

## HUNGARY

### CEDAW

#### **RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS**

*(Unless otherwise indicated, the reservations and declarations were made upon ratification, accession or succession)*

#### Note

In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 29 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1249, p. 129.

*[Ed. note: as follows:*

*"The Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the terms of article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention."]*

*(Note 27, Chapter IV.8, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)*

#### **OBJECTIONS MADE TO OTHER STATES PARTIES RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS**

*(Ed. note: for the text targeted by the following objections, see the Reservations and Declarations of the State which is the subject of the objection)*

7 February 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Oman upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservations made by the Sultanate of Oman on 7 February 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservations state the Sultanate of Oman does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the Convention that are not in accordance with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia and legislation in force in the Sultanate of Oman, and also state that it is not bound by Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and Article 16, subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that by giving precedence to the principles of the Sharia and its own national law over the application of the provisions of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman has made a reservation which leaves it unclear to what extent it feels bound by the obligations of the Convention and which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. Furthermore, the reservations to Article 9 (2), Article 15 (4) and

Article 16 will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Sultanate of Oman."

\*\*\*\*\*

24 April 2007

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservation made by the Brunei Darussalam on 24 May 2006 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservation states that the Brunei Darussalam does not consider itself bound by Article 9 (2) of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the reservation to Article 9 (2) will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Brunei Darussalam."

\*\*\*\*\*

15 April 2010

With regard to the reservations made by Qatar upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the reservations made by the State of Qatar on 29 April 2009 upon accession to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of 18 December 1979. The reservations state that the State of Qatar does not consider itself bound by Article 2 (a), Article 9 (2), Article 15 (1), Article 15 (4) and Article 16, subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary is of the opinion that the reservations to Article 2

(a), Article 9 (2), Article 15 (1), Article 15 (4) and Article 16, subparagraphs (a), (c) and (f) will unavoidably result in a legal situation that discriminates against women, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 28 (2) of the Convention, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the State of Qatar.”

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Note

The Secretary-General received several objections to the signature of the above Convention by Democratic Kampuchea. These objections are identical in matter, mutatis mutandis, as those reproduced in note 3 in chapter IV.3.

[*Ed. note: as follows:*

*The signature was effected by Democratic Kampuchea. In this regard the Secretary-General received, on 5 November 1980, the following communication from the Government of Mongolia:*

*"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that only the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea as the sole authentic and lawful representative of the Kampuchean people has the right to assume international obligations on behalf of the Kampuchean people. Therefore the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the signature of the Human Rights Covenants by the representative of the so-called Democratic Kampuchea, a régime that ceased to exist as a result of the people's revolution in Kampuchea, is null and void.*

*"The signing of the Human Rights Covenants by an individual, whose régime during its short period of reign in Kampuchea had exterminated about 3 million people and had thus grossly violated the elementary norms of human rights, each and every provision of the Human Rights Covenants is a regrettable precedence, which discredits the noble aims and lofty principles of the United Nations Charter, the very spirit of the above-mentioned Covenants, gravely impairs the prestige of the United Nations."*

*Thereafter, similar communications were received from the Government of the following States on the dates indicated and their texts were circulated as depositary notifications or, at the request of the States concerned, as official documents of the General Assembly (A-33-781 and A-35-784):*

<u>State</u>	<u>Date of receipt</u>
<i>German Democratic Republic</i>	<i>11 Dec 1980</i>
<i>Poland</i>	<i>12 Dec 1980</i>
<i>Ukraine</i>	<i>16 Dec 1980</i>
<i>Hungary</i>	<i>19 Jan 1981</i>
<i>Bulgaria</i>	<i>29 Jan 1981</i>
<i>Belarus</i>	<i>18 Feb 1981</i>
<i>Russian Federation</i>	<i>18 Feb 1981</i>
<i>Czechoslovakia</i>	<i>10 Mar 1981]</i>

Following is the list of States who have notified their objection with the date of receipt of the notifications:

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Date of receipt</u>
German Democratic Republic	11 Dec 1980
Hungary	19 Jan 1981
Bulgaria	29 Jan 1981
Russian Federation	13 Feb 1981
Belarus	18 Feb 1981
Czechoslovakia	10 Mar 1981

*(Note 10, Chapter IV.8, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)*