

RATIFICATIONS,  
ETC.



Treaty Series No. 64 (1989)

**FOURTH  
SUPPLEMENTARY LIST  
OF RATIFICATIONS, ACCESSIONS,  
WITHDRAWALS, ETC., FOR 1989**

[In continuation of Treaty Series No. 63 (1989), Cm 1056]

*Presented to Parliament  
by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs  
by Command of Her Majesty  
June 1990*

LONDON : HMSO  
£4.15 net

Cm 1076

# FOURTH SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF RATIFICATIONS, ACCESSIONS, WITHDRAWALS, ETC. FOR 1989

[In continuation of Treaty Series No. 63 (1989), Cm 1056]

*N.B.* Unless otherwise stated, the dates given herein are the dates of deposit of the ratifications, etc. and are not necessarily effective dates, which must normally be determined from the terms of the treaties concerned.

Declarations, reservations etc. are given only in English, being either the texts of the originals or, alternatively, translations from foreign language texts. In the latter case, the translations given are not in all cases official or authoritative; for an authoritative statement, the foreign language text of the original should be consulted.

This publication contains information received up to 31 December, 1989.

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>AGRICULTURE</b>		
Agreement on the Reconstitution of the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux as CAB International with Agreed Minute .. .. .	London, 8 July, 1986	59/1987 Cm 387
Extensions—		
Bermuda .. .. .	3 Aug., 1987	
Falkland Islands .. .. .	3 Aug., 1987	
British Virgin Islands .. .. .	3 Aug., 1987	
St Helena .. .. .	3 Aug., 1987	
<b>AVIATION</b>		
Convention on International Civil Aviation .. .. .	Chicago, 7 Dec., 1944	8/1953 Cmd. 8742
Adherence—		
Mongolia* .. .. .	7 Oct., 1989 (effective date)	
*The Protocol on the Authentic Trilingual Text of the Convention also entered into force for Mongolia on October 7, 1989, in accordance with the provisions of Article V thereof (see Treaty Series No. 115(1969), Cmnd. 4198, p.3).		
Protocol on the Authentic Trilingual Text of the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Chicago, 1944) .. .. .	Buenos Aires, 24 Sept., 1968	115/1969 Cmnd. 4198
Acceptance—		
Cyprus .. .. .	2 July, 1989	
<b>BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS</b>		
See UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
<b>CONSERVATION</b>		
Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats .. .. .	Berne, 19 Sept., 1979	56/1982 Cmnd. 8738
Accession—		
Hungary (with reservations*) .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
*Reservations		
" APPENDIX I		
From among the plant species specified in Appendix I, three species occur in Hungary. The following plant species are not protected:		
Centaurea horrida Badaro		
Rheum rhaponticum L.		
There are 414 protected plant species in Hungary which are not listed in Appendix I of the Convention.		

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<b>CONSERVATION (continued)</b>		
APPENDIX II		
From among the species specified in Appendix II, the following ones are not protected in Hungary in any way:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cricetus cricetus</li> <li>Coenagrion fregi</li> <li>Coenagrion mercuriale</li> <li>Stylurus (= Gomphus) flavipes</li> <li>Ophiogomphus cecilia</li> <li>Oxygastra curtisii</li> <li>Leucorrhinia caudalis</li> <li>Leucorrhinia pectoralis</li> <li>Graphoderus bilineatus</li> <li>Cucujus cinnaberinus</li> <li>Melanargia arge</li> <li>Erebia calcaria</li> <li>Lopinga achine</li> <li>Lycaena dispar</li> <li>Maculinea arion</li> <li>Maculinea teleius</li> </ul>		
APPENDIX III		
From among the species specified in Appendix III, the following ones are not protected in Hungary:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Martes foina</li> <li>Putorius putorius</li> <li>Phalacrocorax carbo</li> <li>Fulica atra</li> <li>Streptopelia decaocto</li> <li>Passer montanus</li> <li>Eudontomyzon mariae</li> <li>Eudontomyzon vladkyovi</li> <li>Lampetra planeri</li> <li>Alosa pontica</li> <li>Coregonus albula</li> <li>Coregonus lavarodus</li> <li>Thymallus thymallus</li> <li>Abramis ballerus</li> <li>Abramis sapa</li> <li>Abramis vimba</li> <li>Chalcalburnus chalcoides</li> <li>Chondrostoma nasus</li> <li>Pelecus cultratus</li> <li>Rhodeus sericeus</li> <li>Rutilus frisii</li> <li>Rutilus pigus</li> <li>Gymnocephalus baloni</li> <li>Astacus astacus</li> <li>Helix pomatia</li> <li>Hirudo medicinalis</li> </ul>		
APPENDIX IV		
For the capture of Cervidae the use of anaesthetic shot and anaesthetic bait is allowed in Hungary.		
For the capture of Lepus capensis the use of nets is allowed in Hungary.		
For the killing of the following species the use of semi-automatic weapons is allowed in Hungary:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lepus capensis</li> <li>Phasianus colchicus</li> <li>Perdix perdix</li> <li>Anser Albifrons</li> <li>Anser fabalis</li> <li>Anas platyrhynchos</li> <li>Anas querquedula</li> <li>Anas crecca</li> <li>Anas penelope</li> <li>Aythya ferina</li> <li>Fulica atra</li> <li>Scolopax rusticola</li> <li>Streptopelia decaocto</li> <li>Columba palumbus</li> </ul>		

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>CONSERVATION (continued)</b>		
<p>Note— By a letter dated 28 September 1989, registered at the Secretariat-General of the Council of Europe on 3 October 1989, the Ministry of Environment of <i>Norway</i> gave notice of its withdrawal of objections to Amendments to Appendices II and III as follows:</p> <p>“ Following the decision of the Standing Committee of the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats to include several cetacean species in Appendix II of the Convention in December 1987, Norway made reservations regarding six of these species:</p> <p>Orcinus orca Lagenorhynchus acutus Lagenorhynchus albirostris Globicephala melaena Hyperoodon rostratus Mesoplodon bidens</p> <p>During the 8th meeting of the Standing Committee of the Convention, 6–9 June 1989, the Norwegian delegate informed the Committee that Norway prepared the withdrawal of the reservations regarding three of these species.</p> <p>On behalf of the Norwegian Government the Ministry of Environment hereby confirm the withdrawal of the reservations regarding the listing in Appendix II of the following three whale species:</p> <p>Globicephala melaena Hyperoodon rostratus Mesoplodon bidens</p> <p>The reservations will be maintained for the remaining three species.”</p>		
<b>CONSULAR RELATIONS</b>		
Vienna Convention on Consular Relations .. .. .	Vienna, 24 Apr., 1963	14/1973 Cmnd. 5219
Accession— South Africa .. .. .	21 Aug., 1989	
<b>CULTURAL PROPERTY</b>		
European Convention for the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage .. .. .	London, 6 May, 1969	26/1973 Cmnd. 5224
Ratification— Iceland .. .. .	19 Sept., 1989	
Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage .. .. .	Paris, 23 Nov., 1972	2/1985 Cmnd. 9424
Ratification— Albania .. .. .	10 July, 1989	
Acceptance— Indonesia .. .. .	6 July, 1989	
Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe .. .. .	Granada, 3 Oct., 1985	46/1988 Cm 439
Ratification— Turkey .. .. .	11 Oct., 1989	

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>CULTURAL RELATIONS</b>		
<b>European Cultural Convention</b> .. .. .	Paris, 19 Dec., 1954	49/1955 Cmd. 9545
Accessions—		
Hungary .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
Poland .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
<b>CUSTOMS</b>		
<b>Convention on the Nomenclature for the Classification of Goods in Customs Tariffs, with Protocol of Amendment of 1 July 1955</b> .. .. .	Brussels, 15 Dec., 1950	29/1960 Cmnd. 1070
Withdrawals—	<i>Effective dates</i>	
Nigeria .. .. .	25 Aug., 1990	
Senegal .. .. .	30 Aug., 1990	
<b>Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets</b> .. .. .	Geneva, 14 Nov., 1975	56/1983 Cmnd. 9032
Accession—		
Indonesia .. .. .	11 Oct., 1989	
<b>International Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance for the Prevention, Investigation and Repression of Customs Offences</b> .. .. .	Nairobi, 9 June, 1977	10/1984 Cmnd. 9153
Accession—		
Niger—Accepting Annexes II, V, VI, IX, X and XI ..	8 Sept., 1989	
<b>DISARMAMENT</b>		
<b>Treaty banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water</b> .. .. .	Moscow, 5 Aug., 1963	3/1964 Cmnd. 2245
Succession in Washington—		
Antigua and Barbuda .. .. .	1 Nov., 1981 (effective date)	
<b>DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS</b>		
<b>Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations</b> .. .. .	Vienna, 18 Apr., 1961	19/1965 Cmnd. 2565
Ratification—		
South Africa .. .. .	21 Aug., 1989	
<b>DOMINICA</b>		
<b>Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica for the Promotion and Protection of Investments</b> .. .. .	Roseau, 23 Jan., 1987	53/1987 Cm 252
By an Exchange of Notes at Bridgetown and Roseau, dated 25 September 1989 and 4 October 1989 respectively, the above Agreement was extended to the Bailiwicks of Jersey and Guernsey and to the Isle of Man.		
<b>DRUGS</b>		
<b>Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 as amended by the Protocol done at Geneva, on 25 March 1972 (for text of Protocol see Miscellaneous No. 19 (1976), Cmnd. 6487)</b>	New York, 30 Mar., 1961	23/1979 Cmnd. 7466

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>DRUGS (continued)</b>		
Note—		
On 6 October 1989, the instrument of accession to the <b>Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961</b> was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Government of <i>Jamaica</i> .		
In accordance with its Article 18(2), the Protocol will enter into force for Jamaica on 5 November 1989, i.e. the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit of the instrument. Consequently, Jamaica will also become on the same date a party to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol of 25 March 1972 amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, done at New York on 8 August 1975.		
<b>EDUCATION</b>		
<b>Convention on the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees concerning Higher Education in the States belonging to the Europe Region</b> .. .. .	Paris, 21 Dec., 1979	21/1986 Cmnd. 9762
Ratification—		
France .. .. .	28 July, 1989	
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS</b>		
<b>Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide</b> .. .. .	Paris, 9 Dec., 1948	58/1970 Cmnd. 4421
Note—		
In a communication dated 30 March 1989, received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 April 1989, the Government of the <i>Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic</i> notified the Secretary-General as follows: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has decided to withdraw the reservation to Article IX of the above-mentioned Convention made upon ratification which reservation read as follows:		
<i>[Translation]</i>		
As regards Article IX: The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider as binding upon itself the provisions of Article IX which provides that disputes between the Contracting Parties with regard to the interpretation, application and implementation of the present Convention shall be referred for examination to the International Court at the request of any party to the dispute, and declares that, as regards the International Court's jurisdiction in respect of disputes concerning the interpretation, application and implementation of the Convention, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will, as hitherto, maintain the position that in each particular case the agreement of all parties to the dispute is essential for the submission of any particular dispute to the International Court for decision.		
<b>Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms</b> .. .. .	Rome, 4 Nov., 1950	71/1953 Cmd. 8969
Renewal of Declarations under Article 25—		
France .. .. .	25 Sept., 1989 (for five years)	
Switzerland .. .. .	28 Nov., 1989 (for three years)	
Renewal of Declarations under Article 46—		
France .. .. .	25 Sept., 1989 (for five years)	
Iceland .. .. .	2 Sept., 1989 (for five years)	
<b>Convention on the Political Rights of Women</b> .. .. .	New York, 31 Mar., 1953	101/1967 Cmnd. 3449

HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<p>Note— In a communication dated 30 March 1989, received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 April 1989, the Government of the <i>Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic</i> notified the Secretary-General as follows: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has decided to withdraw the reservation to Article IX of the above-mentioned Convention made upon ratification which reservation read as follows:</p> <p>[Translation] As regards Article IX: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article IX which provides that disputes between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and declares that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.</p>		
<p><b>European Social Charter</b> .. .. .</p>	<p>Turin, 18 Oct., 1961</p>	<p>38/1965 Cmnd. 2643</p>
<p>Ratification— Turkey (with declaration*) .. .. .</p>	<p>24 Nov., 1989</p>	
<p>*Declaration “The Republic of Turkey declares, in accordance with Article 20, paragraph 2, that it considers itself bound by the following articles and paragraphs of the European Social Charter:</p> <p>a. In accordance with Article 20, paragraph 1(b): Articles 1, 12, 13, 16 and 19.</p> <p>b. In accordance with Article 20, paragraph 1(c): Articles 9, 10, 11, 14, 17 and 18 with all their paragraphs. Article 4, paragraphs 3 and 5. Article 7, paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9.”</p>		
<p><b>International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination</b> .. .. .</p>	<p>New York, 7 Mar., 1966</p>	<p>77/1969 Cmnd. 4108</p>
<p>Notes— In a communication dated 30 March 1989, received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 April 1989, the Government of the <i>Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic</i> notified the Secretary-General as follows: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has decided to withdraw the reservation to Article 22 of the above-mentioned Convention made upon ratification which reservation read as follows:</p> <p>[Translation] The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist 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.</p> <p>On 5 July 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Sweden</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):</p> <p>“The Swedish Government has examined the reservations made by Yemen with respect to Article 5(c) and Article 5(d)(iv), (vi) and (vii) of the Convention.</p> <p>Article 5 contains undertakings, in compliance with the fundamental obligations laid down in Article 2 of the</p>		

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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."</p>		
<p>On 7 July 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Finland</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (<i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):</p>		
<p>"The Government of Finland has taken note of the reservations made by Yemen when acceding to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The reservations concern Article 5(c) and Article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the Convention. These provisions lay down the obligation of the State party 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 ...'</p>		
<p>(c) Political rights, in particular the rights to participate in elections—to vote and stand for election—on the basis of universal and equal suffrage, to take part in the Government as well as in the conduct of public affairs at any level and to have equal access to public service.</p>		
<p>... (d) ...     (iv) The right to marriage and choice of spouse;     ...     (vi) The right to inherit;     (vii) The right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion;     ...</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>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 the 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.</p>		
<p>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 fundamental rights and liberties is clearly against the general</p>		



## HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)

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."

On 10 July 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of *Denmark* the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):

"... the Government of Denmark does not accept the reservations made by the Government of Yemen upon accession to the Convention, reservations which concern Article 5(e) and Article 5(d)(iv), (vi) and (vii) of the Convention.

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, §2 of the Convention. In accordance with Article 20, §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."

On 25 July 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of the *Netherlands* the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):

"The Permanent Representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and, with reference to the latter's Note C.N.81.1989.TREATIES-2 (Depositary Notification) of 10 May 1989, concerning the reservations of Yemen in respect of the Articles 5(c) and 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, opened for signature at New York on 7 March 1966, made upon its accession to that Convention on 6 April 1989, has the honour to inform the Secretary-General that the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned reservations, as they are incompatible with the 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."

On 28 July 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of *Norway* the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):

"The Government of Norway has taken note of the reservations made by Yemen when acceding to the International Convention on the Elimination on All Forms of Racial Discrimination. The instrument of accession contains

Date

Treaty Series  
and  
Command Nos.

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b>		
<p>reservations in respect of Article 5, paragraph (c) and Article 5, paragraph (d), sub-paragraphs (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the Convention.</p>		
<p>The Government of Norway hereby enters its formal objection to the reservations made by Yemen."</p>		
<p>On 4 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>New Zealand</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (<i>see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8</i>):</p>		
<p>"The New Zealand Government welcomes the accession by Yemen to this Convention which contains fundamental human rights. However, the instrument of accession contains reservations in respect of Article 5, paragraph (c) and Article 5, paragraph (d), sub-paragraphs (iv), (vi) and (vii) of the Convention.</p>		
<p>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 Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.</p>		
<p>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."</p>		
<p>On 4 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of the <i>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (<i>see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8</i>):</p>		
<p>"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."</p>		
<p>On 7 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Italy</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (<i>see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8</i>):</p>		
<p>"The Government of the Republic of Italy raise an objection to the reservations entered by the Government of the Arab Republic of Yemen to Article 5 (c) and (d) rom. 4, rom. 6 and rom. 7 of the above-mentioned Convention."</p>		
<p>On 8 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Australia</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (<i>see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8</i>):</p>		
<p>"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."</p>		
<p>On 8 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Belgium</i> the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (<i>see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8</i>):</p>		
<p>[<i>Translation</i>] The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium objects to the reservations made by the Government of the Yemen Arab Republic with regard to Article 5, paragraphs (c) and (d) (iv), (vi) and (vii), of the International Convention on the</p>		

## HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)

Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. 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.

On 8 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of the *Federal Republic of Germany* the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany raises an objection to the reservations made by the Government of 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. 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."

On 10 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of *Canada* the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):

"The Government of Canada hereby formally objects to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic when ratifying the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic are in respect to Article 5, paragraph (c) and Article 5, paragraph (d), subparagraphs (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."

On 11 August 1989 the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of *Mexico* the following objection with regard to the reservations made by the Yemen Arab Republic on accession (see Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8):

## [Translation]

Having studied the provisions in respect of which the Government of Yemen has entered a reservation, namely, Article 5 (c) and Article 5(d) (iv), (vi) and (vii) of said Convention, the Government of the United Mexican States has concluded that, in view of Article 20 of that same 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

Date

Treaty Series  
and  
Command Nos.

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<p><b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b></p> <p>impediment to the entry into force of the Convention of 1966 between the United States of Mexico and the Government of Yemen.</p> <p>On 12 September 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received the following declaration from the Government of Algeria:</p> <p><i>[Translation]</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>On 13 September 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received the following declaration from the Government of Hungary:</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>In a communication received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 13 September 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to Article 22 of the above-mentioned Convention made upon ratification (<i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 77 (1969), Cmnd. 4108, p.110), which reservation reads as follows:</p> <p>"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by Article 22 of the Convention providing that any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision. The Hungarian People's Republic takes the view that such disputes shall be referred to the International Court of Justice only by agreement of all parties concerned."</p>		
<p><b>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</b></p>	<p>New York, 19 Dec., 1966</p>	<p>6/1977 Cmnd. 6702</p>
<p><b>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</b></p>		
<p>Ratification— Algeria (with declarations*) . . . . .</p>	<p>12 Sept., 1989</p>	
<p><i>*Declarations [translation]</i></p> <p>1. The Algerian Government interprets Article 1, which is common to the two Covenants, as in no case impairing the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and to control over their natural wealth and resources.</p> <p>It further considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories referred to in Article 1, paragraph 3, of the two Covenants and in Article 14 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights is contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, to the Charter of the Organization and to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)).</p> <p>2. The Algerian Government interprets the provisions of Article 8 of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Article 22 of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as making the law the framework for action by the State with respect to the organization and exercise of the right to organize.</p>		

**HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)**

3. The Algerian Government considers that the provisions of Article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4, of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights can in no case impair its right freely to organize its educational system.

4. The Algerian Government interprets the provisions of Article 23, paragraph 4, of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights regarding the rights and responsibilities of spouses as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution as in no case impairing the essential foundations of the Algerian legal system.

Furthermore, the instrument of ratification was accompanied by a declaration by which the Government of Algeria recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee under Article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The declaration reads as follows:

*[Translation]*

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Algeria declares, pursuant to Article 41 of the Covenant, that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in Article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant.

**International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** . . . .

*Derogations under Article 4:*

**I**

On 29 October 1987, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of *Ecuador* a notification dated 28 October 1987, informing the Secretary-General that a state of national emergency had been declared through the national territory, effective as of 28 October 1987 under Executive Decree No. 3376. On 30 October 1987, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received a further communication informing him that the state of emergency had been terminated on 29 October 1987, at 0 hour.

**II**

On 3 June 1988, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of *Ecuador* two notifications, dated respectively 1 and 2 June 1988, concerning respectively the proclamation of the state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as from 9 p.m. on 31 May 1988 and the subsequent termination of the said state of emergency, on 1 June 1988. The following is a translation of the notification concerning the said declaration of the state of emergency:

*[Translation]*

In accordance with the provisions of Article 4, paragraph 3, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of Ecuador [hereby notifies that it] declared a state of national emergency throughout the national territory, effective as from 9 p.m. on 31 May 1988.

Owing to the special circumstances, the constitutional guarantees as provided for and as limited in Article 78(n)(6) of the Constitution, ensuring the inviolability of life and security of person and prohibiting the deportation and local banishment of Ecuadorians, have been suspended; a security zone has been declared throughout the Republic, subject to the relevant laws; and censorship has been announced in respect of organs of the mass media which attempt to subvert the legal order. In order to ensure the safety of students, all educational activities have been suspended for 48 hours.

This emergency measure is the necessary legal response to the 24-hour work stoppage called for by the Frente Unitario de Trabajadores (United Workers' Front) and scheduled for today, since incitement to national strikes and work stoppages threatens the existing legal order and since such unlawful action as is envisaged may lead to acts of vandalism, violations

*Date*

*Treaty Series  
and  
Command Nos.*

New York,  
19 Dec., 1966

6/1977  
Cmnd. 6702

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<p><b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b></p>		
<p>of the security of person of individuals and attacks on public and private property, thereby creating a serious state of domestic disturbance.</p>		
<p>Subsequently, on 9 August 1989, the Government of <i>Ecuador</i> has specified, in accordance with Article 4(3) of the Covenant that the Articles thereof that were derogated from by virtue of the proclamations of the state of emergency were Articles 9(1) and (2); 12(1) and (2); 19(2); and 21.</p>		
<p>III</p>		
<p>On 7 June 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received in the name of the Government of <i>Argentina</i> a notification dated 7 June 1989, as follows:</p>		
<p>[<i>Translation</i>]</p>		
<p>I have the honour to write to you in your capacity as depositary of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the Argentine Republic ratified on 2 June 1986, and with reference to Article 4 of that international instrument, to inform you that, on 29 May 1989, a state of siege was proclaimed throughout the national territory for a period of 30 days in response to events whose seriousness jeopardizes the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by the entire community, objective conditions which have prompted the declaration of the state of siege.</p>		
<p>As world public opinion has learnt, the regrettable incidents which have occurred recently in the country started with the perpetration of attacks, breaks-ins and looting at supermarkets and other retail shops, and, while these acts have, for the most part, been committed by individuals from the disadvantaged segments of society, in nearly every case the presence of instigators has been noted, who have, in a co-ordinated way, incited the population to commit acts of vandalism and other abuses.</p>		
<p>The emergency measures originally adopted by the national Government proved inadequate to resolve the crisis and stop the attacks and break-ins, which spread to involve passers-by and private homes, thereby seriously disturbing public order and general security.</p>		
<p>In addition, the presence of agitators who possess the logistic capacity to interfere with communications and who, moreover, have used firearms, led to acts of physical violence and intimidation, thereby creating a generalized climate of insecurity and fear among the population at large which forced the national authorities to take extraordinary measures to restore normality, public tranquillity and domestic peace.</p>		
<p>The serious incidents that have occurred have similar and, in the majority of cases, identical characteristics, in spite of the fact that they have taken place in different parts of the country, namely, Buenos Aires, Chaco, Corrientes, La Pampa, Mendoza, Neuquén, Río Negro, Salta, Santa Fe, San Juan and Tucumán.</p>		
<p>These widely known events, which, as will be noted, make for a true state of internal disturbance, have made it necessary to take emergency measures; these measures have taken the form of the declaration of a state of siege by decree No. 714/89 of the National Executive, which was immediately ratified by the National Congress by Act No. 23.662.</p>		
<p>Measures adopted:</p>		
<p>It should be pointed out that none of the measures adopted pursuant to the state of siege impair or affect the inviolable rights protected by Article 4, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. On the contrary, the measures are limited to restrictions on the freedom of movement of the inhabitants, and, to date, only 24 persons have been detained on the orders of the National Executive in the exercise of the powers vested in it by Article 23 of the National Constitution.</p>		
<p>In addition, the power to restrict the right of assembly has been delegated to the governors of the provinces and, in the</p>		

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<p><b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b></p> <p>case of the federal capital, to the Minister of the Interior, and the prior authorization of those authorities is required for the holding of political meetings or meetings which by their nature may give rise to acts that might disrupt public order.</p> <p>Furthermore, the governors of the provinces may also place restrictions on the freedom of movement for specified periods of time in areas under their jurisdiction where events might take place that could disturb domestic peace.</p> <p>Lastly, it can be expected that the Government of Argentina, faithful to the international commitments it has assumed, especially with respect to the promotion and protection of human rights, will keep all the States parties to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights informed, through you and in a timely and adequate manner, about developments in the situation and about the measures adopted to restore normality and the effect which those measures may have on the enjoyment and effective exercise of the human rights and fundamental freedoms protected by the Covenant.</p> <p>The Government of Argentina has specified that the Articles of the Covenant that are derogated from are Articles 9 and 21. The Government of Argentina has further specified that, although under the provisions of the state of siege proclamation, it was contemplated derogating also from Article 12, it was in fact not necessary to do so.</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">IV</p> <p>On 12 July 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received in the name of the Government of <i>Argentina</i> a subsequent notification dated 11 July 1989, advising that the state of siege had been lifted. This notification reads as follows:</p> <p><i>[Translation]</i></p> <p>On instructions from my Government, and in connection with my note NU No. 99/89/601/307 of 7 July 1989, I have the honour to inform you that, on 27 June 1989, the President of the Republic ordered that the state of siege be lifted throughout the national territory. This action was taken because the circumstances which had given rise to the imposition of the state of siege on 28 May 1989 for a period of 30 days no longer existed.</p> <p>The present communication is being made under Article 4, paragraph 3, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.</p> <p>In my earlier communication, I informed you of the reasons and described the serious incidents which had given rise to the imposition of the state of siege. On that occasion, I stated that the Argentine Government was willing to continue to provide information and to give further details of the scope of the measures taken. In that connection, I would mention that the declaration of the state of siege was limited to suspending the exercise of the rights of assembly and movement throughout the national territory. In addition, restrictions on individual freedom of movement were imposed in some cases by virtue of the constitutional powers conferred on the President of the Republic by Article 23 of the Constitution.</p> <p>While the state of siege was in force, 57 people were arrested, held at the disposal of the national executive branch and gradually released. In instructions issued to provincial governors, the Minister of the Interior established the conditions governing detention: detainees were to be held in places permitting the necessary communication, and were to be kept separate from common criminals, special provision was to be made for detained minors, unjustified inspections and the possibility of self-inflicted physical injury were to be avoided, detainees were to be allowed to receive visits and any kind of personal effects, their health and nutrition were to be protected, and any other steps which would help to ensure that such conditions were effectively applied were to be taken. The remedy of habeas corpus was invoked in only 13 cases. On only three occasions was it upheld by judges of first instance and in</p>		

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<p><b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b></p>		
<p>all three cases the remedies were later quashed by courts of appeal for lack of cause. From the standpoint of domestic law, the declaration of the state of siege offered the safeguards established by the Supreme Court of Justice of Argentina: judicial controls to determine whether arrests were reasonable functioned fully. The law courts, which are responsible for protecting individual rights in a state of emergency, declared not only that the state of siege was legal but also that there was a direct relationship between the circumstances which gave rise to the state of emergency and the arrests that took place.</p>		
<p>The restrictions imposed on the exercise of the rights of assembly and movement were very limited and designed simply to maintain order and put an end to the internal unrest which had given rise to the declaration of the state of siege. During the state of emergency, restrictions were imposed on the right to hold, in public places or in places to which the public has access, meetings of a political nature or of a nature such as might give rise to incidents disruptive of law and order. Only meetings that had the prior express authorization of the Ministry of the Interior could be held. Of the 36 requests for authorization made during the state of siege, only four were denied. It should be mentioned that, although the national executive branch authorized provincial governors to restrict the exercise of the right of freedom of movement, the governors took no steps to restrict that right.</p>		
<p>Lastly, the population was kept permanently informed of the course of events. To that end, the Ministry of the Interior issued eight press releases giving detailed information on the situation.</p>		
<p>It can be concluded from the foregoing that both the declaration of the state of siege and the measures taken while it was in force were fully in keeping with the relevant requirements of domestic and international law. The state of emergency was declared in response to a situation of internal unrest and for the sole purpose of restoring normality and ensuring the full exercise of the human rights of the population as a whole. The principle that the measure should be temporary was respected, in that the state of siege was imposed for 30 days by the President of the Republic, with the immediate approval of the National Congress. The measures taken were limited to those strictly necessary to restore order and in no case affected the inalienable rights protected by Article 4, paragraph 2, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Furthermore, they involved no discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, economic position, birth or any other social condition. The communication provided for in that Article was also made.</p>		
<p>Lastly, the restrictions on individual freedom of movement were in all cases subject to judicial oversight to determine whether they were reasonable in relation to the circumstances that motivated them. Moreover, the measures taken were effective, for they protected the human rights and restored the peace and tranquillity of the entire national community.</p>		
<p>V</p>		
<p>On 4 August 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Peru</i> a notification, dated 2 August 1989, as follows:</p>		
<p>[<i>Translation</i>]</p>		
<p>By Supreme Decree No. 0019-89-IN of 28 July 1989 and in accordance with the provisions of Article 4(3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Government of Peru, by the authority granted under Article 231 of the Political Constitution of the State, has extended the state of emergency for a period of 30 days from 31 July 1989 in the Department of Ucayali and the Province of Ucayali-Contamaná of the Department of Loreto.</p>		
<p>In consequence, the individual guarantees provided for in paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 20(G) of Article 20 of the Political Constitution of Peru have been suspended.</p>		



	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b>		
<p>During the state of emergency, the Armed Forces will continue to maintain domestic public order in the departments and provinces cited.</p>		
<p>With reference to the above communication, the Secretary-General wishes to recall that the Government of Peru has previously informed him that the rights provided for in paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 20(G) of Article 2 of the Constitution of Peru, mentioned in the said notification, relate to the inviolability of the domicile, the right of liberty of movement within the national territory, the right of peaceful assembly and the right to liberty and security of persons, which rights correspond to those provided for in Articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the Covenant.</p>		
VI		
<p>On 15 August 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Peru</i> a notification, dated 14 August 1989, as follows:</p>		
<p>[Translation]</p>		
<p>By Supreme Decree No. 0021-89-IN of 9 August 1989, the Government of Peru, by the authority vested in it under Article 231 of the Political Constitution of the State, has declared a state of emergency for a period of 30 days from 9 August 1989 in the Province of Huarochiri of the Department of Lima.</p>		
<p>In consequence, the individual guarantees provided for in Article 2, paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 20(G) of the Political Constitution of Peru have been suspended.</p>		
<p>During the state of emergency, the Armed Forces will continue to maintain domestic public order in the department and province cited.</p>		
<p>With reference to the above communication, the Secretary-General wishes to recall that the Government of Peru has previously informed him that the rights provided for in paragraphs 7, 9, 10 and 20(G) of Article 2 of the Constitution of Peru, mentioned in the said notification, relate to the inviolability of the domicile, the right of liberty of movement within the national territory, the right of peaceful assembly and the right to liberty and security of persons, which rights correspond to those provided for in Articles 17, 12, 21 and 9 of the Covenant.</p>		
VII		
<p>On 29 August 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of <i>Sri Lanka</i> a notification, dated 18 August 1989, as follows:</p>		
<p>The Government of Sri Lanka has the honour to refer to its notification dated 13 January 1989 (Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.8), made under Article 4 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights informing that by virtue of a Proclamation to that effect by the President of Sri Lanka, the State of Emergency which continued since July 1983, had ceased to exist with effect from 11 January 1989.</p>		
<p>Immediately after the lifting of the Emergency, over 1800 persons who were held in detention were released unconditionally. However, subsequently, many acts of violence, including the murder of innocent persons, burning of buses, destruction of government property and other acts of sabotage were committed by various subversive groups. It is now manifest that subversives who are operating in various parts of the country are making every effort to disrupt government activities and to damage the economy of the country.</p>		
<p>In view of the progressive escalation of violence, acts of sabotage and the disruption of essential services throughout the country, the Government has been reluctantly compelled, in the interest of national security and the well-being of the people of Sri Lanka, to invoke Part II of the Public Security Ordinance and declare a State of Emergency throughout the country.</p>		

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b>		
<p>The State of Emergency took effect on 20 June 1989, and the Proclamation of the President under the Public Security Ordinance was published in the Official Gazette No. 563/7 of 20 June 1989. The Emergency is required to be renewed by a resolution of Parliament after the expiry of each 30 day period.</p>		
<p>The Emergency Regulations do not derogate from any of the non-derogable Articles set out in Article 4(2) of the Covenant. However, the regulations derogate in certain respects from the provisions of Article 9(2).</p>		
<p>In terms of Emergency Regulation 16, power has been given to the Secretary, Ministry of Defence, where he is of the opinion with respect to any particular person, with a view to preventing that person from acting, <i>inter alia</i>, in any manner prejudicial to the national security or to the maintenance of public order or to the maintenance of essential services, it is necessary so to do, to make an order restricting the movements of such person in any part of Sri Lanka.</p>		
<p>Emergency Regulation 17 empowers the Secretary, where he is of opinion, with regard to any person, that, with a view to preventing such persons from acting, <i>inter alia</i>, in any manner prejudicial to the national security or to the maintenance of public order or to the maintenance of essential services, it is necessary so to do, to make an order that such person be taken into custody and detained in custody.</p>		
<p>Emergency Regulation 17, is, however, subject to the safeguard provided in Emergency Regulation 17(4), whereby any person aggrieved by an order made against him may make his objections to an Advisory Committee appointed by the President.</p>		
<p>The remedy provided by the Prerogative Writ of Habeas Corpus is also available to canvas an order made by the Secretary.</p>		
<p>The Court of Appeal in a recent judgement has pronounced upon the powers of judicial review in relation to an order made by the Secretary, in terms of Emergency Regulation 17. The Court stated:—</p>		
<p>“(1) That the powers vested in the Secretary to the Ministry of Defence in terms of Regulation 17(1)(a) to order the arrest and detention of any person can be exercised if the conduct proximate in point of time of that person is such that if he is not arrested and detained he is likely to act in a manner prejudicial to the national security or to the maintenance of essential services;</p>		
<p>(2) That a detention order issued by the Secretary is subject to review by Court in a proceeding for a Writ of Habeas Corpus on the ground of reasonableness. The Court will consider whether grounds existed which are capable of supporting the Secretary's decision and whether the Secretary has misdirected himself on the law.</p>		
<p>(3) That the ouster provisions contained in Section 8 of the Public Security Ordinance and Regulation 17(10), do not preclude the Court from examining and ruling upon the validity of a detention order issued in terms of Regulation 17(1)(a)”. (Court of Appeal Habeas Corpus Application 7/88).</p>		
<p>The measures set out in Emergency Regulations 16 and 17 are strictly required by the exigencies of the Emergency situation.</p>		
<p>The Government of Sri Lanka has the honour to state further, that the Emergency Regulations are not inconsistent with Sri Lanka's other obligations under International Law and do not involve discrimination solely on the grounds of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin.</p>		
<p>The Emergency Regulations are temporary measures necessitated by the existence of an extraordinary security situation. It is not intended to continue with them longer than it is absolutely necessary.</p>		

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>HUMAN RIGHTS (continued)</b>		
<b>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</b> .. .. .	New York, 18 Dec., 1979	2/1989 Cm 643
Accession— Antigua and Barbuda .. .. .	1 Aug., 1989	
Note— In a communication dated 30 March 1989, received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 April 1989, the Government of the <i>Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic</i> notified the Secretary-General as follows: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has decided to withdraw the reservation to Article 29(1) of the above-mentioned Convention made upon ratification which reservation read as follows:		
[Translation] Pursuant to Article 29, paragraph 2, of the Convention the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention, according to which any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of this Convention, which is not settled by negotiations, shall, upon the request of any one of the Parties, be referred to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and declares that the referral of any such dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice shall in each case require the consent of all Parties to the dispute.		
<b>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY</b>		
<b>Convention on the Unification of Certain Points of Substantive Law on Patents for Invention</b> .. .. .	Strasbourg, 27 Nov., 1963	70/1980 Cmnd. 8002
Ratification— Denmark .. .. .	29 Sept., 1989	
<b>Convention establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization</b> .. .. .	Stockholm, 14 July, 1967	52/1970 Cmnd. 4408
Ratification— Madagascar .. .. .	22 Sept., 1989	
Accessions— Thailand .. .. . Yemen, People's Democratic Republic .. .. .	25 Sept., 1989 27 Sept., 1989	
<b>Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), as amended</b> .. .. .	Washington, 19 June, 1970	78/1978 Cmnd. 7340
Ratification— Canada .. .. .	2 Oct., 1989	
<b>Universal Copyright Convention, as revised (with Protocols 1 and 2)</b> .. .. .	Paris, 24 July, 1971	9/1975 Cmnd. 5844
Accession— Rwanda (Convention and Potocols 1 and 2)* .. .. .	10 Aug., 1989	
*Accession by Rwanda to the above Convention also constitutes accession to the <b>Universal Copyright Convention of 1952</b> (see Treaty Series No. 66 (1957), Cmnd. 289). Under the terms of paragraph 2(c) of the aforementioned Protocol 1 on the entry into force of this Protocol in respect of Rwanda, Protocol 1 annexed to the 1952 Convention shall be deemed to enter into force in respect of that State.		
<b>Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against unauthorised Duplication of their Phonograms</b>	Geneva, 29 Oct., 1971	41/1973 Cmnd. 5275
Accession— Honduras .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	

	Date	Treaty Series and Command Nos.
<b>INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY (continued)</b>		
Nice Agreement concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services for the purposes of the Registration of Marks of 15 June, 1957, as revised at Stockholm on 14 July, 1967 and at Geneva on 13 May, 1977 .. .. .	Geneva, 13 May, 1977	72/1979 Cmnd. 7671
Accession— Japan .. .. .	17 Nov., 1989	
<b>INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT</b>		
Articles of Agreement for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (for 1965 amendments <i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 78 (1966), Cmnd. 3156 .. .. .	Washington, 27 Dec., 1945	21/1946 Cmnd. 6885
Signature— Angola .. .. .	19 Sept., 1989	
Acceptance— Angola .. .. .	19 Sept., 1989	
<b>INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND</b>		
Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund (for amendments <i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 44 (1978), Cmnd. 7205 and Treaty Series No. 83 (1978), Cmnd. 7331 .. .. .	Washington, 27 Dec., 1945	21/1946 Cmnd. 6885
Signature— Angola .. .. .	19 Sept., 1989	
Acceptance— Angola .. .. .	19 Sept., 1989	
<b>LAW</b>		
Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties .. .. .	Vienna, 23 May, 1969	58/1980 Cmnd. 7964
Accession— Solomon Islands .. .. .	9 Aug., 1989	
Note— On 11 October 1989, the Secretary-General of the United Nations received from the Government of the <i>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</i> the following objection with regard to the reservation made by Algeria upon accession to the above-mentioned Convention ( <i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 61 (1989), Cm 949 p.16): “The Government of the United Kingdom wish in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 (in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) ( <i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 61 (1987), Cm 286, p.20) which in accordance with its terms applies to the reservations mentioned above, and will similarly apply to any like reservations which any other State may formulate.”		
<b>MARITIME LAW</b>		
International Convention on Certain Rules concerning Civil Jurisdiction in Matters of Collision .. .. .	Brussels, 10 May, 1952	47/1960 Cmnd. 1128
Accession— Ireland, Republic of .. .. .	17 Oct., 1989	

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>MARITIME LAW (continued)</b>		
<b>International Convention</b> relating to the Arrest of Sea-going Ships	Brussels, 10 May, 1952	
Accession— Ireland, Republic of (with reservation*) .. .. .	17 Oct., 1989	
<i>*Reservation</i> "Ireland reserves the right not to apply the provisions of this Convention to warships or to ships owned by or in the service of a State".		
<b>International Convention</b> relating to the Limitation of the Liability of Owners of Sea-going Ships .. .. .	Brussels, 10 Oct., 1957	52/1968 Cmnd. 3678
Denunciations—	<i>Effective dates</i>	
Belgium .. .. .	1 Oct., 1990	
Netherlands* .. .. .	1 Sept., 1990	
<i>*Note—</i> On 9 October 1989 the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs received from the Government of the <i>Netherlands</i> a Note dated 21 September 1989, notifying that the denunciation of the above-mentioned Convention by the Netherlands is not valid for Aruba.		
<b>PLANTS</b>		
<b>International Convention</b> for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants of 2 December 1961 as revised at Geneva on 10 November 1972, and on 23 October 1978 .. .. .	Geneva, 23 Oct., 1978	11/1984 Cmnd. 9152
Accession— Poland .. .. .	11 Oct., 1989	
<b>PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW</b>		
<b>Convention</b> on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters .. .. .	The Hague, 15 Nov., 1965	50/1969 Cmnd. 3986
Signature— Ireland, Republic of* .. .. .	20 Oct., 1989	
<i>*Subject to ratification</i>		
Accession— Canada .. .. .	1 May, 1989 (effective date)	
<i>Note—</i> The Government of <i>Canada</i> transmitted by Note of 3 January 1989 to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands a revised version of the "Canadian Document related to the Accession to the Hague Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters" to replace the document that was transmitted on the occasion of the deposit of its instrument of accession on 26 September 1988.		
<b>European Convention</b> on Information on Foreign Law .. .. .	London, 7 June, 1968	117/1969 Cmnd. 4229
Accession— Hungary .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
<b>Convention</b> on the Taking of Evidence abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters .. .. .	The Hague, 18 Mar., 1970	20/1977 Cmnd. 6727

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL LAW (continued)</b>		
Note—		
The following States declared their acceptance of the accession of the <i>United Mexican States</i> to the above-mentioned Convention:		
Argentina .. .. .	26 Oct., 1989	
Israel .. .. .	18 Oct., 1989	
Norway .. .. .	21 Sept., 1989	
United States of America .. .. .	25 Oct., 1989	
In accordance with Article 39 the Convention will enter into force between the <i>United Mexican States</i> and—		
Argentina .. .. .	25 Dec., 1989	
Israel .. .. .	17 Dec., 1989	
Norway .. .. .	20 Nov., 1989	
United States of America .. .. .	24 Dec., 1989	
<b>European Agreement on the Transmission of Applications for Legal Aid</b> .. .. .	Strasbourg, 27 Jan., 1977	39/1978 Cmnd. 7179
Signature—		
Netherlands* .. .. .	10 Oct., 1989	
*Subject to acceptance		
<b>Additional Protocol to the European Convention on Information on Foreign Law</b> .. .. .	Strasbourg, 15 Mar., 1978	88/1981 Cmnd. 8431
Accession—		
Hungary .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
Iceland .. .. .	19 Sept., 1989	
<b>Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction</b> .. .. .	The Hague, 25 Oct., 1980	66/1986 Cm 33
Note—		
The following State declared its acceptance of the accession of <i>Belize</i> to the above-mentioned Convention—		
United States of America .. .. .	14 Aug., 1989	
In accordance with Article 38, paragraph 5, the Convention will enter into force between <i>Belize</i> and		
United States of America .. .. .	1 Nov., 1989	
<b>PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES</b>		
<b>Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations</b> .. .. .	London, 13 Feb., 1946	10/1950 Cmnd. 7891
Note—		
In a communication received on 7 August 1989, the Government of <i>Bulgaria</i> notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it has decided to withdraw the reservation with respect to Section 30 of the Convention made upon accession ( <i>see</i> Treaty Series No. 87 (1960), Cmnd. 1276, p. 10) which reservation read as follows:		
<i>(Translation)</i>		
The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provision of Section 30 of the Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and, with respect to the competence of the International Court in the case of differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention, the position of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is that, for the submission of a particular dispute to the International Court for settlement, the consent of all parties to the dispute is necessary in each case. This reservation also applies to the provision of the same section that the advisory opinion given by the International Court shall be accepted as decisive.		
The said withdrawal took effect on 7 August 1989, the date of receipt of the notification.		

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES (continued)</b>		
<b>General Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Council of Europe</b> .. .. .	Paris, 2 Sept., 1949	34/1953 Cmd. 8852
Accession— Finland .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
<b>Protocol to the General Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Council of Europe</b> .. .. .	Strasbourg, 6 Nov., 1952	17/1957 Cmnd. 84
Accession— Finland .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
<b>Second Protocol to the General Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Council of Europe</b> .. .. .	Paris, 15 Dec., 1956	50/1958 Cmnd. 579
Signature— Finland* .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
*With reservation in respect of ratification		
Ratification— Finland .. .. .	11 Dec., 1989	
<b>Fourth Protocol to the General Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the Council of Europe</b> .. .. .	Paris, 16 Dec., 1961	58/1971 Cmnd. 4739
Signature— Finland* .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
*With reservation in respect of ratification		
Ratification— Finland .. .. .	11 Dec., 1989	
<b>ROAD TRANSPORT</b>		
<b>Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Conditions of Approval and Reciprocal Recognition of Approval for Motor Vehicle Equipment and Parts</b> .. .. .	Geneva, 20 Mar., 1958	7/1965 Cmnd. 2535
<b>Regulation No. 15: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles equipped with a positive-ignition engine with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine</b>		
Termination of application— United Kingdom .. .. .	1 Oct., 1990 (effective date)	
<b>Regulation No. 75: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of pneumatic tyres for motor cycles</b>		
Acceptance— United Kingdom .. .. .	28 Nov., 1989 (effective date)	
<b>Regulation No. 77: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of parking lamps for power-driven vehicles</b>		
Acceptance— Belgium .. .. .	19 Dec., 1989 (effective date)	
<b>Regulation No. 78: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles of category L with regard to braking</b>		
Acceptance— Belgium .. .. .	19 Dec., 1989 (effective date)	

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>ROAD TRANSPORT (continued)</b>		
<b>Regulation No. 83: Uniform provisions concerning the approval of vehicles with regard to the emission of gaseous pollutants by the engine according to the engine fuel requirements</b>		
Acceptances—	<i>Effective dates</i>	
France .. .. .	5 Nov., 1989	
Italy .. .. .	18 Dec., 1989	
The Netherlands .. .. .	5 Nov., 1989	
United Kingdom .. .. .	28 Nov., 1989	
<b>Protocol to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR) .. .. .</b>	Geneva, 1 Sept., 1978– 31 Aug., 1979	6/1981 Cmnd. 8138
Accession—		
Portugal .. .. .	22 Aug., 1989	
<b>SHIPPING</b>		
<b>Special Trade Passenger Ships Agreement, 1971 .. .. .</b>	London 6 Oct., 1971	7/1980 Cmnd. 7761
Accession—		
Cyprus .. .. .	24 Aug., 1989	
<b>Protocol on Space Requirements for Special Trade Passenger Ships, 1973 .. .. .</b>	London, 13 July, 1973	7/1980 Cmnd. 7761
Accession—		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines .. .. .	31 Aug., 1989	
<b>Protocol to the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1969 .. .. .</b>	London, 19 Nov., 1976	26/1981 Cmnd. 8238
Accessions—		
Belgium .. .. .	15 June, 1989	
Cyprus .. .. .	19 June, 1989	
<b>International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978 .. .. .</b>	London, 1 Dec., 1978– 30 Nov., 1979	50/1984 Cmnd. 9266
Accession—		
Cape Verde .. .. .	18 Sept., 1989	
<b>Note—</b>		
The Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization received from the Government of <i>Belgium</i> the following communication on the application, by the Belgian Administration, of regulations II/5, III/5 and IV/2 of the above-mentioned Convention:		
"I have the honour to submit to your Organisation a report concerning the way of implementation of the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (1978) and feel pleased to inform the Secretariat that the Belgian Government has issued the proper documents STCW-cards to the Masters, Deck-officers and Engineer-officers and Radio-officers, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the aforementioned Convention such as approved by the Belgian legislation on 16th August 1982, and as published in the "Moniteur belge" (Official Journal) on 29th October 1982.		
Furthermore I have the honour to inform you that the competent Belgian Authorities have taken the necessary measures, in order to live up to their obligations as laid down in particular in rules II, 5 (Masters and Deck officers), III, 5 (Engineers), and IV, 2 (Radio Officers), and have consequently verified that bearers of said certificates still meet the requirements as specified by the aforementioned convention.		



	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>SHIPPING (continued)</b>		
<p>Taking into account the foregoing, and after thorough examination, the Belgian Authorities have decided that the current STCW-certificates, duly issued by the competent services will remain valid, for the forthcoming five years, unless specific notification to this effect, in particular circumstances, by our side.</p> <p>The Belgian Maritime Administration avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organisations the expression of its highest consideration while restating that it will seek to further promote the proper implementation of this instrument in the future."</p>		
<b>TELECOMMUNICATIONS</b>		
<b>Commonwealth Telecommunications Organisation Financial Agreement, 1983</b> .. .. .	London, 30 Mar., 1983	58/1984 Cmnd. 9317
Signature— Seychelles .. .. .	3 Nov., 1989	
<b>TERRORISM</b>		
<b>European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism</b> ..	Strasbourg, 27 Jan., 1977	93/1978 Cmnd. 7390
Signature— Finland .. .. .	16 Nov., 1989	
<b>International Convention against the Taking of Hostages</b> ..	Adopted New York, 17 Dec., 1979	81/1983 Cmnd. 9100
Accession— Cote d'Ivoire .. .. .	22 Aug., 1989	
<b>UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION—</b>		
<b>Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (as amended) (see also Treaty Series No. 82 (1965), Cmnd. 2784; Treaty Series No. 99 (1970), Cmnd. 4511; Treaty Series No. 104 (1976), Cmnd. 6651 and Treaty Series No. 59 (1977), Cmnd. 6864)</b> .. .. .	London, 16 Nov., 1945	36/1961 Cmnd. 1376
Signatures— Cook Islands .. .. .	25 Oct., 1989	
Kiribati .. .. .	24 Oct., 1989	
Acceptances— Cook Islands .. .. .	25 Oct., 1989	
Kiribati .. .. .	24 Oct., 1989	
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>		
<b>Exchange of Letters concerning the Cayman Islands and Matters connected with, arising from, related to, or resulting from any Narcotics Activity referred to in the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 (see also Treaty Series No. 67 (1986), Cm 61, p.17; Treaty Series No. 68 (1986), Cm 159, p.21; Treaty Series No. 47 (1987), Cm 217, p.30; Treaty Series No. 62 (1987), Cm 345, p.25; Treaty Series No. 79 (1988), Cm 597, p.20; Treaty Series No. 81 (1988), Cm 749, p.16; Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm 988, p.20).</b> ..	London, 26 July, 1984	70/1984 Cmnd. 9344
<p>In an Exchange of Notes at Washington on 28 November 1989 the above Agreement was extended for an additional three-</p>		

	<i>Date</i>	<i>Treaty Series and Command Nos.</i>
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (continued)</b>		
<p>month period or until the Treaty between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning the Cayman Islands relating to Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters has come into force, whichever is sooner.</p> <p>The Exchange of Notes entered into force on 28 November 1989 with effect from 29 November 1989.</p> <p><b>Exchange of Letters</b> constituting a Narcotics Co-operation Agreement with respect to the British Virgin Islands (<i>see also</i> Treaty Series No. 81 (1988), Cm. 749, p.16 and Treaty Series No. 62 (1989), Cm. 988, p.20) .. .. .</p> <p>By an Exchange of Notes at Washington on 9 November 1989 the above Agreement was extended for an additional three month period.</p> <p>The Exchange of Notes entered into force on 9 November 1989 with effect from 12 November 1989.</p>	<p>London, 14 Apr., 1987</p>	<p>46/1987 Cm 216</p>
<b>WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION</b>		
<p><b>Convention</b> of the World Meteorological Organization (as later amended). <i>See also</i> Treaty Series No. 36 (1950), Cmd. 7989 and Treaty Series No. 38 (1976), Cmd. 6472 .. .. .</p> <p>Accession— Antigua and Barbuda .. .. .</p>	<p>Washington, 11 Oct., 1947</p> <p>16 Nov., 1988</p>	<p>26/1969 Cmd. 3902</p>



HMSO publications are available from:

**HMSO Publications Centre**

(Mail and telephone orders only)

PO Box 276, London SW8 5DT

Telephone orders 071-873 9090

General enquiries 071-873 0011

(queuing system in operation for both numbers)

**HMSO Bookshops**

49 High Holborn, London, WC1V 6HB 071-873 0011 (Counter service only)

258 Broad Street, Birmingham, B1 2HE 021-643 3740

Southey House, 33 Wine Street, Bristol, BS1 2BQ (0272) 264306

9-21 Princess Street, Manchester, M60 8AS 061-834 7201

80 Chichester Street, Belfast, BT1 4JY (0232) 238451

71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh, EH3 9AZ 031-228 4181

**HMSO's Accredited Agents**

(see Yellow Pages)

*and through good booksellers*