

MEXICO

CEDAW

RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS

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

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In signing ad referendum the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which the General Assembly opened for signature by States on 18 December 1979, the Government of the United Mexican States wishes to place on record that it is doing so on the understanding that the provisions of the said Convention, which agree in all essentials with the provisions of Mexican legislation, will be applied in Mexico in accordance with the modalities and procedures prescribed by Mexican legislation and that the granting of material benefits in pursuance of the Convention will be as generous as the resources available to the Mexican State permit.

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)

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]:

i) 21 February 1985: In respect of reservations by Bangladesh* concerning article 2, article 13 (a) and article 16 paragraph 1 (c) and (f).

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

iii) 22 May 1985: In respect of reservations by New Zealand (applicable to the Cook Islands) concerning article 2 (f) and article 5 (a).

iv) 6 June 1985: In respect of reservations by the Republic of Korea concerning article 9 and article 16, paragraph 1 (c), (d), (e), (f) and (g). In this case, the Government of Mexico stated that the principles of the equal rights of men and women and of non-discrimination on the basis of sex, which 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, have already become general principles of international law which apply to the international community, to which the Republic of Korea belongs.

v) 29 January 1986: In respect of the reservation made by Cyprus to article 9, paragraph 2.

vi) 7 May 1986: In respect of the reservations made by Turkey* to paragraphs 2 and 4 of article 15 and paragraphs 1 (c), 1 (d), 1 (f) and 1 (g) of article 16.

vii) 16 July 1986: In respect of reservations made by Egypt to articles 9 and 16.

viii) 16 October 1986: In respect of reservations by Thailand* concerning article 9, paragraph 2, article 15, paragraph 3 and article 16.

ix) 4 December 1986: In respect of reservations by Iraq concerning article 2, paragraphs (f) and (g), article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 16.

x) 23 July 1990: In respect of the reservation made by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

Note

On 24 October 1991, the Government of Malawi notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession:

"Owing to the deep-rooted nature of some traditional customs and practices of Malawians, the Government of the Republic of Malawi shall not, for the time being, consider itself bound by such of the provisions of the Convention as require immediate eradication of such traditional customs and practices.

While the Government of the Republic of Malawi accepts the principles of article 29, paragraph 2 of the Convention this acceptance should nonetheless be read in conjunction with [its] declaration of 12th December 1966, concerning the recognition, by the Government of the Republic of Malawi, as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Justice under article 36, paragraph 2 of the Statute of the Court."

In respect of the first reservation, the Secretary-General had received, on 5 August 1987, from the Government of Mexico the following communication:

The Government of the United Mexican States hopes that the process of eradication of traditional customs and practices referred to in the first reservation of the Republic of Malawi will not be so protracted as to impair fulfilment of the purpose and intent of the Convention.
(Note 35, Chapter IV.8, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)

Note

The Secretary-General received communications with regard to the reservations made by Qatar upon accession from the following States:

Mexico (10 May 2010)

The United Mexican States has examined the reservations made by Qatar to articles 2, 9, 15 and 16, 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. The said 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 objection of the Government of the United Mexican States to the reservations in question shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Mexican States and Qatar.

...

(Note 73, Chapter IV.8, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)