July 2nd, 1927)
Iran
Czechoslovakia[2] (January 17th, 1929)
Ireland
France (July 2nd, 1927)

It being understood on behalf of the French Government, and as provided for in Article 6 of the Protocol of Signature, that in the event of a re-measurement of a vessel originally measured by its own officials the original indelible marks, when they are not intended solely to indicate that the vessel has been measured, shall have added to them an indelible cross having arms of equal length, and that this addition shall be regarded as equivalent to the removal described in Article 10 of the Annex to the Convention; that the old measurement plates shall be marked with a cross instead of being withdrawn; and that, if new plates are affixed, the old plates shall be placed at the same level and near to the new ones. In the case provided for above, the notification provided for in the third paragraph of Article 5 and in Article 6 of the Convention shall also be addressed to the original office of inscription.

Germany (July 2nd, 1927)
Greece (February 6th, 1931)
Hungary (January 3rd, 1928)
Italy (September 27th, 1932)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 2nd, 1927)
Poland (June 16th, 1930)
Romania (May 18th, 1928)
Spain (July 11th, 1927)
Switzerland (July 2nd, 1927)
Yugoslavia (May 7th, 1930)

Under Clause IV of the Protocol of Signature.

Open to accession by:

Albania
Denmark
Estonia
Iran
Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Norway
Portugal
Sweden
Turkey

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Finland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2]	*Denunciation*	*Participant*	*Denunciation*
Belgium	9 Mar 1972	Netherlands	14 Aug 1978
Bulgaria	4 Mar 1980	Romania	24 May 1976
France	13 Jun 1975	Switzerland	7 Feb 1975
Germany[3]	14 Feb 1975	Yugoslavia	28 Jul 1975[4]
Hungary	5 Jan 1978		

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 1539. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 67, p. 63.

[2] Czechoslovakia had notified its denunciation on 19 April 1974. See also note 11 in chapter I.2.

[3] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic has declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 21 August 1958. See also note 13 in chapter I.2.

[4] In a communication received on 24 November 1975, the Government of Yugoslavia informed the Secretary-General that the denunciation should be considered, for the purpose of article 14 of the Convention of 1925, as having taken effect on 19 April 1975, the date when the Convention of 15 February 1966 on the same subject entered into force in respect of Yugoslavia.

29. General Act of Arbitration (Pacific Settlement of International Disputes)

Geneva, September 26th, 1928[1]

IN FORCE since August 16th, 1929 (Article 44).
FIVE-YEAR PERIODS OF OBLIGATION (Article 45).
1st period: August 16th, 1929—August 15th, 1934—*Expired.*
2nd period: August 16th, 1934—August 15th, 1939—*Expired.*
3rd period: August 16th, 1939—August 15th, 1944—*Current period.*
4th period: August 16th, 1944—August 15th, 1949—*Period next following*
etc . . .

Under the system established by the General Act (Article 45), States cannot be released from their obligation before the expiration of a five-year period.

In order to obtain release for the ensuing period, they must notify their denunciation six months before the expiration of the current period.

1. Accessions: 22

A (20 accessions)
All the provisions of the Act

Belgium (May 18th, 1929)
Subject to the reservation provided in Article 39 (2) *(a)*, with the effect of excluding from the procedures described in this Act disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession of Belgium or prior to the accession of any other Party with whom Belgium may have a dispute.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (May 21st, 1931)
Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

B (2 accessions)

Provisions relating to conciliation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV)

The Netherlands[2] (including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (August 8th, 1930)
Sweden (May 13th, 1929)

Provisions relating to conciliation (Chapter I) and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV)

3. *(i)* That, in the case of a dispute not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, by a communication which was received at the Secretariat on February 15th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will continue, after the 16th August 1939, to participate in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes subject to the reservation that, as from that date, the participation of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the General Act will not, should they unfortunately find themselves involved in hostilities, cover disputes arising out of events occurring during the war. This reservation applies also to the procedure of conciliation.

"The participation of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the General Act, after the 16th August 1939, will continue, as heretofore, to be subject to the reservations set forth in their instrument of accession."

Canada (July 1st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession in respect of Canada to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in Canada and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty in respect of Canada reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. *(i)* That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

By a letter of December 7th, 1939, which the Secretary-General was asked to communicate to the Governments concerned,[3] the Permanent Delegate of Canada to the League of Nations notified the Secretary-General that, in view of the considerations set out in the letter:

The Canadian Government will not regard their acceptance of the General Act as covering disputes arising out of events occurring during the present war.

Australia (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. *(i)* That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

By a telegram of September 7th, 1939, which the Secretary-General was asked to communicate to the Governments concerned,[4] the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia notified the Secretary-General that, in view of the considerations set out in the telegram:

His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia will not regard its accession to the General Act as covering or relating to any disputes arising out of events occurring during the present crisis.

New Zealand (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in New Zealand and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. *(i)* That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

The High Commissioner for New Zealand in London, by a communication which, was received at the Secretariat on February 15th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand will continue, after the 16th August 1939, to participate in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes subject to the reservation that, as from that date, the participation of the New Zealand Government will not, should it unfortunately find itself involved in hostilities, cover disputes arising out of events occurring during the war. This reservation applies also to the procedures of conciliation.

"The participation of the New Zealand Government in the General Act, after the 16th August 1939, will continue, as heretofore, to be subject to the reservations set forth in its instrument of accession."

Ireland (September 26th, 1931)

India (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between the Government of India and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. *(i)* That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, by a communication which was received at the Secretary on February 15th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"India will continue, after the 16th August 1939, to participate in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of

International Disputes subject to the reservation that, as from that date, the participation of India will not, should she unfortunately find herself involved in hostilities, cover disputes arising out of events occurring during the war. This reservation applies also to the procedure of conciliation.

"The participation of India in the General Act, after the 16th August 1939, will continue, as heretofore, to be subject to the reservations set forth in the instrument of accession in respect of India."

Denmark (April 14th, 1930)

Estonia (September 3rd, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(a) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Estonia or to the accession of another Party with whom Estonia might have a dispute;

(b) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

Ethiopia (March 15th, 1935)

Finland (September 6th, 1930)

France (May 21st, 1931)

The said accession concerning all disputes that may arise after the said accession with regard to situations or facts subsequent thereto, other than those which the Permanent Court of International Justice may recognize as bearing on a question left by international law to the exclusive competence of the State, it being understood that in application of Article 39 of the said Act the disputes which the parties or one of them may have referred to the Council of the League of Nations will not be submitted to the procedures described in this Act unless the Council has been unable to pronounce a decision under the conditions laid down in Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant.

Furthermore, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations "on the submission and recommendations of the General Act", Article 28 of this Act is interpreted by the French Government as meaning in particular that "respect for rights established by treaty or resulting from international law" is obligatory upon arbitral tribunals constituted in application of Chapter III of the said General Act.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, by a communication which was received at the Secretariat on February 14th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"The Government of the French Republic declares that it adds to the instrument of accession to the General Act of Arbitration deposited in its name on May 21st, 1931, the reservation that in future that accession shall not extend to disputes relating to any events that may occur in the course of a war in which the French Government is involved."

Greece (September 14th, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation referred to in Chapter I:

(a) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Greece or to the accession of another Party with whom Greece might have a dispute;

(b) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States and in particular disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication.

Italy (September 7th, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. The following disputes shall be excluded from the procedure described in the said Act:

(a) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(b) Disputes relating to questions which international law leaves to the sole jurisdiction of States;

(c) Disputes affecting the relations between Italy and any third Power.

II. It is understood that, in conformity with Article 29 of the said Act, disputes for the solution of which a special procedure is provided by other conventions shall be settled in accordance with the provisions of those conventions; and that, in particular, disputes which may be submitted to the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations in virtue of one of the provisions of the Covenant shall be settled in accordance with those provisions.

III. It is further understood that the present accession in no way affects Italy's accession to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and to the clause in that Statute concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Latvia (September 17th, 1935)

Luxembourg (September 15th, 1930)

Norway[5] (June 11th, 1930)

Peru (November 21st, 1931)

Subject to reservation *(b)* provided for in Article 39, paragraph 2.

Spain[6]: Denunciation (April 8th, 1939)

Switzerland (December 7th, 1934)

Turkey (June 26th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the Act:

(a) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(b) Disputes relating to questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(c) Disputes affecting the relations between Turkey and any third Power.

2. Open to accession by:

(1) The Members of the League of Nations which have not acceded:
(2) Further, the following States:

United States of America	Guatemala	Salvador
Brazil	Honduras	Spain
Chile	Hungary	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Costa Rica	Japan	Venezuela
Germany	Nicaragua	
	Paraguay	

Notification received by the Secretary-General of the Organization of the United Nations after he assumed the functions of depositary

Australia[7]
Dominica[8]
France[9]
India[10]
Pakistan[11]
Turkey[12]
United Kingdom[13]

NOTES:

[1] Registered under the number 2123. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 93, p. 343.

[2] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[3] The letter was received by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on December 8th, 1939. For the text, see *Official Journal of the League of Nations*, Nos. 1-3, January, February, March 1940.

[4] The telegram was received by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on September 8th, 1939. For the text, see *Official Journal of the League of Nations*, Nos. 9-10, September-October 1939.

[5] On June 11th, 1929, Norway acceded to Chapters I, II and IV. On June 11th, 1930, it extended its accession to the whole of the Act.

[6] Spain acceded on September 16th, 1930.
By a letter dated April 1st, 1939, and received by the Secretariat on April 8th, the Spanish National Government denounced the accession of Spain, pursuant to the terms of Article 45 of the General Act.
Under Article 45, this denunciation should have been effected six months before the expiration of the current five-year period—that is to say, in this case, before February 16th, 1939.
In regard to this point, the National Government states in its letter that, as the Secretary-General and almost all the States which are parties to the General Act have "in the past... refused to receive any communications from the National Government, this Government could not have acted earlier in pursuance of the right which it now exercises in virtue of Article 45 of the Act".
The Secretary-General brought this communication to the knowledge of the Governments concerned.

[7] On 17 March 1975, the Secretary-General received a declaration to the effect that the Government of Australia, in accordance with article 40, of the above-mentioned Act, abandons all the conditions to which its acceptance is subject (instrument of accession deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on 21 May 1931) with the exception of the condition relating to disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement.

[8] In a notification received on 24 November 1987, the Government of Dominica declared the following:
"The Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica has now examined the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes signed in Geneva on 26th September 1928 and is of the opinion that the provisions of the Act ceased to apply to the Commonwealth of Dominica after 8th February 1974 when the United Kingdom formally denounced it and in any case the Commonwealth of Dominica does not regard itself bound by that Act after its Independence."

[9] In a notification received on 10 January 1974, the Government of France declared the following:
In a case dealt with by the International Court of Justice the Government of the French Republic noted that it was contended that the 1928 General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes could, in the present circumstances, justify the exercise of jurisdiction by the Court.
On that occasion the French Government specified the reasons why it considered that view to be unfounded.
While reaffirming that position, and, accordingly, without prejudice to it, the French Government requests you, with a view to avoiding any new controversy, to take cognizance of the fact that, with respect to any State or any institution that might contend that the General Act is still in force, the present letter constitutes denunciation of that Act in conformity with Article 45 thereof.

[10] In a notification received on 18 September 1974, the Minister of External Affairs of India declared the following:
"I have the honour to refer to the General Act of 26th September 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, which was accepted for British India by the then His Majesty's Secretary of State for India by a communication addressed to the Secretariat of the League of Nations dated 21st May 1931, and which was later revised on 15th February 1939.
"The Government of India never regarded themselves as bound by the General Act of 1928 since her Independence in 1947, whether by succession or otherwise. Accordingly, India has never been and is not a party to the General Act of 1928 ever since her Independence. I write this to make our position absolutely clear on this point so that there is no doubt in any quarter."

[11] The notification of succession specified that the Government of Pakistan does not maintain the reservations formulated by British India upon accession to the General Act of Arbitration.
The notification also contains the following declaration:
When Pakistan became a Member of the United Nations in October 1947, the delegation of India communicated to the Secretary-General the text of the Constitutional arrangements made at the time when India and Pakistan became independent (Document A/C.6/161 of 7 October 1947), with reference to the devolution upon them, as successor States of the former British India, of British India's international rights and obligations.
Among the rights and obligations of former British India were those of the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes done at Geneva on 26th September 1928, which was acceded to by British India on 21st May 1931. The Government of

Pakistan regards the Act as continuing in force as between parties to the Act as established on 26th September 1928 and all successor States. Article 17 of the said Act is given efficacy by Article 37 of the Statute of International Court of Justice, as between Members of the United Nations or parties to the Statute of the Court.

As a result of the arrangements mentioned in paragraph 1, Pakistan has been a separate party to the General Act of 1928 from the date of her independence, i.e. the 14th August 1947, since in accordance with Section 4 of the Indian Independence (International Arrangements), Order, 1947 (Document No. A/C.6/161 of 7 October 1946), Pakistan succeeded to the rights and obligations of British India under all multilateral treaties binding upon her before her partition into the two successor States. By virtue of these arrangements, the Government of Pakistan did not need to take any steps to indicate its consent *de novo* to acceding to multilateral conventions by which British India had been bound. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was made aware of the situation through the communication referred above.

However, in order to dispel all doubts in this connection and without prejudice to Pakistan's rights as a successor State to British India, the Government of Pakistan have decided to notify Your Excellency, in your capacity as depositary of the General Act of 1928, that the Government of Pakistan continues to be bound by the accession of British India of the General Act of 1928. The Government of Pakistan does not, however, affirm the reservations made by British India.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 18 September 1974 a communication from the Minister of External Affairs of India stating *inter alia*:

...

2. In the aforementioned communication, the Prime Minister of Pakistan has stated, *inter alia*, that as a result of the constitutional arrangements made at the time when India and Pakistan became independent, Pakistan has been a separate party to the General Act of 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes from the date of her independence, i.e. 14th August 1947, since in accordance with Section 4 of the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order 1947, Pakistan succeeded to the rights and obligations of British India under all multilateral treaties binding upon her before her partition into the two successor States.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan has further stated that accordingly, the Government of Pakistan did not need to take any steps to communicate its consent *de novo* to acceding to multilateral conventions by which British India had been bound. However, in order to dispel all doubts in this connection, the Government of Pakistan have stated that they continue to be bound by the accession of British India to the General Act of 1928. The communication further adds that 'the Government of Pakistan does not, however, affirm the reservations made by British India'.

3. In this connection, the Government of India has the following observations to make:

(1) The General Act of 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes was a political agreement and was an integral part of the League of Nations system. Its efficacy was impaired by the fact that the organs of the League of Nations to which it refers have now disappeared. It is for these reasons that the General Assembly of the United Nations on 28 April 1949 adopted the Revised General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes.

(2) Whereas British India did accede to the General Act of 1928, by a communication of 21 May 1931, revised on 15 February 1939, neither India nor Pakistan, into which British India was divided in 1947, succeeded to the General Act of 1928, either under general international law or in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947.

(3) India and Pakistan have not yet acceded to the Revised General Act of 1949.

(4) Neither India nor Pakistan have regarded themselves as being party to or bound by the provisions of the General Act of 1928. This is clear from the following:

(a) In 1947, a list of treaties to which the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947 was to apply was prepared by 'Expert Committee No. 9 on Foreign Relations'. Their report is contained in *Partition Proceedings*, Volume III, pages 217-276. The list comprises 627 treaties in force in 1947. The 1928 General Act is not included in that list. The report was signed by the representatives of India and Pakistan. India should not therefore have been listed in any record as a party to the General Act of 1928 since 15 August 1947.

(b) In several differences or disputes since 1947, such as those relating to the uses of river waters or the settlement of the boundary in the Rann of Kutch area, the 1928 General Act was not relied upon or cited either by India or by Pakistan.

(c) In a case decided in 1961, the Supreme Court of Pakistan while referring to the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947 held that this Order 'did not and, indeed, could not provide for the devolution of treaty rights and obligations which were not capable of being succeeded to by a part of a country, which is severed from the parent State and established as an independent sovereign power, according to the practice of States'. Such treaties would include treaties of alliance, *arbitration* or commerce. The Court held that 'an examination of the provision of the said Order of 1947 also reveals no intention to depart from this principle'.

(d) Statements on the existing international law of succession clearly establish that political treaties like the 1928 General Act are not transmissible by succession or by devolution agreements. Professor O'Connell states as follows: 'Clearly not all these treaties are transmissible; no State has yet acknowledged its succession to the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes' (1928). *(State Succession in Municipal Law and International Law*, vol. II, 1967, page 213.) See also Sir Humphrey Waldock's *Second Report* (article 3) and *Third Report* (articles 6 and 7) on State Succession submitted to the International Law Commission in 1969 and 1970, respectively; *Succession of States and Governments*, Doc. A/CN.4/149-Add.1 and A/CN.4/150—Memorandums prepared by UN Secretariat on 3 December 1962 and 10 December 1962, respectively; and Oscar Schachter, 'The Development of International Law through Legal Opinions of the United Nations Secretariat', *British Yearbook of International Law* (1948) pages 91, 106–107.

(e) The Government of Pakistan had attempted to establish the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the Trial of Prisoners of War case in May 1973 and in that connection, as an alternative pleading, for the first time cited the provisions of the General Act of 1928 in support of the Court's jurisdiction to deal with the matter. Although the Government of India did not appear in these proceedings on the ground that their consent, required under the relevant treaty, had not been obtained before instituting these proceedings, their views regarding the non-application of the General Act of 1928 to India-Pakistan were made clear to the Court by a communication dated 4 June 1973 from the Indian Ambassador at The Hague.

4. To sum up the 1928 General Act, being an integral part of the League of Nations system, ceased to be a treaty in force upon the disappearance of the organs of the League of Nations. Being a political agreement it could not be transmissible under the law of succession. Neither India nor Pakistan have regarded themselves as bound by the General Act of 1928 since 1947. The General Act of 1928 was not listed in the list of 627 agreements to which the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947 related and India and Pakistan could therefore not have been listed in any record as parties to the 1928 General Act. Nor have Pakistan or India yet acceded to the Revised General Act of 1949.

5. The Government of Pakistan, by their communication dated 30 May 1974, have now expressed their intention to be bound

by the General Act of 1928, without the reservations made by British India. This new act of Pakistan may or may not amount to accession to the General Act of 1928 depending upon their wishes as a sovereign State and the position in international law of the treaty in question. In view of what has been stated above, the Government of India consider that Pakistan cannot, however, become a party to the General Act of 1928 by way of succession under the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947, as stated by Pakistan.

12 In a notification received on 18 December 1978 the Government of Turkey declared the following:

"In a case being dealt with by the International Court of Justice, it has been alleged that the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes of 26 September 1928 provides a basis of jurisdiction for the Court to entertain a unilateral application. In that connection, the Government of Turkey has made clear its position that the General Act is no longer in force. The Government of Turkey reaffirms this position.

"Nevertheless, without prejudice to that position, and for the removal of any possibility of doubt that might arise as a result of any state or any institution considering that the afore-mentioned General Act continues to have any force or validity, the Government of Turkey hereby gives notice of denunciation of the General Act and requests that this notice be treated as a formal notification of denunciation under Article 45 thereof in so far as the General Act might be regarded as still in force."

"Article 45 of the General Act provides as follows:

" '1. The present General Act shall be concluded for a period of five years, dating from its entry into force.

" '2. It shall remain in force for further successive periods of five years in the case of Contracting Parties which do not denounce it at least six months before the expiration of the current period.

" '3. Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 43.

" '4. A denunciation may be partial only, or may consist in notification of reservations not previously made.

" '5. Notwithstanding denunciation by one of the Contracting Parties concerned in a dispute, all proceedings pending at the expiration of the current period of the General Act shall be duly completed.' "

13 In a notification received on 8 February 1974, the Government of the United Kingdom declared *inter alia* the following:

"In the light of events since then [the accession of the United Kingdom to the General Act] doubts have been raised as to the continued legal force of the General Act. Without prejudice to the views of the United Kingdom as to the continued force of the General Act,

(i) insofar as the General Act may be regarded as still in force, the United Kingdom hereby gives notice of its denunciation of the General Act in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 45 thereof;

(ii) insofar as the General Act may be regarded as no longer in force, this notice serves to place beyond doubt the position of the United Kingdom in this matter."

In a notification received on 1 March 1974, the Government of the United Kingdom subsequently indicated that the notification received on 8 February 1974 was to be treated as a formal notification of denunciation under Article 45 of the General Act in so far as the latter might be regarded as still in force.

30. Convention concerning the Unification of Road Signals

Geneva, March 30th, 1931[1]

IN FORCE since July 16th, 1934 (article 11).[2]

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Egypt (June 10th, 1940 *a*)
France (October 11th, 1934)
Does not assume any obligation in regard to Algeria, colonies, protectorates and territories under its mandate.
Algeria (July 22nd, 1935 *a*)
Hungary (January 8th, 1937)
Italy (September 25th, 1933)
Latvia (January 10th, 1939 *a*)
Luxembourg (April 9th, 1936)
Monaco (January 19th, 1932 *a*)
The Netherlands[3] (for the Kingdom in Europe, *Surinam and Curacao*) (January 16th, 1934 *a*)
Netherlands Indies (January 29th, 1940 *a*)
In view of the special character of the roads in the Netherlands Indies, the Netherlands Government reserves the right to place upon them the danger signals referred to in paragraph I, subparagraph (2), of the Annex to the Convention, at a distance from the obstacle which shall not be less than 60 metres, without making special arrangements.
Poland (April 5th, 1934)
Portugal (April 18th, 1932 *a*)
Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.
Romania (June 19th, 1935 *a*)
Spain (July 18th, 1933)
Sweden (February 25th, 1938 *a*)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Turkey (October 15th, 1936)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 *a*)

Signatures subject to ratification:

Belgium
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.
Czechoslovakia[4]
Denmark
Germany
Yugoslavia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Denunciation*	*Participant*	*Denunciation*
France	19 Oct 1954	Poland	29 Oct 1958
Hungary	30 Jul 1962	Portugal	6 Jun 1957
Italy	29 Mar 1953	Romania	26 May 1961
Luxembourg	30 Nov 1954	Spain	28 Feb 1958
Monaco	18 May 1953	Sweden	31 Mar 1952
Netherlands[5]	29 Dec 1952	Russian Federation	26 Apr 1961

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 3459. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 150, p. 247.

[2] The Convention ceased to have effect on 30 July 1963, the number of States bound by its provisions having been reduced to less than five as the result of successive denunciations.

[3] This reservation has been submitted to the States Parties to the Convention for acceptance.

[4] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[5] Denunciation for the Kingdom in Europe only: The Netherlands wishes to remain a party to the Convention in respect of the Netherlands Antilles, Surinam and Netherlands New Guinea until the Protocol of 19 September 1949 has become applicable to those territories (see chapter XI.B-2).

31. Agreement concerning Maritime Signals

Signed at Lisbon, October 23, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since November 22nd, 1931 (article 12).

Definitive signatures or accessions and Ratifications

Belgium (February 10th, 1932)

Belgium cannot undertake, for the present, to apply the provisions relating to "Warning of gale expected to affect the locality" which form the first chapter of the Regulations of this Agreement.

Further, the ratification by Belgium of the provisions which are the object of Chapter II (Tide and depth signals), and Chapter III (Signals concerning the movement of vessels at the entrances of harbours or important channels), will only take effect when Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Norway shall have themselves notified their effective ratifications of the provisions contained in these two chapters.

The ratification by Belgium does not apply to the Belgian Congo.

Brazil (November 21st, 1932 *a*)
China (May 29th 1935)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
Finland (June 12th, 1936)
France (July 13th, 1931)
Morocco (September 3rd, 1931)
Tunis (October 27th, 1931)
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:
Cameroon (October 28th, 1983 *a*)
French Cost of Somaliland "
French Equatorial Africa "
French Settlements in India "
French West Africa "
Guadeloupe, Guyana "
Indo-China "
Madagascar, Martinique "
New Caledonia "
Oceania "
Reunion "
St. Pierre and Miquelon "
Togoland "
Greece (September 14th, 1932)
Latvia (September 17th, 1935 *a*)
Monaco (November 3rd, 1933)
The Netherlands (August 24th, 1931 *s*)
(Including the *Netherlands Indies.*)
Poland (October 2nd, 1933)
Portugal (October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Romania (June 1st, 1931 *s*)
Spain (November 3rd, 1933)
Turkey (June 27th, 1936 *a*)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (April 27th, 1931 *s*)
Yugoslavia (December 11th, 1937)

Signatures subject to ratification:

Union of South Africa
Cuba
Estonia
Germany
Sweden

Open to accession by:

Albania
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bulgaria
Canada
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Peru
Salvador
Tangier
Thailand
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Denunciation*
Belgium	1 Oct 1985
France	11 Jul 1983
Greece	24 Jul 1986
Netherlands	29 Dec 1992

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 2849. See *Treaty Series of the League of Nations*, vol. 125, p. 95. Ratifications and accessions subsequent to registration: vol. 138, p. 453; vol. 142, p. 379; vol. 156, p. 241; vol. 160, p. 393; vol. 164, p. 390 and vol. 181, p. 395.

32. Convention relating to the Non-Fortification and Neutralisation of the Aaland Islands

Geneva, October 20, 1921[1]

IN FORCE for each signatory or acceding Power immediately on the deposit of such Power's ratification or instrument of accession (Article 10).

Ratifications or definitive accessions		*Ratifications or definitive accessions*	
British Empire	(April 6th, 1922)	Germany	(April 6th, 1922)
Denmark	(April 6th, 1922)	Italy	(May 11th, 1922)
Estonia	(April 3rd, 1923)	Latvia	(September 9th, 1922)
Finland	(April 6th, 1922)	Poland	(June 29th, 1922)
France	(April 6th, 1922)	Sweden	(April 6th, 1922)

Notifications received by the Secretary-General of the Organization of the United Nations after he assumed the functions of depositary

Estonia[2] Latvia[3]

Notes:

[1] Registered No. 255. See Treaty Series, *League of Nations*, vol. 9. p. 211.

[2] In a notification received on 21 July 1992, the Government of Estonia declared the following:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia [notifies] the declaration of continuity by Estonia regarding the [said] Convention."

[3] In a notification received on 14 April 1992, the Government of Latvia declared the following:

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs declares, in conformity with article 8 and article 10 of the Convention [. . .] that the said Convention is still binding for the Republic of Latvia and the provisions so accepted shall be observed in their entirety."

33. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS

Lisbon, October 23, 1930[1]

IN FORCE since January 21st, 1931 (Article 4).

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium	(February 10th, 1923)
This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.	
Brazil	(November 21st, 1932 *a*)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Does not include any Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate of His Britannic Majesty.	
Burma[2]	
India	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Does not include any of the Indian States under British suzerainty.	
China	(May 29th, 1935)
Free City of Danzig	(through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
Denmark	(April 29th, 1931 *s*)
Estonia	(September 16th, 1936)
Finland	(May 23rd, 1934)
France	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Morocco	*(October 23rd, 1930 s)*
Tunis	*(October 23rd, 1930 s)*
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:	
Cameroons	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
French Coast of Somaliland	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
French Equatorial Africa	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
French Settlements in India	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
French West Africa	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Guadeloupe, Guiana	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Indo-China	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Madagascar, Martinique	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
New Caledonia	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Oceania	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Reunion	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
St. Pierre and Miquelon	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Togoland	*(October 28th, 1933 a)*
Greece	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Iraq	(October 15th, 1935 *a*)
Latvia	(September 17th, 1935 *a*)
Monaco	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
The Netherlands	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
(Including the *Netherlands Indies*.)	
Poland	(October 2nd, 1933)
Portugal	(October 23rd, 1930 *s*)
Romania	(June 1st, 1931 *s*)
Spain	(November 3rd, 1933)
Sweden	(February 3rd, 1933)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(April 27th, 1931 *s*)
Turkey	(June 27th, 1936 *a*)
Yugoslavia	(January 16th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Cuba Germany

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Denunciation*
Netherlands[3]	29 Dec 1992

NOTES:

[1] Registered No. 2603. See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, vol. 112, p. 21.

[2] See note 3 in Part II.2.

[3] For the Kingdom of Europe. With effect from 29 December 1993.

INDEX

(Reference numbers correspond to chapters and their subdivisions – see "Table of Contents" and running head on top of each page)

A

B

C

D

E

F

S

T

U

V

W

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى: الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York
07301—April 1996—1,925

ISBN 92-1-133508-6

Sales No. E.96.V.5
ST/LEG/SER.F/14