

EDITOR'S NOTE

*Michael Le Huynh**

A continuous stream of high quality submissions, two years after an initial open call, is reassuring for the editor of a young journal. A particularly envious position is one where, faced with a growing interest, the editor must choose to expand the number of issues. Thanks to the financial support of the McGill Faculty of Law and its students, the *MJLH* is now able to move to two issues per volume and still provide its content online, free of charge. As such, the *MJLH* remains true to its mandate of publishing current and valuable health law research while at the same time ensuring open access to this legal scholarship.

Our first issue leads off with a short piece by Lawrence Gostin. He proposes two innovative governance structures to address global health disparities. These improve on current international law approaches by, amongst other things, prioritizing populations' basic survival needs and harmonizing the activities of major global health actors.

Dianne Pothier provides a comprehensive review of the Canadian jurisprudence on disability discrimination in the workplace. She argues that judges should replace the ad hoc system of condemning disability discrimination with a systemic approach based on a social model of disability. This model challenges able-bodied norms by preemptively adjusting the environment such that it meets the needs and abilities of all people.

Like the two previous articles, the third proposes an alternative legal framework to address deficiencies—here, in the area of tort law. Rebecca Rodal and Dr. Kumanan Wilson present epidemiological data demonstrating how the decision not to vaccinate one's child can amplify the occurrence of otherwise preventable outbreaks. For parents whose immunized children have contracted a disease, recourse against those parents who have refused to immunize their children is tenuous. The authors discuss current barriers to recovery and the reforms needed to support the tort of 'failure to immunize'.

La *RDSM* a également reçu et sélectionné deux commentaires d'arrêt complémentaires. Chacun se penche sur la décision *A.C. c. Manitoba*, issue de la Cour suprême en 2009. D'une part, Shawn Harmon examine attentivement la façon dont la Cour définit l'autonomie individuelle et ses droits afférents. D'autre part, Robert Kouri explique la pertinence de l'analyse de la Cour dans le contexte du droit québécois.

Je tiens à remercier toute l'équipe de la *RDSM*. Chaque succès de la *Revue* naît des efforts soutenus et de la diligence de nos membres. J'apprécie aussi l'aide apportée par notre comité consultatif. En ce sens, j'aimerais souhaiter la bienvenue aux nouveaux membres du comité : le docteur Philippe Couillard et maître Christine Baudouin. Encore cette année, il importe de souligner le soutien indéfectible de notre superviseure, madame Angela Campbell, qui joue un rôle intégral dans notre organisation. Encore plus que son expérience et ses conseils, c'est son exceptionnel dévouement qui a permis à la *RDSM* de tant progresser en si peu de temps.

À votre santé!

* Editor-in-Chief, McGill Journal of Law and Health, Vol. 4.