

EGYPT

CEDAW

RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS

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

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

In respect of article 9

Reservation to the text of article 9, paragraph 2, concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, without prejudice to the acquisition by a child born of a marriage of the nationality of his father. This is in order to prevent a child's acquisition of two nationalities where his parents are of different nationalities, since this may be prejudicial to his future. It is clear that the child's acquisition of his father's nationality is the procedure most suitable for the child and that this does not infringe upon the principle of equality between men and women, since it is customary for a woman to agree, upon marrying an alien, that her children shall be of the father's nationality.

In respect of article 16

Reservation to the text of article 16 concerning the equality of men and women in all matters relating to marriage and family relations during the marriage and upon its dissolution, without prejudice to the Islamic Sharia's provisions whereby women are accorded rights equivalent to those of their spouses so as to ensure a just balance between them. This is out of respect for the sacrosanct nature of the firm religious beliefs which govern marital relations in Egypt and which may not be called in question and in view of the fact that one of the most important bases of these relations is an equivalency of rights and duties so as to ensure complementary which guarantees true equality between the spouses. The provisions of the Sharia lay down that the husband shall pay bridal money to the wife and maintain her fully and shall also make a payment to her upon divorce, whereas the wife retains full rights over her property and is not obliged to spend anything on her keep. The Sharia therefore restricts the wife's rights to divorce by making it contingent on a judge's ruling, whereas no such restriction is laid down in the case of the husband.

In respect of article 29

The Egyptian delegation also maintains the reservation contained in article 29, paragraph 2, concerning the right of a State signatory to the Convention to declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article concerning the submission to an arbitral body of any dispute which may arise between States concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. This is in order to avoid being bound by the system of arbitration in this field.

Reservation made upon ratification:

General reservation on article 2

The Arab Republic of Egypt is willing to comply with the content of this article, provided that such compliance does not run counter to the Islamic Sharia.

[Ed. Note:

Depository notification C.N.24.2008-TREATIES-1:

With effect from 4 January 2008, Egypt withdrew the reservation made upon ratification in respect of article 9(2). The reservation read as follows:

“In respect of article 9

Reservation to the text of article 9, paragraph 2, concerning the granting to women of equal rights with men with respect to the nationality of their children, without prejudice to the acquisition by a child born of a marriage of the nationality of his father. This is in order to prevent a child's acquisition of two nationalities where his parents are of different nationalities, since this may be prejudicial to his future. It is clear that the child's acquisition of his father's nationality is the procedure most suitable for the child and that this does not infringe upon the principle of equality between men and women, since it is customary for a woman to agree, upon marrying an alien, that her children shall be of the father's nationality.”]

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]:

...

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

...

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:

- Egypt regarding article 2, article 9, paragraph 2, and article 16

...

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."

...