INDEX

activist courts, 8, 9
Adams, John, 13
advertising, 132
Alexy, Robert, 45–47
Alexy’s weight formula, 45–47, 184
Andrews decision (Canada), 100–01
apex courts, 8, 156
minority protection and, 36
appeals, 142–43

balancing test. See also implicit balancing; non-balancing arguments; proportionality test absence of in South African Constitutional Court, 81–83, 86, 116, 158, 184, 186
ad-hoc balancing and legal certainty and, 9, 54–57
Alexy’s weight formula as defense of, 45–47, 184
avoidance of in Canadian Supreme Court, 116, 158, 184
balancing and legislative review in South African Constitutional Court, 109–10
balancing arguments and, 73
Canadian Supreme Court’s use of, 83
categorical arguments and, 77, 150–53, 155
COD decision of German Federal Constitutional Court and, 90–91
consistency or coherency arguments and, 75–76
as cost-benefit analysis, 2
in criminal and criminal procedure cases in Canadian Supreme Court, 161–62, 181
in criminal and criminal procedure cases in German Federal Constitutional Court, 92–95, 162–63, 181
in criminal and criminal procedure cases in South African Constitutional Court, 158–60, 181
Crucifix decision (Germany) and, 5, 178–79
determinacy considerations in, 78
difficulties with less restrictive means test and, 132–33
Engel’s defense of, 48–49
Ex parte Minister of Safety and Security case (South Africa) and, 109
factors influencing courts use of, 10
as global, 6
incommensurable values critique and, 4, 9, 39–45
institutional constraints on, 59
institutional strength of German Federal Constitutional Court and, 95–98
judicial legitimacy and, 67–68
judicial self-empowerment and, 53–54, 57–58, 182
legitimate expectations test and, 77, 148–49
less restrictive means test as alternative to, 50–52
as more transparent than categorical argumentation, 57
Nash’s solution to incomparable values problem, 47–49
in Oakes decision of Canadian Supreme Court, 98–100

241
balancing test (cont.)
outlier cases of Canadian Supreme Court, 179–81
outlier cases of German Federal Constitutional Court, 178–79
pre-balancing period of German Federal Constitutional Court, 89–91
precarious institutional position of South African Constitutional Court and, 112–13
as predominant argumentative framework of German Federal Constitutional Court, 91–92, 158, 184
procedural considerations in, 78
rareness of in first 25 years of German Federal Constitutional Court, 91
reduced form of as alternative to, 40
in review of civil decisions of German Federal Constitutional Court, 92–95
review of common law in South African Constitutional Court and, 110–12
as review of legislative rationality vs. judicial activism in German Federal Constitutional Court, 175–77
as review of rationality of legislative decision-making, 158, 182
role of constitutional courts in a democratic society and, 8
in same-sex marriage (Germany), 92
South African Constitutional Court’s use of, 86
in status of transsexuals (Germany), 92
as unsuitable instrument to hide judicial activism, 9, 156, 181, 183
use of in Canadian Supreme Court vs. other means, 102–06
Bedford decision (Canada), 161–62, 164
Bhe v. Khayelitsha Magistrate (South Africa), 118
Black Administration Act of 1927 (South Africa), 118

INDEX

Brümmer case (South Africa), 136
Bryde, Justice Brun-Otto, 139
burden of proof, in court decisions, 122–27

Canadian Supreme Court, 10, 116
Andrews decision of, 100–01
balancing arguments in jurisprudence of, 73
balancing in Hutterian Brethren decision, 102–04
balancing in Sharpe decision (Canada), 101, 161, 162
balancing test in criminal and criminal procedure cases of, 161–62, 181
Bedford decision of, 161–62, 164
Chaussoll decision in, 6–8, 11, 124–25, 128, 129, 134
classification of judicial arguments of case studies of, 71–73, 83
confirmation of judicial review in Canadian Charter, 14
consistency or coherency arguments in jurisprudence of, 75–76, 135–36
critique of proportionality test, 190
determinacy considerations and, 116, 147–48
empirical analysis of proportionality test in, 83
Harper decision of, 126
Health Services Bargaining Association case of, 144–45
implicit balancing by, 131–32, 186
internal consistency in Charkaoui judgment of, 135–36
Irwin Toy decision of, 125
judicial activism and, 188, 190
judicial prognoses in court decisions of, 127–29
lack of use of first stage of proportionality test by, 119
legislative deference and burden of proof in decisions of, 122–27
less restrictive means test in, 80–82, 83, 99–102, 120, 186
Logan decision of, 101, 161, 162
Malmo-Levine decision of, 125
minimal impairment test of, 106
Morales case of, 147
Mounted Police Association of Ontario case of, 105
outlier balancing test cases of, 179–81
overbreadth argument in jurisprudence of, 75
procedural arguments in criminal cases by, 142
procedural arguments preserving impartiality of decision-making process, 144
procedural arguments targeting statute drafting process by, 144–45
proportionality in Oakes decision of, 98–100, 122, 190
proportionality in Vriend v. Alberta (Canada), 119
proportionality tests of as case studies, 69–71
Provincial Court Judges case of, 144
rational connection test in, 119, 186
RJR-MacDonald decision of, 51–52, 123–24, 127
Tse case of, 142
United Food and Commercial Workers case and overturning of PIPA, 179–81
use of balancing test vs. other means, 102–06
Whaling decision of, 105
Wholesale Travel decision by, 131–32
Caroline Products decision (U.S. Supreme Court), 23
Casino decision (Germany), 136–37
categorical arguments, 77, 150–53, 155, 157
legal certainty and, 150
Chaoulli decision (Canada), 6–8, 11, 124–25, 128, 129, 134
Charkaoui judgment (Canada), 135–36
Chaskalson, Albert, 106–09
child pornography, 101, 161, 182
coalition building
as protector of minorities, 22
coherency tests, 75–76
collusion
judicial review as corrector of, 28–30
competency disputes
constitutional courts as arbitrators in, 19–20
conscientious objectors, 127
consistency tests, 75–76, 134–35
external consistency arguments, 136
historical consistency arguments, 136–37
illicit motives and, 138–40
internal consistency, 135–36
Makwanyane decision (South Africa) and, 106–09
rationalising of balancing by German Federal Constitutional Court and, 172–73
as tool increasing legislative rationality, 137–38, 140
constitutional courts as arbitrators in competency disputes, 19–20
criticism of, 189
role of in a democratic society, 8
criminal and criminal procedure law, 146, 147
balancing tests of Canadian Supreme Court and, 161–62, 181
balancing tests of German Federal Constitutional Court and, 92–95, 162–63, 181
balancing tests of South African Constitutional Court and, 158–60, 181
procedural arguments and, 141–43
underrepresentation in political process and, 164
Crucifix decision (Germany), 1, 5, 178–79
as judicial activism, 187–88
data protection, 148
De Vos decision (South Africa), 160
death penalty, 74, 107, 113, 181
debt and debtors, 130
deductive reasoning, 153–56, 157, 189
defereence in court decisions, 122–27
detention of foreign citizens, 135–36, 143
determinacy considerations, 78, 116, 147–48, 156
discrimination, court rulings and, 119

Ely, John Hart, 16
empirical into analytical questions, court decisions and, 129
Engel, Christoph, 48–49
equal protection guarantees, 77
Ex parte Minister of Safety and Security case (South Africa), 109, 160
external consistency arguments, 136
external effects, judicial review as corrector of, 30–32
false stereotypes, 118, 181
Friedman, Barry, 188

German Federal Constitutional Court, 10, 116
balancing and institutional strength of, 95–98
balancing arguments in jurisprudence of, 73
balancing as predominant argumentative framework in, 91–92, 158, 184
balancing as review of legislative rationality vs. judicial activism, 175–77
balancing in COD decision of, 90–91
balancing in Lüth judgment of, 93–94, 97
balancing in pharmacy decision of, 86–89, 129
balancing in review of civil and criminal decisions, 92–95
balancing in same-sex marriage decision, 92
balancing in status of transsexuals decision, 92, 170–71
balancing test in criminal and criminal procedure cases of, 162–63, 181
categorical arguments in defense of human dignity by, 150–53, 155
classification of judicial arguments of case studies of, 71–73, 83
confirmation of judicial review in German constitution, 14
consistency or coherency arguments in jurisprudence of, 75–76, 136–37, 138–40, 172–73
consistency test in smoking ban case of, 138–40
critique of proportionality test, 190
Cruciﬁx decision of, 1, 5, 178–79, 187–88
deductive style of argumentation in jurisprudence of, 77, 153–56, 189
determinacy considerations and, 116, 147–48
empirical analysis of proportionality test in, 80–83
equality considerations in jurisprudence of, 77
failed resistance against, 62
historical consistency arguments in Casino decision of, 136–37
hoof care decision of, 169–70
implicit balancing via less restrictive means test of, 130–31, 133
institutional constraints on application of proportionality test, 191
judicial activism and, 157, 187–88, 190
judicial prognoses in court decisions of, 127–29
lack of use of ﬁrst stage of proportionality test by, 119
legislative deference and burden of proof and, 126–27
legitimacy crisis in, 2
legitimate expectations test in jurisprudence of, 77, 148–49
less restrictive means test and, 121, 168–70
outlier balancing test cases of, 178–79
overbreadth argument in jurisprudence of, 170–71
pre-balancing period of, 89–91
procedural arguments in criminal cases by, 141–42
INDEX 245

procedural arguments regarding the legislative procedure, 145–46
procedural arguments to avoid conflicts of interest, 144
proportionality tests of as case studies, 69–71
rareness of balancing decisions in first twenty-five years of, 91
rational connection test and, 121, 168–70
rationalising of balancing by correcting cases of individual hardship, 173–75, 184, 186
rationalising of balancing test by, 165, 182
rationalising of balancing test by shifting financial burdens, 165–68, 184, 186
rationalising of balancing test through insufficient fit between measure and purpose, 168–71, 184, 186
rationalising of balancing through consistency tests by, 172–73, 184, 186
rulings on marriage by, 118
telecommunications surveillance case of, 141–42, 162–63

Harper (Canada), 126
health insurance, 124–25, 128, 129, 130, 134
Health Services Bargaining Association (Canada), 144–45
historical consistency arguments, 136–37
hoof care decision (Germany), 169–70
human dignity, 150–53, 155
Hutterian Brethren (Canada), 102–04

Immigration and Refugee Protection Act (IRPA, Canada), 135
implicit balancing, 11, 116, 122, 156, 186
less restrictive means test and, 130–32
as review of legislative rationality vs. judicial activism, 133–34
incommensurable values, critique of balancing test and, 4, 9, 39–45

Alexy’s defense of balancing, 45–47
Engel’s defense of balancing, 48–49
Nash bargaining solution to, 47–49
information access, 136
institutional constraints, 8
on application of proportionality test, 191
on balancing tests, 59
on judicial decision-making, 183
internal consistency arguments, 135–36
Irwin Toy (Canada), 125

Jefferson, Thomas, 13
judges
independence of, 34
judicial independence cases, 144
judicial power and judicial legitimacy and, 61–66
judicial prognoses in court decisions, 127–29
judicial self-empowerment in balancing test and, 53–54, 57–58, 182
judicial activism
analytical openness of doctrinal instrument and, 189
balancing as review of legislative rationality vs. judicial activism in German Federal Constitutional Court, 175–77
balancing as unable to hide, 9, 156, 181, 183
based on on alternative forms of reasoning vs. proportionality test, 157
in Canadian Supreme Court, 188
Crucifix decision (Germany) and, 187–88
defined, 8, 185
implicit balancing and, 133–34
proportionality as non-primary means of, 156
proportionality test as instrument of, 187–89
proportionality test as review of legislative rationality vs. judicial activism, 156, 184–87
public scrutiny and, 188, 189
judicial decision-making
institutional constraints on, 8, 183
legal as well as non-legal factors
in, 15–16
judicial review
correction of political market failures
by, 16, 18–19, 32, 35, 156, 181, 185
as corrector of collusion between
political parties, 28–30
as corrector of external effects, 30–32
critique of mistakes made in, 35
democracy and, 16–18
legitimacy of, 15, 183, 185
minority protection and, 34–36, 185
political influence in, 8
as review of rationality of legislative
decision-making, 186–87
in U.S., 13
judicial review (Canada)
confirmation of in Canadian Charter
of Rights and Freedoms, 14
judicial review (Germany)
in German Constitution, 14
judicial review (South Africa)
in South African Constitution, 14
Khumalo case (South Africa), 111
labor unions and collective
bargaining, 144–45
last step of the proportionality test, 10
Lawyers for Human Rights v. Minister of
Home Affairs (South Africa), 143
legal certainty, 9
ad-hoc balancing tests and, 9, 54–57
categorical arguments and, 150
determinacy considerations
and, 147–48
legislation
balancing as review of legislative
rationality vs. judicial activism,
133–34, 182, 186–87
balancing as review of legislative
rationality vs. judicial activism in
German Federal Constitutional
Court, 175–77
consistency tests as tool increasing
legislative rationality, 137–38, 140

deference and burden of proof in
court decisions and, 122–27
legislative capture by lobbying
groups, 26–28
legislative prognoses of courts, 122
procedural arguments relating to
legislative procedure, 144–46
review of legislative procedure, 79
legitimacy
balancing tests and judicial
legitimacy, 67–68
of constitutional order through social
contracts, 20
in German Federal Constitutional
Court, 2
independence of judges and, 34
judicial power and judicial
legitimacy and, 61–66
of judicial review, 15, 183, 185
of judicial review in U.S., 13
of U.S. Supreme Court, 16
legitimate aim, 73–74, 116–19
legitimate expectations test, 77, 148–49
Lerche, Peter, 98
less restrictive means test, 73–75, 99–102, 110, 119–22
as alternative to balancing test, 50–52
in Canadian Supreme Court, 80–82, 83, 186
difficulties with, 132–33
in German Federal Constitutional
Court, 168–70
implicit balancing and, 130–32
as review of legislative rationality vs.
judicial activism, 133–34
in South African Constitutional
Court, 110, 186
lobbying groups, 26–28, 138–40
Logan decision (Canada), 101, 161, 162
Lüth judgment (Germany), 93–94, 97
Makwanyane decision (South Africa),
106–09, 159
Malachi (South Africa), 130
Malmo-Levine (Canada), 125
Manamela case (South Africa), 81, 110, 128, 129
Marbury v. Madison (U.S.), 13
Mbatha case (South Africa), 57
mental illness, 160
military service, 127
minimal impairment test, 106
Minister of Home Affairs v. National Institute of Crime Prevention case (South Africa), 164
minority protection, 134, 181
apex courts and, 36
argument of commonalities with political community as, 21
argument of dynamics of political process as, 22
coalition building as, 22
danger of false stereotypes and, 24
danger of majority disregard of minority interests in decision-making process, 24
danger of political majority disregarding minority interests, 24 falsity of individual fundamental rights as, 24–26
freedom of religion and expression as, 25
infeasibility of protection of specific social group rights as, 23–24
judicial review and, 34–36, 185
from legislative capture by lobbying groups, 26–28
perception of as fundamental function of constitutional courts, 20
social contracts and, 20–21
Morales (Canada), 147
morality considerations in court rulings, 116–19
Mounted Police Association of Ontario (Canada), 105
Niemand decision (South Africa), 159
non-balancing arguments, 116
categorical arguments as, 150–53, 155, 157
deductive reasoning as, 153–56, 157
implicit balancing and, 156
Oakes decision (Canada), 98–100, 122, 190
parole scheme, 105
Personal Information Protection Act (PIPA, Canada), 179–81
Pharmacy decision of German Federal Constitutional Court, 86–89, 129
political market failures, correction of by judicial review, 16, 18–19, 32, 35, 156, 181, 185
procedural arguments and, 146
prisoner voting rights, 164
procedural arguments, 140–41, 146
as avoiding political market failures, 146
in criminal and criminal procedure law, 141–43
for preserving impartiality of decision making process, 143–44
relating to legislative procedure, 144–46
proportionality test. See also balancing test; implicit balancing; non-balancing arguments
balancing arguments and, 73
case studies of in three courts, 69–71
categorical arguments and, 77
Chaoulli decision (Canada) and, 6–8, 11, 124–25
classification of judicial arguments of case studies of, 71–73
critique of in Canada, 190
critique of in Germany, 190
critique of in South Africa, 190
Cruciifx decision (Germany) and, 5, 178–79, 187–88
deductive style of argumentation and, 77
determinacy considerations in, 78
difficulties with less restrictive means test and, 132–33
empirical analysis of Canadian Supreme Court's use of, 83
empirical analysis of German Constitutional Court's use of, 80–83
empirical analysis of South African Constitutional Court's use of, 86
equality considerations and, 77
four steps of, 38
proportionality test (cont.)
  institutional constraints on application of, 191
  as instrument for judicial activism, 8, 187–89
  legislative deference and burden of proof in Canadian Supreme Court decisions, 122–27
  legitimate aim argument classification and, 73–74, 116–19
  legitimate expectations test and, 77
  less restrictive means test in Canadian Supreme Court, 80–82, 83, 99–102, 119
  *Makwanyane* decision (South Africa) and, 106–09, 159
  in *Mhatha* case (South Africa), 57
  morality considerations in court rulings and, 116–19
  as non-primary instrument for judicial activism, 156, 175–77
  in *Oakes* decision of Canadian Supreme Court, 98–100, 122, 190
  overbreadth argument and, 75, 170–71
  procedural considerations in, 78
  rational connection and less restrictive means argument classification and, 73–75, 119–22, 168–70
  reduced form of without the balancing stage, 40
  review of legislative procedure in, 79
  as review of rationality of legislative decision-making, 8, 156, 158, 175–77, 184–87
  role of constitutional courts in a democratic society and, 8
  variations in application of by courts, 80
  prostitution, 162, 164, 181
  *Provincial Court Judges* case (Canada), 144
  rational connection test, 73–75, 99–102, 119–22, 168–70, 186
  as review of legislative rationality vs. judicial activism, 133–34
  religious freedom
    *Crucifix* decision (Germany) and, 1, 5, 178–79, 187–88
    minority protection and, 25
    rent control, 169
  research design, 68
  *RJR-MacDonald* (Canadian Supreme Court case), 51–52, 123–24, 127
  Rogers, James, 174
  Roosevelt, Franklin D., 61
  same-sex marriage, 92
  Scalia, Anthony, 46
  Schlink, Bernhard, 36, 40, 52–53, 190
  selection process for university students, 148
  *Sharpe* decision (Canada), 101, 161, 162
  social contracts, 20–21
  sodomy, 119
  South African Constitutional Court
    absence of balancing in, 10, 81–83, 86, 116, 158, 184, 186
    balancing and legislative review in, 109–10
    balancing and precarious institutional position of, 112–13, 190
    balancing and review of common law in, 110–12
    balancing arguments in jurisprudence of, 73
    balancing in *Ex parte Minister of Safety and Security* case, 109, 160
    balancing test in criminal and criminal procedure cases of, 158–60, 181
  *Bhe v. Khayelitsha Magistrate* and, 118
  Black Administration Act of 1927 and, 118
  classification of judicial arguments of case studies of, 71–73, 86
  confirmation of judicial review in South African Constitution, 14
  consistency or coherency arguments in jurisprudence of, 75–76, 106–09, 136
  *De Vos* decision of, 160
  empirical analysis of proportionality test in, 86
INDEX

external consistency in Brümmer case of, 136
judicial prognoses in court decisions of, 127–29
Khumalo case of, 111
Lawyers for Human Rights v. Minister of Home Affairs case of, 143
less restrictive means test and, 110, 120, 186
Malachi decision of, 130
Manamela case of, 81, 110, 128, 129
Minister of Home Affairs v. National Institute of Crime Prevention case of, 164
Niemand decision of, 159
opinion of failure to protect individual rights by, 190
overbreadth argument in jurisprudence of, 75
procedural arguments in criminal and public security cases, 142–43
proportionality in Makwanyane decision and, 106–09, 159
proportionality test in Mbatha case, 57
proportionality tests of as case studies, 69–71
rational connection test and, 120, 186
ruling on sodomy of, 119
Steyn case of, 142–43
Steyn case (South Africa), 142–43
telecommunications surveillance, 141–42, 162–63
Theory of Constitutional Rights (Alexy), 45
tobacco, 123–24
smoking ban case in Germany, 138–40
transsexuals, status of, 92, 170–71
Tse case (Canada), 142
U.S. Supreme Court, 15, 96, 188
court-packing plan of FDR and, 61
judicial review and, 13
Marbury v. Madison, 13
unemployment benefits, 170
United Food and Commercial Workers (Canada), 179–81
university students, selection process for, 148
vaccines, 129
Veel, Paul-Erik, 47–49
Vermeule, Adrian, 54
voting rights, 164
Vriend v. Alberta (Canada), 119
welfare benefits, 156, 189
Whaling decision (Canada), 105
Wholesale Travel (Canada), 131–32