

NETHERLANDS

CCPR

RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS

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

Reservations:

Article 10

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands subscribes to the principle set out in paragraph 1 of this article, but it takes the view that ideas about the treatment of prisoners are so liable to change that it does not wish to be bound by the obligations set out in paragraph 2 and paragraph 3 (second sentence) of this article.

Article 12, paragraph 1

The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate territories of a State for the purpose of this provision.

Article 12, paragraphs 2 and 4

The Kingdom of the Netherlands regards the Netherlands and the Netherlands Antilles as separate countries for the purpose of these provisions.

Article 14, paragraph 3 (d)

The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory option of removing a person charged with a criminal offence from the court room in the interests of the proper conduct of the proceedings.

Article 14, paragraph 5

The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the statutory power of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands to have sole jurisdiction to try certain categories of persons charged with serious offences committed in the discharge of a public office.

Article 14, paragraph 7

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts this provision only insofar as no obligations arise from it further to those set out in article 68 of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands and article 70 of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands Antilles as they now apply. They read:

1. Except in cases where court decisions are eligible for review, no person may be prosecuted again

for an offence in respect of which a court in the Netherlands or the Netherlands Antilles has delivered an irrevocable judgement.

2. If the judgement has been delivered by some other court, the same person may not be prosecuted for the same offence in the case of (I) acquittal or withdrawal of proceedings or (II) conviction followed by complete execution, remission or lapse of the sentence.

Article 19, paragraph 2

The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the provision with the proviso that it shall not prevent the Kingdom from requiring the licensing of broadcasting, television or cinema enterprises.

Article 20, paragraph 1

The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept the obligation set out in this provision in the case of the Netherlands."

[The Kingdom of the Netherlands] clarify that although the reservations [...] are partly of an interpretational nature, [it] has preferred reservations to interpretational declarations in all cases, since if the latter form were used doubt might arise concerning whether the text of the Covenant allows for the interpretation put upon it. By using the reservation form the Kingdom of the Netherlands wishes to ensure in all cases that the relevant obligations arising out of the Covenant will not apply to the Kingdom, or will apply only in the way indicated."

11 October 2010

Declaration

"...The Kingdom of the Netherlands, consisting, as per 10 October 2010, of the European part of the Netherlands, the Caribbean part of the Netherlands (the islands of Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba), Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten, regards these parts as separate territories for the purpose of Article 12, paragraph 1, and as separate countries for the purpose of Article 12, paragraphs 2 and 4, of the Covenant."

Note

In a communication received on 20 December 1983, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that it was withdrawing its reservation with regard to article 25 (c). The text of the reservation read as follows:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not accept this provision in the case of the Netherlands Antilles."

See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of [*the electronic version on the website of the Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General; <http://treaties.un.org/pages/HistoricalInfo.aspx>].*

[Ed. note: Note 1 under Netherlands is as follows:

Netherlands

Note 1

By a communication received on 30 December 1985, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that "the island of Aruba which was a part of the Netherlands Antilles would obtain internal autonomy as a separate country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands as of 1 January 1986". The said change would have no consequence in international law. The treaties concluded by the Kingdom which applied to the Netherlands Antilles, including Aruba, would continue, after 1 January 1986 to apply to the Netherlands Antilles (of which Aruba is no longer a part) and to Aruba.]

(Note 32, Chapter IV.4, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)

OBJECTIONS MADE TO OTHER STATES PARTIES RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS

(Ed. note: for the text targeted by the following objections, see the Reservations and Declarations of the State which is the subject of the objection)

12 June 1980

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the Covenant that [reservation (i) by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago] is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it."

12 January 1981

["The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of India in relation to article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, since the right of self determination as embodied in the Covenants is conferred upon all peoples. This follows not only from the very language of article 1 common to the two Covenants but as well from the most authoritative statement of the law concerned, i.e., the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in

accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Any attempt to limit the scope of this right or to attach conditions not provided for in the relevant instruments would undermine the concept of self-determination itself and would thereby seriously weaken its universally acceptable character."]
(Chapter IV.3, *Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General*)

17 September 1981

"I. Reservation by Australia regarding articles 2 and 50

The reservation that article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, and article 50 shall be given effect consistently with and subject to the provisions in article 2, paragraph 2, is acceptable to the Kingdom on the understanding that it will in no way impair Australia's basic obligation under international law, as laid down in article 2, paragraph 1, to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

II. Reservation by Australia regarding article 10

The Kingdom is not able to evaluate the implications of the first part of the reservation regarding article 10 on its merits, since Australia has given no further explanation on the laws and lawful arrangements, as referred to in the text of the reservation. In expectation of further clarification by Australia, the Kingdom for the present reserves the right to raise objection to the reservation at a later stage.

III. Reservation by Australia regarding 'Convicted Persons'

The Kingdom finds it difficult, for the same reasons as mentioned in its commentary on the reservation regarding article 10, to accept the declaration by Australia that it reserves the right not to seek amendment of laws now in force in Australia relating to the rights of persons who have been convicted of serious criminal offences. The Kingdom expresses the hope it will be possible to gain a more detailed insight in the laws now in force in Australia, in order to facilitate a definitive opinion on the extent of this reservation."

6 November 1984

[Same objection as the one made by Belgium]

[Ed. note: as follows:

[The Belgian Government] wishes to observe that the sphere of application of article 11 is particularly restricted. In fact, article 11 prohibits imprisonment only when there is no reason

for resorting to it other than the fact that the debtor is unable to fulfil a contractual obligation. Imprisonment is not incompatible with article 11 when there are other reasons for imposing this penalty, for example when the debtor, by acting in bad faith or through fraudulent manoeuvres, has placed himself in the position of being unable to fulfil his obligations. This interpretation of article 11 can be confirmed by reference to the travaux préparatoires (see document A-2929 of 1 July 1955).

After studying the explanations provided by the Congo concerning its reservation, [the Belgian Government] has provisionally concluded that this reservation is unnecessary. It is its understanding that the Congolese legislation authorizes imprisonment for debt when other means of enforcement have failed when the amount due exceeds 20,000 CFA francs and when the debtor, between 18 and 60 years of age, makes himself insolvent in bad faith. The latter condition is sufficient to show that there is no contradiction between the Congolese legislation and the letter and the spirit of article 11 of the Covenant.

By virtue of article 4, paragraph 2, of the aforementioned Covenant, article 11 is excluded from the sphere of application of the rule which states that in the event of an exceptional public emergency, the States Parties to the Covenant may, in certain conditions, take measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant. Article 11 is one of the articles containing a provision from which no derogation is permitted in any circumstances. Any reservation concerning that article would destroy its effects and would therefore be in contradiction with the letter and the spirit of the Covenant.

Consequently, and without prejudice to its firm belief that Congolese law is in complete conformity with the provisions of article 11 of the Covenant, [the Belgian Government] fears that the reservation made by the Congo may, by reason of its very principle, constitute a precedent which might have considerable effects at the international level.

[The Belgian Government] therefore hopes that this reservation will be withdrawn and, as a precautionary measure, wishes to raise an objection to that reservation.]

18 March 1991

With regard to interpretative declaration made by Algeria:

[With regard to the interpretative declaration made by Algeria concerning article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4:

In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the interpretative declaration concerning article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights must be regarded as a reservation to the Covenant. From the text and history of the Covenant it follows that the reservation with respect to article 13, paragraphs 3 and 4 made by the Government of Algeria is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The

Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises an objection to it.

[This objection is] not an obstacle to the entry into force of [the Covenant] between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Algeria."]

(Chapter IV.3, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)

10 June 1991

"In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands it follows from the text and the history of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that the reservations with respect to articles 14, paragraphs 5 and 7 and 22 of the Covenant made by the Government of the Republic of Korea are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers the reservation unacceptable and formally raises objection to it. This objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of this Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea."

28 September 1993

With regard to the reservations to articles 6 and 7 made by the United States of America:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations with respect to capital punishment for crimes committed by persons below eighteen years of age, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the said reservation is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation with respect to article 7 of the Covenant, since it follows from the text and the interpretation of this article that the said reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

In the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands this reservation has the same effect as a general derogation from this article, while according to article 4 of the Covenant, no derogations, not even in times of public emergency, are permitted.

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the understandings and declarations of the United States do not exclude or modify the legal effect of provisions of the Covenant in their application to the United States, and do not in any way limit the competence of the Human Rights Committee to interpret these provisions in their application to the United States.

Subject to the proviso of article 21, paragraph 3 of the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties,

these objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United States."

22 July 1997

With regard to the declarations and the reservation made by Kuwait:

[Same objection identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made for Algeria.] [*Ed. note: see above*]

26 December 1997

With regard to the interpretative declaration concerning article 6 paragraph 5 made by Thailand:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers this declaration as a reservation. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the aforesaid declaration, since it follows from the text and history of the Covenant that the declaration is incompatible with the text, the object and purpose of article 6 of the Covenant, which according to article 4 lays down the minimum standard for the protection of the right to life.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Thailand."

9 October 2001

With regard to the reservations made by Botswana upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of Botswana upon signature of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and confirmed upon ratification, regarding articles 7 and 12, paragraph 3, of the Covenant. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the said articles of the Covenant are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Botswana.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, these reservations raise doubts as to the commitment of Botswana as to the object and purpose of the Covenant and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty 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 the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Botswana to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Botswana."

31 May 2005

With regard to the reservations made by Mauritania upon accession:

"The Government of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The application of the Articles 18 and 23 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been made subject to religious considerations. This makes it unclear to what extent Mauritania considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of Mauritania to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

It is of the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted (Art. 19 c).

The Government of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by Mauritania to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between Mauritania and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, without Mauritania benefiting from its reservation."

27 July 2007

With regard to the reservation made by Maldives upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Government

of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservation with respect to article 18 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

Furthermore, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the provisions of constitutional law in force in the Republic of Maldives. This makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Maldives considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Republic of Maldives to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party 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 therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Maldives to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and expresses the hope that the Republic of Maldives will soon be able to withdraw its reservation in light of the ongoing process of a revision of the Maldivian Constitution.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Maldives.”

8 October 2010

Objection to the reservation made by the Lao People's Democratic Republic upon ratification:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of Article 22 of the Covenant is made subject to national law in force in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic. This makes it unclear to what extent the Lao People’s Democratic Republic considers itself bound by the obligations under Article 22 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic to Article 22 of the Covenant.

This object does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Lao People's Democratic Republic.”

Note

The reservation was lodged with the Secretary-General on 4 December 2006 by Bahrain, following its accession to the Covenant on 20 September 2006.

In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the reservation in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 12 months from the date of the present depositary notification. In the absence of any such objection, the above reservation would be accepted in deposit upon the expiration of the above-stipulated 12 month period, that is on 28 December 2007.

In view of the below objections, the Secretary-General did not accept the reservation made by Bahrain in deposit. The Secretary-General received the following objections on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Netherlands (27 July 2007):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Since the reservations were made after the accession of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the Covenant, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations were too late and therefore inconsistent with article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Furthermore, the reservation with respect to articles 3, 18 and 23 of the Covenant is a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights is made subject to the Islamic Shariah. This makes it unclear to what extent the Kingdom of Bahrain considers itself bound by the obligations of the Covenant and therefore raises concerns as to the commitment of the Kingdom of Bahrain to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation

incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party 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 objects to all of the reservations made by the Kingdom of Bahrain since they were made after accession, and specifically objects to the content of the reservation on articles 3, 18 and 23 made by the Kingdom of Bahrain to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Kingdom of Bahrain."

...

(Note 15, Chapter IV.4, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)

Note

The Secretary-General received the following communication(s) related to the reservations made by Pakistan, on the date(s) indicated hereinafter:

The Netherlands (30 June 2011)

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with its reservations to the Articles 3, 6, 7, 12, 13, 18, 19 et 25 of the Covenant, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan has made the application of essential obligations under the Covenant concerning, amongst others, equality between men and women, the right to life, including restrictions on the imposition of the death penalty, the prohibition of torture, freedom of thought, conscience and religion, freedom of expression, the right to liberty of movement and freedom in the choice of residence, restrictions on the expulsion of aliens lawfully in the territory of a State Party, the right to take part in public affairs, the right to vote and to be elected and the right to have access to public service on terms of equality subject to the Sharia laws and/or the constitutional and/or national laws in force in Pakistan.

This makes it unclear to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the treaty and raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Covenant.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that reservations of this kind must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Covenant and would recall that, according to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of

Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has also examined the reservation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan with respect to Article 40 of the Covenant.

The Government of the Netherlands considers that the supervisory machinery established under the Covenant, including the system of periodic reporting to the Human Rights Committee established pursuant to Article 40 forms an essential part of the treaty. Accordingly, a reservation such as the reservation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, in which a State Party declares not to recognize the competence of the Human Rights Committee to review and comment State periodic reports must be considered contrary to the object and purpose of the Covenant and shall therefore not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservations of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the aforesaid Articles of the Covenant.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Covenant between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.”

(Note 34, Chapter IV.4, Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General)

DECLARATION RE: ARTICLE 41

11 December 1978

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares under article 41 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that it recognizes the competence of the Human Rights Committee referred to in article 28 of the Covenant to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under the Covenant."

TERRITORIAL APPLICATION

<u>Participant:</u>	<u>Date of receipt of notification:</u>	<u>Territories:</u>
...		
Netherlands	11 December 1978	Netherlands Antilles

[Ed. note: See also Note 30, under “Reservations and Declarations”, above]