

TRACTATENBLAD

VAN HET

KONINKRIJK DER NEDERLANDEN

JAARGANG 1997 Nr. 83

A. TITEL

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

B. TEKST

De Engelse en de Franse tekst zijn geplaatst in *Trb.* 1990, 46.
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.

Bij proces-verbaal van 8 mei 1990 heeft de depositaris de volgende correctie aangebracht in de Engelse en de Franse tekst:

in artikel 10, tweede lid, is de verwijzing naar „article 9, paragraph 2,” en „paragraphe 2 de l'article 9,” vervangen door „article 9, paragraph 1,” en „paragraphe 1 de l'article 9,”.

Bij vergelijking met het door de depositaris verstrekte gewaarmerkte afschrift is gebleken dat in de in *Trb.* 1990, 46 afgedrukte Engelse en Franse tekst nog de volgende correcties dienen te worden aangebracht:

Engelse tekst:

in artikel 9, eerste lid, tweede regel, dient voor „whem” te worden gelezen „when”.

Franse tekst:

preambule, tweede alinea op blz. 5:

vierde regel: „Assemblée” vervangen door „Assemblée”,

de zevende regel vervangen door: „politiques (en particulier aux articles 23 et 24) dans le Pacte”;

artikel 3, eerste lid, eerste regel: „que elles” vervangen door „qu'elles”;

artikel 4, eerste regel: „pendre” vervangen door „prendre”;

artikel 23, tweede lid, tweede regel: „dans le” vervangen door „dans la”;

artikel 29, eerste lid, letter c: lees „le respect”;

artikel 35, vierde regel: lees „que ce soit.”;
 artikel 38, derde lid, tweede regel: achter „atteint” de komma schrappen;
 artikel 40:
 tweede lid, letter b, ii, derde regel (blz. 37): lees „légaux”,
 tweede lid, letter b, iv, tweede regel: lees „témoins”,
 derde lid, letter b, eerste regel: lees „De prendre”;
 artikel 42, eerste regel: „connaitre” vervangen door „connaître”;
 artikel 45:
 letter c, tweede regel: lees „Secrétaire général”,
 letter d, derde regel: „en” vervangen door „et”,
 letter d, vierde regel: „tous Etat” vervangen door „tout Etat”;
 artikel 49, tweede lid, derde regel: „jour que” vervangen door „jour qui”.

C. VERTALING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 170.

Tengevolge van de in rubriek B hierboven weergegeven correctie van artikel 10, tweede lid, dient in de vijfde/zesde regel van genoemd artikel en lid „artikel 9, tweede lid,” te worden vervangen door „artikel 9, eerste lid,”.

D. PARLEMENT

Zie *Trb.* 1995, 92.

E. BEKRACHTIGING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 170, *Trb.* 1995, 92¹⁾ en *Trb.* 1996, 188²⁾.

¹⁾ De Regering van Syrië heeft op 6 mei 1996 naar aanleiding van het door de Regering van Duitsland gemaakte bezwaar tegen de door Syrië bij de bekrachtiging gemaakte voorbehouden het volgende medegedeeld:

The laws in effect in the Syrian Arab Republic do not recognize the system of adoption, although they do require that protection and assistance should be provided to those for whatever reason permanently or temporarily deprived of their family environment and that alternative care should be assured them through foster placement and kafalah, in care centres and special institutions and, without assimilation to their blood lineage (nasab), by foster families, in accordance with the legislation in force based on the principles of the Islamic Shariah.

The reservations of the Syrian Arab Republic to articles 20 and 21 mean that approval of the Convention should not in any way be interpreted as recognizing or permitting the system of adoption to which reference is made in these two articles and are subject to these limitations only.

The reservations of the Syrian Arab Republic to article 14 of the Convention are restricted only to its provisions relating to religion and do not concern those relating to thought or conscience. They concern: the extent to which the right in question might conflict with the right of parents and guardians to ensure the religious education of their children, as recognized by the United Nations and set

forth in article 18, paragraph 4, of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; the extent to which it might conflict with the right, established by the laws in force, of a child to choose a religion at an appointed time or in accordance with designated procedures or at a particular age in the case where he clearly has the mental and legal capacity to do so; and the extent to which it might conflict with public order and the principles of the Islamic Shariah on this matter that are in effect in the Syrian Arab Republic with respect to each case. (*vertaling*)

²⁾ De Regering van *Finland* heeft op 14 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Qatar* een soortgelijk bezwaar gemaakt als gemaakt tegen het voorbehoud van Iran (zie voor de tekst van dat bezwaar *Trb.* 1996, 188, blz. 3).

De Regering van *Italië* heeft op 14 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Qatar* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of the Italian Republic has examined the reservation contained in the instrument of ratification by the Government of the State of Qatar, which enters a general reservation in respect of provisions that conflict with the provisions of the Islamic Sharia. The Government of the Italian Republic considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of Qatar under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Qatar to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties should be respected, as to the objects and the purpose, by all Parties. The Government of the Italian Republic therefore objects to this reservation. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Government of the Italian Republic and the State of Qatar.”.

De Regering van *Noorwegen* heeft op 14 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Qatar* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation The Government of Norway considers that the reservation made by the State of Qatar, due to its unlimited scope and undefined character, is inadmissible under international law. For that reason, the Government of Norway objects to the reservation made by the State of Qatar.

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 State of Qatar.”.

De Regering van *Oostenrijk* heeft op 18 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Qatar* een soortgelijk bezwaar gemaakt als gemaakt tegen het voorbehoud van Iran (zie voor de tekst van dat bezwaar *Trb.* 1996, 188, blz. 4).

De Regering van *België* heeft op 1 juli 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Qatar* bezwaar gemaakt. Zie voor de tekst van het bezwaar rubriek F, noot 1, van dit Tractatenblad.

De Regering van *Denemarken* heeft op 3 juli 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Qatar* een soortgelijk bezwaar gemaakt als gemaakt tegen het o.a. door Djibouti bij de bekrachtiging gemaakte voorbehoud (zie voor de tekst van dat bezwaar *Trb.* 1996, 188, blz. 4 en 5).

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 3 maart 1997 tegen de voorbehouden van *Liechtenstein* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Liechtenstein relating to the Articles 7 and 10 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

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 national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Liechtenstein to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would like to 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 Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Liechtenstein 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 Liechtenstein.”.

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 6 maart 1997 tegen de voorbehouden van *Andorra* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Andorra relating to the Articles 7 and 8 of the Convention on the rights of the child.

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 national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Andorra to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would like to 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 Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Andorra 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 Andorra.”.

F. TOETREDING

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 46, *Trb.* 1995, 92 en *Trb.* 1996, 188¹⁾.

Behalve de aldaar genoemde Staten heeft nog de volgende Staat in overeenstemming met artikel 48 van het Verdrag een akte van toetreding bij de Secretaris-Generaal van de Verenigde Naties nedergelegd:

Oman²⁾ 9 december 1996

¹⁾ De Regering van *Duitsland* heeft op 13 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Botswana* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the contents of the reservation of the Government of Botswana According to the said reservation the Government of Botswana enters a reservation in respect of article 1 of the Convention by stating that it “does not consider itself bound by the same in so far as such may conflict with the laws and statutes of Botswana”. Given the central nature of article 1 of the Convention and the flexibility with regard to the national definition of majority already contained in arti-

cle 1 of the Convention this may be seen as subjecting all provisions of the Convention to the provisions of national laws of Botswana. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of Botswana under the Convention by invoking practically all principles of national law may raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the said reservation.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Botswana. (*vertaling*)

De Regering van *Italië* heeft op 14 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Botswana* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of the Italian Republic has examined the reservation contained in the instrument of [accession] by the Government of Botswana, which enters a general reservation in respect of any provisions that conflict with the internal law. The Government of the Italian Republic considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of Botswana under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties should be respected, as to the objects and the purpose, by all Parties. The Government of the Italian Republic therefore objects to this reservation. This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Government of the Italian Republic and the Republic of Botswana.”

De Regering van *Denemarken* heeft op 3 juli 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Botswana* een soortgelijk bezwaar gemaakt als gemaakt tegen het o.a. door Djibouti bij de bekrachtiging gemaakte voorbehoud (zie voor de tekst van dat bezwaar *Trb.* 1996, 188, blz. 4 en 5).

De Regering van *Finland* heeft op 14 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of Finland has examined the contents of the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia upon accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, by which it expresses that [zie voor de tekst van het voorbehoud *Trb.* 1996, 188, blz. 7].

The reservation made by Malaysia covers several central provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The broad nature of the said reservation leaves open to what extent Malaysia commits itself to the Convention and to the fulfilment of its obligations under the Convention. In the view of the Government of Finland reservations of such comprehensive nature may contribute to undermining the basis of international human rights treaties.

The Government of Finland also recalls that the said reservation is subject to the general principle of the observance of the treaties according to which a party may not invoke its internal law, much less its national policies, as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. It is in the common interest of States that contracting parties to international treaties are prepared to undertake the necessary legislative changes in order to fulfil the object and purpose of the treaty. Moreover, the internal legislation as well as the national policies are also subject to changes which might further expand the unknown effects of the reservation.

In its present formulation the reservation is clearly incompatible with the object

and purpose of the Convention and therefore inadmissible under article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to such reservation. The Government of Finland further notes that the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia is devoid of legal effect.

The Government of Finland recommends the Government of Malaysia to reconsider its reservation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.”

De Regering van *Oostenrijk* heeft op 18 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* een soortgelijk bezwaar gemaakt als gemaakt tegen het voorbehoud van Iran (zie voor de tekst van dat bezwaar *Trb.* 1996, 188, blz. 4).

De Regering van *Ierland* heeft op 26 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of Ireland has examined the contents of the reservation of the Government of Malaysia contained in the instrument of ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Ireland considers that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is therefore prohibited by article 51 (2) of the Convention. The Government of Ireland also considers that it contributes to undermining the basis of international treaty law. The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the said reservation.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and Malaysia.”

De Regering van *Zweden* heeft op 26 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of Sweden has examined the content of the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia upon accession The Swedish Government considers that a reservation by which a State seeks to limit its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking principles of national laws and policies may cast doubts on the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention. Moreover, it may contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

It is a common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake legislative changes necessary to comply with such treaties. The Government of Sweden finds the unspecific reservation made by the Government of Malaysia in respect of central provisions of the Convention to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

In view of the above the Government of Sweden objects to the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia.”

De Regering van *Noorwegen* heeft op 27 juni 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation made by Malaysia upon accession

The Government of Norway considers that the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia, due to its very broad scope and undefined character, is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and thus not permitted under article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Moreover, the Government of Norway considers that the monitoring system established under the Convention is not optional and that, accordingly, reservations with respect to articles 44 and 45 of the Convention are not permissible. For these reasons, the Government of Norway objects to the reservation made by the Government of Malaysia.

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

De Regering van *België* heeft op 1 juli 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

The Belgian Government has noted the content of the reservation expressed by the Government of Malaysia with respect to articles 1, 2, 7, 13, 14, 15, 22, 28, 37, 40, paragraphs 3 and 4, 44 and 45 of the Convention.

The Belgian Government believes that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and that, consequently, in accordance with article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention, it is not permitted.

Moreover, the Permanent Representative of Belgium has the honour to communicate to the Secretary-General the position of Belgium concerning the reservation made by Qatar with respect to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Belgium Government has noted the general reservation expressed by the Government of Qatar with respect to the provisions of the Convention.

The Belgian Government believes that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and that, consequently, in accordance with article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention, it is not permitted.

Accordingly, Belgium wishes to be bound by the Convention in its entirety as regards the two above-mentioned States, which have expressed reservations prohibited by the Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted on 20 November 1989.

Moreover, as the 12-month period specified in article 20.5 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties is not applicable to reservations which are null and void, Belgium's objection to such reservations is not subject to any particular time-limit. (*vertaling*)

De Regering van *Denemarken* heeft op 2 juli 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Maleisië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of Denmark has examined the reservation made by Malaysia upon [accession] to the Convention on the Rights of the Child The reservation is covering multiple provisions, including central provisions of the Convention. Furthermore, it is a general principle of international law that internal law may not be invoked as justification for failure to perform treaty obligations. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law.

The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Malaysia and Denmark.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that no time limit applies to objections against reservations, which are inadmissible under international law.

The Government of Denmark recommends the Government of Malaysia to reconsider its reservation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.”

De Regering van *Duitsland* heeft op 4 september 1996 tegen het voorbehoud van *Singapore* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the contents of the reservation of the Government of Singapore contained in the instrument of ratification of the Convention of the Rights of the Child. According to the said reservation (3) the Government of Singapore enters a general reservation in respect of any provisions of the Convention which may go beyond already existing national legislation.

Furthermore, the interpretation contained in the said reservation (2) contradicts the clear and unqualified content of articles 19 and 37 of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of Singapore under the Convention by restricting them to already existing national legislation and by restricting the

application of central articles of the Convention, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Singapore to the object and purpose of the Convention. It is the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the said reservation.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Singapore. (*vertaling*)

De Regering van *België* heeft op 26 september 1996 tegen de verklaringen en voorbehouden van *Singapore* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

The Government of Belgium has noted the declarations and reservations expressed by Singapore concerning the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Government considers that paragraph 2 of the declarations, concerning articles 19 and 37 of the Convention, and paragraph 3 of the reservations, concerning the constitutional limits upon the acceptance of the obligations contained in the Convention, are contrary to the purposes of the Convention and are consequently without effect under international law. (*vertaling*)

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 6 november 1996 tegen de verklaringen en voorbehouden van *Singapore* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands having examined the declarations and reservations made by Singapore upon its accession to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, considers paragraph 2 of the declarations as a reservation. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers in respect of paragraph 2 of the declarations and paragraph 3 of the reservations that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law and the Constitution, raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to these reservations.

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

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 28 februari 1997 tegen de voorbehouden van *Brunei* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of His Majesty the Sultan and Yang di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam at the time of its ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the said reservations include reservations of a general kind in respect of the provisions of the Convention which may be contrary to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islam, the state religion.

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 Constitution and general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Brunei Darussalam 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 Kingdom of the Netherlands is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Brunei Darussalam, 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 the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of his Majesty the Sultan and Yang di-Pertuan of Brunei Darussalam 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 Brunei Darussalam.”

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 28 februari 1997 tegen de voorbehouden van *Saudi-Arabië* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“The Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia at the time of its accession to the Convention on the rights of the child.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the said reservations relate to all such Articles of the Convention as are in conflict with the provision of Islamic Law.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that these reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Saudi Arabia 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 Kingdom of the Netherlands is further of the view that general reservations of the kind made by the Government of Saudi Arabia, 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 Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Saudi Arabia 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 Saudi Arabia.”

De Regering van het *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* heeft op 3 maart 1997 tegen de verklaring en het voorbehoud van *Kiribati* bezwaar gemaakt als volgt:

“Objection

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration made by the Government of Kiribati relating to the Articles 12–16 of the Convention on the rights of the child, and considers this declaration to be a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that this declaration, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of Kiribati to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands would like to recall that, according to paragraph 2 of Arti-

cle 51 of the Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of Kiribati 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 Kiribati.

Declaration

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Kiribati and wishes to declare the following.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the rights set down in the Articles 24, paragraph 1, (b, c, d, e and f), 26 and paragraph 1 (b, c, and d) to be of fundamental importance to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands wishes to point out that a gradual fulfilment of the obligations set down in the said Articles are inherent to the said rights.”

²) Onder de volgende voorbehouden:

1. The words “or to public safety” should be added in article 9 [, paragraph 4,] after the words “unless the provision of the information would be detrimental to the well-being of the child”.

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.

3. The provisions of the Convention should be applied within the limits imposed by the material resources available.

4. The Sultanate considers that article 7 of the Convention as it relates to the nationality of a child shall be understood to mean that a child born in the Sultanate of unknown parents shall acquire Omani nationality, as stipulated in the Sultanate’s Nationality Law.

5. The Sultanate does not consider itself to be bound by those provisions of article 14 of the Convention that accord a child the right to choose his or her religion or those of its article 30 that allow a child belonging to a religious minority to profess his or her own religion. (*vertaling*)

G. INWERKINGTREDING

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

H. TOEPASSELIJKVERKLARING

Zie *Trb.* 1995, 92 en *Trb.* 1996, 88.

J. GEDEVENS

Zie *Trb.* 1990, 46 en 170, *Trb.* 1995, 92 en *Trb.* 1996, 188.

Wijziging van 12 december 1995 van het Verdrag

De wijziging is aanvaard door de volgende Staten:

Togo 19 juni 1996

Vaticaanstad	15 augustus 1996
Denemarken	10 september 1996
De Voormalige Joegoslavische Republiek Macedonië	16 oktober 1996
Zweden	17 oktober 1996
Cuba	23 oktober 1996
Trinidad en Tobago	1 november 1996
Panama	5 november 1996
het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden (voor Nederland)	4 december 1996
Finland	3 januari 1997
Andorra	17 januari 1997
Marokko	27 januari 1997
Colombia	31 januari 1997
Costa Rica	12 februari 1997

In tegenstelling tot het op blz. 11 van *Trb.* 1996, 188 vermelde behoeft de wijziging van 12 december 1995 ingevolge artikel 7, onderdeel b, van de Rijkswet goedkeuring en bekendmaking verdragen niet de goedkeuring der Staten-Generaal.

Uitgegeven de *tiende* april 1997.

De Minister van Buitenlandse Zaken,

H. A. F. M. O. VAN MIERLO