

## SAUDI ARABIA

### CRC

#### **RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS**

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

Reservation:

[The Government of Saudi Arabia enters] reservations with respect to all such articles as are in conflict with the provisions of Islamic law.

#### **OBJECTIONS MADE TO STATE PARTY'S RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS**

*(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession)*

**Austria**, 3 March 1997

With regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

*[Ed. note: as follows:*

18 June 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession:

"Under article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which is reflected in article 51 of the [Convention] a reservation, in order to be admissible under international law, has to be compatible with the object and purpose of the treaty concerned. A reservation is incompatible with object and purpose of a treaty if it intends to derogate from provisions the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling its object and purpose.

The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by Malaysia to the [Convention]. Given the general character of these reservations a final assessment as to its admissibility under international law cannot be made without further clarification.

Until the scope of the legal effects of this reservation is sufficiently specified by Malaysia, the Republic of Austria considers these reservations as not affecting any provision the implementation of which is essential to fulfilling the object and purpose of the [Convention].

Austria, however, objects to the admissibility of the reservations in question if the application of this reservation negatively affects the compliance of Malaysia ... with its obligations under the [Convention] essential for the fulfilment of its object and purpose.

Austria could not consider the reservation made by Malaysia ... as admissible under the regime of article 51 of the [Convention] and article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties unless Malaysia ... , by providing additional information or through subsequent practice to ensure [s] that the reservations are compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the [Convention]" .]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Denmark**, 10 February 1997

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Brunei Darussalam.]

[*Ed. note: as follows:*

10 February 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Brunei Darussalam upon accession:

"The Government of Denmark finds that the general reservation with reference to the Constitution of Brunei Darussalam and to the beliefs and principles of Islamic law is of unlimited scope and undefined character. Consequently, the Government of Denmark considers the said reservation as being incompatible with the object and purposes of the Convention and accordingly inadmissible and without effect under international law. Furthermore, it is a general principle of international law that national law may not be invoked as justification for failure to perform treaty obligations.

The Convention remains in force in its entirety between Brunei Darussalam 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 Brunei Darussalam to reconsider its reservation to the Convention on the Rights of the Child."]

\*\*\*\*\*

**Germany**

20 March 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Malaysia upon accession and Qatar upon ratification:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of [Malaysia and Qatar, respectively] under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of [Malaysia and Qatar, respectively] 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 [Malaysia and Qatar, respectively].

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Germany, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

...

- 12 February 1997: with regard to the reservations made by Brunei Darussalam and Saudi Arabia upon accession.

...

\*\*\*\*\*

**Ireland**, 13 March 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

*[Ed. note: as follows:*

26 June 1996

With regard to the reservation made by Malaysia upon accession:

"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.]

\*\*\*\*\*

## Netherlands

With regard to the reservations made by Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Pakistan and the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such reservations, which seek to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of these States 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 does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the aforementioned States."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of the Netherlands, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

...

- 3 March 1997: with regard to the reservations made by Liechtenstein upon ratification and Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Saudi Arabia upon accession;

...

\*\*\*\*\*

**Norway**, 13 March 1997

With regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same objection, mutatis mutandis, as the one made with regard to Malaysia.]

*[Ed. note: as follows:*

27 June 1996

With regard to the reservation made by Malaysia upon ratification:

"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."]

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Portugal**

15 July 1992

With regard to the reservations made by Myanmar upon accession, by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Kuwait and Pakistan upon ratification and by Turkey upon signature:

"The Government of Portugal considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of National Law may create doubts on the commitments of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of International Law. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the reservations.

This objection shall not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and Myanmar.

The Government of Portugal furthermore notes that, as a matter of principle, the same objection could be made to the reservations presented by Bangladesh, Djibouti, Indonesia, Kuwait, Pakistan and Turkey."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of the Portugal, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

...

- 30 January 1997: with regard to reservations made by Brunei Darussalam, Kiribati and Saudi Arabia upon accession.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Sweden**

20 September 1991

With regard to the reservation made by Indonesia upon ratification concerning articles 1, 14, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 29:

"A reservation by which a State party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of national law may cast doubts on the commitments of the reserving 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 also are respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservations.

"This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and the Republic of Indonesia."

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Sweden, objections of the same nature as the one above with regard to reservations made by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

...

- 18 March 1997: with regard to the reservation made by Saudi Arabia upon accession;

...

#### Note

On 20 March 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Finland communications with regard to reservations made by Brunei Darussalam and Saudi Arabia upon accession:

[Same text, mutatis mutandis, as the objection made with regard to Singapore under "Objections".]

*[Ed. note: as follows:*

26 November 1996

With regard to the reservations made by Singapore upon accession:

"The reservations made in paragraphs 2 and 3 by the Republic of Singapore, consisting of a general reference to national law without stating unequivocally the provisions the legal effect of which may be excluded or modified, do not clearly define to the other Parties of the Convention the extent to which the reserving State commits itself to the Convention and therefore create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to fulfil its obligations under the said Convention. Reservations of such unspecified nature may contribute to undermining the basis of international human rights treaties.

The Government of Finland also recalls that these reservations of the Republic of Singapore

are subject to the general principle of observance of treaties according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for failure to perform its treaty obligations. It is in the common interest of States that Parties to international treaties are prepared to take the necessary legislative changes in order to fulfil the object and purpose of the treaty.

The Government of Finland considers that in their present formulation these reservations made by the Republic of Singapore are incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention and therefore, inadmissible under article 51, paragraph 2, of the said Convention. In view of the above, the Government of Finland objects to these reservations and notes that they are devoid of legal effect"]

*(Note 22, Chapter IV.11, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)*