

Date of most recent action: June 30, 2019

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling

Done at: Washington; December 2, 1946

Entered into force: November 10, 1948

In accordance with Article X, paragraph 1, this Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America.

In accordance with Article X, paragraph 2, any Government which has not signed the Convention may adhere thereto after it enters into force by a notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America.

In accordance with Article X, paragraph 4, the Convention entered into force when instruments of ratification had been deposited by at least six signatory Governments, including the Governments of the Netherlands, Norway, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. The Convention shall enter into force with respect to each Government which subsequently ratifies or adheres on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or the receipt of its notification of adherence.

Legend: (no mark) = ratification; **h** = adherence; **w** = withdrawal or equivalent action

Participant	Signature	Consent to be bound		Entry into Force	Other Action	Notes
Antigua and Barbuda		July 21, 1982	h	July 21, 1982		
Argentina	December 2, 1946	May 18, 1960		May 18, 1960		¹
Australia	December 2, 1946	December 1, 1947		November 10, 1948		
Austria		May 20, 1994	h	May 20, 1994		
Belgium		July 14, 2004	a	July 14, 2004		
Belize		June 17, 2003	h	June 17, 2003		²
Benin		April 26, 2002	h	April 26, 2002		
Brazil	December 2, 1946	January 4, 1974	h	January 4, 1974		^{3 4}
Bulgaria		August 10, 2009	h	August 10, 2009		
Cambodia		June 1, 2006	h	June 1, 2006		
Cameroon		June 14, 2005	h	June 14, 2005		
Chile	December 2, 1946	July 6, 1979		July 6, 1979		⁵
China		September 24, 1980	h	September 24, 1980		⁶
Colombia		March 22, 2011	h	March 22, 2011		

Congo, Rep. of		May 29, 2008	h	May 29, 2008		
Costa Rica		July 24, 1981	h	July 24, 1981		7
Côte d'Ivoire		July 8, 2004	h	July 8, 2004		
Croatia		January 10, 2007	h	January 10, 2007		
Cyprus		February 26, 2007	h	February 26, 2007		
Czech Republic		January 24, 2005	h	January 24, 2005		
Denmark	December 2, 1946	May 23, 1950		May 23, 1950		
Dominica		June 18, 1992	h	June 18, 1992		8
Dominican Republic		July 30, 2009	h	July 30, 2009		
Ecuador		May 10, 2007	h	May 10, 2007		9 10
Eritrea		October 10, 2007	h	October 10, 2007		
Estonia		January 7, 2009	h	January 7, 2009		
Finland		February 23, 1983	h	February 23, 1983		
France	December 2, 1946	December 3, 1948		December 3, 1948		
Gabon		May 8, 2002	h	May 8, 2002		
The Gambia		May 17, 2005	h	May 17, 2005		
Germany		July 2, 1982	h	July 2, 1982		11
Ghana		July 17, 2009	h	July 17, 2009		
Grenada		April 7, 1993	h	April 7, 1993		
Guinea		June 21, 2000	h	June 21, 2000		
Guinea-Bissau		May 29, 2007	h	May 29, 2007		
Hungary		June 1, 2004	h	June 1, 2004		
Iceland		October 10, 2002	h	October 10, 2002		12 13
India		March 9, 1981	h	March 9, 1981		
Ireland		January 2, 1985	h	January 2, 1985		
Israel		June 7, 2006	h	June 7, 2006		
Italy		February 12, 1998	h	February 12, 1998		
Kenya		December 2, 1981	h	December 2, 1981		
Kiribati		December 28, 2004	h	December 28, 2004		
Korea (ROK)		December 29, 1978	h	December 29, 1978		
Laos		May 22, 2007	h	May 22, 2007		
Liberia		August 10, 2018	h	August 10, 2018		
Lithuania		November 25, 2008	h	November 25, 2008		
Luxembourg		June 10, 2005	h	June 10, 2005		
Mali		August 17, 2004	h	August 17, 2004		
Marshall Islands		June 1, 2006	h	June 1, 2006		
Mauritania		December 23, 2003	h	December 23, 2003		
Mexico		June 30, 1949	h	June 30, 1949		
Monaco		March 15, 1982	h	March 15, 1982		
Mongolia		May 16, 2002	h	May 16, 2002		
Morocco		February 12, 2001	h	February 12, 2001		
Nauru		June 15, 2005	h	June 15, 2005		
Netherlands		June 14, 1977	h	June 14, 1977		14 15 16 17

New Zealand		June 15, 1976	h	June 15, 1976		18
Nicaragua		June 5, 2003	h	June 5, 2003		
Norway		September 23, 1960	h	September 23, 1960		19 20 21 22
Oman		July 15, 1980	h	July 15, 1980		
Palau		May 8, 2002	h	May 8, 2002		
Panama		June 12, 2001	h	June 12, 2001		23
Peru	December 2, 1946	June 18, 1979		June 18, 1979		24 25 26
Poland		April 17, 2009	h	April 17, 2009		
Portugal		May 14, 2002	h	May 14, 2002		
Romania		April 9, 2008	h	April 9, 2008		
Russian Federation	December 2, 1946	September 11, 1948		November 10, 1948		27
Saint Kitts and Nevis		June 24, 1992	h	June 24, 1992		
Saint Lucia		June 29, 1981	h	June 29, 1981		
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		July 22, 1981	h	July 22, 1981		
San Marino		April 16, 2002	h	April 16, 2002		
Sao Tome and Principe		May 18, 2018	h	May 18, 2018		
Senegal		July 15, 1982	h	July 15, 1982		
Slovak Republic		March 22, 2005	h	March 22, 2005		
Slovenia		September 20, 2006	h	September 20, 2006		
Solomon Islands		May 10, 1993	h	May 10, 1993		28
South Africa	December 2, 1946	May 5, 1948		November 10, 1948		
Spain		July 6, 1979	h	July 6, 1979		
Suriname		July 14, 2004	h	July 14, 2004		
Sweden		June 15, 1979	h	June 15, 1979		29
Switzerland		May 29, 1980	h	May 29, 1980		
Tanzania		June 23, 2008	h	June 23, 2008		
Togo		June 15, 2005	h	June 15, 2005		
Tuvalu		June 30, 2004	h	June 30, 2004		
United Kingdom	December 2, 1946	June 17, 1947		November 10, 1948		
United States	December 2, 1946	July 18, 1947		November 10, 1948		
Uruguay		September 27, 2007	h	September 27, 2007		30

Former Parties to the Convention:

Participant	Signature	Consent to be bound		Entry into Force	Other Action	Notes
Canada	December 2, 1946	February 25, 1949		February 25, 1949	w	31
Egypt		September 18, 1981	h	September 18, 1981	w	32
Greece		May 16, 2007	h	May 16, 2007	w	33
Guatemala		May 16, 2006	h	May 16, 2006	w	34
Jamaica		July 15, 1981	h	July 15, 1981	w	35
Japan		April 21, 1951	h	April 21, 1951	w	36
Mauritius		June 17, 1983	h	June 17, 1983	w	37
Philippines		August 10, 1981	h	August 10, 1981	w	38
Seychelles		March 19, 1979	h	March 19, 1979	w	39
Venezuela		July 11, 1991	h	July 11, 1991	w	40

¹ (a) The Argentine instrument of ratification contains the following statement designated as a reservation:
 “Se deja expresa constancia de que si otra Parte Contratante, de acuerdo con los términos del artículo I, inciso 2 y el artículo IX, inciso 1, 3 y 4, de la Convención referida; y el artículo Iº, punto b), del Reglamento adjunto a la misma, o disposiciones concordantes, extendiera la aplicación de la Convención o del Reglamento a territorios que pertenecen a la Soberanía de la República Argentina tales como las islas Malvinas, islas Georgias del Sud, islas Sandwich del Sud y el Sector Antártico Argentino, tal extensión en nada afectará sus derechos.”

(b) The British Ambassador informed the Secretary of State by a note dated August 12, 1960, as follows:

“The [Argentine] instrument contained a statement, designated as a reservation, which refers to the Falkland Islands under the incorrect designation ‘Islas Malvinas’ and to alleged Argentine sovereignty over these islands and the Falkland Islands Dependencies, including South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands.

“Her Majesty's Ambassador has been instructed to request the United States Government to inform all Contracting Governments that the Falkland Islands and the Falkland Islands Dependencies are, and remain, under the sovereignty of Her Majesty; and that Her Majesty's Government do not admit the claim of the Argentine Government to sovereignty over any part of these territories.”

(c) The Secretary of State informed the Argentine Ambassador by a note dated September 14, 1960, as follows:

“My Government wishes to point out, as it has on previous occasions, that it does not recognize any of the claims of sovereignty which have been asserted over territory in Antarctica and that it reserves all of the rights of the United States of America with respect to the area.”

(d) With reference to the views expressed in the British Ambassador's note dated August 12, 1960, to the Secretary of State, the Secretary informed the British Chargé d'Affaires ad interim by a note dated October 6, 1960, as follows:

“In as much as it is understood that the Government of the United Kingdom considers the ‘Falkland Islands Dependencies’ to include a portion of Antarctica, the Secretary of State wishes to point out, as has been done by his Government on previous occasions, that the Government of the United States of America does not recognize any of the claims of sovereignty which have been asserted over territory in Antarctica and that it reserves all of the rights of the United States of America with respect to the area.”

² Previously, Belize adhered to the Convention on June 15, 1982. By note of December 30, 1987, the Ambassador of Belize gave notice of withdrawal from the Convention by the Government of Belize. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1988.

³ Previously, Brazil adhered to the Convention on May 9, 1950. By a note dated December 27, 1965, to the Secretary of State, the Brazilian Chargé d'Affaires ad interim gave notice of Brazil's withdrawal from the Convention, to be effective June 30, 1966.

⁴ The Brazilian adherence applies to the Convention as amended by the 1956 Protocol.

⁵ Ratification by Chile includes the reservation that none of the provisions of the Convention could affect or restrict the sovereign rights of Chile in its Maritime Zone of 200 miles.

⁶ The notification of adherence by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains a declaration, the text of which, in translation, reads as follows:

"... the Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the recognition of and application to accede to the above Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China."

⁷ Previously, Costa Rica adhered to the Convention on May 6, 1981. By note of June 1, 1981, Costa Rica retracted its notification of adherence pending completion of legislative procedures.

⁸ Previously, Dominica adhered to the Convention on July 9, 1981. By a note dated June 15, 1982, the Ministry of External Affairs of the Commonwealth of Dominica gave notice of Dominica's withdrawal from the Convention effective June 30, 1983.

⁹ Previously, Ecuador adhered to the Convention on May 2, 1991, with a reservation which, in translation, reads as follows:

"None of [the Convention's] provisions may affect or diminish the sovereign rights which Ecuador holds, has exercised, and exercises over its 200 nautical mile territorial sea, both insular and continental."

The United States of America, the Russian Federation, and the Federal Republic of Germany communicated objections to this reservation, which objections read as follows:

From the United States of America:

"The Secretary of State presents his compliments to Their Excellencies and Messieurs and Mesdames the Chiefs of Mission of the Governments concerned with the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, signed at Washington on December 2, 1946, and has the honor to refer to his circular note of May 15, 1991 referring to the deposit with the Government of the United States of America on May 2, 1991 by Ecuador of an instrument of adherence which includes a reservation, which, in translation, reads as follows:

"None of its provisions may affect or diminish the sovereign rights which Ecuador holds, has exercised, and exercises over its 200 nautical mile territorial sea, both insular and continental."

"The Secretary of State wishes to state that, while the United States recognizes the right of Ecuador under international law to exercise fisheries jurisdiction within 200 nautical miles of its coast, the United States does not accept the reservation contained in the instrument of adherence by Ecuador, insofar as it asserts a claim to the territorial sea greater than 12 nautical miles, the maximum limit permitted under international law.

"The Secretary of State would be grateful if the Chiefs of Mission would forward this information to their respective governments.

Department of State
Washington, May 1, 1992."

From the Russian Federation:

“The Embassy of the Russian Federation presents its compliments to the Department of State of the United States of America and, referring to the note from the U.S. Secretary of State, dated May 15, 1991, notifying it of Ecuador’s accession to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, has the honor to communicate that the Russian Federation cannot agree with the proviso made by Ecuador, because it is incompatible with the objective and goals of this Convention and contradicts the norms of international law, according to which the breadth of the territorial waters of a state may not exceed 12 nautical miles.

“The Embassy takes the occasion to renew to the Department of State the assurances of its high consideration.

Washington, D.C., February 10, 1992.”

From the Federal Republic of Germany:

“The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honor to refer to its circular note of May 15, 1991 concerning the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and in particular to the instrument of adherence by the Government of Ecuador as of May 2, 1992 including a reservation as mentioned in the above circular note.

“The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to submit a statement of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany concerning this matter which reads as follows:

“The reservation made in the circular note of May 15, 1991 – concerning Ecuador – cannot be accepted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany as it is not in accordance with the general principles of International Law as these have found expression in the 1982 UN Convention of the Law of the Sea. Those principles state explicitly that Sovereign Rights exercised by a State over its Territorial Sea should not exceed the limit of 12 nautical miles.

“The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration.

Washington, D.C., May 29, 1992.”

¹⁰ By note of December 8, 1993, the Embassy of Ecuador gave notice of Ecuador's withdrawal from the Convention effective June 30, 1994.

¹¹ Adherence by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany accompanied by a Declaration that the convention and protocol shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which they enter into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

¹² Previously, Iceland adhered to the Convention on March 10, 1947, and the Convention entered into force for all parties November 10, 1948. By note of December 27, 1991, the Embassy of Iceland gave notice of Iceland's withdrawal from the Convention effective June 30, 1992.

¹³ On June 8, 2001, Iceland deposited an instrument of adherence to the Whaling Convention and the 1956 Protocol thereto which contains a reservation to Paragraph 10 (e) of the Convention’s Schedule. In performance of its depositary function, the United States, in a circular note dated June 11, 2001, informed the parties to the Whaling Convention of Iceland’s action. On July 22, 2001, at the 53rd meeting of the International Whaling Commission, the Commission decided (by a vote of 19 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstentions and 16 states not participating) not to accept Iceland’s reservation. A subsequent vote of the Commission decided to continue to recognize Iceland as an observer (by a vote of 18 in favor, 16 opposed and 4 abstentions).

On May 14, 2002, Iceland deposited another instrument of adherence to the Whaling Convention and the 1956 Protocol thereto which contains a reservation to Paragraph 10 (e) of the Convention’s Schedule identical to the

reservation Iceland had included in the instrument of adherence it deposited on June 8, 2001. Included in this instrument is a statement which reads as follows from the English translation provided by Iceland:

Notwithstanding the aforementioned reservation, the Government of Iceland will not authorize whaling for commercial purposes by Icelandic vessels while progress is being made in negotiations within the International Whaling Commission on the Revised Management Scheme. This does not apply, however, in case of the so-called moratorium on whaling for commercial purposes, contained in paragraph 10 (e) of the Schedule, not being lifted within reasonable time after the completion of the Revised Management Scheme.

Under no circumstances will whaling for commercial purposes be authorized in Iceland without a sound scientific basis and an effective management and enforcement scheme.

The depositary communicated Iceland's action to the members of the International Whaling Commission attending its 54th meeting in Shimonoseki, Japan. On May 20, 2002, the Commission decided (by a 25-20 vote) to uphold the Chairman's ruling that he was bound by the decisions not to accept Iceland's reservation and to recognize Iceland as an observer which were taken at the 53rd meeting of the International Whaling Commission.

On October 10, 2002, Iceland deposited another instrument of adherence to the Whaling Convention and the 1956 Protocol thereto which contains a reservation to Paragraph 10 (e) of the Convention's Schedule identical to the reservation Iceland had included in the instruments of adherence to the Convention it deposited on June 8, 2001 and May 14, 2002. Included in this instrument is a statement which reads as follows from the English translation provided by Iceland:

Notwithstanding this [reservation], the Government of Iceland will not authorize whaling for commercial purposes by Icelandic vessels before 2006 and, thereafter, will not authorize such whaling while progress is being made in negotiations within the International Whaling Commission on the Revised Management Scheme. This does not apply, however, in case of the so-called moratorium on whaling for commercial purposes, contained in paragraph 10 (e) of the Schedule, not being lifted within reasonable time after the completion of the Revised Management Scheme.

Under no circumstances will whaling for commercial purposes be authorized in Iceland without a sound scientific basis and an effective management and enforcement scheme.

The depositary communicated Iceland's action to the members of the International Whaling Commission attending its Fifth Special Meeting in Cambridge, United Kingdom on October 14, 2002. In a challenge vote to the Chairman's ruling that he was bound by the decisions not to accept Iceland's reservation and to recognize Iceland as an observer, taken at the 53rd Meeting of the Commission, the Commission decided (by a 19-18 vote) not to uphold that ruling.

Certain parties to the Convention provided communications to the depositary with respect to the events described above as follows:

By note dated November 26, 2002, and received on November 27, 2002, the Government of **Sweden** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated December 5, 2002, and received on December 16, 2002, the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated December 13, 2002, and received on January 7, 2003, **France** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated December 6, 2002, and received on February 5, 2003, **Italy** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002. The objection by Italy states in relevant part: “. . . that Iceland, because of its reservation, may not be regarded as a party to the Convention nor a member of the IWC.”

By note dated January 31, 2003, and received on February 5, 2003, **Brazil** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated February 3, 2003, and received on that same date, **Germany** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated February 5, 2003, and received on that same date, **Australia** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated February 6, 2003, and received on that same date, **Argentina** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated February 10, 2003, and received on February 14, 2003, **Mexico** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002. The objection by Mexico states in relevant part: "... because of its reservation, Iceland will not be regarded as a party to the Convention, nor as a member of the International Whaling Commission (IWC), insofar as Mexico is concerned."

By note dated February 12, 2003, and received on February 26, 2003, the **Netherlands** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated February 4, 2003, and received on March 6, 2003, **Spain** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated February 13, 2003, and received on March 24, 2003, the Department of Foreign Relations of the **Principality of Monaco** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated March 5, 2003, and received on March 11, 2003, **Peru** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated March 13, 2003, and received on March 17, 2003, the Department of Foreign Affairs of the **Republic of San Marino** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated March 25, 2003, and received on March 26, 2003, the Royal Norwegian Embassy communicated the position of the **Norwegian Government** regarding Iceland's membership in the International Whaling Commission. The note reads in relevant part as follows:

"The position of the Norwegian Government is that the competent body of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) has already made a decision with regard to Iceland's adherence to the IWC, with binding effect for all IWC Parties, and in accordance with the principle of Art. 20 Para. 3 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969. The decision of the 5th Special Meeting of the IWC on 14 October 2002 to accept Iceland's adherence obliges all IWC Members to fully recognize Iceland as a Member of the IWC with such reservations as have been made, and Norway will consider any and all objections to this decision to be without legal consequence.

"The Government of Norway undertakes to act in accordance with the said decision, and will oppose attempts to question its legitimacy."

By note dated April 17, 2003, and received on April 23, 2003, the Embassy of **New Zealand** communicated the position of the Government of New Zealand regarding the reservation contained in Iceland's instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002. The note reads in relevant part as follows:

"It is the view of the Government of New Zealand that the reservation is not permitted by the Convention. Further, the Government of New Zealand considers that the reservation is incompatible with the object and

purpose of the Convention and is without legal effect. Accordingly, New Zealand does not accept the Convention as being in force between New Zealand and Iceland.”

By note dated May 6, 2003, and received on May 23, 2003, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the **Republic of Chile** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland’s instrument of adherence of October 10, 2002. The objection by Chile reads in relevant part as follows: “The Government of Chile would like to express its objection with respect to the . . . reservation, declaring that it constitutes an untimely presentation of an amendment to the Schedule or Annex of the Convention approved by the International Whaling Commission in 1986, which is inadmissible.” [Non-official translation provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Chile]

By note dated May 15, 2003, and received on May 30, 2003, the Government of **Finland** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland’s instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

By note dated May 19, 2003, and received on June 4, 2003, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of **Iceland** communicated its views regarding the objection by Sweden to the reservation contained in Iceland’s instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002. The note from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Iceland reads in relevant part:

“The . . . Note [from the Embassy of Sweden] states that the objection by the Government of Sweden shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Iceland and Sweden. However, the Note also contains the following conclusion: ‘The Convention enters into force in its entirety without Iceland benefiting from its reservation.’

“This conclusion is without foundation in international law. According to Article 21, paragraph 3, of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which reflects customary international law, ‘[w]hen a State objecting to a reservation has not opposed the entry into force of the treaty between itself and the reserving State, the provisions to which the reservation relates do not apply as between the two States to the extent of the reservation.’

“Accordingly, the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling is in force between Iceland and Sweden with the exception of paragraph 10 (e) of the Schedule attached to the Convention, to which the reservation of Iceland relates.”

By note dated May 15, 2003, and received on June 16, 2003, the Government of **Portugal** objected to the reservation contained in Iceland’s instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002. The note reads in relevant part as follows:

“When paragraph 10 (e) of the schedule was adopted (1982), Iceland was a party to the Whaling Convention and did not present any objection to it, as it could have done within the 90-day deadline and under the procedures set forth in Art. V. paragraph 3, of the Convention.

“Portugal considers that the reservation is not compatible with the object and purpose of the Whaling Convention and therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Iceland with respect to paragraph 10 (e) of the Schedule attached to the Convention.

“Nevertheless, it is our understanding that the remainder of the Convention may [enter] into force between Iceland and Portugal.”

By circular note dated May 27, 2003, the **United States of America**, in its capacity as a party to the Convention, objected to the reservation contained in Iceland’s instrument of adherence deposited on October 10, 2002.

¹⁴ Previously, the Netherlands submitted an instrument of ratification for the Convention November 10, 1948. By a note dated December 31, 1958, to the Secretary of State, the Netherlands Ambassador gave notice of the Netherlands withdrawal from the Convention, to be effective June 30, 1959. The Netherlands rejoined the Convention by adherence on May 6, 1962. By a note dated December 24, 1969, to the Secretary of State, the

Netherlands Ambassador gave notice of the Netherlands' withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1970.

¹⁵ The Netherlands adherence applies to the Convention as amended by the 1956 Protocol.

¹⁶ The notification of adherence by the Netherlands states that the Convention and the 1956 Protocol will apply to the Kingdom in Europe.

¹⁷ Declaration received February 16, 1982, from Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that the application of the Convention and 1956 Protocol is extended to the Netherlands Antilles.

The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Washington transmitted to the Department of State a diplomatic note, dated January 9, 1986, which reads as follows:

“The Royal Netherlands Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honor to request the Department’s attention for the following with respect to the Department’s capacity of depositary of [the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling].

“Effective January 1, 1986 the island of Aruba – formerly part of the Netherlands Antilles – obtained internal autonomy as a country within the Kingdom of The Netherlands. Consequently the Kingdom of The Netherlands as of January 1, 1986 consists of three countries, to wit: the Netherlands proper, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. “Since the abovementioned event concerns only a change in internal constitutional relations within the Kingdom of The Netherlands, and as the Kingdom as such, under international law, will remain the subject with which treaties are concluded, the aforementioned change will have no consequences in international law with regard to treaties concluded by the Kingdom, the application of which (treaties) were extended to the Netherlands Antilles, including Aruba.

“These treaties, thus, will remain applicable for Aruba in its new status as autonomous country within the Kingdom of The Netherlands effective January 1, 1986.

“Consequently the [Convention] to which the Kingdom of the Netherlands is a Party, and which [has] been extended to the Netherlands Antilles will as of January 1, 1986 apply to all three countries of the Kingdom of The Netherlands.

“The Embassy would appreciate if the other Parties concerned would be notified of the above.

“The Royal Netherlands Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State the assurance of its highest consideration.”

The Royal Netherlands Embassy in Washington transmitted to the Department of State a diplomatic note, dated October 6, 2010, which reads in pertinent part as follows:

“The Kingdom of the Netherlands currently consists of three parts: the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba. The Netherlands Antilles consists of the islands of Curaçao, Sint Maarten, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba. “With effect from 10 October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles will cease to exist as a part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. From that date onwards, the Kingdom will consist of four parts: the Netherlands, Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten. Curaçao and Sint Maarten will enjoy internal self-government within the Kingdom, as Aruba and, up to 10 October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles do.

“These changes constitute a modification of the internal constitutional relations within the Kingdom of the Netherlands. The Kingdom of the Netherlands will accordingly remain the subject of international law with which agreements are concluded. The modification of the structure of the Kingdom will therefore not affect the validity of the international agreements ratified by the Kingdom for the Netherlands Antilles; these agreements will continue to apply to Curaçao and Sint Maarten.

“The other islands that have until now formed part of the Netherlands Antilles – Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba – will become part of the Netherlands, thus constituting ‘the Caribbean part of the Netherlands’. The agreements that now apply to the Netherlands Antilles will also continue to apply to these islands; however, the Government of the Netherlands will now be responsible for implementing these agreements.”

¹⁸ Previously, New Zealand signed the Convention on December 2, 1946, and submitted an instrument of ratification August 2, 1949. By a note dated October 1, 1968, to the Secretary of State, the New Zealand Ambassador gave notice of New Zealand's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1969.

¹⁹ Previously, Norway signed the Convention December 2, 1946, and submitted an instrument of ratification March 3, 1948. By a note dated December 29, 1958, to the Secretary of State, the Norwegian Ambassador gave notice of Norway's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1959.

²⁰ The Norwegian adherence applies to the Convention as amended by the 1956 Protocol.

²¹ The Norwegian Ambassador informed the Secretary of State by a note dated September 23, 1960, that "the continued adherence of the Norwegian Government to the Convention is dependent upon the following conditions being fulfilled: 1) that the Government of the Netherlands adheres to the Convention, 2) that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics maintains its pledge of November 1958 to limit the catch of the Soviet expeditions' share of the total quota established by the International Whaling Commission to 20 percent annually for a seven year period, 3) that an agreement is reached within reasonable time on the division of the remaining 80 percent of the total quota between Norway, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The Norwegian Government at the same time wishes to emphasize the vital importance of reaching an agreement between the countries engaged in Pelagic Whaling in Antarctic Waters on an International Inspection System for the observance of the regulations drawn up by the International Whaling Commission."

²² By a note dated December 29, 1961, to the Secretary of State, the Norwegian Ambassador gave notice of Norway's withdrawal from the Convention, to be effective June 30, 1962. A note was received on June 6, 1962, from the Norwegian Ambassador, canceling the notification of withdrawal dated December 29, 1961.

²³ Previously, Panama adhered to the Convention September 30, 1948. By a note dated July 2, 1968, to the Secretary of State, the Panamanian Ambassador gave notice of Panama's withdrawal from the Convention, to be effective June 30, 1969. A note was received on June 13, 1969, from the Panamanian Ambassador, canceling the notification of withdrawal dated July 2, 1968.

By a note dated November 16, 1977, the Embassy of Panama gave notice to the Department of State of Panama's withdrawal from the Convention to be effective June 30, 1978. A note dated June 26, 1978, was received from the Embassy of Panama informing the Department of State of the Government of Panama's decision to remain a party to the Convention and, consequently, of the withdrawal of its notice of November 16, 1977.

By a note February 7, 1979, the Embassy of Panama gave notice of Panama's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1980.

²⁴ Ratification by Peru accompanied by a statement "that this cannot be interpreted as detrimental to or restrictive of the sovereignty and jurisdiction which Peru exercises up to a limit of two hundred miles off its coast."

²⁵ By a note dated May 27, 1983, from the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, a formal objection was placed on record to the statement made by Peru on June 18, 1979, on ratifying the Convention.

²⁶ By note of March 1, 1984, from the British Ambassador, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that it "considers that the claim by the Government of Peru that Peru exercises unrestricted sovereignty and jurisdiction to a limit of two hundred miles off its coasts has no validity under international law."

²⁷ The former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics signed and ratified the Convention. By a note dated January 13, 1992, the Russian Federation informed the United States Government that it "continues to perform the rights and fulfil the obligations following from the international agreements signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." Furthermore, by note of June 25, 1992, the Embassy of the Russian Federation in London informed the International Whaling Commission that the membership of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling is continued by the Russian Federation and that the name "The Russian Federation" should be used.

²⁸ Previously, Solomon Islands adhered to the Convention on July 18, 1985. By note dated November 9, 1989, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Solomon Islands gave notice of withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective June 30, 1990.

²⁹ Previously, Sweden adhered to the Convention on January 28, 1949. By a note dated December 17, 1963, to the Secretary of State, the Swedish Ambassador gave notice of Sweden's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1964.

³⁰ Previously, Uruguay adhered to the Convention July 15, 1981. By note of October 15, 1990, the Embassy of Uruguay gave notice of Uruguay's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1991.

³¹ By a note of June 24, 1981, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada gave notice of Canada's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1982.

³² By note dated November 29, 1988, the Embassy of the Arab Republic of Egypt gave notice of withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1989.

³³ By note dated December 19, 2012, the Embassy of Greece gave notice of Greece's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 2013.

³⁴ By note dated December 26, 2016, the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Guatemala gave notice of Guatemala's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 2017.

³⁵ By a notification dated September 2, 1983, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Jamaica gave notice of Jamaica's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1984.

³⁶ By a note dated February 6, 1959, to the Secretary of State, the Japanese Ambassador gave notice of Japan's withdrawal from the Convention, to be effective June 30, 1959.

The Japanese Ambassador informed the Secretary of State by a note dated June 29, 1959, that "the Government of Japan hereby cancels the above notice of withdrawal."

By a note verbale dated December 26, 2018, the Embassy of Japan informed the United States Government of Japan's withdrawal from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 2019.

³⁷ By note of August 27, 1987, the Ambassador of Mauritius gave notice of withdrawal from the Convention by the Government of Mauritius. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1988.

³⁸ By note of December 3, 1987, the Embassy of the Philippines gave notice of withdrawal from the Convention by the Government of the Philippines. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1988.

³⁹ By note of April 18, 1994, received by USG on June 3, 1994, the Government of Seychelles informed the Embassy in Victoria of its intention to withdraw from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1995.

⁴⁰ By a notification dated February 18, 1998, the Government of Venezuela informed the Department of State of its intention to withdraw from the Convention. The withdrawal became effective on June 30, 1999.