

3. INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

New York, 16 December 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 January 1976, in accordance with article 27.¹

REGISTRATION: 3 January 1976, No. 14531.¹

STATUS: Signatories: 71. Parties: 173.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 3; depositary notification C.N.781.2001.TREATIES-6 of 5 October 2001 [Proposal of correction to the original of the Covenant (Chinese authentic text) and C.N.7.2002.TREATIES-1 of 3 January 2002 [Rectification of the original of the Covenant (Chinese authentic text)].

Note: The Covenant was opened for signature at New York on 19 December 1966.

<i>Participant²</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)</i>	<i>Participant²</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)</i>
Afghanistan.....		24 Jan 1983 a	Central African Republic		8 May 1981 a
Albania.....		4 Oct 1991 a	Chad.....		9 Jun 1995 a
Algeria	10 Dec 1968	12 Sep 1989	Chile.....	16 Sep 1969	10 Feb 1972
Angola		10 Jan 1992 a	China ^{6,7,8}	27 Oct 1997	27 Mar 2001
Antigua and Barbuda.....		3 Jul 2019 a	Colombia	21 Dec 1966	29 Oct 1969
Argentina	19 Feb 1968	8 Aug 1986	Comoros.....	25 Sep 2008	
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a	Congo.....		5 Oct 1983 a
Australia.....	18 Dec 1972	10 Dec 1975	Costa Rica.....	19 Dec 1966	29 Nov 1968
Austria	10 Dec 1973	10 Sep 1978	Côte d'Ivoire		26 Mar 1992 a
Azerbaijan.....		13 Aug 1992 a	Croatia ³		12 Oct 1992 d
Bahamas (The).....	4 Dec 2008	23 Dec 2008	Cuba.....	28 Feb 2008	
Bahrain.....		27 Sep 2007 a	Cyprus.....	9 Jan 1967	2 Apr 1969
Bangladesh.....		5 Oct 1998 a	Czech Republic ⁹		22 Feb 1993 d
Barbados		5 Jan 1973 a	Democratic People's Republic of Korea ...		14 Sep 1981 a
Belarus	19 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973	Democratic Republic of the Congo		1 Nov 1976 a
Belgium	10 Dec 1968	21 Apr 1983	Denmark	20 Mar 1968	6 Jan 1972
Belize	6 Sep 2000	9 Mar 2015	Djibouti.....		5 Nov 2002 a
Benin.....		12 Mar 1992 a	Dominica		17 Jun 1993 a
Bolivia (Plurinational State of).....		12 Aug 1982 a	Dominican Republic		4 Jan 1978 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina ³		1 Sep 1993 d	Ecuador.....	29 Sep 1967	6 Mar 1969
Brazil		24 Jan 1992 a	Egypt.....	4 Aug 1967	14 Jan 1982
Bulgaria	8 Oct 1968	21 Sep 1970	El Salvador	21 Sep 1967	30 Nov 1979
Burkina Faso.....		4 Jan 1999 a	Equatorial Guinea		25 Sep 1987 a
Burundi		9 May 1990 a	Eritrea		17 Apr 2001 a
Cabo Verde		6 Aug 1993 a	Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Cambodia ^{4,5}	17 Oct 1980	26 May 1992 a	Eswatini		26 Mar 2004 a
Cameroon.....		27 Jun 1984 a	Ethiopia.....		11 Jun 1993 a
Canada		19 May 1976 a	Fiji		16 Aug 2018 a

<i>Participant²</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)</i>	<i>Participant²</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)</i>
Finland.....	11 Oct 1967	19 Aug 1975	Maldives.....		19 Sep 2006 a
France.....		4 Nov 1980 a	Mali.....		16 Jul 1974 a
Gabon.....		21 Jan 1983 a	Malta.....	22 Oct 1968	13 Sep 1990
Gambia.....		29 Dec 1978 a	Marshall Islands.....		12 Mar 2018 a
Georgia.....		3 May 1994 a	Mauritania.....		17 Nov 2004 a
Germany ^{2,10}	9 Oct 1968	17 Dec 1973	Mauritius.....		12 Dec 1973 a
Ghana.....	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000	Mexico.....		23 Mar 1981 a
Greece.....		16 May 1985 a	Monaco.....	26 Jun 1997	28 Aug 1997
Grenada.....		6 Sep 1991 a	Mongolia.....	5 Jun 1968	18 Nov 1974
Guatemala.....		19 May 1988 a	Montenegro ¹¹		23 Oct 2006 d
Guinea.....	28 Feb 1967	24 Jan 1978	Morocco.....	19 Jan 1977	3 May 1979
Guinea-Bissau.....		2 Jul 1992 a	Myanmar.....	16 Jul 2015	6 Oct 2017
Guyana.....	22 Aug 1968	15 Feb 1977	Namibia.....		28 Nov 1994 a
Haiti.....		8 Oct 2013 a	Nepal.....		14 May 1991 a
Honduras.....	19 Dec 1966	17 Feb 1981	Netherlands (Kingdom of the) ¹²	25 Jun 1969	11 Dec 1978
Hungary.....	25 Mar 1969	17 Jan 1974	New Zealand ¹³	12 Nov 1968	28 Dec 1978
Iceland.....	30 Dec 1968	22 Aug 1979	Nicaragua.....		12 Mar 1980 a
India.....		10 Apr 1979 a	Niger.....		7 Mar 1986 a
Indonesia.....		23 Feb 2006 a	Nigeria.....		29 Jul 1993 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of).....	4 Apr 1968	24 Jun 1975	North Macedonia ³		18 Jan 1994 d
Iraq.....	18 Feb 1969	25 Jan 1971	Norway.....	20 Mar 1968	13 Sep 1972
Ireland.....	1 Oct 1973	8 Dec 1989	Oman.....		9 Jun 2020 a
Israel.....	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1991	Pakistan.....	3 Nov 2004	17 Apr 2008
Italy.....	18 Jan 1967	15 Sep 1978	Palau.....	20 Sep 2011	
Jamaica.....	19 Dec 1966	3 Oct 1975	Panama.....	27 Jul 1976	8 Mar 1977
Japan.....	30 May 1978	21 Jun 1979	Papua New Guinea.....		21 Jul 2008 a
Jordan.....	30 Jun 1972	28 May 1975	Paraguay.....		10 Jun 1992 a
Kazakhstan.....	2 Dec 2003	24 Jan 2006	Peru.....	11 Aug 1977	28 Apr 1978
Kenya.....		1 May 1972 a	Philippines.....	19 Dec 1966	7 Jun 1974
Kuwait.....		21 May 1996 a	Poland.....	2 Mar 1967	18 Mar 1977
Kyrgyzstan.....		7 Oct 1994 a	Portugal ⁶	7 Oct 1976	31 Jul 1978
Lao People's Democratic Republic.....	7 Dec 2000	13 Feb 2007	Qatar.....		21 May 2018 a
Latvia.....		14 Apr 1992 a	Republic of Korea.....		10 Apr 1990 a
Lebanon.....		3 Nov 1972 a	Republic of Moldova.....		26 Jan 1993 a
Lesotho.....		9 Sep 1992 a	Romania.....	27 Jun 1968	9 Dec 1974
Liberia.....	18 Apr 1967	22 Sep 2004	Russian Federation.....	18 Mar 1968	16 Oct 1973
Libya.....		15 May 1970 a	Rwanda.....		16 Apr 1975 a
Liechtenstein.....		10 Dec 1998 a	San Marino.....		18 Oct 1985 a
Lithuania.....		20 Nov 1991 a	Sao Tome and Principe..	31 Oct 1995	10 Jan 2017
Luxembourg.....	26 Nov 1974	18 Aug 1983	Senegal.....	6 Jul 1970	13 Feb 1978
Madagascar.....	14 Apr 1970	22 Sep 1971	Serbia ³		12 Mar 2001 d
Malawi.....		22 Dec 1993 a	Seychelles.....		5 May 1992 a
			Sierra Leone.....		23 Aug 1996 a

<i>Participant²</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)</i>	<i>Participant²</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Ratification, Accession(a), Succession(d)</i>
Slovakia ⁹		28 May 1993 d	Trinidad and Tobago		8 Dec 1978 a
Slovenia ³		6 Jul 1992 d	Tunisia	30 Apr 1968	18 Mar 1969
Solomon Islands ¹⁴		17 Mar 1982 d	Türkiye.....	15 Aug 2000	23 Sep 2003
Somalia		24 Jan 1990 a	Turkmenistan.....		1 May 1997 a
South Africa.....	3 Oct 1994	12 Jan 2015	Uganda.....		21 Jan 1987 a
South Sudan.....		5 Feb 2024 a	Ukraine	20 Mar 1968	12 Nov 1973
Spain	28 Sep 1976	27 Apr 1977	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ^{8,15} ..	16 Sep 1968	20 May 1976
Sri Lanka.....		11 Jun 1980 a	United Republic of Tanzania.....		11 Jun 1976 a
St. Kitts and Nevis.....		1 Nov 2024 a	United States of America.....	5 Oct 1977	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a	Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	1 Apr 1970
State of Palestine		2 Apr 2014 a	Uzbekistan		28 Sep 1995 a
Sudan		18 Mar 1986 a	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	24 Jun 1969	10 May 1978
Suriname.....		28 Dec 1976 a	Viet Nam.....		24 Sep 1982 a
Sweden.....	29 Sep 1967	6 Dec 1971	Yemen ¹⁶		9 Feb 1987 a
Switzerland		18 Jun 1992 a	Zambia.....		10 Apr 1984 a
Syrian Arab Republic		21 Apr 1969 a	Zimbabwe.....		13 May 1991 a
Tajikistan		4 Jan 1999 a			
Thailand.....		5 Sep 1999 a			
Timor-Leste		16 Apr 2003 a			
Togo.....		24 May 1984 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

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 of all States to sovereignty, both Covenants should be left open for the purpose of the participation of all States.

ALGERIA¹⁷

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.

BAHAMAS (THE)

“The Government of the Bahamas 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 behavior but not of differences in treatment based on objective and

reasonable considerations, in conformity with principles prevailing in democratic societies.”

BAHRAIN

The obligation of the Kingdom of Bahrain to implement article 8, paragraph 1 (d), of the Covenant shall not prejudice its right to prohibit strikes at essential utilities.

BANGLADESH¹⁸

It is the understanding of the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh that the words "the right of self-determination of Peoples" appearing in this article apply in the historical context of colonial rule, administration, foreign domination, occupation and similar situations.

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh will implement articles 2 and 3 in so far as they relate to equality between man and woman, in accordance with the relevant provisions of its Constitution and in particular, in respect to certain aspects of economic rights viz. law of inheritance.

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh will apply articles 7 and 8 under the conditions and in conformity with the procedures established in the Constitution and the relevant legislation of Bangladesh.

While the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh accepts the provisions embodied in articles 10 and 13 of the Covenant in principle, it will implement the said provisions in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country."

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."

BELARUS¹⁹

BELGIUM

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 objective 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."

CHINA

The signature that the Taiwan authorities affixed, by usurping the name of "China", to the [said Covenant] on 5 October 1967, is illegal and null and void.

In accordance with the Decision made by the Standing Committee of the Ninth National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China at its Twentieth Session, the President of the People's Republic of China hereby ratifies *The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, which was signed by Mr. Qin Huasun on behalf of the People's Republic of China on 27 October 1997, and declares the following:

1. The application of Article 8.1 (a) of the Covenant to the People's Republic of China shall be consistent with the relevant provisions of the *Constitution of the People's Republic of China*, *Trade Union Law of the People's Republic of China* and *Labor Law of the People's Republic of China* ;

2. In accordance with the official notes addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations on 20 June 1997 and 2 December 1999 respectively, the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights* shall be applicable to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and shall, pursuant to the provisions of the *Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China* and the *Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China* , be implemented through the respective laws of the two special administrative regions.

CONGO²⁰

CUBA

Declaration:

The Republic of Cuba hereby declares that it was the Revolution that enabled its people to enjoy the rights set out in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America and its policy of hostility and aggression against Cuba constitute the most serious obstacle to the Cuban people's enjoyment of the rights set out in the Covenant.

The rights protected under this Covenant are enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic and in national legislation.

The State's policies and programmes guarantee the effective exercise and protection of these rights for all Cubans.

With respect to the scope and implementation of some of the provisions of this international instrument, Cuba will make such reservations or interpretative declarations as it may deem appropriate.

CZECH REPUBLIC⁹

DENMARK²¹

"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

... 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 ratify it

FRANCE

(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

"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."

"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

"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, and articles 12, 19 (3), 21 and 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political 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."

INDONESIA

"With reference to Article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of [the] Republic of Indonesia declares that, consistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States, and the relevant paragraph of the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action of 1993, the words "the right of self-determination" appearing in this article do not apply to a section of people within a sovereign independent state and can not be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent states."

IRAQ²²

"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."

"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

"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.

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."

JAPAN²³

"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 to 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.

[...]
"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 is 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."

KUWAIT

Although the Government of Kuwait endorses the worthy principles embodied in article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 as consistent with the provisions of the Kuwait Constitution in general and of its article 29 in particular, it declares that the rights to which the articles refer must be exercised within the limits set by Kuwaiti law.

The Government of Kuwait declares that while Kuwaiti legislation safeguards the rights of all Kuwaiti

and non-Kuwaiti workers, social security provisions apply only to Kuwaitis.

The Government of Kuwait reserves the right not to apply the provisions of article 8, paragraph 1 (d).

LIBYA²²

"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.

MALTA²⁴

"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

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.

MONACO

The Princely Government declares that it interprets the principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of national origin, embodied in article 2, paragraph 2, as not necessarily implying an automatic obligation on the part of States to guarantee foreigners the same rights as their nationals.

The Princely Government declares that articles 6, 9, 11 and 13 should not be constituting an impediment to provisions governing access to work by foreigners or fixing conditions of residence for the granting of certain social benefits.

The Princely Government declares that it considers article 8, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) on the exercise of trade union rights to be compatible with the appropriate legislative provisions regarding the formalities, conditions and procedures designed to ensure effective trade union representation and to promote harmonious labour relations.

The Princely Government declares that in implementing the provisions of article 8 relating to the exercise of the right to strike, it will take into account the requirements, conditions, limitations and restrictions which are prescribed by law and which are necessary in a democratic society in order to guarantee the rights and

freedoms of others or to protect public order (*ordre public*), national security, public health or morals.

Article 8, paragraph 2, should be interpreted as applying to the members of the police force and agents of the State, the Commune and public enterprises.

MONGOLIA

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.

MYANMAR

"With reference to article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar declares that, in consistency with the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action of 1993, the term "the right of self-determination" appearing in this article does not apply to any section of people within a sovereign independent state and cannot be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of a sovereign and independent state. In addition, the term shall not be applied to undermine Section 10 of the Constitution of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, 2008."

NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)²⁵

NEW ZEALAND²⁶

"The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not [to] 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.

...

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."

OMAN

... [the Government of Oman makes] a reservation in respect of article 8, paragraph 1, subparagraphs (a) and (d) of that Covenant, regarding the right to form trade unions and the right to strike, in so far as the employees of government units are concerned.

PAKISTAN^{27,28,29}

"Pakistan, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present Covenant, shall use all appropriate means to the maximum of its available resources."

QATAR³⁰

The State of Qatar does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 3 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, for they

contravene the Islamic Sharia with regard to questions of inheritance and birth.

The State of Qatar shall interpret that what is meant by "trade unions" and their related issues stated in Article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Right[s], is in line with the provisions of the Labor Law and national legislation. The State of Qatar reserves the right to implement that article in accordance with such understanding.

ROMANIA

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.

(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

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.

RWANDA³¹

SLOVAKIA⁹

SOUTH AFRICA

"The Government of the Republic of South Africa will give progressive effect to the right to education, as provided for in Article 13 (2) (a) and Article 14, within the framework of its National Education Policy and available resources."

SWEDEN

Sweden³⁰ 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 REPUBLIC²²

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.

THAILAND

"The Government of the Kingdom of Thailand declares that the term "self-determination" as appears in Article 1 Paragraph 1 of the Covenant shall be interpreted as being compatible with that expressed in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights on 25 June 1993."

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"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.

TÜRKIYE

The Republic of Turkey declares that; it will implement its obligations under the Covenant in accordance to the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations (especially Article 1 and 2 thereof).

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

The Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of the paragraph (3) and (4) of the Article 13 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in accordance to the provisions under the Article 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

UKRAINE

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

"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."

"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 Pitcairn 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

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.

YEMEN¹⁶

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

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.)

AUSTRIA

“The Government of Austria has carefully examined the declaration made by the Republic of the Union of Myanmar upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966. It considers this declaration to amount to a reservation of a general and indeterminate scope, as it aims at applying a provision of the Covenant only in conformity with the Constitution of Myanmar. However, the Covenant is to be applied in accordance with international law, not in accordance with the legislation of a particular state.

For this reason, Austria considers the reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and objects to it. This objection shall however not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Austria and the Republic of the Union of Myanmar. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without Myanmar benefitting from the aforementioned reservation.

Finally, Austria wishes to point out that it does not share the narrow interpretation of the right of self-determination expressed by Myanmar, i.e. that it were excluded that this right ‘apply to any section of people within a sovereign independent state’. At the same time, Austria also underlines the fundamental difference between the right of self-determination and a claim to secession, taking into account the various ways of exercising the right of self-determination including by way of autonomy within a sovereign state.”

“The Government of Austria has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Austria considers the statement concerning Article 8 to amount to a reservation as it aims at applying a provision of the Covenant only in conformity with national legislation. However, the Covenant is to be applied in accordance with international law, not only in accordance with the legislation of a particular state.

By referring to its national legislation or to the Islamic sharia, Qatar’s reservations to Article 3 and Article 8 of the Covenant are of a general and indeterminate scope. These reservations do not clearly define for the other States Parties the extent to which the reserving state has accepted the obligations of the Covenant. Furthermore,

the reservation to Article 3 seeks to exclude, at least partly, the application of one of the most central provisions which is related to all rights set forth in the Covenant.

Austria therefore considers both reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and objects to them. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Austria and the State of Qatar. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without Qatar benefitting from the aforementioned reservations.”

BELGIUM

The Kingdom of Belgium has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the State of Qatar upon its accession, on 21 May 2018, to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The reservation to article 3 and the statement concerning article 8 make the provisions of the Covenant subject to their compatibility with the Sharia or national legislation. The Kingdom of Belgium considers that this reservation and this declaration tend to limit the responsibility of the State of Qatar under the Covenant by means of a general reference to the rules of national law and Sharia. This creates uncertainty as to the extent to which the State of Qatar intends to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant and raises doubts about the State of Qatar's compliance with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Kingdom of Belgium recalls that under article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, a State cannot make a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty. Moreover, article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties stipulates that a party may not invoke the provisions of its national law as justifying the non-fulfilment of a treaty.

Accordingly, the Kingdom of Belgium objects to the reservation made by the State of Qatar with respect to article 3 and to its statement in respect of article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Kingdom of Belgium specifies that this objection does not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights between the Kingdom of Belgium and the State of Qatar.

CANADA

“The Government of Canada has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the Government of Qatar upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of Canada notes that the reservation made by the Government of Qatar, addressing an essential provision of the Covenant and aiming to exclude the obligations under that provision, is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and thus inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of Canada notes that the statement made by the Government of Qatar aims at applying a provision of the Covenant only in conformity with domestic law or Islamic Sharia. However, the Covenant is to be applied in accordance with international law. The Government of Canada considers that this statement is a reservation in disguise, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and thus inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of Canada considers that a reservation consisting of a general reference to national law or Islamic Sharia makes it impossible to identify the modifications to obligations under the Covenant, which it purports to introduce. With this reservation, the other States Parties do not know the extent to which Qatar has accepted the obligations to ensure the equal rights of men and women. This uncertainty is unacceptable, especially in the context of a human rights treaty.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Party are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the reservation and statement made by the Government of Qatar. This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between Canada and Qatar.”

CYPRUS

“.....the Government of the Republic of Cyprus wishes to express its objection with respect to the declarations entered by the Republic of Turkey upon ratification on 23 September 2003, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, New York, 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus considers that the declaration relating to the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant only to the States with which the Republic of Turkey has diplomatic relations, and the declaration that the Convention is “ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied” amount to reservations. These reservations create uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Covenant, and raise doubt as to the commitment of Turkey to the object and purpose of the said Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus objects to the said reservations entered by the Republic of Turkey and states that these reservations or the objection to them shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey.”

CZECH REPUBLIC

“The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the reservation and statement formulated by the

State of Qatar upon its accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that both the reservation formulated by the State of Qatar with respect to Article 3 of the Covenant and the statement with respect to Article 8 of the Covenant amount to reservations of general and vague nature, since they make the application of specific provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia and national law and their character and scope cannot be properly assessed.

The Government of the Czech Republic wishes to recall that the reservations may not be general or vague and that the Covenant is to be applied and interpreted in accordance with international law.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore considers the aforementioned reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and objects to them. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Czech Republic and the State of Qatar, without the State of Qatar benefitting from the reservations.”

DENMARK

“The Government of Denmark has examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon [signing] the 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The application of the provisions of the said Covenant has been made subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This general formulation makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises doubt as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Denmark considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the international Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation and that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the Government of Denmark objects to this declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Denmark without Pakistan benefitting from her declaration.”

ESTONIA

“The Government of Estonia has carefully examined the reservation made by the State of Qatar to Article 3 and the statement concerning Article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Estonia considers that the reservation as well as the statement make the application of these provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. The statement concerning Article 8 is thus of its nature also a reservation. Estonia is of the opinion that by making Article 3 and Article 8 of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national law, the State of Qatar has submitted reservations which raise doubts concerning the extent to which it intends to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. Thus, Estonia considers the reservation and the statement to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and objects to them.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Estonia and the State of Qatar.”

FINLAND

"The Government of Finland notes that according to the interpretative declaration regarding article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 the application of these articles of the Covenant is in a general way subjected to national law. The Government of Finland considers this interpretative declaration as a reservation of a general kind. The Government of Finland is of the view that such a general reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

The Government of Finland also considers the interpretative declaration to article 9 as a reservation and regards this reservation as well as the reservation to article 8, paragraph 1(d), as problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is in the common interests of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Kuwait, which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the Covenant, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Kuwait to the [said Covenant].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Kuwait and Finland."

"The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh to Articles 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 13 and notes that the declarations constitute reservations as they seem to modify the obligations of Bangladesh under the said articles.

A reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving state commits itself to the Convention and therefore may raise doubts as to the commitment of the reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such a reservation is also, 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 domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Therefore the Government of Finland objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefitting from these reservations".

"The Government of Finland has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Government of Finland notes that the Republic of Turkey reserves the right to interpret and apply the provisions of the paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 13 of the Covenant in accordance with the provisions under articles 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

The Government of Finland emphasises the great importance of the rights provided for in paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The reference to certain provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey is of a general nature and does not clearly specify the content of the reservation. The Government of Finland therefore wishes to declare that it assumes that

the Government of the Republic of Turkey will ensure the implementation of the rights recognised in the Covenant and will do its utmost to bring its national legislation into compliance with the obligations under the Covenant with a view to withdrawing the reservation. This declaration does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Finland."

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan regarding the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The Government of Finland takes note that the provisions of the Covenant shall, according to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

The Government of Finland notes that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying the contents does not clearly define to other Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and creates serious doubts as to the commitment of the receiving State to fulfil its obligations under the Convention. Such reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Finland. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefitting from its declaration."

"The Government of Finland is pleased to learn that the Republic of Myanmar has become party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. However, the Government of Finland has carefully examined the declaration made by the Republic of the Union of Myanmar upon ratification, and is of the view that it raises certain concerns. In fact, the declaration amounts to a reservation that purports to subject the application of one of the core articles of the Covenant to the Constitution of Myanmar.

Reservation of such an indeterminate and general scope as that made by Myanmar is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and as such one that is not permitted. Therefore Finland objects to it. This objection shall not preclude the continued validity of the Covenant between the Republic of Finland and the Republic of the Union of Myanmar. The Covenant will thus continue to operate between the two states without Myanmar benefitting from the aforementioned reservation."

"The Government of Finland is pleased to learn that the State of Qatar has become party to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. However, the Government of Finland has carefully examined the reservation to Article 3 and the statement concerning Article 8 made by the State of Qatar upon accession, and is of the view that they raise certain concerns. In fact, also the statement amounts to a reservation that purports to subject the application of one of the Covenant's provisions to national legislation.

Both reservations make the application of these provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. Thus, the Government of Finland is of the opinion that the State of Qatar has submitted reservations which cast doubts on the commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Covenant. Such

reservations are, furthermore, subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

The above-mentioned reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and are accordingly not permitted under Article 19 sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to these reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Finland and the State of Qatar. The Covenant will thus enter into force between the two states without Qatar benefitting from the aforementioned reservation."

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.

The Government of France notes that the 'declarations' made by Bangladesh in fact constitute reservations since they are aimed at precluding or modifying the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty. With regard to the declaration concerning article 1, the reservation places on the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination conditions not provided for in the Charter of the United Nations. The declarations concerning articles 2 and 3 and articles 7 and 8, which render the rights recognized by the Covenant in respect of individuals subordinate to domestic law, are of a general nature and undermine the objective and purpose of the treaty. In particular, the country's economic conditions and development prospects should not affect the freedom of consent of intended spouses to enter into marriage, non-discrimination for reasons of parentage or other conditions in the implementation of special measures of protection and assistance on behalf of children and young persons, or the freedom of parents or legal guardians to choose schools for their children. Economic difficulties or problems of development cannot free a State party entirely from its obligations under the Covenant. In this regard, in compliance with article 10, paragraph 3, of the Covenant, Bangladesh must adopt special measures to protect children and young persons from economic and social exploitation, and the law must punish their employment in work harmful to their morals or health and should also set age limits below which the paid employment of child labour should be prohibited. Consequently, the Government of France lodges an objection to the reservations of a general scope mentioned above. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Covenant between Bangladesh and France.

The Government of the French Republic has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon signing the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, according to which 'The provisions of the Covenant shall be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan'. Such a declaration is general in scope and unclear and could render the provisions of the Covenant null and void. The Government of the French Republic considers that the said declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and it therefore objects to that declaration. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between France and Pakistan.

GERMANY⁹

"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."

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that article 2 (2) and article 3 have been made subject to the general reservation of national law. It is of the view that these general reservations may raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the reservation concerning article 8 (1) (d), in which the Government of Kuwait reserves the right not to apply the right to strike expressly stated in the Covenant, as well as the interpretative declaration regarding article 9, according to which the right to social security would only apply to Kuwaitis, as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. It particularly feels that the declaration regarding article 9, as a result of which the many foreigners working on Kuwaiti territory would, on principle, be totally excluded from social security protection, cannot be based on article 2 (3) of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of all parties that a treaty should be respected, as to its object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the [said] general reservations and interpretative declarations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Kuwait and the Federal Republic of Germany."

The Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the states with which it has diplomatic relations. Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has declared that it ratifies the Covenant exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied. Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Turkey has reserved the right to interpret and apply the provisions of Article 13 paragraphs (3) and (4) of the Covenant in accordance with the provisions of Articles 3, 14 and 42 of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to recall that it is in the common interest of all states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected and applied as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore concerned about declarations and reservations such as those made and expressed by the Republic of Turkey with respect to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

However, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany believes these declarations do not aim to limit

the Covenant's scope in relation to those states with which Turkey has established bonds under the Covenant, and that they do not aim to impose any other restrictions that are not provided for by the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany attaches great importance to the liberties recognized in Article 13 paragraphs (3) and (4) of the Covenant. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany understands the reservation expressed by the Government of the Republic of Turkey to mean that this Article will be interpreted and applied in such a way that protects the essence of the freedoms guaranteed therein.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declared that it "will implement the (...) Provisions in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country". Since some fundamental obligations resulting from the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, including in particular the principle of non-discrimination found in Article 2 (2) thereof, are not susceptible to progressive implementation and are thus to be guaranteed immediately, the declaration represents a significant qualification of Pakistan's commitment to guarantee the human rights referred to in the Covenant.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan also declared that "the provisions of the Covenant shall, however, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan". The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that this leaves it unclear to which extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations resulting from the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore regards the above-mentioned declarations as reservations and as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that by granting its Constitution precedence over a provision of the Covenant as well as by restricting the term self-determination contained in Article 1 of the Covenant, Myanmar has made a reservation which makes it unclear to what extent Myanmar accepts being bound by the Covenant.

If Myanmar grants its Constitution precedence then this is a reservation of general and indeterminate scope. What is important when it comes to applying the provisions of the Covenant is conformity with international law and not with the national legislation of the state which has acceded to the Covenant.

The right to self-determination anchored in the United Nations Charter and in the Covenant applies to all peoples and not only to peoples under foreign rule. All peoples therefore have the inalienable right to freely determine their political status and to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. The German Government cannot regard as legally valid an interpretation of the right to self-determination which is at variance with the clear meaning of the provision in question. Furthermore, it considers that any restriction of

its applicability to all peoples is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to this reservation, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and thus impermissible.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and Myanmar.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the State of Qatar with regard to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966.

Both the reservation to Article 3 and the statement concerning Article 8 make the application of these provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. The statement concerning Article 8 is thus of its nature also a reservation.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that by making the application of Article 3 and Article 8 of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national law, the State of Qatar has submitted reservations which raise doubts concerning the extent to which it intends to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant.

The above-mentioned reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and are accordingly not permitted under Article 19 sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969. The Federal Republic of Germany thus objects to these reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the State of Qatar.

GREECE

"The Government of Greece has examined the declarations made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is incompatible with the principle that inter-State reciprocity has no place in the context of human rights treaties, which concern the endowment of individuals with rights. It is therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Republic of Turkey furthermore declares that the Covenant is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

In the view of the Government of Greece, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is incompatible with the obligation of a State Party to respect and ensure the rights laid down in the Covenant to anyone within the power or effective control of that State Party, even if not situated within the territory of such State Party. Accordingly, this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

For these reasons, the Government of Greece objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Turkey. The Covenant, therefore, enters into force between the two States without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from these reservations."

“The Government of the Hellenic Republic has examined the reservation and the statement made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966 (hereinafter ‘the Covenant’).

In the above reservation, the State of Qatar states that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 3 of the Covenant ‘for they contravene the Islamic Sharia with regard to questions of inheritance and birth’.

Moreover, in the statement made upon accession to the Covenant, the Government of the State of Qatar declares that it shall implement Article 8 of the Covenant based on the understanding that ‘what is meant by ‘trade unions’ and their related issues [...] is in line with the provisions of the Labor Law and national legislation’. However, in the view of the Government of the Hellenic Republic, this statement in fact amounts to a reservation as it limits the scope of application of Article 8 solely to the extent that it does not contravene the relevant national legislation of Qatar.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic notes that the above reservations are of a general and indeterminate scope, as they purport to subject the application of the aforementioned provisions of the Covenant to the Islamic sharia and national legislation, without, however, specifying the content thereof, and are, accordingly, contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant, since they do not clearly define for the other States Parties the extent to which Qatar has accepted the obligations of the Covenant.

For the above reasons, the Government of the Hellenic Republic considers the aforesaid reservations of Qatar impermissible as contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant, according to customary international law, as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic, therefore, objects to the abovementioned reservations made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Hellenic Republic and the State of Qatar.”

HUNGARY

“Hungary has examined the reservation and statement made by the State of Qatar upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights done in New York on 16 December 1966.

The reservation to Article 3 of the Covenant make[s] the application of this provision subject to the Islamic Sharia. The statement to Article 8 of the Covenant make[s] the application of this provision subject to the national legislation. Hungary considers the statement to Article 8 made by the State of Qatar by its nature also as a reservation.

Hungary is of the view that making the application of Article 3 of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia and Article 8 of the Covenant subject to the national legislation raises doubts as to the extent of Qatar’s commitment to meet its obligations under the Covenant and are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, that is to promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all economic, social and cultural rights by all individuals.

Hungary considers the aforementioned reservations inadmissible as they are not permitted under Article 19 sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law

of Treaties, thus objects to these reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Hungary and the State of Qatar. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two States without the State of Qatar benefitting from its reservations.”

IRELAND

“Ireland has examined the declaration made by Myanmar to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at the time of its ratification on 6 October 2017.

Ireland is of the view that the declaration of Myanmar, purporting to subject the application of the term “the right of self-determination” to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar, in substance constitutes a reservation limiting the scope of the Covenant.

Ireland considers that a reservation which consists of a general reference to the Constitution of the reserving State and which does not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provision of the Covenant may cast doubt on the commitment of the reserving state to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant. Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. Ireland recalls that under international treaty law a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Myanmar to Article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and Myanmar.”

“Ireland welcomes the accession of Qatar to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on 21 May 2018.

Ireland has examined the reservation and statement made by Qatar to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at the time of its accession.

Ireland is of the view that the reservation by Qatar, purporting to exclude its obligations under Article 3, is contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Ireland is furthermore of the view that the statement by Qatar, purporting to subject the implementation of Article 8 to national law, in substance constitutes a reservation limiting the scope of the Covenant.

Ireland considers that such reservations, which purport to subject the reserving State’s obligations under an international agreement to national law without specifying the content thereof and which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the international agreement, may cast doubt on the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the international agreement. Ireland is furthermore of the view that such a reservation may undermine the basis of international treaty law and is incompatible with the object and purpose of the international agreement. Ireland recalls that under international treaty law a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the international agreement shall not be permitted.

Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by Qatar to Articles 3 and 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Ireland and Qatar.”

ITALY

"The Government of Italy considers these reservations to be contrary to the object and the purpose of this International Covenant. The Government of Italy notes that the said reservations include a reservation of a general kind in respect of the provisions on the internal law.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Kuwait to the [said Covenant].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the State of Kuwait and the Italian Republic."

"The Government of the Italian Republic has carefully examined the reservation and statement by the State of Qatar with regard to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966.

Both the reservation to Article 3 and the statement concerning Article 8 make the application of these provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. The statement concerning Article 8 is thus of its nature also a reservation.

The Government of the Italian Republic is of the opinion that by making the application of Article 3 and Article 8 of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national law, the State of Qatar has submitted reservations which raise doubts concerning the extent to which it intends to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant.

The above-mentioned reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and are accordingly not permitted under customary international law, as codified in Article 19 sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969. The Italian Republic thus objects to these reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Italian Republic and the State of Qatar."

LATVIA

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on [Economic, Social and Cultural] Rights upon accession.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the declaration contains general reference to national law, making the provisions of International Covenant subject to the national law of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that the declaration is in fact a unilateral act deemed to limit the scope of application of the International Covenant and therefore, it shall be regarded as a reservation.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia noted that the reservation does not make it clear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the provisions of the International Covenant and whether the way of implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant is in line with the object and purpose of the International Covenant.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out the reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant between the Republic of Latvia and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Thus, the International Covenant will become operative without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the declaration made by the Republic of the Union of Myanmar upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

In the view of the Government of the Republic of Latvia, this declaration amounts to a reservation. Article 1 of the Covenant forms the very basis of the Covenant and its main purpose, thus no derogations from those obligations can be made.

Moreover, a reservation which subordinates any provision of the Covenant in general to the Constitution of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar constitutes a reservation of general scope which is likely to cast doubt on the full commitment of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Reservation made by the Republic of the Union of Myanmar seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis thus the reservation is incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Covenant and therefore inadmissible under Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Latvia objects to this reservation.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of the Union of Myanmar. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two States without the Republic of the Union of Myanmar benefiting from its declaration."

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the reservation and the statement made by the State of Qatar upon ratification of the 1966 Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural rights.

The Republic of Latvia considers that Article 3 of the Covenant forms the very basis of the Covenant and its main purpose, thus no derogations from those obligations can be made. In addition, the statement regarding the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant making the application of these provisions subject to national law is in its own nature also a reservation.

The reservations made by the State of Qatar regarding Article 3 and Article 8 [exclude] the legal effect of central provision[s] of the Covenant, thus the reservations are incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Covenant and therefore inadmissible under Article 19 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Latvia and the State of Qatar. Thus, the Covenant will become operative between the two States without the State of Qatar benefitting from its reservations."

NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

"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."

"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."

[Same objection identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Algeria.]

".....the statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to article 8.1 (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the statement and would like to recall that, under well established 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. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to article 8.1 (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the application of Article 8.1 (a) of the Covenant is being made subject to a statement referring to the contents of national legislation. According to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to abide by the treaty. Furthermore, the right to form and join a trade union of one's choice is one of the fundamental principles of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the People's Republic of China to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and China."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 upon signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, done at New York on 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would like to recall that the status of a statement is not determined by the designation assigned to it. The application of the provisions of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has been made subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty. It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. A reservation as

formulated by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is thus likely to contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without Pakistan benefiting from its declaration."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the declaration made by the Republic of the Union of Myanmar upon ratification on 6 October 2017 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by the Republic of the Union of Myanmar in substance constitutes a reservation limiting the scope of the right of self-determination of all peoples in Article 1 of the Covenant, by applying that provision only in conformity with the Constitution of Myanmar.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Covenant by invoking provisions of its domestic law, is likely to deprive the provisions of the Covenant of their effect and therefore must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that according to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar to the Covenant. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of the Union of Myanmar."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation and the statement made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as communicated by the Secretary-General via depositary notification C.N.260.2018.TREATIES-IV.3 of 21 May 2018, and wishes to communicate the following.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that Qatar does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 3 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, for they contravene the Islamic Sharia with regard to questions of inheritance and birth.

Further, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the statement made by the State of Qatar with respect to Article 8 of the Covenant in substance constitutes a reservation limiting the scope of the rights of trade unions in Article 8 of the Covenant, by applying that provision only in conformity with the national legislation of the State of Qatar.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Covenant by invoking provisions of the Islamic Sharia and national legislation, are likely to deprive the provisions of the Covenant of their effect and therefore must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that according to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservations of the State of Qatar to the Covenant.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the State of Qatar."

NORWAY

"In the view of the Government of Norway, a statement by which a State Party purports to limit its responsibilities by invoking general principles of internal law may create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to the objective and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. Under well-established treaty law, a State is not permitted to invoke internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. Furthermore, the Government of Norway finds the reservations made to article 8, paragraph 1 (d) and article 9 as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said reservations made by the Government of Kuwait.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the State of Kuwait.

"The Government of Norway has examined the statement made by the People's Republic of China upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

It is the Government of Norway's position that the statement made by China in substance constitutes a reservation, and consequently can be made subject to objections.

According to the first paragraph of the statement, the application of Article 8.1(a) of the Covenant shall be consistent with relevant provisions of national legislation. This reference to national legislation, without further description of its contents, exempts the other States Parties from the possibility of assessing the intended effects of the statement. Further, the contents of the relevant provision is not only in itself of fundamental importance, as failure to implement it can also contribute to a less effective implementation of other provisions of the Covenant, such as Articles 6 and 7.

For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the said part of the statement made by the People's Republic of China, as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the People's Republic of China. The Covenant thus becomes operative between Norway and China without China benefiting from the reservation."

"The Government of the Kingdom of Norway have examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 on signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (New York, 16 December

1966). According to the first part of the Declaration, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan "will implement the (...) provisions (embodied in the Covenant) in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country". Since some fundamental obligations embodied in the Covenant, including in particular the principle of non-discrimination found in Article 2 (2) thereof, are not susceptible to progressive implementation and are thus to be guaranteed immediately, the Government of the Kingdom of Norway consider that this part of the Declaration represents a significant qualification of Pakistan's commitment to guarantee the provisions embodied in the Covenant.

According to the second part of the Declaration, "(t)he provisions of the Covenant shall, however, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. "The Government of the Kingdom of Norway note that a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Norway consider that both parts of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan's Declaration seek to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis and therefore constitute reservations. The Government of the Kingdom of Norway consider both reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant, and therefore object to the reservations made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservations."

"... the Government of the Kingdom of Norway has carefully examined the reservation and the statement made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966.

The reservation to Article 3 and the statement concerning Article 8 make these provisions subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. Both declarations are thus formulated as reservations.

The Government of the Kingdom of Norway is of the view that by making the application of Article 3 and Article 8 of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national law, the State of Qatar has submitted reservations which raise doubts as to the full commitment of the State of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of Norway thus objects to these reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Norway and the State of Qatar."

PAKISTAN

"The Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan 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 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 under foreign occupation and alien domination.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan cannot consider as valid any interpretation of the right of self-determination which is contrary to the clear language of the provisions in question. Moreover, the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenants. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic

of Pakistan and India without India benefiting from its reservations."

POLAND

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has carefully examined the [reservation] to the Article 3 and the declaration to the Article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, done in New York on December 16, 1966, done upon its [accession] on May 21, 2018.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers the reservation that the Qatar does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 3 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, for they contravene the Islamic Sharia with regard to questions of inheritance and birth and the statement according to which the Qatar shall interpret that what is meant by 'trade unions' and their related issues stated in Article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, is in line with the provisions of the Labor Law and national legislation and that the Qatar reserves the right to implement that article in accordance with such understanding is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. Therefore the Government of the Republic of Poland objects to them.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the [Covenant] between the Republic of Poland and the State of Qatar."

PORTUGAL

"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."

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) by invoking certain provisions of national law in general terms may create doubts as to the commitment 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 all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservation by Turkey to the ICESCR. This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between Portugal and Turkey."

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar to Article I of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and considers that it is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights by invoking the

domestic law or/and religious beliefs and principles raise doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention, as such reservations are likely to deprive the provisions of the Convention of their effect and are contrary to the object and purpose thereof.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

Furthermore, the Government of the Portuguese Republic does not share the interpretation of "the right of self-determination" expressed by the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar which limits the content of this right and is not in line with the definition enshrined in International Law.

Thus the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to this reservation.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Portuguese Republic and the Republic of the Union of Myanmar."

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the contents of the reservation to Article 3 and of the statement regarding Article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights made by the State of Qatar.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that the reservation to Article 3 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is contrary to the object and purpose of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Furthermore, it considers that the statement regarding Article 8 of the Covenant is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under [the] International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights by invoking the domestic law or/and religious beliefs and principles [raise] doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention, as such reservations are likely to deprive the provisions of the Convention of their effect and are contrary to the object and purpose thereof.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

Thus, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to these reservations.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Portuguese Republic and the State of Qatar."

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

"The Government of the Republic of Moldova has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the State of Qatar on May 21, 2018 upon accession to the

International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966.

Both the reservation to Article 3 and the statement concerning Article 8 make the application of these provisions of the Covenant subject to the Islamic Sharia or national legislation. The statement concerning Article 8 is thus of its nature also a reservation.

The Republic of Moldova considers that the reservations regarding Articles 3 and 8 of the Covenant are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant since these articles form an essential element of the Covenant, and are accordingly not permitted under Article 19 sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969.

Therefore, the Republic of Moldova objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the State of Qatar.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Moldova and the State of Qatar. The Covenant enters into force in its entire[t]y between the Republic of Moldova and the State of Qatar, without the State of Qatar benefiting from its reservation."

ROMANIA

"Romania has examined the reservation and the declaration made upon [accession] by the State of Qatar to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (New York, 1966).

Romania considers that the reservation aiming to interpret the Article 3 of the Covenant in the light of the Islamic sharia and the declaration aiming at interpreting the Article 8 of the Covenant in the light with the national legislation qualifies them as reservations of undefined character, inadmissible under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. In accordance with Article 27 of Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, it is the duty of States Parties to a treaty to ensure that their internal law allows the application and observance of the treaty.

Moreover, the general nature of the reservations limits the understanding as to the extent of the obligations assumed by State of Qatar under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

Therefore, Romania objects to the reservations formulated by State of Qatar to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as being incompatible with the scope and purpose of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as required by the Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not affect the entry into force of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights between Romania and State of Qatar."

SLOVAKIA

"The Government of the Slovak Republic has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted on 16 December 1966, according to which, 'Pakistan, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the present

Covenant, shall use all ap[p]ropriate means to the maximum of its available resources.'

The Government of the Slovak Republic is of the view that the reservation is too general and unclear and raises doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to its obligations under the Covenant, essential for the fulfillment of its object and purpose.

The Government of the Slovak Republic objects for these reasons to the above mentioned reservation made by

the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights between the Slovak Republic and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights enters into force in its entirety between the Slovak Republic and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

SPAIN

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 on signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, of 16 December 1966.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain points out that regardless of what it may be called, a unilateral declaration made by a State for the purpose of excluding or changing the legal effects of certain provisions of a treaty as it applies to that State constitutes a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, which seeks to subject the application of the provisions of the Covenant to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is a reservation which seeks to limit the legal effects of the Covenant as it applies to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. A reservation that includes a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not make it possible to determine clearly the extent to which the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has accepted the obligations of the Covenant and, consequently, creates doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the effect that it subjects its obligations under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights to the provisions of its constitution is a reservation and that that reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

Consequently, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of Spain and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

SWEDEN

"[The Government of Sweden] is of the view that these general reservations may raise doubts as to the commitment of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden regards the reservation concerning article 8 (1) (d), in which the Government of Kuwait reserves the right not to apply the right to strike expressly stated in the Covenant, as well as the interpretative declaration regarding article 9, according to which the right to social security would only apply to Kuwaitis, as being problematic in view of the object and purpose of the Covenant. It particularly considers the declaration regarding article 9, as a result of which the many foreigners working on Kuwaiti territory would, in principle, be totally excluded from social security

protection, cannot be based on article 2 (3) of the Covenant.

It is in the common interest of all parties that a treaty should be respected, as to its object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the above-mentioned general reservations and interpretative declarations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Kuwait and Sweden in its entirety."

"In this context the Government of Sweden would like to recall, that under well-established 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 of Sweden considers that the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitute reservations to the Covenant.

The declaration concerning article 1 places on the exercise of the rig of peoples to self-determination conditions not provided for in international law. To attach such conditions could undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden notes that the declaration relating to articles 2 and 3 as well as 7 and 8 respectively, imply that these articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to relevant provisions of the domestic laws of Bangladesh.

Consequently, the Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these declarations raise doubts as to the commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to well-established international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Bangladesh and Sweden. The Covenant will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefiting from the declarations".

"The Government of Sweden has examined the statement and would like to recall that, under well-established 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. The Government of Sweden considers that the statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to article 8.1 (a) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Sweden notes that the application of Article 8.1 (a) of the Covenant is being made subject to a statement referring to the contents of national legislation. According to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to abide by the treaty. Furthermore, the right to form and join a trade union of one's choice is one of the fundamental principles of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the People's Republic of China to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between China and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force without China benefiting from the reservation."

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declarations and reservation made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Covenant only to the State Parties with which it has diplomatic relations. This statement in fact amounts, in the view of the Government of Sweden, to a reservation. The reservation of the Republic of Turkey makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant. In absence of further clarification, therefore, the reservation raises doubt as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretation and application of paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 13 of the Covenant is being made subject to a reservation referring to certain provisions of the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey without specifying their contents. The Government of Sweden is of the view that in the absence of further clarification, this reservation, which does not clearly specify the extent of the Republic of Turkey's derogation from the provisions in question, raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

According to established customary law as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of all States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Republic of Turkey and Sweden. The Covenant enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from its reservations."

"The Government of Sweden would like to recall that the designation 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.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that although Article 2 (1) of the Covenant allows for a progressive realization of the provisions, this may not be invoked as a basis for discrimination.

The application of the provisions of the Covenant has been made subject to provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises doubts as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in substance constitutes a reservation.

It is of common interest of States that all Parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any

legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Pakistan and Sweden, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar upon ratification to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights by which, with reference to Article 1, it declared that the term 'right to self-determination' does not apply to any section of people within a sovereign independent state and cannot be construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of a sovereign and independent state and also that the provision of the Covenant will only be applied in conformity with the Constitution of Myanmar.

In this context the Government of Sweden would like to recall, that under well-established 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 of Sweden considers that the declaration made by the Government of Myanmar, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitutes a reservation to the Covenant.

The declaration concerning Article 1 places conditions on the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination not provided for in international law. To attach such conditions could undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character.

Furthermore, the Government of Sweden notes that the declaration implies that Article 1 of the Covenant is made subject to a general reservation referring to domestic law of Myanmar.

Consequently, the Government of Sweden is of the view that the declaration raises doubts as to the commitment of Myanmar to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For this reason, the Government of Sweden objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Myanmar. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the treaty between Sweden and Myanmar. The treaty enters into force in its entirety between Myanmar and Sweden without Myanmar benefiting from its reservation."

SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Federal Council has examined the reservation and the statement made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights of 16 December 1966.

The Swiss Federal Council considers that the declaration of Qatar concerning article 8 of the Covenant amounts, in fact, to a reservation. Reservations subjecting all or part of article 3 and article 8 of the Covenant in general terms to Islamic Sharia and/or national legislation constitute reservations of general scope which raise doubts about the full commitment of the State of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Swiss Federal Council recalls that, according to sub-paragraph (c) of article 19 of the Vienna Convention of 23 May 1969 on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant are not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that instruments to which they have chosen to become parties be respected in their object and purpose by all parties, and that States be prepared to amend their legislation in order to fulfil their treaty obligations.

Henceforth, the Swiss Federal Council objects to these reservations of the State of Qatar. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant, in its entirety, between Switzerland and the State of Qatar.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom have examined the Declaration made by the Government of Pakistan on 3 November 2004 on signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (done at New York on 16 December 1966).

The Government of the United Kingdom consider that the Government of Pakistan's Declaration which seeks to subject its obligations under the Covenant to the provisions of its own Constitution is a reservation which seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United Kingdom note that a reservation to a Convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to this reservation made by the Government of Pakistan.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Pakistan."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has examined the reservation and declaration made by the State of Qatar on ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights ('the Covenant'), done at New York on 16 December 1966, which read:

Reservation

The State of Qatar does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 3 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, for they contravene the Islamic Sharia with regard to questions of inheritance and birth.

Declaration

The State of Qatar shall interpret that what is meant by "trade unions" and their related issues stated in Article 8 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Right[s], is in line with the provisions of the Labor Law and national legislation. The State of Qatar reserves the right to implement that article in accordance with such understanding.

In respect of the reservation to Article 3, the Government of the United Kingdom understands this to mean that the State of Qatar considers itself bound by the provisions of Article 3, except with regard to questions of inheritance and birth, and will interpret the State of Qatar's obligations under the Covenant accordingly.

The Government of the United Kingdom considers that the Government of the State of Qatar's declaration in respect of Article 8, which seeks to subject its obligations under the Covenant to the provisions of its own national legislation, is a reservation which seeks to limit the scope of the Covenant on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United Kingdom notes that a reservation to a

convention which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its contents does not clearly define for the other States Parties to the convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the convention. The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to this reservation made by the Government of the State of Qatar.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the State of Qatar."

Territorial Application

<i>Participant</i>	<i>Date of receipt of the notification</i>	<i>Territories</i>
Netherlands (Kingdom of the) ¹²	11 Dec 1978	Netherlands Antilles
Portugal ⁶	27 Apr 1993	Macau
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ^{8,15}	20 May 1976	Belize, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands (Malvinas) and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Guernsey, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Jersey, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Solomon Islands, St. Helena and Dependencies, 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 (See, [C.N.5.1976](#) of 5 January 1976).

² The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention with reservations on 27 March 1973 and 8 November 1973, respectively (See, [C.N.88.1973.TREATIES-3](#) of 20 April 1973). For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 83. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

³ The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Covenant on 8 August 1967 and 2 June 1971, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

⁴ 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):

<i>Participant:</i>	<i>Date of receipt:</i>		
German Democratic Republic	11	Dec	1980
Poland	12	Dec	1980
Ukraine	16	Dec	1980

<i>Participant:</i>	<i>Date of receipt:</i>		
Hungary	19	Jan	1981
Bulgaria	29	Jan	1981
Belarus	18	Feb	1981
Russian Federation	18	Feb	1981
Czechoslovakia	10	Mar	1981

⁵ 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 3 in this chapter), the Government of Cambodia deposited an instrument of accession to the said Covenants.

⁶ 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.

Subsequently, on 21 October and 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with reservation made by China will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region as well as with the following declaration:

1. The application of the Covenant, and its article 1 in particular, to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall not affect the status of Macao as defined in the Joint Declaration and in the Basic Law.

2. The provisions of the Covenant which are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region shall be implemented in Macao through legislation of the Macao Special Administrative Region.

The residents of Macao shall not be restricted in the rights and freedoms that they are entitled to, unless otherwise provided for by law. In case of restrictions, they shall not contravene the provisions of the Covenant that are applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights that place on a Party to the Covenant.

⁷ Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 5 October 1967. See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

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".

⁸ With regard to the application of the Covenant to Hong Kong, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United

Kingdom (see note 2 under “China” and note 2 under “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” concerning Hong Kong in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Covenant with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

Further, on 20 April 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of China the following communication:

1. Article 6 of the Covenant does not preclude the formulation of regulations by the HKSAR for employment restrictions, based on place of birth or residence qualifications, for the purpose of safeguarding the employment opportunities of local workers in the HKSAR

2. "National federations or confederations" in Article 8.1(b) of the Covenant shall be interpreted, in this case, as "federations or confederations in the HKSAR", and this Article does not imply the right of trade union federations or confederations to form or join political organizations or bodies established outside the HKSAR.

⁹ 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 3 in this chapter and note 1 under “Czech Republic” and note 1 under “Slovakia” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

¹⁰ See note 1 under “Germany” regarding Berlin (West) in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

¹¹ See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

¹² See notes 1 and 2 under “Netherlands” regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

¹³ See note 1 "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau under in the "Historical Information" section in the preliminary pages in the front matter of this volume.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ 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 Depository 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."

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), 1/49, 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."

¹⁶ The formality was effected by the Yemen Arab Republic. See also note 1 under “Yemen” in the “Historical Information” section in the front matter of this volume.

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (17 December 1999):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that the declaration concerning article 1 constitutes a reservation that places on the exercise of the right of all peoples to self-determination conditions not provided for in international law. To attach such conditions could undermine the concept of self-determination and seriously weaken its universally acceptable character.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany further notes that the declarations with regard to articles 2 and 3, 7 and 8, and 10 and 13 constitute reservations of a general nature in respect of provisions of the Covenant which may be contrary to the Constitution, legislation, economic conditions and development plans of Bangladesh.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that these general reservations raise doubts as to the full commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Covenant. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Federal Republic of Germany and the People's Republic of Bangladesh".

Netherlands (20 December 1999):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh at the time of its accession to the International Covenant on economic, social and cultural rights and considers the declarations concerning Articles 1, 2 and 3, and 7 and 8 as reservations.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh in relation to Article 1 of the said Covenant, since the right of self-determination as embodied in the Covenant is conferred upon all peoples. This follows not only from the very language of Article 1 of the Covenant 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.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh in relation to Articles 2 and 3, and, 7 and 8 of the said Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such reservations which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Covenant by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Covenant 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 the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh.

These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bangladesh".

¹⁹ 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*, vol. 993, p. 78.

²⁰ On 21 March 2001, the Government of the Congo informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon accession which read as follows:

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.

²¹ 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.

²² 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".

²³ On 11 September 2012, the Government of Japan informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"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."

²⁴ 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.

²⁵ On 6 July 2017, the Kingdom of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General as follows of its decision to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 8 (1) (d) of the Covenant made upon ratification:

"... the Kingdom of the Netherlands, for Aruba, Curaçao, Sint Maarten and the Caribbean part of the Netherlands (the islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba), withdraws the reservation made with respect to Article 8, paragraph 1, under d, of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights..."

The reservation made upon ratification read as follows:

"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."

²⁶ On 5 September 2003, the Government of New Zealand informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservation in respect only of the metropolitan territory of New Zealand. The reservation reads as follows:

"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."

Moreover, the Government of New Zealand notified the Secretary-General of the the following territorial exclusion:

"Declares that, consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, the withdrawal of this reservation shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

See also note 1 under "Cook Islands" and note 1 under "Niue" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

²⁷ With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon signature, the Secretary-General received a communication from the following State on the date indicated hereinafter:

Austria (25 November 2005):

"The Government of Austria has examined the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon signature of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The application of the provisions of the Covenant has been made subject to provisions of national law. This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant in substance constitutes a reservation and that this reservation is incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Covenant.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and the Republic of Austria."

²⁸ On 17 April 2008, the Government of Pakistan informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration made upon signature. The declaration reads as follows:

“While the Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan accepts the provisions embodied in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, it will implement the said provisions in a progressive manner, in keeping with the existing economic conditions and the development plans of the country. The provisions of the Covenant shall, however, be subject to the provisions of the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.”

²⁹ With regard to the reservation made by Pakistan upon ratification, the Secretary-General received the following communications from the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

France (16 April 2009):

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which was adopted on 16 December 1966. The reservation states that “Pakistan, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in the

present Covenant, shall use all appropriate means to the maximum of its available resources.” Although this declaration has been referred to as a “reservation”, it simply reformulates the content of article 2, paragraph 1, of the Covenant. Furthermore, it cannot have the effect of modifying the other provisions of the Covenant without constituting a reservation of general scope that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the French Republic therefore considers the

“reservation” by Pakistan to be a mere declaration that is devoid of legal effect.

Netherlands (15 April 2009):

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of Pakistan upon ratifying the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It is the understanding of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the reservation of Pakistan does not exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Covenant in their application to Pakistan.”

³⁰ The Secretary-General received the following communication(s) related to the reservations made by Qatar, on the date(s) indicated hereinafter:

Sweden (22 May 2019)

“The Government of Sweden has examined the statement and the reservation made by the State of Qatar upon accession to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. In this context the Government of Sweden would like to recall, that under well-established 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 of Sweden considers that the statement made by the State of Qatar concerning Article 8, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitutes a reservation to the [Covenant].

The Government of Sweden notes that the interpretation and application of Article 3 and Article 8 are made subject to in general terms to Islamic sharia and/or national legislation. The Government of Sweden is of the view that such reservations, which does not clearly specify the extent of the derogations, raises doubt as to the commitment of the State of Qatar to the object and purpose of the [Covenant].

According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the [Covenant] shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

For this reason, the Government of Sweden objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of Qatar. The [Covenant] shall enter into force in its entirety between the two States, without Qatar benefitting from its reservations.”

³¹ On 15 December 2008, the Government of Rwanda informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession. The reservation reads as follows:

The Rwandese Republic [is] bound, however, in respect of education, only by the provisions of its Constitution.