

Index

ABSTRACT OR ACADEMIC QUESTIONS

definition, 71
exceptions, 82-83
evidentiary foundation, 80-82
sufficient facts for adjudication, 73-76
test cases, 76-80

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

prematurity, 45-46

ADVISORY OPINIONS, *see* RIPENESS, DOCTRINE OF

ALTERNATIVE GROUNDS IN RIPENESS DECISIONS

definition, 83-84
exhaustion doctrine, 89-103
unnecessary questions, 84-89

ANTICIPATED MOOTNESS, 154

APPEAL, JUSTICIABILITY RAISED AT

mootness, 272

notice of appeal, justiciable issue
in, 271

AUSTRALIA

political questions doctrine, 170-176

BOROWSKI (NO. 2) DECISION, *see* MOOTNESS, DOCTRINE OF

CANADIAN *CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS*

section 1, 207-213
section 2, 77
section 2(b), 65, 73-74, 80, 199, 210
section 7, 58, 60-61, 95, 187, 205, 208, 242
section 11, 37, 288
section 11(d), 82
section 12, 49, 51, 52
section 15, 19, 86, 88, 119, 121, 123, 290
section 23, 121, 145
section 24, 66, 67, 146
section 32, 85, 225, 227

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

intergovernmental relations, 233-234, 239-241
“judicature” sections, 37, 288
preamble, 22, 26, 37, 38, 288
section 35 and 35(1), 245
section 36, 233-235, 237, 239-241
section 52, 16
section 96, 17
section 101, 22, 37-38
separation of powers, 13, 14, 16-17

CHECKS AND BALANCES, 15, 19, 164

CONSTITUTIONAL

CONVENTIONS, 11-12, 217-222

CROWN PREROGATIVE

POWERS, see **PREROGATIVE POWERS**

DECLARATIONS, 39

DECLARATORY ACTIONS

standards of justiciability, 272-275

EXHAUSTION DOCTRINE

American approach, 90, 97
civil actions against the Crown, 99-103
fragmentation, 94
human rights cases, 90-92, 97
principles guiding exercise of discretion, 90

FRAGMENTATION, 94

GOVERNMENT ACTION

FAILING TO RAISE LEGAL ISSUES
generally, 204-206, 216
section 1 of *Charter*, 207-213

“legal component” approach, 209

Oakes test, 209

remedial discretion, 213-216

wisdom vs. validity of government actions, 205-206, 210

HIERARCHY OF GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS, 15-16

HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS

abstract or academic questions

definition, 71

evidentiary foundation, 80-82

exceptions, 82-83

sufficient facts for

adjudication, 73-76

test cases, 76-80

definition, 48

rationale for not deciding

questions, 48

speculative or contingent

questions

generally, 53-54

“reasonable likelihood” test,

62-71

“susceptibility to proof” test,

54-62

use of hypothetical examples, 49-

53

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, DISPUTES INVOLVING

Canada Health Act, 235-236

Canada Health and Social

Transfer, 237-238

s. 36 of Constitution Act, 233-234,

239-241

shared cost programmes, 234

INTERLOCUTORY

INJUNCTIONS

standards of justiciability, 276-277

INTERNATIONAL

AGREEMENTS, *see*

POLITICAL QUESTIONS

DOCTRINE

INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES,

see **POLITICAL QUESTIONS**

DOCTRINE

JUDICIARY

as independent institution, 17-18

hierarchy of governmental

functions, 15-16

judicial economy, efficiency and

effectiveness, 290

judicial economy, mootness and,

130-151

legitimacy of courts to entertain

claims, 291-293

proper role, 151-153

relationship to other branches of

government, 18-23

reticence on social and economic

rights, 242-243

source of judicial independence,

17-18

JUSTICIABILITY

American approach, 24-27

“appropriateness”, 9

definition, 6-10

enforceability, distinguished from,

11-12

overview, 27-30

pragmatic and coherent approach

generally, 283-289

institutional capacity, 289-291

adversarial system, 290-291

judicial economy, efficiency

and effectiveness, 290

legitimacy of courts, 291-293

private vs. public law settings, 12-13

procedural issues, *see*

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

separation of powers, *see*

SEPARATION OF

POWERS

standing, distinguished from, 10-

11

U.K. approach, 23-24

“LEGISLATIVE PROCESS”

DOCTRINE

formulation and introduction of

bills, 197-200

policy development vs. legislative

process, 199

MOOTNESS, DOCTRINE OF

American approach, 108-110

Borowski (No. 2) decision

anticipated mootness, 154

application of *Borowski* criteria

causes of mootness

factual changes, 124

legal changes, 120-124

failure of courts to apply

principles, 158

when moot cases will be

heard

adversarial nature of

dispute, 125-130

judicial economy

generally, 130-131

likelihood of

recurrence and

evasiveness of

issue, 134-143

practical effect on

parties’ rights,

131-134

public interest and

social cost of

uncertainty, 144-151
whether issue of mootness to be considered, 119-120
Borowski (No. 2) framework and criteria for deciding mootness, 114-118
costs where matter not decided because of mootness, 154-155
interests of justice, 155-158
mootness prior to decision, 111-114
proper role for judiciary, 151-153
definition, 107-108
generally, 110-111

PARLIAMENTARY

PRIVILEGES, 223-225

“PLAIN AND OBVIOUS” TEST, 268, 269

POLITICAL QUESTIONS

DOCTRINE

American approach, 164-170
rival approaches to doctrine, 166-167
modern doctrine as established in *Baker v. Carr*, 167-169
origin, 164-165
Australian approach, 170-176
British approach, 176-182
Crown prerogative powers, deference to, 176-180
Canadian approach 185-253
Constitutional conventions, 217-222
generally, 251-253
intergovernmental relations, disputes involving, 233-241
Canada Health Act, 235-236

Canada Health and Social Transfer, 237-238
s. 36 of Constitution Act, 233-234, 239-241
shared cost programmes, 234
international disputes
foreign state, actions of, 250-251
international agreements, 245-248
international law, 248-250
matters failing to raise legal issues
existence of political questions doctrine in Canada, 185-187
governmental action, 204-216
remedial discretion, 213-216
Section 1 of the *Charter*, 207-213
“legislative process” doctrine, 197-204
“purely political” matters, 187-197
Parliamentary privileges, 223-225, 232
prerogative powers, 225-233
social and economic rights, disputes involving, 242-244
definition, 161-164
Israeli approach, 182-185

PRELIMINARY MOTIONS

accepting facts as pleaded, 267-268
judicable issues, 269
“plain and obvious” test, 268, 269

PREMATURITY

administrative law, 45-46
Charter cases, 42-45
American approach, 44

concreteness, 47
 generally, 40-41
 “private” law, 46
 when premature case should be heard, 41-42

PREROGATIVE POWERS, 176-180, 215, 225-233

“PRIVATE” LAW
 justiciability, 12-13
 prematurity, 46

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

appeal, justiciability raised at, 271-272
 generally, 256-257
 preliminary motions, 267-270
Quebec Code of Civil Procedure, Article 55, 256-257, 261-267
 standards of justiciability
 declaratory actions, 272-275
 interlocutory injunctions, 276-277
 references, 277-280
 standing, 257-261
 criteria for granting standing, 258-260
 definition, 257
 trial, justiciability raised at, 270-271

PUBLIC INTEREST STANDING
 see **STANDING**

“PURELY POLITICAL” MATTERS
 American approach, 187-189
 test, 195-196

QUEBEC CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, ARTICLE 55
 generally, 261-262
 relationship to constitutional law principles, 266-267

“sufficient interest” standard, 262-264

“REASONABLE LIKELIHOOD” TEST, *see* **HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS**

REFERENCES

standards of justiciability, 277-280

RIPENESS, DOCTRINE OF, 31-104

alternative grounds, 83-103
 “exhaustion” doctrine, 89-103
 American approach, 90, 97
 civil actions against the Crown, 99-103
 fragmentation, 94
 human rights cases, 90-92, 97
 principles guiding exercise of discretion, 90
 unnecessary questions, 83-89
 American approach, 34-36
 advisory opinions, 34-35
 categories, 35-36
 Canadian approach, 36-40
 as a common law requirement, 37-38
 definition, 32-34
 hypothetical questions, 36, 38 ,
 see also **HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS**

QUESTIONS
 prematurity
 administrative law, 45-46
 Charter cases, 42-45
 American approach, 44
 concreteness, 47
 generally, 40-41
 “private” law, 46
 when premature case should be heard, 41-42
 proper scope for judicial review,
 test for determining, 103-104
 statutory law, 38-39

declarations, 39
interlocutory injunctions, 39
references, 38
standing, 39

SEPARATION OF POWERS

American vs. Canadian concept, 13-15
Canadian Constitution, 13, 14, 16-17
hierarchy of governmental functions, 15-16
judicial review, 20-23
judiciary as independent institution, 16-18
judiciary's relationship to other branches of government, 18-23
justiciability, relationship to, 20

SHARED COST PROGRAMMES,
234

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS

arguments, 243-244
definition, 242

SPECULATIVE OR CONTINGENT QUESTIONS

generally, 53-54
"reasonable likelihood" test, 62-71
"susceptibility to proof" test, 54-62

STANDING

criteria for granting standing, 258-260
definition, 257

justiciability, distinguished from, 10, 11
ripeness, and, 39

"SUSCEPTIBILITY TO PROOF" TEST, *see* HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS

TRIAL, JUSTICIABILITY RAISED AT, 270-271

UNITED KINGDOM

justiciability, 23-24
political questions doctrine, 176-182
Westminster system, 15

UNITED STATES

advisory opinions, 34-35
Article III of U.S. Constitution, 24, 25, 26, 34, 108, 165, 277, 288
exhaustion doctrine, 90, 97
hypothetical questions, 48, 59
justiciability, 24-27
mootness, 108-110
political questions doctrine, 164-170
prematurity, 44
ripeness, doctrine of, 34-36
separation of powers, 13-15

UNNECESSARY QUESTIONS

constitutional questions not put before court, 85-87
deciding case on federalism or *Charter* grounds, 87-89
deciding case on non-constitutional grounds, 84-85