

LAW OF THE SEA
BULLETIN

No. 5

JULY 1985



OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL FOR THE LAW OF THE SEA

85-16516

INTRODUCTION

This Bulletin contains declarations made by States and entities when signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The Convention was adopted on 30 April 1982 and opened for signature on 10 December 1982. As of 9 December 1984, the closing date for signature, 159 signatures had been appended. Thirty-six States and entities made declarations in accordance with articles 287, 298, 310 and Annex IX, article 2.

This Bulletin is divided in two parts:

- I. Full text of the declarations in English with an indication of the original version. These texts are also reproduced in United Nations documents C.N.7. 1983 - Treaties-1; C.N.212. 1983 - Treaties-12; C.N.348. 1983 - Treaties-17; C.N.246. 1984 - Treaties-9; C.N.253. 1984 - Treaties-10; C.N.314. 1984 - Treaties-12.
- II. Declarations analyzed and organized by subject matter. It follows the same classification scheme applied to the declarations made at the time of signature in Montego Bay, as contained in Bulletin No. 1. Additional classifications have been introduced because of new elements contained in the declarations which were made subsequently.

Cuba and the Philippines deposited declarations both at the time of signature and upon ratification of the Convention, in accordance with article 310. (See Annex and Bulletin No. 4.) Egypt ratified the Convention on 26 August 1983 and deposited a declaration at that time. (For the text of the declaration, see Bulletin No. 3.)

Future issues of the Bulletin will continue to carry information on other declarations made upon ratification or accession to the Convention. The declarations contained in this Bulletin will also be reproduced in the near future as a United Nations sales publication.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	ii
I. TEXTS OF DECLARATIONS	
1. Algeria	2
2. Angola	2
3. Argentina	2
4. Belgium	3
5. Bolivia	6
6. Brazil	6
7. Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	7
8. Cape Verde	8
9. Chile	9
10. Costa Rica	10
11. Cuba	10
12. Finland	10
13. France	11
14. German Democratic Republic	12
15. Greece	13
16. Guinea	13
17. Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13
18. Iraq	15
19. Italy	15
20. Luxembourg	16
21. Mali	17
22. Nicaragua	17
23. Oman	18
24. Philippines	18
25. Qatar	19
26. Romania	19
27. Sao Tome and Principe	20
28. South Africa	20
29. Spain	21
30. Sudan	22
31. Sweden	22
32. Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	23
33. Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	23
34. Uruguay	24
35. Yemen	25
36. European Economic Community	26

II. DECLARATIONS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SUBJECT MATTER

A. GENERAL DECLARATIONS

1.	Compatibility	
	(a) Of national law with the Convention (Brazil, Cape Verde, Nicaragua, Philippines, Sao Tome and Principe, Uruguay)	30
	(b) Non-recognition of laws and regulations incompatible with the Convention (France)	31
2.	Non-prejudice of position (Angola, Belgium, Brazil, German Democratic Republic, Guinea, Luxembourg, Mali, Philippines, Sao Tome and Principe, Sweden, Yemen)	31
3.	Recognition of States or entities (Algeria, Iraq, Qatar, South Africa, Sudan, Yemen)	34
4.	Recognition of rights under the Convention	
	(a) Only <u>vis-à-vis</u> States Parties (Islamic Republic of Iran)	35
	(b) Only on the basis of reciprocity (Uruguay)	35
5.	Non-recognition of claims or titles (Argentina, Spain)	35
6.	Link between the Convention and the resolutions (Argentina, Nicaragua)	36
7.	Transfer of competence under Annex IX (Belgium, Luxembourg)	36
8.	Perfectibility of the Convention (Bolivia, Mali)	37
9.	Contribution of the Convention to international law (Luxembourg, European Economic Community)	37
10.	General principles of co-operation (Mali, European Economic Community)	38
11.	Maritime sovereignty (Bolivia)	38

B. INTERPRETATIVE DECLARATIONS

1.	Territorial sea (Part II)	
	(a) Breadth of the territorial sea (Belgium)	38
	(b) Innocent passage through the territorial sea and security interests (Part II, section 3, subsection A) (Cape Verde, Finland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Oman, Romania, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, Sweden, Yemen)	39

	<u>Page</u>
2. Rights of the coastal States in the contiguous zone (Part II, section 4) (Belgium)	41
3. Régime of straits (Part III) (Chile, Finland, Greece, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Oman, Philippines, Spain, Sweden, Yemen)	41
4. Exclusive economic zone (Part V)	
(a) <u>Sui generis</u> nature (Cape Verde, Chile, Uruguay)	43
(b) Application only <u>vis-à-vis</u> other States Parties (Islamic Republic of Iran)	44
(c) Non-military use by other States (Brazil, Cape Verde, Uruguay)	45
(d) Residual rights (Cape Verde, Italy, Uruguay)	45
(e) Application of article 60 (Brazil, Cape Verde, Italy, Uruguay)	46
(f) Duties in relation with article 63, paragraph 2 (Cape Verde, Sao Tome and Principe, Uruguay)	46
(g) Application of articles 62 and 64, paragraph 2 (Costa Rica, Sao Tome and Principe)	47
(h) Application of articles 69 and 70 (Islamic Republic of Iran, Spain, Sudan)	47
(i) Access by geographically disadvantaged States (Romania)	48
(j) Discretionary powers of coastal States (Spain)	48
5. Continental shelf (Part VI)	
(a) Application of article 76 (Brazil, Uruguay)	48
(b) Application of article 80 (Brazil)	49
6. Delimitation (Belgium, Islamic Republic of Iran, Romania)	49
7. Régime of islands (Part VIII) (Islamic Republic of Iran, Romania, Yemen)	50
8. Enclosed and semi-enclosed seas (Part IX) (Islamic Republic of Iran)	50
9. Right of access (Part X) (Bolivia, Islamic Republic of Iran)	51
10. The Area (Part XI)	
(a) Application of article 140 (France)	51
(b) Application only <u>vis-à-vis</u> other States Parties (Islamic Republic of Iran)	51
(c) Work of the Preparatory Commission (Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, European Economic Community)	52
(d) Principle of common heritage as <u>jus cogens</u> (Chile)	54
(e) Participation in joint ventures (Spain)	54
(f) Development of resources (Bolivia)	55

	<u>Page</u>
11. Protection and preservation of the marine environment (Part XII)	
(a) Protection against threat of or from existing pollution (Belgium)	55
(b) Application of article 230, paragraph 2 (France)	55
12. General provisions (Part XVI)	
Application of article 301 (Brazil)	55
 C. DECLARATIONS WITH REGARD TO SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES	
1. Reservation of position (Belgium, Brazil, Cuba, Islamic Republic of Iran, Nicaragua)	56
2. Procedures in accordance with article 287	
(a) Choice of procedure (Belgium)	57
(b) International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (article 287, paragraph 1(a))	
(i) With regard to the interpretation or application of the Convention (Uruguay)	57
(ii) With regard to the prompt release of vessels and crews (Byelorussian SSR, German Democratic Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR)	58
3. International Court of Justice (article 287, paragraph 1(b)) (Uruguay)	58
4. Arbitration in accordance with Annex VII (article 287, paragraph 1(c)) (Byelorussian SSR, German Democratic Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR)	58
5. Special arbitration in accordance with Annex VIII (article 287, paragraph 1(d)) (Belgium, Byelorussian SSR, German Democratic Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR)	59
6. Optional exceptions to application of Part XV, Section 2	
(a) With respect to disputes specified under article 298, paragraphs 1(a), (b) and (c) (Byelorussian SSR, German Democratic Republic, Ukrainian SSR, USSR)	60
(b) With respect to disputes involving law enforcement activities only (article 298, paragraph 1(b)) (Uruguay)	61
ANNEX	62

**DECLARATIONS MADE AT THE TIME OF SIGNATURE OF THE
UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA**

I. TEXTS OF DECLARATIONS

ALGERIA

(Translation) (Original: French)

It is the view of the Government of Algeria that its signing the Final Act and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not entail any change in its position on the non-recognition of certain other signatories, nor any obligation to co-operate in any field whatsoever with those signatories.

ANGOLA

(Original: English)

The Government of the People's Republic of Angola reserves the right to interpret any and all articles of the Convention in the context of and with due regard to Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity as it applies to land, space and sea. Details of these interpretations will be placed on record at the time of ratification of the Convention.

The present signature is without prejudice to the position taken by the Government of Angola or to be taken by it on the Convention at the time of ratification.

ARGENTINA

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

The signing of the Convention by the Argentine Government does not imply acceptance of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In that regard, the Argentine Republic, as in its written statement of 8 December 1982 (A/CONF.62/WS/35), places on record its reservation to the effect that resolution III, in annex I to the Final Act, in no way affects the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which is governed by the following specific resolutions of the General Assembly: 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9 and 38/12, adopted within the framework of the decolonization process.

In this connection, and bearing in mind that the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands form an integral part of Argentine territory, the Argentine Government declares that it neither recognizes nor will it recognize the title of any other State, community or entity or the exercise by it of any right of maritime jurisdiction which is claimed to be protected under any interpretation of resolution III that violates the rights of Argentina over the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands and their respective maritime zones. Consequently, it likewise neither recognizes nor will recognize and will consider null and void any activity or measure that may be carried out or adopted without its consent with regard to this question, which the Argentine Government considers to be of major importance.

The Argentine Government will accordingly interpret the occurrence of acts of the kind referred to above as contrary to the aforementioned resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the patent objective of which is the peaceful settlement of the sovereignty dispute concerning the islands by means of bilateral negotiations and through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that, whereas the Final Act states in paragraph 42 that the Convention "together with resolutions I to IV, [forms] an integral whole", it is merely describing the procedure that was followed at the Conference to avoid a series of separate votes on the Convention and the resolutions. The Convention itself clearly establishes in article 318 that only the Annexes form an integral part of the Convention; thus, any other instrument or document, even one adopted by the Conference, does not form an integral part of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

BELGIUM

(Translation) (Original: French)

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because the Convention has a very large number of positive features and achieves a compromise on them which is acceptable to most States. Nevertheless, with regard to the status of maritime space, it regrets that the concept of equity, adopted for the delimitation of the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone, was not applied again in the provisions for delimiting the territorial sea. It welcomes, however, the distinctions established by the Convention between the nature of the rights which riparian States exercise over their territorial sea, on the one hand, and over the continental shelf and their exclusive economic zone on the other.

It is common knowledge that the Belgian Government cannot declare itself also satisfied with certain provisions of the international régime of the sea-bed which, though based on a principle that it would not think of challenging, seems not to have chosen the most suitable way of achieving the desired result as quickly and surely as possible, at the risk of jeopardizing the success of a generous undertaking which Belgium consistently encourages and supports. Indeed, certain provisions of Part XI and of Annexes III and IV appear to it to be marred by serious defects and shortcomings which explain why consensus was not reached on this text at the last session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in New York, in April 1982. These shortcomings and defects concern in particular the restriction of access to the Area, the limitations on production and certain procedures for the transfer of technology, not to mention the vexatious implications of the cost and financing of the future International Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. The Belgian Government sincerely hopes that these shortcomings and defects will in fact be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures which the Preparatory Commission should draw up with the twofold intent of facilitating acceptance of the new régime by the whole international community and enabling the common heritage of mankind to be properly exploited for the benefit of all and, preferably, for the benefit of the least favoured countries.

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium is not alone in thinking that the success of this new régime, the effective establishment of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the economic viability of the Enterprise will depend to a large extent on the quality and seriousness of the Preparatory Commission's work: it therefore considers that all decisions of the Commission should be adopted by consensus, that being the only way of protecting the legitimate interests of all.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, the Belgian Government wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Kingdom of Belgium is not here and now determined to ratify it. It will take a separate decision on this point at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all, focusing mainly on the questions to which attention has been drawn above.

The Belgian Government also wishes to recall that Belgium is a member of the European Economic Community, to which it has transferred powers in certain areas covered by the Convention; detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

It also wishes to draw attention formally to several points which it considers particularly crucial. For example, it attaches great importance to the conditions to which Articles 21 and 23 of the Convention subject the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, and it intends to ensure that the criteria prescribed by the relevant international agreements are strictly applied, whether the flag States are parties thereto or not. The limitation of the breadth of the territorial sea, as established by Article 3 of the Convention, confirms and codifies a widely observed customary practice which it is incumbent on every State to respect, as it is the only one admitted by

international law: the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium will not therefore recognize, as territorial sea, waters which are, or may be, claimed to be such beyond 12 nautical miles measured from baselines determined by the riparian State in accordance with the Convention. Having underlined the close linkage which it perceives between Article 33, paragraph 1(a), and Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium intends to reserve the right, in emergencies and especially in cases of blatant violation, to exercise the powers accorded to the riparian State by the latter text, without notifying beforehand a diplomatic agent or consular officer of the flag State, on the understanding that such notification shall be given as soon as it is physically possible. Finally, everyone will understand that the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium chooses to emphasize those provisions of the Convention which entitle it to protect itself, beyond the limit of the territorial sea, against any threat of pollution and, a fortiori, against any existing pollution resulting from an accident at sea, as well as those provisions which recognize the validity of rights and obligations deriving from specific conventions and agreements concluded previously or which may be concluded subsequently in furtherance of the general principles set forth in the Convention.

In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it obviously gives priority, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium deems it expedient to choose alternatively, and in order of preference, as Article 287 of the Convention leaves it free to do, the following means of settling disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
2. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
3. the International Court of Justice.

Still in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium wishes here and now to recognize the validity of the special arbitration procedure for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the provisions of the Convention in respect of fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

For the time being, the Belgian Government does not wish to make any declaration in accordance with Article 298, confining itself to the one made above in accordance with Article 287. Finally, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other States have made, or may make, upon signing or ratifying the Convention, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time.

BOLIVIA

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

1. The Convention on the Law of the Sea is a perfectible instrument and, according to its own provisions, is subject to revision. As a party to it, Bolivia will, when the time comes, put forward proposals and revisions which are in keeping with its national interests.

2. Bolivia is confident that the Convention will ensure, in the near future, the joint development of the resources of the sea-bed, with equal opportunities and rights for all nations, especially developing countries.

3. Freedom of access to and from the sea, which the Convention grants to land-locked nations, is a right that Bolivia has been exercising by virtue of bilateral treaties and will continue to exercise by virtue of the norms of positive international law contained in the Convention.

4. Bolivia wishes to place on record that it is a country that has no maritime sovereignty as a result of a war and not as a result of its natural geographic position and that it will assert all the rights of coastal States under the Convention once it recovers the legal status in question as a consequence of negotiations on the restoration to Bolivia of its own sovereign outlet to the Pacific Ocean.

BRAZIL

(Original: English)

- (I) Signature by Brazil is ad referendum, subject to ratification of the Convention in conformity with Brazilian constitutional procedures, which include approval by the National Congress.
- (II) The Brazilian Government understands that the régime which is applied in practice in maritime area adjacent to the coast of Brazil is compatible with the provisions of the Convention.
- (III) The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of article 301, which prohibits "any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations", apply, in particular, to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or the jurisdiction of the coastal State.
- (IV) The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those that imply the use of weapons or explosives, without the consent of the coastal State.

- (V) The Brazilian Government understands that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the coastal State has, in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and regulate the construction, operation and use of all types of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose.
- (VI) Brazil exercises sovereignty rights over the continental shelf, beyond the distance of two hundred nautical miles from the baselines, up to the outer edge of the continental margin, as defined in article 76.
- (VII) The Brazilian Government reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298, concerning the settlement of disputes.

BYELORUSSIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

(Translation) (Original: Russian)

1. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it accepts, as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in relation to questions of the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292.

2. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions in the consideration of disputes concerned with the delimitation of marine limits, disputes relating to military activity and disputes in relation to which the United Nations Security Council performs functions entrusted to it under the United Nations Charter.

CAPE VERDE

(Original: English)

The Government of the Republic of Cape Verde signs the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea with the following understandings:

- I. This Convention recognizes the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea or archipelagic waters. This right is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it was clearly stated in the Declaration made by the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on 26 April 1982.
- II. The provisions of the Convention relating to the archipelagic waters, territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf are compatible with the fundamental objectives and aims that inspire the legislation of the Republic of Cape Verde concerning its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to and within its coasts and over the seabed and subsoil thereof up to the limit of 200 miles.
- III. The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights recognized therein to the coastal State leave no doubt as to its character of a "sui generis" zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and which is not a part of the high seas.
- IV. The regulations of the uses or activities which are not expressly provided for in the Convention but are related to the sovereign rights and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of the said State, provided that such regulation does not hinder the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication which are recognized to other States.
- V. In the exclusive economic zone, the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication, in conformity with its definition and with other relevant provisions of the Convention, excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State, such as exercises with weapons or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of the said State; and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State.

- VI. This Convention does not entitle any State to construct, operate or use installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, either those provided for in the Convention or those of any other nature, without the consent of the coastal State.
- VII. In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to enter into arrangements with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stock or stocks of associated species.

CHILE

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

In exercise of the right conferred by article 310 of the Convention, the delegation of Chile wishes first of all to reiterate in its entirety the statement it made at [the April 1982] meeting when the Convention was adopted, which statement is reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164. In particular [it wishes to refer] to the Convention's pivotal legal concept, that of the 200 mile exclusive economic zone to the elaboration of which [Chile] made an important contribution, having been the first to declare such a concept, 35 years ago in 1947, and having subsequently helped to define and earn it international acceptance. The exclusive economic zone has a sui generis legal character distinct from that of the territorial sea and the high seas. It is a zone under national jurisdiction, over which the coastal State exercises economic sovereignty and in which third States enjoy freedom of navigation and overflight and the freedoms inherent in international communication. The Convention defines it as a maritime space under the jurisdiction of the coastal State, bound to the latter's territorial sovereignty and actual territory, on terms similar to those governing other maritime spaces, namely the territorial sea and the continental shelf. With regard to straits used for international navigation, the delegation of Chile wishes to reaffirm and reiterate in full the statement made last April, as reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164 referred to above, as well as the content of the supplementary written statement dated 7 April 1982 contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/19.

With regard to the international sea-bed régime, [the delegation of Chile wishes] to reiterate the statement made by the Group of 77 at [the April 1982] meeting regarding the legal concept of the common heritage of mankind, the existence of which was solemnly confirmed by consensus by the General Assembly in 1970 and which the present Convention defines as a part of jus cogens. Any action taken in contravention of this principle and outside the framework of the sea-bed régime would, as [the April 1982] debate showed, be totally invalid and illegal.

COSTA RICA

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

The Government of Costa Rica declares that the provisions of Costa Rican law under which foreign vessels must pay for licences to fish in its exclusive economic zone, shall apply also to fishing for highly migratory species, pursuant to the provisions of articles 62 and 64, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

CUBA 1/

(Original: Spanish, English and French)

At the time of signing the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Cuban Delegation declares that, having gained possession of the definitive text of the Convention just a few hours ago, it will leave for the time of the ratification of the Convention the issuing of any statement it deems pertinent with respect to articles:

287 - on the election of the procedure for the settlement of controversies pertaining to the interpretation or implementation of the Convention;

292 - on the prompt release of ships and their crews;

298 - on the optional exceptions to the applicability of Section 2;

as well as whatever statement or declaration it might deem appropriate to make in conformity with article 310 of the Convention.

FINLAND

(Original: English)

It is the understanding of the Government of Finland that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in article 35(c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Finland (the Aland Islands) and Sweden. Since in that strait the passage is regulated in part by a longstanding international convention in force, the present legal régime in that strait will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention.

1/ Cuba ratified the Convention on 15 August 1984 and made a declaration at that time. (For the text of the declaration, see Annex and Bulletin No. 4.)

As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Finland to continue to apply the present régime to the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Finnish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention.

FRANCE

(Translation) (Original: French)

1. The provisions of the Convention relating to the status of the different maritime spaces and to the legal régime of the uses and protection of the marine environment confirm and consolidate the general rules of the law of the sea and thus entitle the French Republic not to recognize as enforceable against it any foreign laws or regulations that are not in conformity with those general rules.

2. The provisions of the Convention relating to the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction show considerable deficiencies and flaws with respect to the exploration and exploitation of the said area which will require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of draft rules, regulations and procedures to ensure the establishment and effective functioning of the International Sea-Bed Authority.

To this end, all efforts must be made within the Preparatory Commission to reach general agreement on any matter of substance, in accordance with the procedure set out in rule 37 of the rules of procedure of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

3. With reference to article 140, the signing of the Convention by France shall not be interpreted as implying any change in its position in respect of resolution 1514 (XV).

4. The provisions of article 230, paragraph 2, of the Convention shall not preclude interim or preventive measures against the parties responsible for the operation of foreign vessels, such as immobilization of the vessel. They shall also not preclude the imposition of penalties other than monetary penalties for any wilful and serious act which causes pollution.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

(Original: English)

[1] The German Democratic Republic declares that it accepts an arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1(c), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, which cannot be settled by the States involved by recourse to other peaceful means of dispute settlement agreed between them.

The German Democratic Republic further declares that it accepts a special arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1(d), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VIII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles of this Convention relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from ships and through dumping.

The German Democratic Republic recognizes the competence, provided for in article 292 of the Convention, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in matters relating to the prompt release of vessels and crews.

The German Democratic Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept any compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions

- in disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations,
- in disputes relating to military activities and
- in disputes concerning which the United Nations Security Council exercises the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

[2] The German Democratic Republic reserves the right, in connection with the ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to make declarations and statements pursuant to article 310 of the Convention and to present its views on declarations and statements made by other States when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention.

GREECE

(Original: English)

Interpretative declaration on the subject of straits:

The present declaration concerns the provisions of Part III "on straits used for international navigation" and more especially the application in practice of articles 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea. In areas where there are numerous spread out islands that form a great number of alternative straits which serve in fact one and the same route of international navigation, it is the understanding of Greece that the coastal State concerned has the responsibility to designate the route or routes, in the said alternative straits, through which ships and aircrafts of third countries could pass under transit passage régime, in such a way as on the one hand the requirements of international navigation and overflight are satisfied, and on the other hand the minimum security requirements of both the ships and aircrafts in transit as well as those of the coastal State are fulfilled.

GUINEA

(Translation) (Original: French)

The Government of the Republic of Guinea reserves the right to interpret any article of the Convention in the context and taking due account of the sovereignty of Guinea and of its territorial integrity as it applies to the land, space and sea.

ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

(Original: English)

Declaration of understanding:

In accordance with article 310 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran seizes the opportunity at this solemn moment of signing the Convention to place on the records its "understanding" in relation to certain provisions of the Convention. The main objective for submitting these declarations is the avoidance of eventual future interpretation of the following articles in a manner incompatible with the original intention and previous positions or in disharmony with national laws and regulations of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

It is ... the understanding of the Islamic Republic of Iran that:

- 1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of guid-pro-quo which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only States parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein.

The above considerations pertain specifically (but not exclusively) to the following:

- The right of transit passage through straits used for international navigation (Part III, Section 2, article 38).
 - The notion of "Exclusive Economic Zone" (Part V).
 - All matters regarding the International Seabed Area and the Concept of "Common Heritage of mankind" (Part XI).
- 2) In the light of customary international law, the provisions of article 21, read in association with article 19 (on the Meaning of Innocent Passage) and article 25 (on the Rights of Protection of the Coastal States) recognize (though implicitly) the rights of the Coastal States to take measures to safeguard their security interests including the adoption of laws and regulations regarding, inter alia, the requirements of prior authorization for warships willing to exercise the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea.
 - 3) The right referred to in article 125 regarding access to and from the sea and freedom of transit of Land-locked States is one which is derived from mutual agreement of States concerned based on the principle of reciprocity.
 - 4) The provisions of article 70, regarding "Right of States with Special Geographical Characteristics" are without prejudice to the exclusive right of the Coastal States of enclosed and semi-enclosed maritime regions (such as the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman) with large population predominantly dependent upon relatively poor stocks of living resources of the same regions.
 - 5) Islets situated in enclosed and semi-enclosed seas which potentially can sustain human habitation or economic life of their own, but due to climatic conditions, resource restriction or other limitations, have not yet been put to development, fall within the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 121 concerning "Régime of Islands", and have, therefore, full effect in boundary delimitation of various maritime zones of the interested Coastal States.

Furthermore, with regard to "Compulsory Procedures Entailing Binding Decisions" the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, while fully endorsing the Concept of settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, and recognizing the necessity and desirability of settling, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and co-operation, issues relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, at this time will not pronounce on the choice of procedures pursuant to articles 287 and 298 and reserves its positions to be declared in due time.

IRAQ

(Translation) (Original: Arabic)

Pursuant to article 310 of the present Convention and with a view to harmonizing Iraqi laws and regulations with the provisions of the Convention, the Republic of Iraq has decided to issue the following statement:

1. The present signature in no way signifies recognition of Israel and implies no relationship with it.

2. Iraq interprets the provisions applying to all types of straits set forth in Part III of the Convention as applying also to navigation between islands situated near those straits if the shipping lanes leaving or entering those straits and defined by the competent international organization lie near such islands.

ITALY

(Original: English)

Upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, Italy wishes to state that in its opinion Part XI and Annexes III and IV contain considerable flaws and deficiencies which require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea of appropriate draft rules, regulations and procedures.

Italy wishes also to confirm the following points made in its written statement dated 7 March 1983:

- according to the Convention, the coastal State does not enjoy residual rights in the exclusive economic zone. In particular, the rights and jurisdiction of the coastal State in such zone do not include the right to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them.

Moreover, the rights of the coastal State to build and to authorize the construction, operation and the use of installations and structures in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf is limited only to the categories of such installations and structures as listed in article 60 of the Convention.

- None of the provisions of the Convention, which corresponds on this matter to customary international law, can be regarded as entitling the coastal State to make innocent passage of particular categories of foreign ships dependent on prior consent or notification.

LUXEMBOURG

(Translation) (Original: French)

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because it represents, in the context of the law of the sea, a major contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law.

Nevertheless, in the view of the Government of Luxembourg, certain provisions of Part XI and Annexes III and IV of the Convention are marred by serious shortcomings and defects which, moreover, explain why it was not possible to reach a consensus on the text at the last session of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in New York in April 1982.

These shortcomings and defects concern, in particular, the mandatory transfer of technology and the cost and financing of the future Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. They will have to be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures to be drawn up by the Preparatory Commission. The Government of Luxembourg recognizes that the work remaining to be done is of great importance and hopes that it will be possible to reach agreement on the modalities for operating a sea-bed mining régime that will be generally acceptable and therefore conducive to promoting the activities of the international zone of the sea-bed.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, my Government wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is not here and now determined to ratify it.

It will take a separate decision on this point, at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all.

My Government also wishes to recall that Luxembourg is a member of the European Economic Community and, by virtue thereof, has transferred to the Community powers in certain areas covered by the Convention. Detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

Like other members of the Community, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg also reserves its position on all declarations made at the final session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, at Montego Bay, that may contain elements of interpretation concerning the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

MALI

(Translation) (Original: French)

On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Republic of Mali remains convinced of the interdependence of the interests of all peoples and of the need to base international co-operation on, in particular, mutual respect, equality, solidarity at the international, regional and sub-regional levels, and positive good-neighbourliness between States.

It thus reiterates its statement of 30 April 1982, reaffirming that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the negotiation and adoption of which the Government of Mali participated in good faith, constitutes a perfectible international legal instrument.

Nevertheless, Mali's signature of the said Convention is without prejudice to any other instrument concluded or to be concluded by the Republic of Mali with a view to improving its status as a geographically disadvantaged and land-locked State. It is likewise without prejudice to the elements of any position which the Government of the Republic of Mali may deem it necessary to take with regard to any question of the law of the sea pursuant to article 310.

In any case, the present signature has no effect on the course of Mali's foreign policy or on the rights it derives from its sovereignty under its Constitution or the Charter of the United Nations and any other relevant rule of international law.

NICARAGUA

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

In accordance with article 310, Nicaragua declares that such adjustments of its domestic law as may be required in order to harmonize it with the Convention will follow from the process of constitutional change initiated by the revolutionary State of Nicaragua, it being understood that the Convention and the Resolutions adopted on 10 December 1982 and the Annexes to the Convention constitute an inseparable whole.

For the purposes of articles 287 and 298 and of other articles concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of Nicaragua shall, if and as the occasion demands, exercise the right conferred by the Convention to make further supplementary or clarificatory declarations.

OMAN

(Original: English)

It is the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman that the application of the provisions of articles 19, 25, 34, 38 and 45 of the Convention does not preclude a coastal State from taking such appropriate measures as are necessary to protect its interest of peace and security.

PHILIPPINES 1/

(Original: English)

Understandings:

1. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines under and arising from the Constitution of the Philippines;
2. Such signing shall not in any manner affect the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines as successor of the United States of America, under and arising out of the Treaty of Paris between Spain and the United States of America of 10 December 1898, and the Treaty of Washington between the United States of America and Great Britain of January 2, 1930;
3. Such signing shall not diminish or in any manner affect the rights and obligations of the contracting parties under the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of 30 August 1951, and its related interpretative instruments; nor those under any other pertinent bilateral or multilateral treaty or agreement to which the Philippines is a party;
4. Such signing shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines over any territory over which it exercises sovereign authority, such as the Kalayaan Islands, and the waters appurtenant thereto;
5. The Convention shall not be construed as amending in any manner any pertinent laws and presidential decrees or proclamations of the Republic of the Philippines; the Government of the Republic of the Philippines maintains and reserves the right and authority to make any amendments to such laws, decrees or proclamations pursuant to the provisions of the Philippines Constitution;

1/ Philippines ratified the Convention on 8 May 1984 and made a declaration at that time. (For the text of the declaration, see Annex and Bulletin No. 4.)

6. The provisions of the Convention on archipelagic passage through sea lanes do not nullify or impair the sovereignty of the Philippines as an archipelagic State over the sea lanes and do not deprive it of authority to enact legislation to protect its sovereignty, independence, and security;

7. The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation;

8. The agreement of the Republic of the Philippines to the submission for peaceful resolution, under any of the procedures provided in the Convention, of disputes under Article 298 shall not be considered as a derogation of Philippines sovereignty.

QATAR

(Translation) (Original: Arabic)

The State of Qatar declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or any dealing with Israel or, lead to entry with Israel into any of the relations governed by the Convention or entailed by the implementation of the provisions thereof.

ROMANIA

(Original: English and French)

1. As a geographically disadvantaged country bordering a sea poor in living resources, Romania reaffirms the necessity to develop international co-operation for the exploitation of the living resources of the economic zones, on the basis of just and equitable agreements that should ensure the access of the countries from this category to the fishing resources in the economic zones of other regions or subregions.

2. The Socialist Republic of Romania reaffirms the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt national laws and regulations relating to the passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea.

The right to adopt such measures is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it is also specified in the Statement by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on 26 April 1982.

3. The Socialist Republic of Romania states that according to the requirements of equity - as it results from articles 74 and 83 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea - the uninhabited islands and without economic life can in no way affect the delimitation of the maritime spaces belonging to the main land coasts of the coastal States.

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

(Translation) (Original: French)

I. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe will in no way affect or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe embodied in and flowing from the Constitution of Sao Tome and Principe;

II. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through its territorial sea or its archipelagic waters and to take any other measures aimed at safeguarding its security;

III. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that the provisions of the Convention relating to archipelagic waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the legislation of the Republic of Sao Tome and Principe as regards its sovereignty and its jurisdiction over the maritime space adjacent to its coasts;

IV. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur within the exclusive economic zone or in an area adjacent thereto, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are under an obligation to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of the stock or stocks of associated species;

V. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations to ensure the conservation of highly migratory species and to co-operate with the States whose nationals harvest these species in order to promote the optimum utilization thereof.

SOUTH AFRICA

(Original: English)

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 310 of the Convention the South African Government declares that the signature of this Convention by South Africa in no way implies recognition by South Africa of the United Nations Council for Namibia or its competence to act on behalf of South West Africa/Namibia.

SPAIN

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

1. The Spanish Government, upon signing this Convention, declares that this act cannot be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations relating to the maritime spaces of Gibraltar which are not included in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht of 13 July 1713 between the Spanish and British Crowns. The Spanish Government also considers that Resolution III of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is not applicable in the case of the Colony of Gibraltar, which is undergoing a decolonization process in which only the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly apply.

2. It is the Spanish Government's interpretation that the régime established in Part III of the Convention is compatible with the right of the coastal State to issue and apply its own air regulations in the air space of the straits used for international navigation so long as this does not impede the transit passage of aircraft.

3. With regard to article 39, paragraph 3, it takes the word "normally" to mean "except in cases of force majeure or distress".

4. With regard to article 42, it considers that the provisions of paragraph 1(b) do not prevent it from issuing, in accordance with international law, laws and regulations giving effect to generally accepted international regulations.

5. The Spanish Government interprets articles 69 and 70 of the Convention as meaning that access to fishing in the economic zones of third States by the fleets of developed land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States is dependent upon the prior granting of access by the coastal States in question to the nationals of other States who have habitually fished in the economic zone concerned.

6. It interprets the provisions of article 221 as not depriving the coastal State of a strait used for international navigation of its powers, recognized by international law, to intervene in the case of the casualties referred to in that article.

7. It considers that article 233 must be interpreted, in any case, in conjunction with the provisions of article 34.

8. It considers that, without prejudice to the provisions of article 297 regarding the settlement of disputes, articles 56, 61 and 62 of the Convention preclude considering as discretionary the powers of the coastal State to determine the allowable catch, its harvesting capacity and the allocation of surpluses to other States.

9. Its interpretation of Annex III, article 9, is that the provisions thereof shall not obstruct participation, in the joint ventures referred to in paragraph 2, of the States Parties whose industrial potential precludes them from participating directly as contractors in the exploitation and resources of the Area.

SUDAN

(Translation) (Original: Arabic)

[1] In accordance with article 310 of the Convention, the Sudanese Government will make such declarations as it deems necessary in order to clarify its position regarding the content of certain provisions of this instrument.

[2] [The Sudan] wishes to reiterate [the statement by the President of the Conference] in plenary meeting during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, on 26 April 1982, concerning article 21, which deals with the laws and regulations of the coastal State relating to innocent passage; namely, that the withdrawal of the amendment submitted at the time by a number of States did not prejudice the right of coastal States to take all necessary measures, particularly in order to protect their security, in accordance with article 19 on the meaning of the term "innocent passage" and article 25 on the rights of protection of the coastal State.

[3] The Sudan also wishes to state that, according to its interpretation, the definition of the term "geographically disadvantaged States" given in article 70, paragraph 2, applies to all the parts of the Convention in which this term appears.

[4] The fact that [the Sudan] is signing this Convention and the Final Act of the Conference in no way means that [it] recognizes any State whatsoever which it does not recognize or with which it has no relations.

SWEDEN

(Original: English)

Declaration: It is the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in article 35(c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Sweden and Denmark (Oresund) as well as to the strait between Sweden and Finland (the Aland islands). Since in both those straits the passage is regulated in whole or in part by long-standing international conventions in force, the present legal régime in the two straits will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention.

As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Sweden to continue to apply the present régime for the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Swedish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention.

It is also the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the Convention does not affect the rights and duties of a neutral State provided for in the Convention concerning the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in case of Naval Warfare (XIII Convention), adopted at The Hague on 18 October 1907.

UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC

(Translation) (Original: Russian)

1. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Ukrainian SSR chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the competence, as stipulated in article 292, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews.

2. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept compulsory procedures, involving binding decisions, for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities and disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

(Translation) (Original: Russian)

1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, under article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. It opts for a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for the consideration of matters relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, including pollution from vessels and dumping. It recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as provided for in article 292, in matters relating to the prompt release of detained vessels and crews.

2. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept the compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities, or disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

URUGUAY

(Translation) (Original: Spanish)

(A) The provisions of the Convention concerning the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the main purposes and principles underlying Uruguayan legislation in respect of Uruguay's sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to its coast and over its bed and sub-soil up to a limit of 200 miles.

(B) The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights which the Convention recognizes to the coastal State leave room for no doubt that it is a "sui generis" zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and that it is not part of the high seas.

(C) Regulation of the uses and activities not provided for expressly in the Convention (residual rights and obligations) relating to the rights of sovereignty and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of that State, provided that such regulation does not prevent enjoyment of the freedom of international communication which is recognized to other States.

(D) In the exclusive economic zone, enjoyment of the freedom of international communication in accordance with the way it is defined and in accordance with other relevant provisions of the Convention excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State - for instance, military exercises or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of that State - and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State.

(E) This Convention does not empower any State to build, operate or utilize installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, neither those referred to in the Convention nor any other kind, without the consent of the coastal State.

(F) In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stocks or associated species.

(G) When the Convention enters into force, Uruguay will apply, with respect to other States Parties, the provisions established by the Convention and by Uruguayan legislation, on the basis of reciprocity.

(H) Pursuant to the provisions of article 287, Uruguay declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of such disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention as are not subject to other procedures, without prejudice to its recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and of such agreements with other States as may provide for other means for peaceful settlement.

(I) Pursuant to the provisions of article 298, Uruguay declares that it will not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, of the Convention, in respect of disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraphs 2 and 3.

(J) Reaffirms that, as stated in article 76, the continental shelf is the natural prolongation of the territory of the coastal State to the outer edge of the continental margin.

YEMEN

(Translation) (Original: Arabic)

1. The Yemen Arab Republic adheres to the rules of general international law concerning rights to national sovereignty over coastal territorial waters, even in the case of the waters of a strait linking two seas.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic adheres to the concept of general international law concerning free passage as applying exclusively to merchant ships and aircraft; nuclear-powered craft, as well as warships and warplanes in general, must obtain the prior agreement of the Yemen Arab Republic before passing through its territorial waters, in accordance with the established norm of general international law relating to national sovereignty.

3. The Yemen Arab Republic confirms its national sovereignty over all the islands in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean which have been its dependencies since the period when the Yemen and the Arab countries were under Turkish administration.

4. The Yemen Arab Republic declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea is subject to the provisions of this declaration and the completion of the constitutional procedures in effect.

The fact that we have signed the said Convention in no way implies that we recognize Israel or are entering into relations with it.

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

(Original: English and French)

On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the European Economic Community declares that it considers that the Convention constitutes, within the framework of the law of the sea, a major effort in the codification and progressive development of international law in the fields to which its declaration pursuant to Article 2 of Annex IX of the Convention refers. The Community would like to express the hope that this development will become a useful means for promoting co-operation and stable relations between all countries in these fields.

The Community, however, considers that significant provisions of Part XI of the Convention are not conducive to the development of the activities to which that Part refers in view of the fact that several member States of the Community have already expressed their position that this Part contains considerable deficiencies and flaws which require rectification. The Community recognises the importance of the work which remains to be done and hopes that conditions for the implementation of a sea bed mining regime, which are generally acceptable and which are therefore likely to promote activities in the international sea bed area, can be agreed. The Community, within the limits of its competence, will play a full part in contributing to the task of finding satisfactory solutions.

A separate decision on formal confirmation (1) will have to be taken at a later stage. It will be taken in the light of the results of the efforts made to attain a universally acceptable Convention.

COMPETENCE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES
WITH REGARD TO MATTERS
GOVERNED BY THE CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA
(DECLARATION MADE PURSUANT TO
ARTICLE 2 OF ANNEX IX TO THE CONVENTION)

Article 2 of Annex IX to the Convention of the Law of the Sea stipulates that the participation of an international organization shall be subject to a declaration specifying the matters governed by the Convention in respect of which competence has been transferred to the organization by its member States.

"(1) "Formal confirmation" is the term used in the Convention for ratification by international organizations (see Article 306 and Annex IX, Article 3)."

The European Communities were established by the Treaties of Paris and of Rome, signed on 18 April 1951 and 25 March 1957 respectively. After being ratified by the Signatory States the Treaties entered into force on 25 July 1952 and 1 January 1958 (1).

In accordance with the provisions referred to above, this declaration indicates the competence of the European Economic Community in matters governed by the Convention.

The Community points out that its member States have transferred competence to it with regard to the conservation and management of sea fishing resources. Hence, in the field of sea fishing it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which are enforced by the member States) and to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent international organizations.

Furthermore, with regard to rules and regulations for the protection and preservation of the marine environment, the member States have transferred to the Community competences as formulated in provisions adopted by the Community and as reflected by its participation in certain international agreements (see Annex).

With regard to the provisions of Part X, the Community has certain powers as its purpose is to bring about an economic union based on a customs union.

With regard to the provisions of Part XI, the Community enjoys competence in matters of commercial policy, including the control of unfair economic practices.

The exercise of the competence that the member States have transferred to the Community under the Treaties is, by its very nature, subject to continuous development. As a result the Community reserves the right to make new declarations at a later date.

"(1) The Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community was registered at the Secretariat of the United Nations on 15.3.1957 under No 3729; the Treaties of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) were registered on 21 April and 24 April 1958 respectively under Nos 4300 and 4301.

The current members of the Communities are the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea shall apply, with regard to matters transferred to the European Economic Community to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty."

"Annex

COMMUNITY TEXTS APPLICABLE IN THE SECTOR OF THE
PROTECTION AND PRESERVATION OF THE MARINE
ENVIRONMENT AND RELATING DIRECTLY TO SUBJECTS
COVERED BY THE CONVENTION

Council Decision of 3 December 1981 establishing a Community information system for the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea (81/971/EEC)
(OJ No L 355, 10.12.1981, p.52).

Council Directive of 4 May 1976 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community (76/464/EEC)
(OJ No L 129, 18.5.1976, p. 23).

Council Directive of 16 June 1975 on the disposal of waste oils (75/439/EEC)
(OJ No L 194, 25.7.1975, p. 23).

Council Directive of 20 February 1978 on waste from the titanium dioxide industry (78/176/EEC)
(OJ No L 54, 25.2.1978, p. 19).

Council Directive of 30 October 1979 on the quality required of shellfish waters (79/923/EEC)
(OJ No L 281, 10.11.1979, p. 47).

Council Directive of 22 March 1982 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (82/176/EEC)
(OJ No L 81, 27.3.1982, p. 29).

Council Directive of 26 September 1983 on limit values and quality objectives for cadmium discharges (83/513/EEC)
(OJ No L 291, 24.10.1983, p. 1 et seq).

Council Directive of 8 March 1984 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by sectors other than the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (84/156/EEC)
(OJ No L 74, 17.3.1984, p. 49 et seq)."

"The Community has also concluded the following Conventions:

Convention for the prevention of marine pollution from land-based sources (Council Decision 75/437/EEC of 3 March 1975 published in OJ No L 194, 25.7.1975, p. 5).

Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution (Council Decision of 11 June 1981 published in OJ No L 171, 27.6.1981, p. 11).

Convention for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution and the Protocol for the prevention of pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by dumping from ships and aircraft (Council Decision 77/585/EEC of 25 July 1977 published in OJ No L 240, 19.9.1977, p. 1).

Protocol concerning co-operation in combating pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by oil and other harmful substances in cases of emergency (Council Decision 81/420/EEC of 19 May 1981 published in OJ No L 162, 19.6.1981, p. 4).

Protocol of 2 and 3 April 1983 concerning Mediterranean specially protected areas (OJ No L 68/36, 10.3.1984)."

II. DECLARATIONS CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO SUBJECT MATTER

A. GENERAL DECLARATIONS

1. Compatibility:

(a) Of national law with the Convention:

Brazil

"(II) The Brazilian Government understands that the régime which is applied in practice in maritime area adjacent to the coast of Brazil is compatible with the provisions of the Convention."

Cape Verde

"II. The provisions of the Convention relating to the archipelagic waters, territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf are compatible with the fundamental objectives and aims that inspire the legislation of the Republic of Cape Verde concerning its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to and within its coasts and over the seabed and subsoil thereof up to the limit of 200 miles."

Nicaragua

"In accordance with article 310, Nicaragua declares that such adjustments of its domestic law as may be required in order to harmonize it with the Convention will follow from the process of constitutional change initiated by the revolutionary State of Nicaragua, ... "

Philippines

"5. The Convention shall not be construed as amending in any manner any pertinent laws and Presidential Decrees or Proclamations of the Republic of the Philippines; the Government of the Republic of the Philippines maintains and reserves the right and authority to make any amendments to such laws, decrees or proclamations pursuant to the provisions of the Philippines Constitution;

6. The provisions of the Convention on archipelagic passage through sea lanes do not nullify or impair the sovereignty of the Philippines as an archipelagic State over the sea lanes and do not deprive it of authority to enact legislation to protect its sovereignty, independence, and security;

7. The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation;"

Sao Tome and Principe

"III. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that the provisions of the Convention relating to archipelagic waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the legislation of the Republic of Sao Tome and Principe as regards its sovereignty and its jurisdiction over the maritime space adjacent to its coasts;"

Uruguay

"(A) The provisions of the Convention concerning the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the main purposes and principles underlying Uruguayan legislation in respect of Uruguay's sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to its coast and over its bed and sub-soil up to a limit of 200 miles."

- (b) Non-recognition of laws and regulations incompatible with the Convention:

France

"1. The provisions of the Convention relating to the status of the different maritime spaces and to the legal régime of the uses and protection of the marine environment confirm and consolidate the general rules of the law of the sea and thus entitle the French Republic not to recognize as enforceable against it any foreign laws or regulations that are not in conformity with those general rules."

2. Non-prejudice of position:

Angola

"The Government of the People's Republic of Angola reserves the right to interpret any and all articles of the Convention in the context of and with due regard to Angolan sovereignty and territorial integrity as it applies to land, space and sea. Details of these interpretations will be placed on record at the time of ratification of the Convention.

The present signature is without prejudice to the position taken by the Government of Angola or to be taken by it on the Convention at the time of ratification."

Belgium

"... Finally, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other States have made, or may make, upon signing or ratifying the Convention, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time."

Brazil

"(I) Signature by Brazil is ad referendum, subject to ratification of the Convention in conformity with Brazilian constitutional procedures, which include approval by the National Congress."

German Democratic Republic

"[2] The German Democratic Republic reserves the right, in connection with the ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to make declarations and statements pursuant to article 310 of the Convention and to present its views on declarations and statements made by other States when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention."

Guinea

"The Government of the Republic of Guinea reserves the right to interpret any article of the Convention in the context and taking due account of the sovereignty of Guinea and of its territorial integrity as it applies to the land, space and sea."

Luxembourg

"Like other members of the Community, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg also reserves its position on all declarations made at the final session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, at Montego Bay, that may contain elements of interpretation concerning the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Mali

"Nevertheless, Mali's signature of the said Convention is without prejudice to any other instrument concluded or to be concluded by the Republic of Mali with a view to improving its status as a geographically disadvantaged and land-locked State. It is likewise without prejudice to the elements of any position which the Government of the Republic of Mali may deem it necessary to take with regard to any question of the law of the sea pursuant to article 310.

In any case, the present signature has no effect on the course of Mali's foreign policy or on the rights it derives from its sovereignty under its Constitution or the Charter of the United Nations and any other relevant rule of international law."

Philippines

"1. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines under and arising from the Constitution of the Philippines;

2. Such signing shall not in any manner affect the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines as successor of the United States of America, under and arising out of the Treaty of Paris between Spain and the United States of America of December 10, 1898, and the Treaty of Washington between the United States of America and Great Britain of January 2, 1930;

3. Such signing shall not diminish or in any manner affect the rights and obligations of the contracting parties under the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of August 30, 1951, and its related interpretative instruments; nor those under any other pertinent bilateral or multilateral treaty or agreement to which the Philippines is a party;

4. Such signing shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines over any territory over which it exercises sovereign authority, such as the Kalayaan Islands, and the waters appurtenant thereto;

...

8. The agreement of the Republic of the Philippines to the submission for peaceful resolution, under any of the procedures provided in the Convention, of disputes under Article 298 shall not be considered as a derogation of Philippines sovereignty."

Sao Tome and Principe

"I. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe will in no way affect or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe embodied in and flowing from the Constitution of Sao Tome and Principe;"

Sweden

"It is also the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the Convention does not affect the rights and duties of a neutral State provided for in the Convention concerning the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in case of Naval Warfare (XIII Convention), adopted at The Hague on 18 October 1907."

Yemen

"4. The Yemen Arab Republic declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea is subject to the provisions of this declaration and the completion of the constitutional procedures in effect."

3. Recognition of States or entities:

Algeria

"It is the view of the Government of Algeria that its signing the Final Act and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not entail any change in its position on the non-recognition of certain other signatories, nor any obligation to co-operate in any field whatsoever with those signatories."

Iraq

"1. The present signature in no way signifies recognition of Israel and implies no relationship with it."

Qatar

"The State of Qatar declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or any dealing with Israel or, lead to entry with Israel into any of the relations governed by the Convention or entailed by the implementation of the provisions thereof."

South Africa

"Pursuant to the provisions of Article 310 of the Convention the South African Government declares that the signature of this Convention by South Africa in no way implies recognition by South Africa of the United Nations Council for Namibia or its competence to act on behalf of South West Africa/Namibia."

Sudan

"[4] The fact that [the Sudan] is signing this Convention and the Final Act of the Conference in no way means that [it] recognizes any State whatsoever which it does not recognize or with which it has no relations."

Yemen

"The fact that we have signed the said Convention in no way implies that we recognize Israel or are entering into relations with it."

4. Recognition of rights under the Convention:

(a) Only vis-à-vis States Parties:

Islamic Republic of Iran

"1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of quid-pro-quo which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only States parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein."

(b) Only on the basis of reciprocity:

Uruguay

"(G) When the Convention enters into force, Uruguay will apply, with respect to other States Parties, the provisions established by the Convention and by Uruguayan legislation, on the basis of reciprocity."

5. Non-recognition of claims or titles:

Argentina

"The signing of the Convention by the Argentine Government does not imply acceptance of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In that regard, the Argentine Republic, as in its written statement of 8 December 1982 (A/CONF.62/WS/35), places on record its reservation to the effect that resolution III, in annex I to the Final Act, in no way affects the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which is governed by the following specific resolutions of the General Assembly: 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9 and 38/12, adopted within the framework of the decolonization process.

In this connection, and bearing in mind that the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands form an integral part of Argentine territory, the Argentine Government declares that it neither recognizes nor will it recognize the title of any other State, community or entity or the exercise by it of any right of maritime jurisdiction which is claimed to be protected under any interpretation of resolution III that violates the rights of Argentina over the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands and their respective maritime zones. Consequently, it likewise neither recognizes nor will recognize and will consider null and void any activity or measure that may be carried out or adopted without its consent with regard to this question, which the Argentine Government considers to be of major importance.

Argentina (continued)

The Argentine Government will accordingly interpret the occurrence of acts of the kind referred to above as contrary to the aforementioned resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the patent objective of which is the peaceful settlement of the sovereignty dispute concerning the islands by means of bilateral negotiations and through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

Spain

"1. The Spanish Government, upon signing this Convention, declares that this act cannot be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations relating to the maritime spaces of Gibraltar which are not included in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht of 13 July 1713 between the Spanish and British Crowns. The Spanish Government also considers that Resolution III of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is not applicable in the case of the Colony of Gibraltar, which is undergoing a decolonization process in which only the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly apply."

6. Link between the Convention and the resolutions:

Argentina

"Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that, whereas the Final Act states in paragraph 42 that the Convention "together with resolutions I to IV, [forms] an integral whole", it is merely describing the procedure that was followed at the Conference to avoid a series of separate votes on the Convention and the resolutions. The Convention itself clearly establishes in article 318 that only the Annexes form an integral part of the Convention; thus, any other instrument or document, even one adopted by the Conference, does not form an integral part of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Nicaragua

"... it being understood that the Convention and the Resolutions adopted on 10 December 1982 and the Annexes to the Convention constitute an inseparable whole."

7. Transfer of competence under Annex IX:

Belgium

"The Belgian Government also wishes to recall that Belgium is a member of the European Economic Community, to which it has transferred powers in certain areas covered by the Convention; detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention."

Luxembourg

"My Government also wishes to recall that Luxembourg is a member of the European Economic Community and, by virtue thereof, has transferred to the Community powers in certain areas covered by the Convention. Detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention."

8. Perfectibility of the Convention:

Bolivia

"The Convention on the Law of the Sea is a perfectible instrument and, according to its own provisions, is subject to revision. As a party to it, Bolivia will, when the time comes, put forward proposals and revisions which are in keeping with its national interests."

Mali

"It thus reiterates its statement of 30 April 1982, reaffirming that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the negotiation and adoption of which the Government of Mali participated in good faith, constitutes a perfectible international legal instrument."

9. Contribution of the Convention to international law:

Luxembourg

"The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because it represents, in the context of the law of the sea, a major contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law."

European Economic Community

"... the Convention constitutes, within the framework of the law of the sea, a major effort in the codification and progressive development of international law in the fields to which its declaration pursuant to Article 2 of Annex IX of the Convention refers. ... "

10. General principles of co-operation:

Mali

"On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Republic of Mali remains convinced of the interdependence of the interests of all peoples and of the need to base international co-operation on, in particular, mutual respect, equality, solidarity at the international, regional and sub-regional levels, and positive good-neighbourliness between States."

European Economic Community

"... The Community would like to express the hope that this development will become a useful means for promoting co-operation and stable relations between all countries in these fields."

11. Maritime sovereignty:

Bolivia

"4. Bolivia wishes to place on record that it is a country that has no maritime sovereignty as a result of a war and not as a result of its natural geographic position and that it will assert all the rights of coastal States under the Convention once it recovers the legal status in question as a consequence of negotiations on the restoration to Bolivia of its own sovereign outlet to the Pacific Ocean."

B. INTERPRETATIVE DECLARATIONS

1. Territorial sea (Part II):

(a) Breadth of the territorial sea:

Belgium

"... it attaches great importance to the conditions to which Articles 21 and 23 of the Convention subject the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, and it intends to ensure that the criteria prescribed by the relevant international agreements are strictly applied, whether the flag States are parties thereto or not. The limitation of the breadth of the territorial sea, as established by Article 3 of the Convention, confirms and codifies a widely observed customary practice which it is incumbent on every State to respect, as it is the only one admitted by international law: the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium will not therefore recognize, as territorial sea, waters which are, or may be, claimed to be such beyond 12 nautical miles measured from baselines determined by the riparian State in accordance with the Convention. ... "

- (b) Innocent passage through the territorial sea and security interests
(Part II, section 3, subsection A):

Cape Verde

"I. This Convention recognizes the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea or archipelagic waters. This right is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it was clearly stated in the Declaration made by the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on April 26, 1982."

Finland

"As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Finland to continue to apply the present régime to the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Finnish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention."

Islamic Republic of Iran

"2) In the light of customary international law, the provisions of article 21, read in association with article 19 (on the Meaning of Innocent Passage) and article 25 (on the Rights of Protection of the Coastal States) recognize (though implicitly) the rights of the Coastal States to take measures to safeguard their security interests including the adoption of laws and regulations regarding, inter alia, the requirements of prior authorization for warships willing to exercise the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea."

Italy

" - None of the provisions of the Convention, which corresponds on this matter to customary international law, can be regarded as entitling the coastal State to make innocent passage of particular categories of foreign ships dependent on prior consent or notification."

Oman

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman that the application of the provisions of articles 19, 25, 34, 38 and 45 of the Convention does not preclude a coastal State from taking such appropriate measures as are necessary to protect its interest of peace and security."

Romania

"2. The Socialist Republic of Romania reaffirms the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt national laws and regulations relating to the passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea.

The right to adopt such measures is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it is also specified in the Statement by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on April 26, 1982."

Sao Tome and Principe

"II. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through its territorial sea or its archipelagic waters and to take any other measures aimed at safeguarding its security;"

Sudan

"[2] [The Sudan] wishes to reiterate [the statement by the President of the Conference] in plenary meeting during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, on 26 April 1982, concerning article 21, which deals with the laws and regulations of the coastal State relating to innocent passage: namely, that the withdrawal of the amendment submitted at the time by a number of States did not prejudice the right of coastal States to take all necessary measures, particularly in order to protect their security, in accordance with article 19 on the meaning of the term "innocent passage" and article 25 on the rights of protection of the coastal State."

Sweden

"As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Sweden to continue to apply the present régime for the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Swedish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention."

Yemen

"2. The Yemen Arab Republic adheres to the concept of general international law concerning free passage as applying exclusively to merchant ships and aircraft; nuclear-powered craft, as well as warships and warplanes in general, must obtain the prior agreement of the Yemen Arab Republic before passing through its territorial waters, in accordance with the established norm of general international law relating to national sovereignty."

2. Rights of the coastal States in the contiguous zone (Part II, section 4):

Belgium

" ... Having underlined the close linkage which it perceives between Article 33, paragraph 1(a), and Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium intends to reserve the right, in emergencies and especially in cases of blatant violation, to exercise the powers accorded to the riparian State by the latter text, without notifying beforehand a diplomatic agent or consular officer of the flag State, on the understanding that such notification shall be given as soon as it is physically possible. ... "

3. Régime of straits (Part III):

Chile

" ... With regard to straits used for international navigation, the delegation of Chile wishes to reaffirm and reiterate in full the statement made last April, as reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164 referred to above, as well as the content of the supplementary written statement dated 7 April 1982 contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/19."

Finland

"It is the understanding of the Government of Finland that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in article 35(c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Finland (the Aland Islands) and Sweden. Since in that strait the passage is regulated in part by a longstanding international convention in force, the present legal régime in that strait will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention."

Greece

"The present declaration concerns the provisions of Part III "on straits used for international navigation" and more especially the application in practice of articles 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea. In areas where there are numerous spread out islands that form a great number of alternative straits which serve in fact one and the same route of international navigation, it is the understanding of Greece, that the coastal State concerned has the responsibility to designate the route or routes, in the said alternative straits, through which ships and aircrafts of third countries could pass under transit passage régime, in such a way as on the one hand the requirements of international navigation and overflight are satisfied, and on the other hand the minimum security requirements of both the ships and aircrafts in transit as well as those of the coastal State are fulfilled."

Islamic Republic of Iran

"1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of quid-pro-quo which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only states parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein.

The above considerations pertain specifically (but not exclusively) to the following:

The right of transit passage through straits used for international navigation (Part III, Section 2, article 38)."

Iraq

"2. Iraq interprets the provisions applying to all types of straits set forth in Part III of the Convention as applying also to navigation between islands situated near those straits if the shipping lanes leaving or entering those straits and defined by the competent international organization lie near such islands."

Oman

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman that the application of the provisions of articles 19, 25, 34, 38 and 45 of the Convention does not preclude a coastal State from taking such appropriate measures as are necessary to protect its interest of peace and security."

Philippines

"7. The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation;"

Spain

"2. It is the Spanish Government's interpretation that the régime established in Part III of the Convention is compatible with the right of the coastal State to issue and apply its own air regulations in the air space of the straits used for international navigation so long as this does not impede the transit passage of aircraft.

3. With regard to Article 39, paragraph 3, it takes the word "normally" to mean "except in cases of force majeure or distress".

Spain (continued)

4. With regard to Article 42, it considers that the provisions of paragraph 1(b) do not prevent it from issuing, in accordance with international law, laws and regulations giving effect to generally accepted international regulations.

...

6. It interprets the provisions of Article 221 as not depriving the coastal State of a strait used for international navigation of its powers, recognized by international law, to intervene in the case of the casualties referred to in that article.

7. It considers that Article 233 must be interpreted, in any case, in conjunction with the provisions of Article 34."

Sweden

"It is the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in Article 35(c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Sweden and Denmark (Oresund) as well as to the strait between Sweden and Finland (the Aland islands). Since in both those straits the passage is regulated in whole or in part by long-standing international conventions in force, the present legal régime in the two straits will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention."

Yemen

"1. The Yemen Arab Republic adheres to the rules of general international law concerning rights to national sovereignty over coastal territorial waters, even in the case of the waters of a strait linking two seas."

4. Exclusive economic zone (Part V):

(a) Sui generis nature:

Cape Verde

"III. The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights recognized therein to the coastal State leave no doubt as to its character of a "sui generis" zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and which is not a part of the high seas."

Chile

"In exercise of the right conferred by article 310 of the Convention, the delegation of Chile wishes first of all to reiterate in its entirety the statement it made at [the April 1982] meeting when the Convention was adopted, which statement is reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164. In particular [it wishes to refer] to the Convention's pivotal legal concept, that of the 200 mile exclusive economic zone to the elaboration of which [Chile] made an important contribution, having been the first to declare such a concept, 35 years ago in 1947, and having subsequently helped to define and earn it international acceptance. The exclusive economic zone has a sui generis legal character distinct from that of the territorial sea and the high seas. It is a zone under national jurisdiction, over which the coastal State exercises economic sovereignty and in which third States enjoy freedom of navigation and overflight and the freedoms inherent in international communication. The Convention defines it as a maritime space under the jurisdiction of the coastal State, bound to the latter's territorial sovereignty and actual territory, on terms similar to those governing other maritime spaces, namely the territorial sea and the continental shelf. ... "

Uruguay

"(B) The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights which the Convention recognizes to the coastal State leave room for no doubt that it is a "sui generis" zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and that it is not part of the high seas."

(b) Application only vis-à-vis other States Parties:

Islamic Republic of Iran

"1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of quid-pro-quo which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only States parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein.

The above considerations pertain specifically (but not exclusively) to the following:

...

- The notion of "Exclusive Economic Zone" (Part V)."

(c) Non-military use by other States:

Brazil

"(IV) The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those that imply the use of weapons or explosives, without the consent of the coastal State."

Cape Verde

"V. In the exclusive economic zone, the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication, in conformity with its definition and with other relevant provisions of the Convention, excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State, such as exercises with weapons or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of the said State; and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State."

Uruguay

"(D) In the exclusive economic zone, enjoyment of the freedom of international communication in accordance with the way it is defined and in accordance with other relevant provisions of the Convention excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State - for instance, military exercises or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of that State - and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State."

(d) Residual rights:

Cape Verde

"IV. The regulations of the uses or activities which are not expressly provided for in the Convention but are related to the sovereign rights and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of the said State, provided that such regulation does not hinder the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication which are recognized to other States."

Italy

" - according to the Convention, the coastal State does not enjoy residual rights in the exclusive economic zone. In particular, the rights and jurisdiction of the coastal State in such zone do not include the right to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them."

Uruguay

"(C) Regulation of the uses and activities not provided for expressly in the Convention (residual rights and obligations) relating to the rights of sovereignty and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of that State, provided that such regulation does not prevent enjoyment of the freedom of international communication which is recognized to other States."

- (e) Application of article 60:

Brazil

"(V) The Brazilian Government understands that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the coastal State has, in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and regulate the construction, operation and use of all types of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose."

Cape Verde

"VI. This Convention does not entitle any State to construct, operate or use installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, either those provided for in the Convention or those of any other nature, without the consent of the coastal State."

Italy

"Moreover, the rights of the coastal State to build and to authorize the construction operation and the use of installations and structures in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf is limited only to the categories of such installations and structures as listed in article 60 of the Convention."

Uruguay

"(E) This Convention does not empower any State to build, operate or utilize installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, neither those referred to in the Convention nor any other kind, without the consent of the coastal State."

- (f) Duties in relation with article 63, paragraph 2:

Cape Verde

"VII. In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to enter into arrangements with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stock or stocks of associated species."

Sao Tome and Principe

"IV. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur within the exclusive economic zone or in an area adjacent thereto, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are under an obligation to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of the stock or stocks of associated species;"

Uruguay

"(F) In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stocks or associated species."

- (g) Application of articles 62 and 64, paragraph 2:

Costa Rica

"The Government of Costa Rica declares that the provisions of Costa Rican law under which foreign vessels must pay for licences to fish in its exclusive economic zone, shall apply also to fishing for highly migratory species, pursuant to the provisions of articles 62 and 64, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

Sao Tome and Principe

"V. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations to ensure the conservation of highly migratory species and to co-operate with the States whose nationals harvest these species in order to promote the optimum utilization thereof."

- (h) Application of articles 69 and 70:

Islamic Republic of Iran:

"4) The provisions of article 70, regarding "Right of States with Special Geographical Characteristics" are without prejudice to the exclusive right of the Coastal States of enclosed and semi-enclosed maritime regions (such as the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman) with large population predominantly dependent upon relatively poor stocks of living resources of the same regions."

Spain

"5. The Spanish Government interprets articles 69 and 70 of the Convention as meaning that access to fishing in the economic zones of third States by the fleets of developed land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States is dependent upon the prior granting of access by the coastal States in question to the nationals of other States who have habitually fished in the economic zone concerned."

Sudan

"[3] The Sudan also wishes to state that, according to its interpretation, the definition of the term "geographically disadvantaged States" given in article 70, paragraph 2, applies to all the parts of the Convention in which this term appears."

- (i) Access by geographically disadvantaged States:

Romania

"1. As a geographically disadvantaged country bordering a sea poor in living resources, Romania reaffirms the necessity to develop international co-operation for the exploitation of the living resources of the economic zones, on the basis of just and equitable agreements that should ensure the access of the countries from this category to the fishing resources in the economic zones of other regions or subregions."

- (j) Discretionary powers of coastal States:

Spain

"8. It considers that, without prejudice to the provisions of Article 297 regarding the settlement of disputes, Articles 56, 61 and 62 of the Convention preclude considering as discretionary the powers of the coastal State to determine the allowable catch, its harvesting capacity and the allocation of surpluses to other States."

5. Continental shelf (Part VI):

- (a) Application of article 76:

Brazil

"(VI) Brazil exercises sovereignty rights over the continental shelf, beyond the distance of two hundred nautical miles from the baselines, up to the outer edge of the continental margin, as defined in article 76."

Uruguay

"(J) Reaffirms that, as stated in article 76, the continental shelf is the natural prolongation of the territory of the coastal State to the outer edge of the continental margin."

(b) Application of article 80:

Brazil

"(V) The Brazilian Government understands that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the coastal State has, in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and regulate the construction, operation and use of all types of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose."

6. Delimitation:

Belgium

"The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because the Convention has a very large number of positive features and achieves a compromise on them which is acceptable to most States. Nevertheless, with regard to the status of maritime space, it regrets that the concept of equity, adopted for the delimitation of the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone, was not applied again in the provisions for delimiting the territorial sea. It welcomes, however, the distinctions established by the Convention between the nature of the rights which riparian States exercise over their territorial sea, on the one hand, and over the continental shelf and their exclusive economic zone on the other."

Islamic Republic of Iran

"5) Islets situated in enclosed and semi-enclosed seas which potentially can sustain human habitation or economic life of their own, but due to climatic conditions, resource restriction or other limitations, have not yet been put to development, fall within the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 121 concerning "Régime of Islands", and have, therefore, full effect in boundary delimitation of various maritime zones of the interested Coastal States."

Romania

"3. The Socialist Republic of Romania states that according to the requirements of equity - as it results from articles 74 and 83 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea - the uninhabited islands and without economic life can in no way affect the delimitation of the maritime spaces belonging to the main land coasts of the coastal States."

7. Régime of islands (Part VIII):

Islamic Republic of Iran

"5) Islets situated in enclosed and semi-enclosed seas which potentially can sustain human habitation or economic life of their own, but due to climatic conditions, resource restriction or other limitations, have not yet been put to development, fall within the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 121 concerning "Régime of Islands", and have, therefore, full effect in boundary delimitation of various maritime zones of the interested Coastal States."

Romania

"3. The Socialist Republic of Romania states that according to the requirements of equity - as it results from articles 74 and 83 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea - the uninhabited islands and without economic life can in no way affect the delimitation of the maritime spaces belonging to the main land coasts of the coastal States."

Yemen

"3. The Yemen Arab Republic confirms its national sovereignty over all the islands in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean which have been its dependencies since the period when the Yemen and the Arab countries were a Turkish administration."

8. Enclosed and semi-enclosed seas (Part IX):

Islamic Republic of Iran

"4) The provisions of article 70, regarding "Right of States with Special Geographical Characteristics" are without prejudice to the exclusive right of the Coastal States of enclosed and semi-enclosed maritime regions (such as the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman) with large population predominantly dependent upon relatively poor stocks of living resources of the same regions.

5) Islets situated in enclosed and semi-enclosed seas which potentially can sustain human habitation or economic life of their own, but due to climatic conditions, resource restriction or other limitations, have not yet been put to development, fall within the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 121 concerning "Régime of Islands", and have, therefore, full effect in boundary delimitation of various maritime zones of the interested Coastal States."

9. Right of access (Part X):

Bolivia

"3. Freedom of access to and from the sea, which the Convention grants to land-locked nations, is a right that Bolivia has been exercising by virtue of bilateral treaties and will continue to exercise by virtue of the norms of positive international law contained in the Convention."

Islamic Republic of Iran

"3) The right referred to in article 125 regarding access to and from the sea and freedom of transit of Land-locked States is one which is derived from mutual agreement of States concerned based on the principle of reciprocity."

10. The Area (Part XI):

(a) Application of article 140:

France

"3. With reference to article 140, the signing of the Convention by France shall not be interpreted as implying any change in its position in respect of resolution 1514 (XV)."

(b) Application only vis-à-vis other States Parties:

Islamic Republic of Iran

"1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law-making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of quid-pro-quo which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only States parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein.

The above considerations pertain specifically (but not exclusively) to the following:

...

- All matters regarding the International Seabed Area and the Concept of "Common Heritage of mankind" (Part XI)."

(c) Work of the Preparatory Commission:

Belgium

"It is common knowledge that the Belgian Government cannot declare itself also satisfied with certain provisions of the international régime of the sea-bed which, though based on a principle that it would not think of challenging, seems not to have chosen the most suitable way of achieving the desired result as quickly and surely as possible, at the risk of jeopardizing the success of a generous undertaking which Belgium consistently encourages and supports. Indeed, certain provisions of Part XI and of Annexes III and IV appear to it to be marred by serious defects and shortcomings which explain why consensus was not reached on this text at the last session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in New York, in April 1982. These shortcomings and defects concern in particular the restriction of access to the Area, the limitations on production and certain procedures for the transfer of technology, not to mention the vexatious implications of the cost and financing of the future International Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. The Belgian Government sincerely hopes that these shortcomings and defects will in fact be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures which the Preparatory Commission should draw up with the twofold intent of facilitating acceptance of the new régime by the whole international community and enabling the common heritage of mankind to be properly exploited for the benefit of all and, preferably, for the benefit of the least favoured countries.

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium is not alone in thinking that the success of this new régime, the effective establishment of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the economic viability of the Enterprise will depend to a large extent on the quality and seriousness of the Preparatory Commission's work: it therefore considers that all decisions of the Commission should be adopted by consensus, that being the only way of protecting the legitimate interests of all.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, the Belgian Government wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Kingdom of Belgium is not here and now determined to ratify it. It will take a separate decision on this point at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all, focusing mainly on the questions to which attention has been drawn above."

France

"2. The provisions of the Convention relating to the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction show considerable deficiencies and flaws with respect to the exploration and exploitation of the said area which will require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of draft rules, regulations and procedures to ensure the establishment and effective functioning of the International Sea-Bed Authority.

To this end, all efforts must be made within the Preparatory Commission to reach general agreement on any matter of substance, in accordance with the procedure set out in rule 37 of the rules of procedure of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea."

Italy

"Upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, Italy wishes to state that in its opinion Part XI and Annexes III and IV contain considerable flaws and deficiencies which require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea of appropriate draft rules, regulations and procedures."

Luxembourg

"Nevertheless, in the view of the Government of Luxembourg, certain provisions of Part XI and Annexes III and IV of the Convention are marred by serious shortcomings and defects which, moreover, explain why it was not possible to reach a consensus on the text at the last session of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in New York in April 1982.

These shortcomings and defects concern, in particular, the mandatory transfer of technology and the cost and financing of the future Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. They will have to be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures to be drawn up by the Preparatory Commission. The Government of Luxembourg recognizes that the work remaining to be done is of great importance and hopes that it will be possible to reach agreement on the modalities for operating a sea-bed mining régime that will be generally acceptable and therefore conducive to promoting the activities of the international zone of the sea-bed.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, my Government wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is not here and now determined to ratify it.

It will take a separate decision on this point, at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all."

European Economic Community

"The Community, however, considers that significant provisions of Part XI of the Convention are not conducive to the development of the activities to which that Part refers in view of the fact that several member States of the Community have already expressed their position that this Part contains considerable deficiencies and flaws which require rectification. The Community recognises the importance of the work which remains to be done and hopes that conditions for the implementation of a sea-bed mining regime, which are generally acceptable and which are therefore likely to promote activities in the international sea bed area, can be agreed. The Community, within the limits of its competence, will play a full part in contributing to the task of finding satisfactory solutions.

A separate decision on formal confirmation (1) will have to be taken at a later stage. It will be taken in the light of the results of the efforts made to attain a universally acceptable Convention."

- (d) Principle of common heritage as jus cogens:

Chile

"With regard to the international sea-bed régime, [the delegation of Chile wishes] to reiterate the statement made by the Group of 77 at [the April 1982] meeting regarding the legal concept of the common heritage of mankind, the existence of which was solemnly confirmed by consensus by the General Assembly in 1970 and which the present Convention defines as a part of jus cogens. Any action taken in contravention of this principle and outside the framework of the sea-bed régime would, as [the April 1982] debate showed, be totally invalid and illegal."

- (e) Participation in joint ventures:

Spain

"9. Its interpretation of Annex III, Article 9, is that the provisions thereof shall not obstruct participation, in the joint ventures referred to in paragraph 2, of the States Parties whose industrial potential precludes them from participating directly as contractors in the exploitation and resources of the Area."

"(1) "Formal confirmation" is the term used in the Convention for ratification by international organizations (see Article 306 and Annex IX, Article 3)."

(f) Development of resources:

Bolivia

"2. Bolivia is confident that the Convention will ensure, in the near future, the joint development of the resources of the sea-bed, with equal opportunities and rights for all nations, especially developing countries."

11. Protection and preservation of the marine environment (Part XII):

(a) Protection against threat of or from existing pollution:

Belgium

"... Finally, everyone will understand that the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium chooses to emphasize those provisions of the Convention which entitle it to protect itself, beyond the limit of the territorial sea, against any threat of pollution and, a fortiori, against any existing pollution resulting from an accident at sea, as well as those provisions which recognize the validity of rights and obligations deriving from specific conventions and agreements concluded previously or which may be concluded subsequently in furtherance of the general principles set forth in the Convention."

(b) Application of article 230, paragraph 2:

France

"4. The provisions of article 230, paragraph 2, of the Convention shall not preclude interim or preventive measures against the parties responsible for the operation of foreign vessels, such as immobilization of the vessel. They shall also not preclude the imposition of penalties other than monetary penalties for any wilful and serious act which causes pollution."

12. General provisions (Part XVI):

Application of article 301:

Brazil

"(III) The Brazilian Government understands that the provision of article 301, which prohibits "any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations", apply, in particular, to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or the jurisdiction of the coastal State."

C. DECLARATIONS WITH REGARD TO SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

1. Reservation of position:

Belgium

"For the time being, the Belgian Government does not wish to make any declaration in accordance with Article 298, confining itself to the one made above in accordance with Article 287. ... "

Brazil

"(VII) The Brazilian Government reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298, concerning the settlement of disputes."

Cuba

"At the time of signing the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Cuban Delegation declares that, having gained possession of the definitive text of the Convention just a few hours ago, it will leave for the time of the ratification of the Convention the issuing of any statement it deems pertinent with respect to articles:

- 287 - on the election of the procedure for the settlement of controversies pertaining to the interpretation or implementation of the Convention;
- 292 - on the prompt release of ships and their crews;
- 298 - on the optional exceptions to the applicability of Section 2;

as well as whatever statement or declaration it might deem appropriate to make in conformity with article 310 of the Convention."

Islamic Republic of Iran

"Furthermore, with regard to "Compulsory Procedures Entailing Binding Decisions" the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, while fully endorsing the Concept of settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, and recognizing the necessity and desirability of settling, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and co-operation, issues relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, at this time will not pronounce on the choice of procedures pursuant to articles 287 and 298 and reserves its positions to be declared in due time."

Nicaragua

"For the purposes of articles 287 and 298 and of other articles concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of Nicaragua shall, if and as the occasion demands, exercise the right conferred by the Convention to make further supplementary or clarificatory declarations."

2. Procedures in accordance with article 287:

(a) Choice of procedure:

Belgium

"In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it obviously gives priority, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium deems it expedient to choose alternatively, and in order of preference, as Article 287 of the Convention leaves it free to do, the following means of settling disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
2. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
3. the International Court of Justice."

(b) International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (article 287, paragraph 1(a)):

(i) With regard to the interpretation or application of the Convention:

Uruguay

"(H) Pursuant to the provisions of article 287, Uruguay declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of such disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention as are not subject to other procedures, without prejudice to its recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and of such agreements with other States as may provide for other means for peaceful settlement."

- (ii) With regard to the prompt release of vessels and crews:

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic

"1. ... The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in relation to questions of the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292."

German Democratic Republic

"The German Democratic Republic recognizes the competence, provided for in article 292 of the Convention, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in matters relating to the prompt release of vessels and crews."

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

"1. ... The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the competence, as stipulated in article 292, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews."

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

"1. ... It recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as provided for in article 292, in matters relating to the prompt release of detained vessels and crews."

3. International Court of Justice (article 287, paragraph 1(b)):

Uruguay

"(H) Pursuant to the provisions of article 287, Uruguay declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of such disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention as are not subject to other procedures, without prejudice to its recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and of such agreements with other States as may provide for other means for peaceful settlement."

4. Arbitration in accordance with Annex VII (article 287, paragraph 1(c)):

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic

"1. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it accepts, as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. ... "

German Democratic Republic

"[1] The German Democratic Republic declares that it accepts an arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1(c), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, which cannot be settled by the States involved by recourse to other peaceful means of dispute settlement agreed between them."

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

"1. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. ... "

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

"1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, under article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. ... "

5. Special arbitration in accordance with Annex VIII (article 287, paragraph 1(d)):

Belgium

"Still in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium wishes here and now to recognize the validity of the special arbitration procedure for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the provisions of the Convention in respect of fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping."

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic

"1. ... For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. ... "

German Democratic Republic

"The German Democratic Republic further declares that it accepts a special arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1(d), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VIII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles of this Convention relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from ships and through dumping."

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

"1. ... For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Ukrainian SSR chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. ... "

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

"1. ... It opts for a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for the consideration of matters relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, including pollution from vessels and dumping. ... "

6. Optional exceptions to application of Part XV, section 2:

- (a) With respect to disputes specified under article 298, paragraphs 1(a), (b) and (c):

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic

"2. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions in the consideration of disputes concerned with the delimitation of marine limits, disputes relating to military activity and disputes in relation to which the United Nations Security Council performs functions entrusted to it under the United Nations Charter."

German Democratic Republic

"The German Democratic Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept any compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions

- in disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations,
- in disputes relating to military activities and
- in disputes concerning which the United Nations Security Council exercises the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations."

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

"2. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept compulsory procedures, involving binding decisions, for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities and disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations."

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

"2. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept the compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities, or disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations."

- (b) With respect to disputes involving law enforcement activities only (article 298, paragraph 1(b)):

Uruguay

"(I) Pursuant to the provisions of article 298, Uruguay declares that it will not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2 of the Convention, in respect of disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraphs 2 and 3."

ANNEX

DECLARATIONS MADE UPON RATIFICATION OF THE CONVENTION
BY CUBA AND THE PHILIPPINES

I. Cuba

With regard to article 287 on the choice of procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and, consequently, will not accept either the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the provisions of either articles 297 and 298.

With regard to article 292, the Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that once financial security has been posted, the detaining State should proceed promptly and without delay to release the vessel and its crew and declares that where this procedure is not followed with respect to its vessels or members of their crew it will not agree to submit the matter to the International Court of Justice.

II. Philippines

1. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines under and arising from the Constitution of the Philippines;

2. Such signing shall not in any manner affect the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines as successor of the United States of America, under and arising out of the Treaty of Paris between Spain and the United States of America of 10 December 1898, and the Treaty of Washington between the United States of America and Great Britain of 2 January 1930;

3. Such signing shall not diminish or in any manner affect the rights and obligations of the contracting parties under the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of 30 August 1951, and its related interpretative instruments; nor those under any other pertinent bilateral or multilateral treaty or agreement to which the Philippines is a party;

4. Such signing shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines over any territory over which it exercises sovereign authority, such as the Kalayaan Islands, and the waters appurtenant thereto;

5. The Convention shall not be construed as amending in any manner any pertinent laws and presidential decrees or proclamations of the Republic of the Philippines; the Government of the Republic of the Philippines maintains and reserves the right and authority to make any amendments to such laws, decrees or proclamations pursuant to the provisions of the Philippines Constitution;

6. The provisions of the Convention on archipelagic passage through sea lanes do not nullify or impair the sovereignty of the Philippines as an archipelagic State over the sea lanes and do not deprive it of authority to enact legislation to protect its sovereignty, independence, and security;

7. The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation;

8. The agreement of the Republic of the Philippines to the submission for peaceful resolution, under any of the procedures provided in the Convention, of disputes under Article 298 shall not be considered as a derogation of Philippines sovereignty.

