

INDEX

Abella J, 80, 191, 193, 229, 239 accountability, 55, 108, 110, 112 administration, principles of good, 165, 166 administrative law, 13, 244 and deliberation, 119 role of judicial review in, 194 administrative review and constitutional review, 186, 187-202, 219 and protection of fundamental rights, 188-202 administrative state, 4 Allan, T. R. S., 26-32 Allison, John, 38 alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, 184 Arbour J, 98 Arthurs, Harry, 253 authority allocation of, 8, 11, 37, 53, 69, 227, 242 and fundamental rights, 189 of legislation, 42, 275 spheres of, 10-12

Baer, Lauren, 73
Barron, David, 107, 108
Bastarache J, 86, 105, 176, 229
Beetz J, 57, 223
Bingham, Lord, 131–2, 234, 274, 282
Binnie J, 102, 103, 259, 263
bounded rationality, 83, 84
Brennan J, 231–3, 272–3, 277, 281, 286
Breyer J, 112, 113, 126, 150–1
Bridge, Lord, 20, 104, 216–17
burden of justification, 153, 168, 170, 172

approaches to, 161–2 cogent reasons and reasoning, 158, 178, 180 discharging, 153 relevancy, 178 sufficient evidence, 160–1

Canada

constitution, 274-6 curial deference in, 12, 15-17 Federal Courts Act, 36, 258 federal system, 14 freedom of expression, 192 implied delegation, 51-2 patent unreasonableness, 174 pragmatic and functional analysis, 15, 30, 56-8, 67, 223 precedents, 183 proportionality, 211 questions of law, 242 Supreme Court's jurisdiction, 14, 222 variable standards of review, 56-8 Charron J, 190, 193 Chevron doctrine, 17, 18, 21, 31, 44, 58, 233 applicability of, 59, 64, 231 and delegation of powers, 112 and democratic legitimacy, 107 and implied delegation, 48 Clyde, Lord, 238 cognitive defects, 83, 84 Cohn, Margit, 32-3 collaboration, 128 collateral fact doctrine, 221, 223 complexity and context, 99-100 and expertise, 99



298 INDEX

complexity (cont.) importance of, 100 and legislative intent, 97-9, 100 and polycentricity, 92-4 and practical justifications for curial deference, 89-100 and problems of incommensurability, 93 recognition of, 97 and uncertainty, 94-7 consensus, 119 constitutional law, 194, 215 constitutional principles, 32, 34 alternative, 44-53 declared, 36-43 and implied delegation, 48 and protection of fundamental rights, 188-202 separation of powers, 44-8 constitutional review, 200 and administrative review, 186, 187-202, 219 and doctrinal deference, 197 and epistemic deference, 198 constitutional rules, 277-8, 284 - 5correctness, 138, 140, 194, 200, 219, 234, 260, 262 and epistemic deference, 138-9 and unreasonableness, 194-8 Cory J, 73-4, 78 courts, function of, 234 courts, institutional shortcomings of, 90 Craig, Paul, 141, 204, 212–13 curial deference, 9-10, 12 and delegation of power, doctrine of, 12, 28, 37, 45, 186 foundations in English law, 133 and independence, 112-14 and legislative intent, 53 practical justifications for, 70–136, 200-2, 228-30 and questions of law, 254-5 scope of, 265 and secondary justiciability, 283 varying degrees of, 56

De Smith, S. A., 241 decision-making processes, 115-17, 126-7, 128-31, 132 deference: see also curial deference automatic, 46-7 in Canada, 15-17 definition of, 7-35 delegation argument, 36-69, 252, 257 doctrinal deference, 7-9, 194-8 and emptiness and perniciousness, 26 - 31in England, 19-21 epistemic deference, 7-9, 21-4, 137, 198, 200, 204, 210 and fundamental rights, 186-219 and illogicality, 25-6 judicial, 10 and judicial capacities, 25 and legislative power, 47-8 and political questions, 267-94 possibility of, 24-35 practical justifications for, 39, 257 principles of, 28, 44-53 and proportionality, 186-219 as respect, 10, 22 submissive deference, 10 in the United States, 17-18 and the value of doctrine in judicial review, 31 delegated decision-makers appointment of, 75-6 autonomy of, 222 choice of procedure, 127 danger of self-aggrandisement, 224, 230 and democratic legitimacy, 101-5, 245, 262-5 and discretion, 261 and expertise, 76-7 and legislators, 111 length of service, 88 level of abstraction permitted, 208 procedural flexibility of, 90, 91 and questions of law, 240 types of questions addressed by, 99 and uncertainty, 95 delegation argument, 36-69, 252, 257 mechanics of, 60-5



INDEX 299

delegation of powers, 37, 225 Dyzenhaus, David, 21-2, 38, 68, 187-8, background assumption of, 49, 52 and curial deference, 53-68 England, 152 and expertise, 73 extent of, 60, 64, 227 Court of the King's Bench, 9 implied delegation, 48 curial deference in, 12 and interpretation of legislation, 256 grounds of review of administrative and judicial restraint, 53-5 action, 50 legislative intent and privative Human Rights Act 1998, 19, 187, clauses, 65-7 203, 217 measurement of, 56, 60, 64, 135 implied delegation, 50 nature of the powers, 61 judicial deference in, 19-21 and practical justifications for curial principles of judicial review, 2 deference, 174 Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement purpose of, 52 Act 2007, 14 and questions of law, 254 epistemic deference, 7-9, 137, 200, reasons for, 70, 71, 91 204, 207 and correctness, 138-9 and statutory appeals, 68 vagueness of, 46 and discretion, 260 variable, 39, 55-60 and fundamental rights, 198 varying degrees of, 136 in practice, 21-4 democracy, deliberative, 118 and proportionality, 210 democratic legitimacy, 101-14, 133, utility of, 22 197, 201, 245, 262-5 Eskridge, William, 73 and accountability, 112 European Convention on Human in context, 106-8 Rights, 28, 187, 195, 199-200 importance of, 264 European Court of Human Rights, 218 Evans, J. A., 262 and independence, 112-14 and jurisdiction, 229, 230 evidence, 160-1, 183 and legislative intent, 105-6 substantial, 17 statutory and non-statutory control, and uncertainty, 95 108 - 12executive powers, 2, 3, 274 Denning, Lord, 245-6 expertise, 72, 133, 147, 197, 199, 201 Deschamps J, 191, 193 accrual of, 76-7, 80 Dickson J, 15, 142, 223 application of, 87 discretion, 255-65 appointment of expert delegated abuse of, 17 decision-makers, 75-6, 80, 88 in Canada, 258-9 ascertaining the extent of, 80, 86-9 delegation of, 256 and common sense, 84-5 distinction between grounds and and complexity, 99 standards of review, 258-62 and context, 80-2 distinction between law and development of, 78 discretion, 255-8 and indeterminacy, 88 in England, 259 and legislative intent, 77-9 doctrinal deference, 7-9 and members of the executive and fundamental rights, 197 branch of government, 75 in practice, 12-21 negative aspects of, 74 Dworkin, Ronald, 41-2, 237 positive aspects of, 73



> INDEX 300 failure to establish, 151 expertise (cont.) problems of, 82-9 illogicality, 143 and questions of law, 243-5 inconsistency with statute, 144-8 a relative concept, 80 and proportionality, 212 relevance of, 73-7, 87 sources of, 165 and standards of review, 152-3 shortcomings in, 82-6 variations in, 81 unexplained changes in policy, 149 - 51fairness, 3-4, 120, 122, 130 interests, 216-19 Finn, Chris, 271 interpretation of statutes, 37, 235, Fish, Stanley, 33 255, 256 Foley, Brian, 7 Irvine, Lord, 37 formalism, 11 Friendly, Henry, 216 Jackson J, 22 Fuller, Lon, 92, 246 Jowell, Jeffrey, 37, 203 judicial intervention, dangers of, Galligan, Denis, 122 92, 236 Geoghegan Finlay J, 180, 193 judicial power, erosion of, 48-53 Gersen, Jacob, 22 judicial restraint, 53-5 Gonthier J, 79 judicial review, 194, 269 government access to as a right, 279 executive branch, 75 and constitutional principles, 32, 34 functions of branches of, 44 cost of, 182 Greene, Lord, 54, 171, 282 in England, 218 Griffiths, Lord, 234 and indicia of unreasonableness, Gutmann, Amy, 121-2, 129 152 - 3intensity of, 282, 283 Hale, Baroness, 189-90 and legislative intent, 255 legitimacy of, 274-6 Hare, Ivan, 243-4 Harris, Bruce, 269 principles of, 36, 165 Hewart, Lord, 65-6 and questions of law, 245 Hickman, Tom, 22 and rule of law, 165 Hoexter, Cora, 138 task of reviewing courts, 72 Hoffmann, Lord, 104-5, 203, 260, 279 value of doctrine in, 31 jurisdiction, 220-33, 265 Hogg, Peter, 210 Hope, Lord, 94, 98 analytical problem of, 222-5 human rights, 29, 93 and complexity, 229 Hunt, Murray, 10, 37, 187-8 concept of, 220-8 the grant of jurisdiction, 225-6 Iacobucci J, 57, 62, 157, 159-60, 172, limited review doctrine, 226-8 and practical justifications for curial deference, 228-30 illogicality, and unreasonableness, 143 inconsistency, 144 jurisdictional error, 11-12 indicia of unreasonableness, 143-53, jurisdictional question doctrine, 221, 166, 173, 184 223, 224, 226 case law on, 153 justiciability, 267-9 demonstration of presence of, 163 definition of, 267 and legal rights, 271 disproportionality, 143-4



INDEX 301

primary justiciability, 270, 272-80 secondary justiciability, 280-6 Kagan, Elena, 107, 108 Kahn-Freund, Otto, 13 Kavanagh, Aileen, 29 Keith J, 177 Kennedy J, 23, 64 King, Jeff, 93, 169, 208 La Forest J, 61, 62, 82 Lamer CJ, 57 Laski, Harold, 84–5 Laws, Sir John, 132-3 Laws LJ, 28, 29, 169 LeBel J, 140, 175, 176, 263-5 legislation interpretation of, 37, 235, 255, 256 power of amendment, 230 presumption of coherence of, 249 legislative intent, 36-43, 68, 173, 201, 225 and complexity, 97-9, 100 and curial deference, 53 and decision costs, 182 definition of, 39 and delegation of power, 52, 55, 65-7 and democratic legitimacy, 105-6 and expertise, 77-9 implied, 134 and individual legislators, 41 and judicial review, 255 and jurisdiction, 228 and legislative power, 47-8 and practical justifications for curial deference, 70-2, 134 and privative clauses, 65-7 and procedural legitimacy, 123-5, 131 and proportionality, 215 and questions of law, 235, 242, 245, 252, 254 reliance upon, 69, 72, 85 requirement of clarity, 45, 97 legislators, and delegated decision-

primary and secondary, 269-72

limited review doctrine, 226-8 Lloyd, Lord, 106, 274 Major J, 104, 230 Marshall J, 286 Mashaw, Jerry, 74 McLachlin CJ, 99, 264 merits review, and unreasonableness, 139 - 40Miles, Thomas, 254 Monaghan, Henry, 194-8 Morissette, Yves-Marie, 164 Mulgan, Richard, 108 Mullan, David, 173 New Zealand, 276-7 Nicholls, Lord, 238 non-jurisdictional error, 11-12 non-statutory powers, 2 O'Connor J, 251–2 O'Sullivan J, 141 paramountcy, doctrine of, 248-9 participation, 114, 115, 121-2, 127 ascertaining who should participate, 128 and deliberation, 121 excess of, 126 legislative requirement for, 130 and procedural legitimacy, 125, 133 quality of, 129 Phillips, Lord, 261 pluralism, 117, 118, 119 policy-making, dynamics of, 129 political questions, 267-94 categories of, 269 definition of, 268 examples of, 273 Poole, Thomas, 94 practical justifications for curial deference, 70-136 and the appropriate standard of review, 170 characteristics of, 71 complexity, 89-100 contextual nature of, 170

and delegation of power, 174

L'Heureux-Dubé J, 61, 82, 123-4, 144,

makers, 111 Lester, Anthony, 203

248-9, 256, 262



302 INDEX

practical justifications (cont.) democratic legitimacy, 101-14 and discretion, 257 and expertise, 72, 243-5 free-standing practical justifications, and fundamental rights, 200-2 and jurisdiction, 228-30 and legislative intent, 70-2, 134 procedural legitimacy, 114-30 and questions of law, 243-54 role of, 200 variable nature of, 39, 136 pragmatic and functional analysis, 15, 30, 51-2, 56-8 precedent, 183, 248 primary justiciability basis of, 274 exceptions, 277-8 and the rule of law, 278-80 scope of, 272-7 privative clauses, 15, 62, 65-7 procedural fairness, 3-4, 120, 122, 130 procedural legitimacy, 114-30, 197, 201 and aggregation of interests, 117-18 assessment of, 131 and choice of procedures, 127 in context, 124 contributors to, 114-22 and decision-making, 115-17 and deliberation, 118-21 difficulties with, 125-30 and imperfect representation, 128 - 31and legislative intent, 123-5, 126-7, 128, 131 and participation, 121-2, 129, 130, 133 reduction of, 125 theories of, 115 proportionality, 186-219 balancing limb, 205, 210-12 comparison with unreasonableness, 203 - 12components of, 204 constraints imposed by statutory construction, 214-16 and illogicality, 207

least restrictive alternative limb, 205, 208 - 10legitimacy limb, 205 protean conception of, 213 rational connection limb, 205, 207-8 stricto sensu, 210-12 and unreasonableness, 202-7, 211, 212 - 13proportionality test, 186, 191, 202 application of, 192, 197 and unreasonableness, 208 public law adjudication nature of, 33 openness of, 33 prevalence of doctrinal arguments value of doctrine in, 34 questions of law, 233-55, 265 broad and narrow approaches, 233-4, 244 the broad approach, 238-43 in Canada, 233 categories of, 239 and congruence, 247 constitutional and analytical problems, 234-43 in England, 234 identification of, 239, 241, 253 and legislative intent, 235, 242 'major questions,' 251-3 the narrow approach, 235-8 and practical justifications for curial deference, 243-54 and precedent, 248 and questions of application, 240 and questions of fact, 240, 242 scope for curial deference on, 254-5 uniformity and equity, 245-50

rationality, 83, 84, 142 reasonableness, 16, 57 see also unreasonableness reasoning, 139, 158 regulation, responsive, 89 Rehnquist J, 285–6 Reid, Lord, 43 relevancy, 183



INDEX 303

Stevn, Lord, 9, 203-4 representation, imperfect, 128-31 republicanism, 118 Stratas JA, 61, 261 rights, fundamental, 186-219 Sunstein, Cass, 254 and constitutional competence, 190 and constitutional limits, 195 Taggart, Michael, 35, 187-8, 257 and constitutional principles, 194-8 textual commitments, 277-8, definition of, 186 284 - 5Thomas J, 58 and doctrinal deference, 194-8 and epistemic deference, 198 Thompson, Denis, 121–2, 129 and practical justifications for curial transparency, 176 deference, 200-2 Tremblay, Luc, 25, 26 protection of, 188, 190-4, 195, 202, tribunals 217, 279 and collective intention, 40 Roberts CJ, 8 general appeals, 14 Rodger, Lord, 270-1 independence of, 113 Roskill LJ, 19, 269 insufficient reasons for decisions, 157 purpose for establishment of, 249 Rothstein J, 86, 246, 247 rule of law, 29 and judicial restraint, 165 ultra vires, doctrine of, 220 and primary justiciability, 278-80 uncertainty, 94-7, 170 United States, 54 Scalia J, 22, 127, 147, 150, 158, 231–3, Administrative Procedure Act, 17, 244, 251 36,284-5Scarman, Lord, 103, 195 constitutional adjudication in, 194, scrutiny 214, 216 anxious scrutiny, 168, 169 curial deference in, 12, 17-18 standard of, 265 **Equal Employment Opportunity** secondary justiciability, 280-6 Commission, 23 in Canada, 282 executive branch of the government, concepts of, 281 109, 110 in England, 282 federal system, 14 and prudential concerns, 281 limit on formal rule-making procedures, 127 self-interest, 83 separation of powers, 44-8, 243 National Labor Relations Act, automatic deference, 46-7 146 - 8checks and balances, 45 strict scrutiny, 196 curial deference and legislative Supreme Court's jurisdiction, 14 Telecommunications Act 1996, power, 47-8 curial deference as discipline, 45-6 158 - 60Shapiro, Martin, 102 variable standards of review, 58-60, Skidmore standard, 18, 21, 22, 23, 31, 58 169 Sossin, Lorne, 87, 281 unreasonableness, 137, 184 Souter J, 59, 279 and anxious scrutiny, 168, 169 standards of review, 16, 258-62 see also broad and narrow senses of, 19 correctness; variable standards of and the burden of justification, 153, review 166, 167 case law on, 143 statutory language, meaning of, 146 Stevens J, 97, 116, 160, 179, 233 and correctness, 194-8



304 INDEX

unreasonableness (cont.) definition of, 141-66 determination of, 164 discharging the burden of justification, 157 foundations of, 165-6 indicia of, 143-53, 166, 173, 184 manifest unreasonableness, 181 and merits review, 139-40 patent unreasonableness, 174, 177 and proportionality, 202-14 protean conception of, 167, 168-71, reason and structure of, 162, 210 reasons for, 141 subjective view of, 163 'voting rule' proposal for determination of, 164 Wednesbury, 19, 131, 168, 177

variable standards of review, 37, 137-85, 202 application in individual cases, 60 in Canada, 56-8 decision costs, 182-3 interests in, 216-19 justification of the third standard, 178 and manifest unreasonableness, 181 objections to, 25 a third standard, 168-81 in the United States, 58-60, 169 and unreasonableness, 184 workability of, 166-83 Vermeule, Adrian, 22 Waldron, Jeremy, 42 White J, 92 Wilberforce, Lord, 226 Wilson J, 175, 244