

TRACTATENBLAD

VAN HET

KONINKRIJK DER NEDERLANDEN

JAARGANG 2001 Nr. 169

A. TITEL

*Verdrag inzake de rechten van het kind;
New York, 20 november 1989*

B. TEKST

De Engelse en de Franse tekst van het Verdrag zijn geplaatst in *Trb.* 1990, 46; zie ook *Trb.* 1997, 83.

Voor wijziging van het Verdrag zie rubriek J van *Trb.* 1996, 188.

Voor de ondertekeningen zie *Trb.* 1990, 46 en 170, *Trb.* 1995, 92 en *Trb.* 1996, 188.

C. VERTALING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 170 en *Trb.* 1997, 83.

D. PARLEMENT

Zie *Trb.* 1995, 92.

E. BEKRACHTIGING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 170, *Trb.* 1995, 92¹⁾, *Trb.* 1996, 188²⁾ *Trb.* 1997, 83 en *Trb.* 1998, 62.

Behalve de aldaar genoemde hebben nog de volgende staten in overeenstemming met artikel 47 van het Verdrag een akte van bekrachtiging bij de Secretaris-Generaal van de Verenigde Naties nedergelegd:

Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden³⁾ 18 december 2000
(voor Aruba)

¹⁾ De Regering van het Verenigd Koninkrijk heeft op 3 augustus 1999 medegedeeld het voorbehoud onder d), gemaakt bij de bekrachtiging, in te trekken onder toevoeging van het volgende:

“The United Kingdom’s reservations to Article 32 in respect of its overseas territories, formerly referred to as “dependent territories”, set out in the Declarations dated 7 September 1994, are unaffected.”

²⁾ Het in *Trb.* 1998, 62 opgenomen bezwaar van het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden tegen de voorbehouden van Liechtenstein en Andorra dient voor wat betreft datum en tekst als de juiste te worden aangehouden.

³⁾ Onder de volgende voorbehouden:

“Article 26

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of Article 26 of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not imply an independent entitlement of children to social security, including social insurance.

Article 37

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of Article 37 (c) of the Convention with the reservation that these provisions shall not prevent:

- the application of adult penal law to children of sixteen years and older, provided that certain criteria laid down by law have been met;
- that a child which has been detained will not always be accommodated separately from adults, if the number of children that has to be detained at a certain time is unexpectedly large, (temporary) accommodation together with adults may be unavoidable.

Article 40

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provisions of Article 40 of the Convention with the reservation that cases involving minor offences may be tried without the presence of legal assistance and that with respect to such offences the position remains that no provision is made in all cases for a review of the facts or of any measures imposed as a consequence.”

en onder de volgende verklaringen:

“Article 14

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that Article 14 of the Convention is in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 19 December 1966 and that this Article shall include the freedom of a child to have or adopt a religion or belief of his or her choice as soon as the child is capable of making such choice in view of his age or maturity.

Article 22

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that whereas Aruba is not bound by the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Article 22 of the present Convention shall be interpreted as containing a reference only to such other international human rights or humanitarian instruments as are binding on the Kingdom of the Netherlands with respect to Aruba.

Article 38

With regard to Article 38 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it is of the opinion that States should not be allowed to involve children directly or indirectly in hostilities and that the minimum age for the recruitment or incorporation of children in the armed forces should be above fifteen years. In times of armed conflict, provisions shall prevail that are most conducive to guaranteeing the protection of children under international law, as referred to in Article 41 of the Convention.”

F. TOETREDING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 170, *Trb.* 1995, 92¹⁾, *Trb.* 1996, 188²⁾, *Trb.* 1997, 83³⁾ en *Trb.* 1998, 62⁴⁾.

¹⁾ De Regering van *Kroatië* heeft op 26 mei 1998 mededeling gedaan van de intrekking van het voorbehoud bij de aflegging van de verklaring van voortgezette gebondenheid.

²⁾ De Regering van *Maleisië* heeft op 23 maart 1999 de bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden inzake de artikelen 22, 28, eerste lid, onderdelen (b), (c), (d), en tweede en derde lid, artikel 40, derde en vierde lid, artikelen 44 en 45 ingetrokken. Maleisië handhaaft echter de voorbehouden inzake de artikelen 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 15, artikel 28, eerste lid, onderdeel (a) en artikel 37.

Voorts heeft de Regering van Maleisië met betrekking tot artikel 28, eerste lid, letter a, de volgende verklaring afgelegd:

“With respect to Article 28 paragraph 1 (a), the Government of Malaysia wishes to declare that in Malaysia, even though primary education is not compulsory and available free to all, primary education is available to everybody and Malaysia has achieved a high rate of enrolment for primary education i.e. at the rate of 98% enrolment.”

³⁾ De Regering van *Duitsland* heeft op 28 januari 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door Oman bij de toetreding gemaakt voorbehouden:

“The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservations of the Government of Oman contained in its instrument of ratification to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that the Government of Oman enters a reservation in respect of “all the provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic Law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate..” (paragraph 2). The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that such a general reservation may raise doubts as to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention and therefore objects to this reservation.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany further notes that the Government of Oman enters a reservation according to which “the provisions of the Convention should be applied within the limits imposed by the material resources available.” (Paragraph 3). The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany understands this reservation not as a limitation of the responsibilities under the Convention but as a reiteration of its article 4.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany further notes the Government of Oman enters a reservation in respect of article 9, paragraph 4, of the Convention by adding “or to public safety” (paragraph 1). The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany holds the view that by invoking general considerations of public safety the Government of Oman would unduly limit its responsibilities under article 9, paragraph 4, of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is convinced that the responsibilities of the States Parties to the Convention under article 9, paragraph 4, can only be limited in the interest of the well-being of the child and therefore objects to this reservation.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany further notes that the Government of Oman enters a reservation in respect of freedom of religion in articles 14 and 30 of the Convention (paragraph 5). Article 14 of the Convention guarantees the right of the child to freedom of religion and article 30 provides for the right of a child belonging to a religious minority to profess and practise his or her religion in community with other member of his or her group. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that these rights are central to the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservation would thus raise doubts as to the commitment of Oman to the Convention's object and purpose. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to this reservation.

These objections do not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Oman and the Federal Republic of Germany.

De Regering van *Finland* heeft op 6 februari 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door Oman bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden:

"The Government of Finland has examined the reservations made by the Government of Oman at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Government of Finland notes that Oman has entered inter alia a reservation "to all provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate".

The Government of Finland is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that according to paragraph 2 of Article 51 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by Oman, which do not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which they apply and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Oman to the Convention on [the] Rights of the Child which is considered to be inadmissible.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Oman and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Oman benefiting from this reservation."

De Regering van *Noorwegen* heeft op 9 februari 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door Oman bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden:

"The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of Oman upon accession to the said Convention, which in its second paragraph reads as follows:

2. A reservation is entered to all the provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate and, in particular, to the provisions relating to adoption set forth in its article 21.

The Government of Norway considers that the reservation (2) made by the Government of Oman, due to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, and thus impermissible under Article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Under well-established treaty law, a State party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for

its failure to perform treaty obligations. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the reservations made by the Government of Oman.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Sultanate of Oman.”

De Regering van *Zweden* heeft op 9 februari 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door Oman bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden:

“The Government of Sweden has examined the reservations made by the Government of Oman at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Government of Oman has entered inter alia a reservation of a general kind in respect of ‘all the provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate’.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to Article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by Oman, which do not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which they apply and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Oman to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Oman and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Oman benefitting from this reservation.”

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 10 februari 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Oman at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the reservation mentioned in paragraph 2 includes a reservation of a general kind in respect of the provisions of the Convention that may be contrary to Islamic law or the legislation in force in Oman.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that these reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State by invoking the general principles of national law, may raise doubts to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 51 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is further of the view that

general reservations of the kind made by Oman, which do not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which they apply and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

Furthermore the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that the reservations mentioned in paragraph 5 in respect of the articles 14 en 30 are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Oman to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Oman.”

De Regering van *Oostenrijk* heeft op 19 februari 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen het door de Oman bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehoud:

“Austria has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Sultanate of Oman at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child which reads as follows.

‘...A reservation is entered to all the provisions of the Convention that do not accord with Islamic law or the legislation in force in the Sultanate and, in particular, to the provisions relating to adoption set forth in its article 21.’

Austria is of the view that a reservation by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention in a general and unspecified manner or by invoking internal law creates doubts as to the commitment of the Sultanate of Oman with its obligations under the Convention, essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

According to paragraph 2 of article 51 of the Convention, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interests of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Austria is further of the view that a general reservation of the kind made by the Sultanate of Oman, which does not clearly specify the provisions of the Convention to which it applies and the extent of the derogation therefrom, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

Given the general character of this reservation a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

According to international law a reservation is inadmissible to the extent as its application negatively affects the compliance by a State with its obligations under the Convention essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

Therefore, Austria cannot consider the reservations made by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman as admissible unless the Government of the Sultanate of Oman, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention.

This view by Austria would not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Sultanate of Oman and Austria.”

⁴⁾ Het in *Trb.* 1998, 62 opgenomen bezwaar van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* tegen de voorbehouden van Brunei Darussalam en Saudi-Arabië dient voor wat betreft datum en tekst als de juiste te worden aangehouden.

De Regering van *Oostenrijk* heeft op 16 november 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door de Verenigde Arabische Emiraten bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden:

“Austria has examined the contents of the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Austria is of the view that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention in a general and unspecified manner or by invoking internal law creates doubts as to the commitment of the United Arab Emirates with its obligations under the Convention, essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

According to paragraph 2 of article 51 of the Convention, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interests of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

Austria is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the United Arab Emirates contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

Given the general character of these reservations a final assessment as to their admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

According to international law a reservation is inadmissible to the extent as its application negatively affects the compliance by a State with its obligations under the Convention essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

Therefore, Austria cannot consider the reservations made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates as admissible unless the Government of the United Arab Emirates, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservations are compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention.

This view by Austria would not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the United Arab Emirates and Austria.”

De Regering van *Italië* heeft tegen heeft op 2 april 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door de Verenigde Arabische Emiraten bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden:

“The Government of the Italian Republic has examined the reservations made by the United Arab Emirates at the time of its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child of 1989.

The Government of [the] Italian Republic notes that reservations to articles 14, 17 and 21 are reservations of a general kind in respect of the provisions of the Convention which may be contrary to the principles of Islamic Law and domestic statutes and laws.

The Government of the Italian Republic is of the view that these general reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of the United Arab Emirates to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to Paragraph 2 of Article 51 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Italian Republic therefore objects to the above-mentioned general reservations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Arab Emirates and the Italian Republic”.

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 6 april 1998 het volgende bezwaar gemaakt tegen de door de Verenigde Arabische Emiraten bij de toetreding gemaakte voorbehouden:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands examined the reserva-

tions made by the Government of the United Arab Emirates at the time of its accession to the Convention on the rights of the child and wishes to make the following declaration and objection.

Declaration in connection with the reservation with respect to article 7.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands assumes that the United Arab Emirates shall ensure the implementation of the rights mentioned in article 7, first paragraph, of the Convention on the rights of the child not only in accordance with its national law, but also with its obligations under the relevant international instruments in this field.

Objection in connection with the reservation with respect to article 14.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the reservation with respect to article 14, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State by invoking the general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Oman to the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 51 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that the reservation in respect of article 14 is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of United Arab Emirates to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Arab Emirates.”

G. INWERKINGTREDING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 46, *Trb.* 1995, 92 en *Trb.* 1998, 62.

Wat het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden betreft, is het Verdrag ingevolge artikel 49, tweede lid, op 17 januari 2001 in werking getreden voor Aruba.

H. TOEPASSELIJKVERKLARING

Zie *Trb.* 1995, 92¹⁾, *Trb.* 1996, 188²⁾ en *Trb.* 1998, 62.

Portugal heeft het Verdrag toepasselijk verklaard op:

Macau 27 april 1999

¹⁾ De Regering van Argentinië heeft op 5 oktober 2000 met betrekking tot de verklaring van het Verenigd Koninkrijk tot uitbreiding van de toepasselijkheid van het Verdrag tot de Falkland-eilanden het volgende medegedeeld:

“[The Argentine Republic] wishes to refer to the report submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, which contains an addendum entitled “Overseas Dependent Territories and Crown Dependencies of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland” (CRC/C/41/Add.9).

In that connection, the Argentine Republic wishes to recall that by its note of

3 April 1995 it rejected the extension of the application of the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 7 September 1994.

The Government of Argentina rejects the designation of the Malvinas Islands as Overseas Dependent Territories of the United Kingdom or any other similar designation. Consequently, the Argentine Republic does not recognize the section concerning the Malvinas Islands contained in the report which the United Kingdom has submitted to the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC-C-41-Add.9) or any other document or instrument having a similar tenor that may derive from this alleged territorial extension.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes that a dispute exists concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to continue negotiations with a view to resolving the dispute peacefully and definitively as soon as possible, assisted by the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces, which are an integral part of its national territory".

Op 20 december 2000 deed het de Regering van het Verenigd Koninkrijk de volgende mededeling:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects as unfounded the claims made by the Argentine Republic in its communication to the depositary of 5 October 2000. The Government of the United Kingdom recalls that in its declaration received by the depositary on 16 January 1996 it rejected the objection by the Argentine Republic to the extension by the United Kingdom of the Convention on the Rights of the Child to the Falkland Islands and to South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands and over South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its consequential rights to apply the Convention with respect to those Territories."

2) In *Trb.* 1998, 62 is hier abusievelijk „88" vermeld.

J. GEGEVENS

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 46 en 170, *Trb.* 1995, 92, *Trb.* 1996, 188, *Trb.* 1997, 83 en 1998, 62.

Wijziging 12 december 1995 van artikel 43, tweede lid van het Verdrag

Behalve de in bovengenoemde Tractatenbladen genoemde hebben nog de volgende staten de wijziging aanvaard:

Spanje	13 januari 1998
Filippijnen	14 januari 1998
Algerije	21 januari 1998
Moldavië	30 januari 1998

Ecuador	25 februari 1998
Brazilië	26 februari 1998
Jamaica	6 april 1998
Ethiopië	15 april 1998
Thailand	30 april 1998
Rusland	1 mei 1998
Kroatië	26 mei 1998
Portugal	29 juni 1998
Guyana	15 september 1998
de Maldiven	2 november 1998
Venezuela	2 november 1998
Indonesië	17 december 1998
Egypte	28 december 1998
Korea	3 februari 1999
Uruguay	17 februari 1999
Argentinië	2 maart 1999
Mali	4 maart 1999
Mozambique	4 maart 1999
Bhutan	17 maart 1999
Bolivia	15 maart 1999
Qatar	5 mei 1999
Guinee	14 mei 1999
Grenada	20 mei 1999
Monaco	26 mei 1999
Bulgarije	25 juni 1999
Burkina Fasso	26 juli 1999
Slowakije	29 juli 1999
Mauritanië	20 augustus 1999
Mauritius	25 augustus 1999
Polen	2 september 1999
Italië	14 september 1999
Turkije	9 december 1999
Israël	27 december 1999
Vietnam	11 januari 2000
IJsland	14 januari 2000
Pakistan	19 januari 2000
Liechtenstein	21 januari 2000
Peru	26 januari 2000
Democratische Volksrepubliek Korea	23 februari 2000
Noorwegen	24 februari 2000
Congo	28 februari 2000
Sri Lanka	29 februari 2000
Singapore	29 maart 2000
Georgië	11 april 2000
De Tsjechische Republiek	23 mei 2000
Kirgizië	31 mei 2000
Myanmar	9 juni 2000

Bahrein	13 juni 2000
Nieuw Zeeland ¹⁾	16 juni 2000
Syrië	16 juni 2000
Brunei	28 juni 2000
Luxemburg	11 juli 2000
Libanon	14 juli 2000
San Marino	10 oktober 2000
Estland	6 december 2000
Belize	15 december 2000
het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden	18 december 2000
(voor Aruba)	
Haïti	20 december 2000

¹⁾ Onder de volgende verklaring:
“The Government of New Zealand declares that this acceptance shall not extend to Tokelau”.

Uitgegeven de *tweëntwintigste* oktober 2001.

De Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken,

J. J. VAN AARTSEN