

Contents

Part 1: Introduction to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child concerning a communications procedure	1
Chapter 1: The Convention on the Rights of the Child Communication/Complaints Procedure and the Convention General Implementation Articles	3
References.....	9
Part II: Selected Weaknesses of the Convention on the Rights of the Child Optional Protocol on a Communications Procedure	21
Chapter 2: The Inadmissibility of Collective Communications Under the OP3-CRC	23
2.1 Introduction	23
2.2 African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child: Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa (IHRDA) and Open Society Justice Initiative on Behalf of Children of Nubian Descent in Kenya v. The Government of Kenya	27
2.2.1 Background to the Case (hereafter the case is also referred to as <i>Institute of Human Rights and Open Society Justice Initiative v Kenya</i>)	27
2.2.2 Decision of the ACERWC in Institute of Human Rights and Open Society Justice Initiative v Kenya (Excerpts)	28
2.2.3 Discussion of Institute of Human Rights (IHRDA) and Open Society Justice Initiative v Kenya Hypothetically Advanced Under the OP3-CRC	33

2.3	Interim Measures	42
2.3.1	Case Example of the Denial of Interim Measures for the Protection of Children from Physical Violence: (APPROACH) Ltd v Ireland	43
2.3.2	Discussion of the Possible Outcome Regarding the Interim Measures Request had Association for the Protection of all Children (APPROACH) Ltd v. Ireland Hypothetically been Advanced as an OP3-CRC Communication	45
2.3.3	Interim Measures and Institute of Human Rights and Open Society Justice Initiative v Kenya Hypothetically Advanced as an OP3-CRC Communication	51
2.3.4	Follow-up Issues Re Institute of Human Rights and Open Society Justice Initiative v Kenya Hypothetically Advanced as an OP3-CRC Communication	52
2.3.4.1	<i>Follow-up to Inquiries</i>	52
2.3.4.2	<i>Investigations Under OP3-CRC versus The African Children's Charter</i>	55
2.3.4.3	<i>Follow-Up to Decisions on the Merits of a Communication/Complaint</i>	56
2.3.5	Human Rights and Open Society Justice Initiative v Kenya Hypothetically Advanced as a <i>Collective Communication</i> under OP3-CRC	58
2.3.6	More on the inquiry procedure under OP3-CRC	60
2.3.7	The Indivisibility of Children's Human Rights Guaranteed Under the Convention and the CRC First Two Optional Protocols	61
2.3.8	The Resistance to Incorporating a Collective Complaints Option: Canada as a Case Example	61
2.4	Defence for Children International (DCI) v. Belgium: A Collective Communication Under the Additional Protocol to the European Social Charter	64
2.4.1	Discussion of Defence for Children International (DCI) v. Belgium: Lessons Re Restrictive Interpretations of OP3-CRC	90
	References.....	104
	Chapter 3: Reliance on the Best Interests of the Child Principle	109
3.1	Introduction	109
3.2	European Court of Human Rights: Case of P., C. and S. v The United Kingdom (Application no. 56547/00) Judgment 16 July, 2002	113
3.2.1	Background to the Case of P., C., and S. v The United Kingdom	113

3.2.1.1	Abbreviated Key Facts of the Case of P., C., and S. v The United Kingdom	114
3.2.1.2	Analysis and Judgment of the European Court of Human Rights in the Case of P., C. and S. v The United Kingdom	120
3.2.1.3	Discussion of the Case of P., C. and S. v The United Kingdom Hypothetically Advanced as an OP3-CRC Communication	123
References	144
 Chapter 4: The Failure to Allow Communications Involving <i>Jus Cogens</i> Violations Where the Complaint is Against State Non-Parties to the OP3-CRC (Even if a State Party to the CRC and/or One or Both of the First Two Protocols to the CRC)		
4.1	A Hypothetical Case Brought Under the OP3-CRC Against the Holy See	147
4.2	Hypothetical Case Example Involving <i>Jus Cogens</i> Violations and a Communication Against a Non-State Party to the OP3-CRC	149
References	160
 Chapter 5: Inter-State Communications under the OP3-CRC and the Requirement for an Opt In Declaration by the State Party		
5.1	Introduction	163
5.2	A Hypothetical Inter-State Communication under the OP3-CRC Re the Omar Khadr Case	164
5.2.1	Background to the Omar Khadr Case	164
5.2.2	Discussion of the Omar Khadr Case Hypothetically Advanced as an Inter-State Communication Under the OP3-CRC	166
5.2.2.1	Aging Out of Accessibility to the OP3-CRC	169
5.2.2.2	Additional Issues re Accessibility of the OP3-CRC and Child Victim Participation	170
5.2.2.3	Child Participation in Consideration of OP3-CRC Communications	173
5.3	The Cyprus v Turkey Inter-State Communication (European Court of Human Rights)	175
5.3.1	Introduction	175
5.3.2	Cyprus v Turkey: Summary of the ECHR Judgment	175
5.3.3	Discussion of Cyprus v Turkey Hypothetically Advanced under the OP3-CRC	180
5.4	Hypothetical Inter-State Communication Complaining of the Broad Reservations to the OP3-CRC made by a Particular State Party	183
References	184

Chapter 6: Children’s Age and Adjudged Maturity as Factors in Taking Children’s Views into Account in OP3-CRC Decision-Making	187
6.1 Introduction	187
6.2 OP3-CRC Hypothetical Case Illustrating the Risks of Weighting the Child’s Views Based on the Child’s Age and Attributed Level of Maturity	189
6.2.1 The Right to Vote as an Inherent Human Right: Fitzgerald v. Alberta	189
6.2.1.1 Denial of Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada	190
6.2.1.2 Fitzgerald v. Alberta, 2004 ABCA 184 (Court of Appeal of Alberta)	190
6.2.1.3 Fitzgerald v. Alberta, 2002 ABQB 1086 (Alberta Court of Queens Bench)	191
6.2.2 Discussion of Fitzgerald v. Alberta Hypothetically Advanced Under the OP3-CRC	202
References	210
Chapter 7: Weaknesses in the OP3-CRC Provisions Regarding Inquiries, Friendly Settlements and Follow-Up	213
7.1 Introduction	213
7.2 Continued Systematic and/or Grave Violations of Children’s Human Rights	215
References	218
Chapter 8: Communications Concerning Violations of Children’s Economic, Social, or Cultural Rights	221
8.1 Introduction: Economic, Social and Cultural Rights under OP3-CRC	221
8.2 Instructive European Case Law: Delimiting the Scope of Children’s Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and their Collective Entitlements	226
8.2.1 DCI v Belgium Advanced as an OP3-CRC Group Complaint Under the Individual Communication Procedure	229
8.3 Children’s Economic Rights	231
8.4 Discussion Re European Committee for Home-Based Priority Action for the Child and the Family (EUROCEF) v. France	240
8.5 The Social and Cultural Rights of Children	245
8.6 Discussion of Selected Weaknesses of the OP3-CRC in Addressing Cases Involving Systemic Violations of Intertwined Social and Cultural Rights	247
References.....	248

Chapter 9: Potential Obstacles Under OP3-CRC to Redress for Violation of Indigenous Children’s Social and Cultural Rights	251
9.1 Exemplar Selected Custody Cases Engaging the Social and Cultural Rights of Indigenous Children	253
9.1.1 The Baby Ishmael Case (The Case of H. (D.) v. M. (H.))	255
9.1.1.1 Excerpts: Supreme Court of Canada Judgment in a Motion for Re-Hearing of an Appeal May 3, 1999	255
9.1.1.2 Trial Court Decision in H. (D.) v. M. (H.), (Affirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada)	257
9.1.1.3 British Columbia Court of Appeal Decision (reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada)	264
9.1.1.4 The Baby Ishmael Case Hypothetically Advanced Under the OP3-CRC Communication Procedure	269
9.1.2 The Baby Veronica Case (Adoptive Couple, Petitioners v. Baby Girl, A Minor Child Under the Age of Fourteen years, et al.)	282
9.1.2.1 Judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States in Adoptive Couple, Petitioners v. Baby Girl, A Minor Child Under the Age of Fourteen years, et al.	283
9.1.2.2 The UN Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Expresses Concerns Regarding the Baby Veronica Case	295
References	297
Chapter 10: Concluding Remarks and Summary	299
10.1 <i>Children’s Défense of Article 12 International v the Current States Parties to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a Communications Procedure (An illustrative hypothetical case) - Children’s Défense of Article 12 International v Albania, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Gabon, Germany, Montenegro, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Belgium and Thailand.....</i>	300
10.1.1 The Complainants	300
10.1.2 The Communication	301
10.1.3 Procedure	301
10.1.3.1 Admissibility	301
10.1.3.2 The States Parties to the OP3-CRC (Respondents’) Argument Against Admissibility and the Committee Ruling	303

10.1.4	Detailed Nature of the Complaint	304
10.1.4.1	Barriers to Child Participation (Directly or Through a Representative) in the OP3-CRC Communication Procedure	304
10.1.4.2	Undermining of Children as Rights Holders Under the OP3-CRC	307
10.1.5	Summary Assessment of the Committee as to Admissibility and Merit of the <i>Children’s Défence of Article 12 International</i> Communication	307
10.1.6	Friendly Settlement	309
10.1.7	Conclusion of the Committee Re <i>Children’s Défence</i> <i>of Article 12 International</i> v Current States Parties to the OP3-CRC (Albania, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Gabon, Germany, Montenegro, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Belgium and Thailand)	311
10.2	Final Comment	312
	References	313
	Index	315