

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: Signatories

The document below gives the dates of signing and ratification of, and reservations expressed by UN states on:

The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

(Note the Australian reservation below. The goal expressed in this declaration has not been achieved).

Opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966

Entry into force: 4 January 1969, in accordance with article 19.1(1)

Registration: 12 March 1969, No. 9464.

Text: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 660, p. 195.

Status: Signatories: 76. Parties: 146.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2106 (XX)2 of 21 December 1965.(2)

Afghanistan	6 Jul 1983		a
Albania	11 May 1994		a
Algeria	9 Dec 1966	14 Feb 1972	
Antigua & Barbuda	25 Oct 1988		d
Argentina	13 Jul 1967	2 Oct 1968	
Armenia	23 Jun 1993		a
Australia	13 Oct 1966	30 Sep 1975	
Austria	22 Jul 1969	9 May 1972	
Bahamas	5 Aug 1975		d
Bahrain	27 Mar 1990		a
Bangladesh	11 Jun 1979		a
Barbados	8 Nov 1972		a
Belarus	7 Mar 1966	8 Apr 1969	
Belgium	17 Aug 1967	7 Aug 1975	
Benin	2 Feb 1967		
Bhutan	26 Mar 1973		
Bolivia	7 Jun 1966	22 Sep 1970	
Bosnia & Herzegovina	16 Jul 1993		d
Botswana	20 Feb 1974		a
Brazil	7 Mar 1966	27 Mar 1968	

Bulgaria	1 Jun 1966	8 Aug 1966	Estonia	21 Oct 1991	a
Burkina Faso	18 Jul 1974	a	Ethiopia	23 Jun 1976	a
Burundi	1 Feb 1967	27 Oct 1977	Fiji	11 Jan 1973	d
Cambodia	12 Apr 1966	28 Nov 1983	Finland	6 Oct 1966	14 Jul 1970
Cameroon	12 Dec 1966	24 Jun 1971	France	28 Jul 1971	a
Canada	24 Aug 1966	14 Oct 1970	Gabon	20 Sep 1966	29 Feb 1980
Cape Verde	3 Oct 1979	a	Gambia	29 Dec 1978	a
Central African Republic	7 Mar 1966	16 Mar 1971	Germany (5, 6)	10 Feb 1967	16 May 1969
Chad	17 Aug 1977	a	Ghana	8 Sep 1966	8 Sep 1966
Chile	3 Oct 1966	20 Oct 1971	Greece	7 Mar 1966	18 Jun 1970
China (3)	29 Dec 1981	a	Grenada	17 Dec 1981	
Colombia	23 Mar 1967	2 Sep 1981	Guatemala	8 Sep 1967	18 Jan 1983
Congo	11 Jul 1988	a	Guinea	24 Mar 1966	14 Mar 1977
Costa Rica	14 Mar 1966	16 Jan 1967	Guyana	11 Dec 1968	15 Feb 1977
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Jan 1973	a	Haiti	30 Oct 1972	19 Dec 1972
Croatia	12 Oct 1992	d	Holy See	21 Nov 1966	1 May 1969
Cuba	7 Jun 1966	15 Feb 1972	Hungary	15 Sep 1966	4 May 1967
Cyprus	12 Dec 1966	21 Apr 1967	Iceland	14 Nov 1966	13 Mar 1967
Czech Republic (4)	22 Feb 1993	d	India	2 Mar 1967	3 Dec 1968
Denmark	21 Jun 1966	9 Dec 1971	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Mar 1967	29 Aug 1968
Dominican Republic	25 May 1983	a	Iraq	18 Feb 1969	14 Jan 1970
Ecuador	22 Sep 1966	a	Ireland	21 Mar 1968	
Egypt	28 Sep 1966	1 May 1967	Israel	7 Mar 1966	3 Jan 1979
El Salvador	30 Nov 1979	a	Italy	13 Mar 1968	5 Jan 1976
			Jamaica	14 Aug 1966	4 Jun 1971

Japan	15 Dec 1995		a	Netherlands	24 Oct 1966	10 Dec 1971
Jordan	30 May 1974		a	New Zealand	25 Oct 1966	22 Nov 1972
Kuwait	15 Oct 1968		a	Nicaragua	15 Feb 1978	a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	22 Feb 1974		a	Niger	14 Mar 1966	27 Apr 1967
				Nigeria	16 Oct 1967	a
Latvia	14 Apr 1992		a	Norway	21 Nov 1966	6 Aug 1970
Lebanon	12 Nov 1971		a	Pakistan	19 Sep 1966	21 Sep 1966
Lesotho	4 Nov 1971		a	Panama	8 Dec 1966	16 Aug 1967
Liberia	5 Nov 1976		a	Papua New Guinea	27 Jan 1982	a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 Jul 1968		a	Peru	22 Jul 1966	29 Sep 1971
Luxembourg	12 Dec 1967	1 May 1978		Philippines	7 Mar 1966	15 Sep 1967
Madagascar	18 Dec 1967	7 Feb 1969		Poland	7 Mar 1966	5 Dec 1968
Malawi	11 Jun 1996		a	Portugal	24 Aug 1982	a
Maldives	24 Apr 1984		a	Qatar	22 Jul 1976	a
Mali	16 Jul 1974		a	Republic of Korea	8 Aug 1978	5 Dec 1978
Malta	5 Sep 1968	27 May 1971		Republic of Moldova	26 Jan 1993	a
Mauritania	21 Dec 1966	13 Dec 1988		Romania	15 Sep 1970	a
Mauritius	30 May 1972		a	Russian Federation	7 Mar 1966	4 Feb 1969
Mexico	1 Nov 1966	20 Feb 1975		Rwanda	16 Apr 1975	a
Monaco	27 Sep 1995		a	Saint Lucia	14 Feb 1990	d
Mongolia	3 May 1966	6 Aug 1969		Saint Vincent & the Grenadines	9 Nov 1981	a
Morocco	18 Sep 1967	18 Dec 1970		Senegal	22 Jul 1968	19 Apr 1972
Mozambique	18 Apr 1983		a	Seychelles	7 Mar 1978	a
Namibia	11 Nov 1982		a			
Nepal	30 Jan 1971		a			

Sierra Leone	17 Nov 1966	2 Aug 1967	Ukraine	7 Mar 1966	7 Mar 1969
Slovakia (4)	28 May 1993	d	United Arab Emirates	20 Jun 1974	a
Slovenia	6 Jul 1992	d	United Kingdom (7)	11 Oct 1966	7 Mar 1969
Solomon Islands	17 Mar 1982	d	United Republic of Tanzania	27 Oct 1972	a
Somalia	26 Jan 1967	26 Aug 1975	United States of America	28 Sep 1966	21 Oct 1994
South Africa	3 Oct 1994		Uruguay	21 Feb 1967	30 Aug 1968
Spain	13 Sep 1968	a	Uzbekistan	28 Sep 1995	a
Sri Lanka	18 Feb 1982	a	Venezuela	21 Apr 1967	10 Oct 1967
Sudan	21 Mar 1977	a	Viet Nam	9 Jun 1982	a
Surinam	15 Mar 1984	d	Yemen (8)	18 Oct 1972	a
Swaziland	7 Apr 1969	a	Yugoslavia	15 Apr 1966	2 Oct 1967
Sweden	5 May 1966	6 Dec 1971	Zaire	21 Apr 1976	a
Switzerland	29 Nov 1994	a	Zambia	11 Oct 1968	4 Feb 1972
Syrian Arab Republic	21 Apr 1969	a	Zimbabwe	13 May 1991	a
Tajikistan	11 Jan 1995	a			
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 Jan 1994	d			
Togo	1 Sep 1972	a			
Tonga	16 Feb 1972	a			
Trinidad & Tobago	9 Jun 1967	4 Oct 1973			
Tunisia	12 Apr 1966	13 Jan 1967			
Turkey	13 Oct 1972				
Turkmenistan	29 Sep 1994	a			
Uganda	21 Nov 1980	a			

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Reservation:

While acceding to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention since according to this article, in the event of disagreement between two or several States Parties to the Convention on the interpretation and implementation of provisions of the Convention, the matters could be referred to the International Court of Justice upon the request of only one side.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, therefore, states that should any disagreement emerge on the interpretation and implementation of the Convention, the matter will be referred to the International Court of Justice only if all concerned parties agree with that procedure.

Declaration:

Furthermore, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan states that the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination have a discriminatory nature against some states and therefore are not in conformity with the principle of universality of international treaties.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Declaration:

The Constitution of Antigua and Barbuda entrenches and guarantees to every person in Antigua and Barbuda the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights, whether by the state or by a private individual. Acceptance of the Convention by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial processes beyond those provided in the Constitution.

The Government of Antigua and Barbuda interprets article 4 of the Convention as requiring a Party to enact measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation.

AUSTRALIA

The Government of Australia ... declares that Australia is not at present in a position specifically to treat as offences all the matters covered by article 4(a) of the Convention. Acts of the kind there mentioned are punishable only to the extent provided by the existing criminal law dealing with such matters as the maintenance of public order, public mischief, assault, riot, criminal libel, conspiracy and attempts. It is the intention of the Australian Government, at the first suitable moment, to seek from Parliament legislation specifically implementing the terms of article 4(a).

AUSTRIA

Article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provides that the measures specifically described in subparagraphs (a), (b)

and (c) shall be undertaken with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. The Republic of Austria therefore considers that through such measures the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association may not be jeopardized. These rights are laid down in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; they were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and are referred to in article 5(d) (viii) and (ix) of the present Convention."

BAHAMAS

Firstly the Government of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas wishes to state its understanding of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration set out in article 5 of the Convention (in particular to freedom of opinion and expression and the right of freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to, or variation of existing law and practice in these fields is necessary for the attainment of the ends specified in article 4. Lastly, the Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas entrenches and guarantees to every person in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial process to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Acceptance of this Convention by the Commonwealth of the Bahamas does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial process beyond those

prescribed under the Constitution.

BAHRAIN (9)

Reservations:

With reference to article 22 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Bahrain declares that, for the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the express consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each case.

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

BARBADOS

The Constitution of Barbados entrenches and guarantees to every person in Barbados the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Accession to the Convention does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligations to introduce judicial processes beyond those provided in the Constitution.

The Government of Barbados interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to enact measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only where it is considered that the need arises to enact such legislation.

BELARUS (10)

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become

Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

BELGIUM

In order to meet the requirements of article 4 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Kingdom of Belgium will take care to adapt its legislation to the obligations it has assumed in becoming a party to the said Convention.

The Kingdom of Belgium nevertheless wishes to emphasize the importance which it attaches to the fact that article 4 of the Convention provides that the measures laid down in subparagraphs (a), (b), and (c) should be adopted with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. The Kingdom of Belgium therefore considers that the obligations imposed by article 4 must be reconciled with the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association. Those rights are proclaimed in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and have been reaffirmed in articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. They have also been stated in article 5, subparagraph (d) (viii) and (ix) of the said Convention.

The Kingdom of Belgium also wishes to emphasize the importance which it attaches to respect for the rights set forth in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, especially in articles 10 and 11 dealing respectively with freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

BULGARIA (11)

The Government of the People's Republic of

Bulgaria considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and article 18, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the effect of which is to prevent sovereign States from becoming Parties to the Convention, are of a discriminatory nature. The Convention, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, should be open for accession by all States without any discrimination whatsoever.

CHINA (12)

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China has reservations on the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and will not be bound by it. (The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 13 January 1982.)

Declaration:

The signing and ratification of the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China are illegal and null and void.

CUBA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba will make such reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when the Convention is ratified.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

The Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba does not accept the provision in article 22 of the Convention to the effect that disputes between two or more States Parties shall be referred to the International Court of Justice, since it considers that such disputes should be settled exclusively by the procedures expressly provided for in the Convention or by negotiation through the diplomatic channel between the disputants.

Statement:

This Convention, intended to eliminate all forms of racial discrimination, should not, as it expressly does in articles 17 and 18, exclude States not Members of the United Nations, members of the specialized agencies or Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice from making an effective contribution under the Convention, since these articles constitute in themselves a form of discrimination that is at variance with the principles set out in the Convention; the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba accordingly ratifies the Convention, but with the qualification just indicated.

CZECH REPUBLIC (4)

DENMARK (13)

EGYPT (14)

The United Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

FIJI

“The reservation and declarations formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom on behalf of Fiji are affirmed but have been redrafted in the following terms:

To the extent, if any, that any law relating to elections in Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5(c), that any law relating to land in Fiji which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5(d) (v), or that the school system of Fiji

may not fulfil the obligations referred to in articles 2, 3, or 5(e) (v), the Government of Fiji reserves the right not to implement the aforementioned provisions of the Convention.

The Government of Fiji wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of Article 4.

Further, the Government of Fiji interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

The Government of Fiji maintains the view that Article 15 is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories whilst making no comparable provision for States without such territories.

FRANCE (15)

With regard to article 4, France wishes to make it clear that it interprets the reference made therein to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to the rights set forth in article 5 of the Convention as

releasing the States Parties from the obligation to enact anti-discrimination legislation which is incompatible with the freedoms of opinion and expression and of peaceful assembly and association guaranteed by those texts.

With regard to article 6, France declares that the question of remedy through tribunals is, as far as France is concerned, governed by the rules of ordinary law.

With regard to article 15, France's accession to the Convention may not be interpreted as implying any change in its position regarding the resolution mentioned in that provision.

GUYANA

The Government of the Republic of Guyana do not interpret the provisions of this Convention as imposing upon them any obligation going beyond the limits set by the Constitution of Guyana or imposing upon them any obligation requiring the introduction of judicial processes going beyond those provided under the same Constitution.

HUNGARY (16)

The Hungarian People's Republic considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and of article 18, paragraph 1, of the Convention, barring accession to the Convention by all States, are of a discriminating nature and contrary to international law. The Hungarian People's Republic maintains its general position that multilateral treaties of a universal character should, in conformity with the principles of sovereign equality of States, be open for accession by all States without any discrimination whatever.

INDIA (17)

The Government of India declare that for reference of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision in terms of Article 22 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, the consent of all parties to the

dispute is necessary in each individual case.

IRAQ (9)

Upon signature:

The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq hereby declares that signature for and on behalf of the Republic of Iraq of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 December 1965, as well as approval by the Arab States of the said Convention and entry into it by their respective governments, shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or lead to entry by the Arab States into such dealings with Israel as may be regulated by the said Convention.

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Iraq does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article twenty-two of the Convention aforementioned and affirms its reservation that it does not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice provided for in the said article.

Upon ratification:

1. The acceptance and ratification of the Convention by Iraq shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry by Iraq into such dealings with Israel as are regulated by the Convention;
2. Iraq does not accept the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The Republic of Iraq does not consider itself to be bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and deems it necessary that in all cases the approval of all parties to the dispute be secured before the case is referred to the International Court of Justice.

ISRAEL

The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the said

Convention.

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

(a) The positive measures, provided for in article 4 of the Convention and specifically described in subparagraphs (a) and (b) of that article, designed to eradicate all incitement to, or acts of, discrimination, are to be interpreted, as that article provides, "with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention. Consequently, the obligations deriving from the aforementioned article 4 are not to jeopardize the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association which are laid down in articles 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, were reaffirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations when it adopted articles 19 and 21 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and are referred to in articles 5(d) (viii) and (ix) of the Convention. In fact, the Italian Government, in conformity with the obligations resulting from Articles 55(c) and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations, remains faithful to the principle laid down in article 29(2) of the Universal Declaration, which provides that "in the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society."

(b) Effective remedies against acts of racial discrimination which violate his individual rights and fundamental freedoms will be assured to everyone, in conformity with article 6 of the Convention, by the ordinary courts within the framework of their respective jurisdiction. Claims for reparation for any damage suffered as a result of acts of racial discrimination must be brought against the persons responsible for the

malicious or criminal acts which caused such damage.

JAMAICA

The Constitution of Jamaica entrenches and guarantees to every person in Jamaica the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual irrespective of his race or place of origin. The Constitution prescribes judicial processes to be observed in the event of the violation of any of these rights whether by the State or by a private individual. Ratification of the Convention by Jamaica does not imply the acceptance of obligations going beyond the constitutional limits nor the acceptance of any obligation to introduce judicial processes beyond those prescribed under the Constitution.

JAPAN

Reservation:

In applying the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of article 4 of the [said Convention] Japan fulfills the obligations under those provisions to the extent that fulfillment of the obligations is compatible with the guarantee of the rights to freedom of assembly, association and expression and other rights under the Constitution of Japan, noting the phrase 'with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of this Convention' referred to in article 4.

KUWAIT (9)

In acceding to the said Convention, the Government of the State of Kuwait takes the view that its accession does not in any way imply recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige it to apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of the said country.

The Government of the State of Kuwait does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with

respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any party to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

LEBANON

The Republic of Lebanon does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any party to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all States parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA (9)

(a) The Kingdom of Libya does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and it states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

(b) It is understood that the accession to this Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the Kingdom of Libya. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the Kingdom of Libya and Israel.

MADAGASCAR

The Government of the Malagasy Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any

dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referral of the dispute to the International Court.

MALTA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification :

The Government of Malta wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention.

It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article should it consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights set forth in article 5 of the Convention, that the need arises to enact 'ad hoc' legislation, in addition to or variation of existing law and practice to bring to an end any act of racial discrimination.

Further, the Government of Malta interprets the requirements in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end.

MONACO

Reservation regarding article 2, paragraph 1:

Monaco reserves the right to apply its own legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the labour market of the Principality.

Reservation regarding article 4:

Monaco interprets the reference in that article to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and to the rights enumerated in article 5 of the Convention as releasing States Parties from the obligation to promulgate repressive laws which are incompatible with freedom of opinion and expression and freedom of peaceful assembly and association, which are guaranteed by those instruments.

MONGOLIA (18)

The Mongolian People's Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and it holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

MOROCCO

The Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Kingdom of Morocco states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

MOZAMBIQUE

Reservation:

The People's Republic of Mozambique does not consider itself to be bound by the provision of article 22 and wishes to restate that for the submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice for decision in terms of the said

article, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary in each individual case.

NEPAL

The Constitution of Nepal contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, including the right to freedom of speech and expression, the right to form unions and associations not motivated by party politics and the right to freedom of professing his/her own religion; and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by Nepal incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of Nepal.

His Majesty's Government interprets article 4 of the said Convention as requiring a Party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as His Majesty's Government may consider, with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that some legislative addition to, or variation of, existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. His Majesty's Government interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available; and further interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end.

His Majesty's Government does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 22 of the Convention under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA (12)

Reservation:

The Government of Papua New Guinea

interprets article 4 of the Convention as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the areas covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles contained in the Universal Declaration set out in Article 5 of the Convention that some legislative addition to, or variation of existing law and practice, is necessary to give effect to the provisions of Article 4. In addition, the Constitution of Papua New Guinea guarantees certain fundamental rights and freedoms to all persons irrespective of their race or place of origin. The Constitution also provides for judicial protection of these rights and freedoms. Acceptance of this Convention does not therefore indicate the acceptance of obligations by the Government of Papua New Guinea which go beyond those provided by the Constitution, nor does it indicate the acceptance of any obligation to introduce judicial process beyond that provided by the Constitution. (The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 22 February 1982.)

POLAND

The Polish People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention.

The Polish People's Republic considers that the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, and article 18, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, which make it impossible for many States to become parties to the said Convention, are of a discriminatory nature and are incompatible with the object and purpose of that Convention.

The Polish People's Republic considers that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the said Convention should be open for participation by all States without any discrimination or restrictions whatsoever.

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, whereby any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation or by the procedures expressly provided for in the Convention shall, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

The Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Romania declares that the provisions of articles 17 and 18 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination are not in accordance with the principle that multilateral treaties, the aims and objectives of which concern the world community as a whole, should be open to participation by all States.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION (10)

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

RWANDA

The Rwandese Republic does not consider itself

as bound by article 22 of the Convention.

SLOVAKIA (4)

SPAIN

With a reservation in respect of the whole of article 22 (jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice).

SWITZERLAND

Reservation concerning article 4:

Switzerland reserves the right to take the legislative measures necessary for the implementation of article 4, taking due account of freedom of opinion and freedom of association, provided for inter alia in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Reservation concerning article 2, paragraph 1(a):

Switzerland reserves the right to apply its legal provisions concerning the admission of foreigners to the Swiss market.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC (9)

1. The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said Convention.

2. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the Parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Syrian Arab Republic states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

TONGA (19)

Reservation:

To the extent, [. . .], that any law relating to land in Tonga which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5(d) (v), [. . .], the Kingdom of Tonga reserves the right not to apply the Convention to Tonga.

Declaration:

Secondly, the Kingdom of Tonga wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. Further, the Kingdom of Tonga interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

Lastly, the Kingdom of Tonga maintains its position in regard to article 15. In its view this article is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories while making no comparable provision for States without such

territories. Moreover, the article purports to establish a procedure applicable to the dependent territories of States whether or not those States have become parties to the Convention. His Majesty's Government have decided that the Kingdom of Tonga should accede to the Convention, these objections notwithstanding because of the importance they attach to the Convention as a whole.

UKRAINE (10)

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic states that the provision in article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and hold that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES (9)

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

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:
Subject to the following reservation and interpretative statements:

First, in the present circumstances deriving from the usurpation of power in Rhodesia by the illegal régime, the United Kingdom must sign subject to a reservation of the right not to apply the Convention to Rhodesia unless and until the United Kingdom informs the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it is in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented.

Secondly, the United Kingdom wishes to state its understanding of certain articles in the Convention. It interprets article 4 as requiring a party to the Convention to adopt further legislative measures in the fields covered by subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of that article only in so far as it may consider with due regard to the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the rights expressly set forth in article 5 of the Convention (in particular the right to freedom of opinion and expression and the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association) that some legislative addition to or variation of existing law and practice in those fields is necessary for the attainment of the end specified in the earlier part of article 4. Further, the United Kingdom interprets the requirement in article 6 concerning 'reparation or satisfaction' as being fulfilled if one or other of these forms of redress is made available and interprets 'satisfaction' as including any form of redress effective to bring the discriminatory conduct to an end. In addition it interprets article 20 and the other related provisions of Part III of the Convention as meaning that if a reservation is not accepted the State making the reservation does not become a Party to the Convention.

Lastly, the United Kingdom maintains its position in regard to article 15. In its view this article is discriminatory in that it establishes a procedure for the receipt of petitions relating to dependent territories while making no comparable provision for States without such territories. Moreover, the article purports to establish a procedure applicable to the dependent territories of States whether or not those States have become parties to the Convention. Her Majesty's Government have decided that the United Kingdom should sign the Convention, these objections notwithstanding, because of the importance they attach to the Convention as a whole.

Upon ratification:

First, the reservation and interpretative statements made by the United Kingdom at the time of signature of the Convention are

maintained.

Secondly, the United Kingdom does not regard the Commonwealth Immigrants Acts, 1962 and 1968, or their application, as involving any racial discrimination within the meaning of paragraph 1 of article 1, or any other provision of the Convention, and fully reserves its right to continue to apply those Acts.

Lastly, to the extent if any, that any law relating to election in Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5(c), that any law relating to land in Fiji which prohibits or restricts the alienation of land by the indigenous inhabitants may not fulfil the obligations referred to in article 5(d) (v), or that the school system of Fiji may not fulfil the obligations referred to in articles 2, 3 or 5(e) (v), the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply the Convention to Fiji.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

The Constitution of the United States contains provisions for the protection of individual rights, such as the right of free speech, and nothing in the Convention shall be deemed to require or to authorize legislation or other action by the United States of America incompatible with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America.

Upon ratification:

I. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservations:

(1) That the Constitution and laws of the United States contain extensive protections of individual freedom of speech, expression and association. Accordingly, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention, in particular under articles 4 and 7, to restrict those rights, through the adoption of legislation or any other measures, to the extent that they are protected by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(2) That the Constitution and laws of the United States establish extensive protections against discrimination, reaching significant areas of non-governmental activity. Individual privacy and freedom from governmental interference in private conduct, however, are also recognized as among the fundamental values which shape our free and democratic society. The United States understands that the identification of the rights protected under the Convention by reference in article 1 to fields of 'public life' reflects a similar distinction between spheres of public conduct that are customarily the subject of governmental regulation, and spheres of private conduct that are not. To the extent, however, that the Convention calls for a broader regulation of private conduct, the United States does not accept any obligation under this Convention to enact legislation or take other measures under paragraph (1) of article 2, subparagraphs (1) (c) and (d) of article 2, article 3 and article 5 with respect to private conduct except as mandated by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

(3) That with reference to article 22 of the Convention, before any dispute to which the United States is a party may be submitted to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under this article, the specific consent of the United States is required in each case.

II. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understanding, which shall apply to the obligations of the United States under this Convention:

That the United States understands that this Convention shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by the state and local governments. To the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall, as necessary, take appropriate measures to ensure the fulfilment of this Convention.

III. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following declaration:

That the United States declares that the provisions of the Convention are not self-executing.

VIET NAM (12)

Declaration:

(1) The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam declares that the provisions of article 17(1) and of article 18(1) of the Convention whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity of becoming Parties to the said Convention are of a discriminatory nature and it considers that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be open to participation by all States without discrimination or restriction of any kind.

Reservation:

(2) The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22 of the Convention and holds that, for any dispute with regard to the interpretation or application of the Convention to be brought before the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary. (The reservation was circulated by the Secretary-General on 10 August 1982.)

YEMEN (8,9)

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into a relationship with it regarding any matter regulated by the said Convention.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 22 of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention is, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for

referral of the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen states that the provisions of Article 17, paragraph 1, and Article 18, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination whereby a number of States are deprived of the opportunity to become Parties to the Convention is of a discriminatory nature, and holds that, in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States, the Convention should be opened to participation by all interested States without discrimination or restriction of any kind."

Objections

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

AUSTRALIA

8 August 1989

In accordance with article 20(2), Australia objects to [the reservations made by Yemen] which it considers impermissible as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

BELARUS

29 December 1983

The ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by the so-called "Government of Democratic Kampuchea" - the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique of hangmen overthrown by the Kampuchean people - is completely unlawful and has no legal force. There is only one State of Kampuchea in the world - The People's Republic of Kampuchea, recognized by a large number of countries. All power in this State is entirely in the hands of its only lawful Government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has the exclusive right to act in the name of Kampuchea

in the international arena, including the right to ratify international agreements prepared within the United Nations.

The farce involving the ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by a clique representing no one mocks the norms of law and morality and blasphemes the memory of millions of Kampuchean victims of the genocide committed by the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary régime.

BELGIUM

8 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

These reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and consequently are not permitted pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

CANADA

10 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The effect of these reservations would be to allow racial discrimination in respect of certain of the rights enumerated in Article 5. Since the objective of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, as stated in its Preamble, is to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and manifestations, the Government of Canada believes that the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic are incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention. Moreover, the Government of Canada believes that the principle of non-discrimination is generally accepted and recognized in international law and therefore is binding on all states.

CZECH REPUBLIC (4)

DENMARK

10 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention, to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in the article.

The reservations made by the Government of Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and the reservations are consequently impermissible according to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention. In accordance with article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention the Government of Denmark therefore formally objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Denmark and Yemen, and the reservations cannot alter or modify in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention.

ETHIOPIA

25 January 1984

The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia should like to reiterate that the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is the sole legitimate representative of the People of Kampuchea and as such it alone has the authority to act on behalf of Kampuchea.

The Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia, therefore, considers the

ratification of the so-called 'Government of Democratic Kampuchea' to be null and void.

FINLAND

7 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The Government of Finland formally, and in accordance with article 20(2) of the Convention, objects to the reservations made by Yemen to the above provisions.

In the first place, the reservations concern matters which are of fundamental importance in the Convention. The first paragraph of article 5 clearly brings this out. According to it, the Parties have undertaken to guarantee the rights listed in that article "In compliance with fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention". Clearly, provisions prohibiting racial discrimination in the granting of such fundamental political rights and civil liberties as the right to participate in public life, to marry and choose a spouse, to inherit and to enjoy freedom of thought, conscience and religion are central in a convention against racial discrimination. Therefore, the reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as specified in paragraph 20(2) thereof and in article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Finland that it would be unthinkable that merely by making a reservation to the said provisions, a State could achieve the liberty to start discriminatory practices on the grounds of race, colour, or national or ethnic origin in regard to such fundamental political rights and civil liberties as the right to participate in the conduct of public affairs, the right of marriage and choice of spouse, the right of inheritance and the freedom of thought, conscience and religion. Any racial discrimination in respect of those general principles of human rights law as reflected in the Universal Declaration on

Human Rights and the practice of States and international organizations. By making a reservation a State cannot contract out from universally binding human rights standards.

For the above reasons, the Government of Finland notes that the reservations made by Yemen are devoid of legal effect. However, the Government of Finland does not consider that this fact is an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention in respect of Yemen.

FRANCE

15 May 1984

The Government of the French Republic, which does not recognize the coalition government of the Democratic Cambodia, declares that the instrument of ratification by the coalition government of Democratic Cambodia of the [International] Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, is without effect.

20 September 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

France considers that the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination are not valid as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Such objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the said Convention between France and the Yemen Arab Republic.

GERMANY

8 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

These reservations relate to the basic obligations of States Parties to the Convention to prohibit and eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone to equality before the law and include the enjoyment of such fundamental political and civil rights as the right to take part in the conduct of public life, the right to marriage and choice of spouse, the right to inherit and the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. As a result, the reservations made by Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention within the meaning of article 20, paragraph 2 thereof.

ITALY

7 August 1989

The Government of the Republic of Italy raises an objection to the reservations entered by the Government of the Arab Republic of Yemen to article 5 [(c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii)] of the above-mentioned Convention."

MEXICO

11 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The Government of the United Mexican States has concluded that, in view of article 20 of the Convention, the reservation must be deemed invalid, as it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Said reservation, if implemented would result in discrimination to the detriment of a certain sector of the population and, at the same time, would violate the rights established in articles 2, 16 and 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

The objection of the United Mexican States to the reservation in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the Convention of 1966 between the

United States of Mexico and the Government of Yemen.

MONGOLIA

7 June 1984

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the ratification of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination by the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a regime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void.

NETHERLANDS

25 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned reservations, as they are incompatible with object and purpose of the Convention.

These objections are not an obstacle for the entry into force of this Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Yemen.

NEW ZEALAND

4 August 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The New Zealand Government is of the view that those provisions contain undertakings which are themselves fundamental to the

Convention. Accordingly it considers that the reservations purportedly made by Yemen relating to political and civil rights are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Treaty within the terms of the article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of New Zealand advises therefore under article 20 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination that it does not accept the reservations made by Yemen.

NORWAY

28 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

The Government of Norway hereby enters its formal objection to the reservations made by Yemen.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

28 December 1983

The ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by the so-called "Government of Democratic Kampuchea" - the Pol Pot clique of hangmen overthrown by the Kampuchean people - is completely unlawful and has no legal force. Only the representatives authorized by the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea can act in the name of Kampuchea. There is only one State of Kampuchea in the world - the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has been recognized by a large number of countries. All power in this State is entirely in the hands of its only lawful Government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which has the exclusive right to act in the name of Kampuchea in the international arena, including the right to ratify international agreements prepared within the United Nations.

Nor should one fail to observe that the farce

involving the ratification of the above-mentioned International Convention by a clique representing no one mocks the norms of law and morality and is a direct insult to the memory of millions of Kampuchean victims of the genocide committed against the Kampuchean people by the Pol Pot-Sary régime. The entire international community is familiar with the bloody crimes of that puppet clique.

SLOVAKIA (4)

SWEDEN

5 July 1989

With regard to reservations made by Yemen concerning article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii):

Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in article 2 of the Convention, to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the rights enumerated in the article.

The Government of Sweden has come to the conclusion that the reservations made by Yemen are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore are impermissible according to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention. For this reason the Government of Sweden objects to these reservations. This objection does not have the effect of preventing the Convention from entering into force between Sweden and Yemen, and the reservations cannot alter or modify, in any respect, the obligations arising from the Convention.

UKRAINE

17 January 1984

The ratification of the above-mentioned international Convention by the Pol Pot-Ieng

Sary clique, which is guilty of the annihilation of millions of Kampuchean people and which was overthrown in 1979 by the Kampuchean people, is thoroughly illegal and has no juridical force. There is only one Kampuchean State in the World, namely, the People's Republic of Kampuchea. All authority in this State is vested wholly in its sole legitimate government, the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. This Government alone has the exclusive right to speak on behalf of Kampuchea at the international level, while the supreme organ of State power, the State Council of the People's Republic of Kampuchea has the exclusive right to ratify international agreements drawn up within the framework of the United Nations.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

4 August 1989

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not accept the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic to article 5(c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

VIET NAM

29 February 1984

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam considers that only the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, which is the sole genuine and legitimate representative of the Kampuchean People, is empowered to act in their behalf to sign, ratify or accede to international conventions.

The Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam rejects as null and void the ratification of the above-mentioned international Convention by the so-called "Democratic Kampuchea" - a genocidal regime overthrown by the Kampuchean people since

January 7, 1979.

Furthermore, the ratification of the Convention by a genocidal regime, which massacred more than 3 million Kampuchean people in gross violation of fundamental standards of morality and international laws on human rights, simply plays down the significance of the Convention and jeopardises the prestige of the United Nations.

Declarations

recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in accordance with article 14 of the Convention. (20)

ALGERIA

12 September 1989

The Algerian Government declares, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by it of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

AUSTRALIA

28 January 1993

The Government of Australia hereby declares that it recognises, for and on behalf of Australia, the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Australia of any of the rights set forth in the aforesaid Convention.

BULGARIA

12 May 1993

The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on

the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Bulgaria of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

CHILE

18 May 1994

In accordance with article 14(1) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Government of Chile declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Government of Chile of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

COSTA RICA

8 January 1974

Costa Rica recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 8 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in accordance with article 14 of the Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the State of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

CYPRUS

The Republic of Cyprus recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination established under article 14(1) of [the Convention] to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by the Republic of Cyprus of any of the rights set forth in this Convention.

DENMARK

11 October 1985

Denmark recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Danish jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Denmark of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communications unless it has ascertained that the same matter has not been, and is not being, examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ECUADOR

18 March 1977

The State of Ecuador, by virtue of Article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention.

FINLAND

16 November 1994

Finland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Finland claiming to be victims of a violation by Finland of any of the rights set forth in the said Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being

examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

FRANCE

16 August 1982

[The Government of the French Republic declares], in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination opened for signature on 7 March 1966, [that it] recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within French jurisdiction that either by reason of acts or omissions, events or deeds occurring after 15 August 1982, or by reason of a decision concerning the acts or omissions, events or deeds after the said date, would complain of being victims of a violation, by the French Republic, of one of the rights mentioned in the Convention.

HUNGARY

13 September 1989

The Hungarian People's Republic hereby recognizes the competence of the Committee established by the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination provided for in paragraph 1 of article 14 of the Convention.

ICELAND

10 August 1981

[The Government of Iceland declares] in accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination which was opened for signature in New York on 7 March 1966, that Iceland recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of

individuals within the jurisdiction of Iceland claiming to be victims of a violation by Iceland of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

ITALY

5 May 1978

With reference to article 14, paragraph 1, of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, the Government of the Italian Republic recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, established by the aforementioned Convention, to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within Italian jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Italy of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

The Government of the Italian Republic recognizes that competence on the understanding that the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination shall not consider any communication without ascertaining that the same matter is not being considered or has not already been considered by another international body of investigation or settlement.

NETHERLANDS

In accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination concluded at New York on 7 March 1966, the Kingdom of the Netherlands recognizes, for the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the competence of the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals

or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation, by the Kingdom of the Netherlands, of any of the rights set forth in the above-mentioned Convention.

NORWAY

23 January 1976

The Norwegian Government recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of Norway claiming to be victims of a violation by Norway of any of the rights set forth in the International Convention of 21 December 1965 on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination according to article 14 of the said Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

PERU

27 November 1984

[The Government of the Republic of Peru declares] that, in accordance with its policy of full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, without distinctions as to race, sex, language or religion, and with the aim of strengthening the international instruments on the subject, Peru recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction, who claim to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, in conformity with the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

1 October 1991

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications, in respect of situations and events occurring after the adoption of the present declaration, from individuals or groups of individuals within the jurisdiction of the USSR claiming to be victims of a violation by the USSR of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SENEGAL

3 December 1982

In accordance with [article 14], the Government of Senegal declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee (on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination) to receive and consider communications from individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation by Senegal of any of the rights set forth in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

SLOVAKIA

17 March 1995

The Slovak Republic, pursuant to article 14 of the Convention, recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals within its jurisdiction claiming to be victims of a violation of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

SWEDEN

Sweden recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of

individuals within the jurisdiction of Sweden claiming to be victims of a violation by Sweden of any of the rights set forth in the Convention, with the reservation that the Committee shall not consider any communication from an individual or a group of individuals unless the Committee has ascertained that the same matter is not being examined or has not been examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement.

UKRAINE

28 July 1992

In accordance with article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination, Ukraine declares that it recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination to receive and consider communications from individuals or groups of individuals [within its jurisdiction] claiming to be victims of a violation by [it] of any of the rights set forth in the Convention.

URUGUAY

11 September 1972

The Government of Uruguay recognizes the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, under article 14 of the Convention.

Notes

- (1) Article 19 of the Convention provides that the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification or instrument of accession. On 5 December 1968, the Government of Poland deposited the twenty-seventh instrument. However, among those instruments there were some which contained a reservation and therefore were subject to the provisions of article 20 of the Convention allowing States to notify objections within ninety days from the date of circulation by the Secretary-General of the reservations. In respect of two such instruments, namely those of Kuwait and Spain, the ninety-day period had not yet expired on the date of deposit of the twenty-seventh instrument. The reservation contained in one further instrument, that of India, had not yet been circulated on that date, and the twenty-seventh instrument itself, that of Poland, contained a reservation; in respect of these two instruments the ninety-day period would only begin to run on the date of the Secretary-General's notification of their deposit. Therefore, in that notification, which was dated 13 December 1968, the Secretary-General called the attention of the interested States to the situation and stated the following:

"It appears from the provisions of article 20 of the Convention that it would not be possible to determine the legal effect of the four instruments in question pending the expiry of the respective periods of time mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Having regard to the above-mentioned consideration, the Secretary-General is

not at the present time in a position to ascertain the date of entry into force of the Convention."

Subsequently, in a notification dated 17 March 1969, the Secretary-General informed the interested States; (a) that within the period of ninety days from the date of his previous notification he had received an objection from one State to the reservation contained in the instrument of ratification by the Government of India; and (b) that the Convention, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 19, had entered into force on 4 January 1969, i.e., on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Convention by the Government of Poland, which was the twenty-seventh instrument of ratification or instrument of accession deposited with the Secretary-General.

- (2) Official Records of the General Assembly, Twentieth Session, Supplement No. 14 (A/6014), p. 47.
- (3) The Convention had previously been signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 31 March 1966 and 10 December 1970, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note in chapter I.1).

With reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, communications have been received by the Secretary-General from the Governments of Bulgaria (12 March 1971), Mongolia (11 January 1971), the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (9 June 1971), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (21 April 1971) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (18 January 1971) stating that they considered the said signature and/or ratification as null and void, since the so-called

"Government of China" had no right to speak or assume obligations on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the twentieth regular session of the United Nations General Assembly, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned, signed the Convention and duly deposited the instrument of ratification thereof, and that "any statements and reservations relating to the above-mentioned Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under this Convention".

Finally, upon depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of the People's Republic of China made the following declaration: "The signing and ratification of the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China are illegal and null and void."

- (4) Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 October 1966 and 29 December 1966, respectively, with reservations. Subsequently, on 12 March 1984, the Government of Czechoslovakia made an objection to the ratification by Democratic Kampuchea. Further, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its

decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservations and the objection see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 660, p. 276 and vol. 1350, p. 386, respectively. See also note 8 below and note in chapter I.2.

- (5) The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 23 March 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and declaration, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 883, p. 190.

Moreover, on 26 April 1984, the Government of the German Democratic Republic had made an objection with regard to the ratification made by the Government of the Democratic Kampuchea. For the text of the objection, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1355, p. 327. See also note in chapter I.2.

- (6) In a note accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the Convention "shall also apply to Land Berlin with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany".

With reference to the above-mentioned declaration, the Secretary-General received communications from the Governments of Bulgaria (16 September 1969), Czechoslovakia (3 November 1969. See note 4 in this chapter), Mongolia (7 January 1970), Poland (20 June 1969), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (10 November 1969) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (4 August 1969). The said communications are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to those referred in the second

paragraph of note in chapter III.3.

On 27 December 1973, the Government of the German Democratic Republic made in respect of the above-mentioned declaration a declaration which is identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one reproduced in the fourth paragraph of note in chapter III.3. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany (15 July 1974 and 19 September 1975), France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (17 June 1974 and 8 July 1975), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (19 September 1974) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (12 September 1974 and 8 December 1975), declarations identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding ones reproduced in note in chapter III.3.

See also note 5 above.

- (7) With respect to the Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Christopher Nevis Anguilla and Saint Lucia) and Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, as well as the State of Brunei, the Kingdom of Tonga and the British Solomon Islands Protectorate.

- (8) The Yemen Arab Republic had acceded to the Convention on 6 April 1989 with the following reservation:

Reservations in respect of article 5(c) and article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii).

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 30 April 1990, from the Government of Czechoslovakia the following objection:

"The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic considers the reservations of

the Government of Yemen with respect to article 5(c) and articles 5(d) (iv),(vi), and (vii) of [the Convention], as incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention."

See also note in chapter I.2.

- (9) In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 10 July 1969, the Government of Israel declared:

"[The Government of Israel] has noted the political character of the declaration made by the Government of Iraq on signing the above Convention.

In the view of the Government of Israel, the Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity. Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Israel that no legal relevance can be attached to those Iraqi statements which purport to represent the views of the other States".

Except for the omission of the last sentence, identical communications in essence, mutatis mutandis, were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel as follows: on 29 December 1966 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of the United Arab Republic upon signature (see also note 14 below); on 16 August 1968 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Libya upon accession; on 12 December 1968 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Kuwait upon accession; on 9 July 1969 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of Syria upon accession; on 21 April 1970

made in respect of the declaration made by Government of Iraq upon ratification with the following statement "With regard to the political declaration in the guise of a reservation made on the occasion of the ratification of the above Treaty, the Government of Israel wishes to refer to its objection circulated by the Secretary-General in his letter [. . .] and to maintain that objection."; on 12 February 1973 in respect of the declaration made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen upon accession; on 25 September 1974 in respect of the declaration made by the United Arab Emirates upon accession and on 25 June 1990 in respect of the reservation made by Bahrain upon accession.

- (10) In communications received on 8 March, 19 and 20 April 1989, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, respectively, notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservations relating to article 22. For the texts of the reservations, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 676, p. 397, vol. 681, p. 392 and vol. 677, p. 435.

- (11) On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 22 made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 660, p. 270.

- (12) None of the States concerned having objected to the reservation by the end of a period of ninety days after the date when it was circulated by the Secretary-General, the said reservation is deemed to have been permitted in

- accordance with the provisions of article 20(1).
- (13) In a communication received on 4 October 1972, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General that it withdrew the reservation made with regard to the implementation on the Faroe Islands of the Convention. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 820, p. 457.
- The legislation by which the Convention has been implemented on the Faroe Islands entered into force by 1 November 1972, from which date the withdrawal of the above reservation became effective.
- (14) In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration it had made in respect of Israel. For the text of the declaration see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 660, p. 318. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal.
- (15) In a communication received subsequently, the Government of France indicated that the first paragraph of the declaration did not purport to limit the obligations under the Convention in respect of the French Government, but only to record the latter's interpretation of article 4 of the Convention.
- (16) In a communication received on 13 September 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 22 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 660, p. 310.
- (17) In a communication received on 24 February 1969, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary-General that it "has decided not to accept the reservation made by the Government of India in her instrument of ratification".
- (18) In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation concerning article 22 made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 660, p. 289.
- (19) By a notification received on 28 October 1977, the Government of Tonga informed the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw only those reservations made upon accession relating to article 5(c) in so far as it relates to elections, and reservations relating to articles 2, 3 and 5(e)(v), in so far as these articles relate to education and training. For the text of the original reservation see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 829, p. 371.
- (20) The first ten declarations recognizing the competence of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination took effect on 3 December 1982, date of the deposit of the tenth declaration, according to article 14, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

(a) Amendment to article 8 of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination

Adopted at the Fourteenth Meeting of the States Parties on 15 January 1992

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see paragraph 4 of the Decision of the States Parties).

TEXT: Doc. CERD/sp/45.

STATUS: Acceptances: 17.

Note: The amendment proposed by the Government of Australia and circulated by the Secretary-General under cover of depositary notification C.N.285.1991.TREATIES-4 of 20 December 1991, was adopted by the States Parties to the Convention at their Fourteenth Meeting and submitted to the General Assembly in accordance with article 23 of the Convention. The General Assembly endorsed the said amendment at its Forty-seventh session by resolution 47/111 of 16 December 1992.

Australia	15 Oct 1993
Bahamas	31 Mar 1994
Bulgaria	2 Mar 1995
Burkina Faso	9 Aug 1993
Canada	8 Feb 1995
Denmark	3 Sep 1993
Finland	9 Feb 1994
France	1 Sep 1994
Netherlands (1)	24 Jan 1995
New Zealand	8 Oct 1993
Norway	6 Oct 1993
Republic of Korea	30 Nov 1993
Seychelles	23 Jul 1993
Sweden	14 May 1993
Trinidad and Tobago	23 Aug 1993
Ukraine	17 Jun 1994
United Kingdom	7 Feb 1994

Notes:

(1) For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.