

EUROPEAN HUMAN RIGHTS

Review

RICHARD CLAYTON
THE LIMITS OF WHAT'S "POSSIBLE":
STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION UNDER THE
HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

FIONNUALA NÍ AOLÁIN
TRUTH TELLING, ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE
RIGHT TO LIFE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

TUFYAL CHOUDHURY
THE DRAFTING OF ARTICLE 26 OF THE
INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL
AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

MARIE-BÉNÉDICTE DEMBOUR
"FINISHING OFF" CASES: THE RADICAL SOLUTION TO THE
PROBLEM OF THE EXPANDING ECtHR CASELOAD

IVAN HARE
MINISTER OF HEALTH v. TREATMENT ACTION
CAMPAIGN: THE SOUTH AFRICAN AIDS
PANDEMIC AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT
TO HEALTHCARE

Issue 5
2002

EUROPEAN HUMAN RIGHTS

Review

Issue 5 2002

pages 559-711

EHRLR aims to promote better understanding of European human rights law, and to provide a forum for serious debate on the European Convention on Human Rights. Tailored to the needs of the practitioner and academic lawyers, it carries articles on all aspects of human rights law as well as providing authoritative commentaries on current developments in this field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION

The Limits of "What's Possible": Statutory Construction under the Human Rights Act

Richard Clayton Q.C. 559

Bulletin 567

ARTICLES

Truth Telling, Accountability and the Right to Life in Northern Ireland

Professor Fionnuala Ní Aoláin 572

The Drafting of Article 26 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Tufyal Choudhury 591

"Finishing Off" Cases: The Radical Solution to the Problem of the Expanding ECtHR Caseload

Marie-Bénédicte Dembour 604

CASE ANALYSIS

Minister of Health v. Treatment Action Campaign: The South African AIDS Pandemic and the Constitutional Right to Healthcare

Ivan Hare 624

Table of Cases Under the Human Rights Act: Commentary <i>Janet Arkininstall and Claire O'Brien</i>	631
Table of Cases Under the Human Rights Act <i>Janet Arkininstall and Claire O'Brien</i>	640
CASES AND COMMENT	
<i>A v. United Kingdom</i>	656
<i>Roche v. United Kingdom</i>	658
<i>Patel v. United Kingdom</i>	660
<i>Stafford v. United Kingdom</i>	663
<i>Morris v. United Kingdom</i>	665
<i>Nikula v. Finland</i>	667
<i>Podkolzina v. Latvia</i>	670
<i>Zehnalová and Zehnal v. Czech Republic</i>	673
<i>John Bland v. United Kingdom</i>	675
<i>Holding and Barnes Plc v. United Kingdom</i>	677
<i>Fretté v. France</i>	679
<i>SEGI and Others v. Germany, Austria, Belgium, Spain, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom, Sweden</i>	683
<i>Pretty v. United Kingdom</i>	686
<i>H.M. v. Switzerland</i>	688
<i>Conka v. Belgium</i>	691
<i>McVicar v. United Kingdom</i>	693
<i>McShane v. United Kingdom</i>	695
<i>Paul and Audrey Edwards v. United Kingdom</i>	699
<i>McGlinchey and Others v. United Kingdom</i>	703
<i>The Gypsy Council and Others v. United Kingdom</i>	705
BOOK REVIEWS	707

This Review may be cited as: [2002] E.H.R.L.R.

© Sweet and Maxwell Limited, 100 Avenue Road, NW3 3PF
(<http://www.sweetandmaxwell.co.uk>) and contributors 2002

All rights reserved. Crown copyright legislation is reproduced under the terms of Crown Copyright Policy Guidance issued by HMSO.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature without prior written permission, except for permitted fair dealing under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or in accordance with the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in respect of photocopying and/or reprographic reproduction.

Application for permission for other use of copyright material including permission to reproduce extracts in other published works shall be made to the publishers. Full acknowledgment of author, publisher and source must be given.