

## **JAMAICA**

### **CEDAW**

#### **RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS**

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

The Government of Jamaica declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

#### Note

Upon ratification, the Government of Jamaica made the following reservations:

"The Government of Jamaica does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 9, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

"The Government of Jamaica declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 29, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

On 8 September 1995, the Government of Jamaica notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 9 (2) which it had made upon ratification.

The complete text of the reservations is published in United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1374, p. 439 [Ed. note: the complete text of the reservations are reproduced at the beginning of this footnote]. (Note 30, Chapter IV.8, *Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General*)

#### **OBJECTIONS MADE TO STATE PARTY'S RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS**

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

#### **Germany**

The Federal Republic of Germany considers that the reservations made by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16, by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), and (f), by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g) and (h), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), and by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them. In relation to the Federal Republic of Germany, they may not be invoked in support of a legal practice which does not pay due regard to the legal status afforded to women and children in the Federal Republic of Germany in conformity with the above-mentioned articles of the Convention. This objection shall

not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Egypt, Bangladesh, Brazil, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Mauritius and the Federal Republic of Germany.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Mexico**

11 January 1985

The Government of the United Mexican States has studied the content of the reservations made by Mauritius to article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), of the Convention and has concluded that they should be considered invalid in the light of article 28, paragraph 2, of the Convention, because they are incompatible with its object and purpose.

Indeed, these reservations, if implemented, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to all the articles of the Convention. The principles of equal rights of men and women and non-discrimination on the basis of sex, which are embodied in the second preambular paragraph and Article 1, paragraph 3, of the Charter of the United Nations, to which Mauritius is a signatory, and in articles 2 and 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, were previously accepted by the Government of Mauritius when it acceded, on 12 December 1973, to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The above principles were stated in article 2, paragraph 1, and article 3 of the former Covenant and in article 2, paragraph 2, and article 3 of the latter. Consequently, it is inconsistent with these contractual obligations previously assumed by Mauritius for its Government now to claim that it has reservations, on the same subject, about the 1979 Convention.

The objection of the Government of the United Mexican States to the reservations in question should not be interpreted as an impediment to the entry into force of the 1979 Convention between the United Mexican States and Mauritius.

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of Mexico in regard to reservations made by various States, as follows [for the States which were not Parties to the Covenants (marked below with an asterisk \*), the participation in the Covenants was not invoked by Mexico in its objection with regard to reservations]:

...

ii) 21 February 1985: In respect of the reservation by Jamaica concerning article 9 (2).

...

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Netherlands**

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by Bangladesh regarding article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16, paragraph 1 (c) and (f), by Egypt regarding article 2, article 9 and article 16, by Brazil regarding article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (a), (c), (g), and (h), by Iraq regarding article 2, sub-paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9 and article 16, by Mauritius regarding article 11, paragraph 1 (b) and (d), and article 16, paragraph 1 (g), by Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2, by the Republic of Korea regarding article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by Thailand regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3, and article 16, by Tunisia regarding article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h), by Turkey regarding article 15, paragraphs 2 and 4, and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (f) and (g), by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya upon accession, and the first paragraph of the reservations made by Malawi upon accession, are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2).

"These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Bangladesh, Egypt, Brazil, Iraq, Mauritius, Jamaica, the Republic of Korea, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi and the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

\*\*\*\*\*

**Sweden**, 17 March 1986

"The Government of Sweden considers that [the following reservations] are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (article 28, paragraph 2) and therefore objects to them:

...

"Indeed the reservations in question, if put into practice, would inevitably result in discrimination against women on the basis of sex, which is contrary to everything the Convention stands for. It should also be borne in mind that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations as one of its purposes, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and in various multilateral instruments, to which Thailand, Tunisia and Bangladesh are parties.

"The Government of Sweden furthermore notes that, as a matter of principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations made by:

...

- Jamaica regarding article 9, paragraph 2

...

"In this context the Government of Sweden wishes to take this opportunity to make the observation that the reason why reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not acceptable is precisely that otherwise they would render a basic international obligation of a contractual nature meaningless. Incompatible reservations, made in respect of the Convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, do not only cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving states to the objects and purpose of this Convention, but moreover, contribute to undermine the basis of international contractual law. It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and

purpose, by other parties."