

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Tables of Legislation</i>	xiii
 1 INTRODUCTION	 1
I. Defining Parliamentary Sovereignty: Dicey's Conception	2
II. The Compatibility of the Human Rights Act 1998 with Dicey's Theory of Parliamentary Sovereignty	3
A. Section 19: the Manner and Form Challenge	5
B. Section 10: the Henry VIII Challenge	6
C. A Constitutional Statute?	9
D. Dialogue and Duality	10
E. Evaluation	12
(i) Sovereignty, Interpretation and Implied Repeal	12
(ii) Defining Legally Valid Legislation	14
III. Sovereignty Explored	15
A. Continuing Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy	15
B. Perspectives of Parliamentary Sovereignty	17
IV. In Defence of the Human Rights Act 1998	22
A. Could the United Kingdom Constitution provide for a Stronger Protection of Rights without Breaching Sovereignty?	22
B. Should Convention Rights be Entrenched?	25
V. In Defence of Dicey	28
 2 INTERPRETATION AND IMPLIED REPEAL	 31
I. Continuing Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy and the Doctrine of Implied Repeal: the Orthodox Account	32
II. The Narrow Scope of Implied Repeal	35
A. General Presumption against Implied Repeal	36
B. <i>Generalia Specialibus Non Derogant</i>	39
C. Constitutional Statutes	40
D. Conflict between two Statutes on the same Subject?	45
E. Specific Repeal	49

III. How to give Human Rights an 'Entrenchment Effect'	54
A. Construe and Give Effect	54
B. Dominant and Subordinate Statutory Provisions and the Principle of Legality	57
C. Misfired Statutes	60
IV. Conclusion	61
3 REDEFINITION AND THE RULE OF RECOGNITION	65
I. Continuing and Self-embracing Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy	66
II. Manner and Form and Redefinition	68
A. Why can Manner and Form provisions be Entrenched?	68
B. Redefinition and Continuing Theories of Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy	71
III. Methods of Entrenchment	75
A. Modification of Rules of Action	77
B. Modification of the Rule of Recognition	82
(i) Modification of the Supreme Criterion	85
(ii) Core and Penumbra	86
(iii) Rule of Recognition and Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy	87
(iv) Practical Problems	90
IV. Conclusion	93
4 DEMOCRACY AND RIGHTS	95
I. Dicey and Democracy	96
A. Factual Accuracy	98
B. Self-Correcting Unitary Democracy?	101
II. Constitutional Rights	103
III. Democratic Dialogue	112
IV. Conclusion	114
5 DEMOCRATIC DIALOGUE AND THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998	115
I. Models of Dialogue	116
A. Defining Democratic Dialogue	117
II. Justification of Democratic Dialogue	118
A. Practical Problems	119
B. Finding the Right Balance	121

C. Justifying the Assumptions underlying Democratic Dialogue: Jeremy Waldron	122
D. Consensus, Dissensus and <i>Prolife</i> : an Example	123
E. Distinguishing between Consensus and Dissensus: Core and Penumbral Applications of a Human Right	124
F. Distinguishing between Consensus and Dissensus: Ronald Dworkin's Easy and Hard Cases	125
III. Justifications of the Human Rights Act 1998	127
A. Justifications of Democratic Dialogue	128
B. Applying Justifications of Democratic Dialogue to the Human Rights Act	128
C. The Human Rights Act, 'Definitive Conclusions' and Theories of Rights	130
IV. Dialogue and Institutional Competences	132
A. Protection of Minority Rights	132
B. Protection of Long-standing Principles	135
C. Protection of Specific Individual Rights	137
D. Interstitial Changes	138
V. Towards a Theory of Adjudication	139
A. Institutional Competences and the Remedial Consequences	139
B. Identifying Cases where it is Reasonable to Disagree about Rights Issues	140
C. Institutional Features and Remedies	141
D. Democratic Dialogue and Principles of Interpretation	141
E. Conclusion	142
VI. Conclusion	143
6 A THEORY OF ADJUDICATION	145
I. The Current Legal Test	146
A. Analysis: Compatibility of the Current Law with a Democratic Dialogue Model of Adjudication	147
B. An Example: <i>Bellinger v Bellinger</i>	148
C. Conclusion	152
II. A New Theory of Adjudication	152
A. Interpretation	153
B. Deference and Adjudication	154
C. An Emerging Legal Test	156
III. Conclusion	158

7 CONCLUSION	161
I. A Modest Defence of Continuing Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy	162
A. Sovereignty v Supremacy	162
B. From Paradox to Justification	165
C. A Constitutional Defence of Continuing Parliamentary Legislative Supremacy	166
D. The Example of <i>R (Jackson) v Attorney-General</i>	170
II. Conclusion	174
<i>Index</i>	177