

been arranged at the book's end to assist the student. Perhaps the author simply felt that other sources are available to fulfill this need.

To conclude, Professor Lederman has made available to the student of constitutional law a convenient and valuable work that touches most major areas of concern today. While one may, at times, disagree with his conclusions on specific issues, the articles make the reader think. What more can one ask of any book?

**DORAN FREDERICK HALLETT\***

---

\*B.A.,M.A.(University of Windsor) LL.B. Candidate (U.N.B.)

***The Cambridge Lectures: Selected Papers Based Upon Lectures Delivered at the Cambridge Conference of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Legal Studies, 1979.***  
**Derek Mendes da Costa, ed. Toronto: Butterworths, 1981.**  
**Pp. xvi, 287, \$40.00 (cloth).**

The inaugural session of the *Canadian Institute for Advanced Legal Studies* was held at Queen's College, Cambridge July 8-21, 1979. The Honourable Paul Martin, Q.C., then Canadian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom, can be given a great deal of credit for initiating the concept of the Institute and for fostering its birth. As indicated in the Preface to the book, the decision to publish the Proceedings of the first Conference was made only during the July 1979 event and, as a result, many of the manuscripts of presentations had to be concocted after the event.

The 1979 Conference was one of the most pleasant and rejuvenating of learning experiences. A representative collection of members from the various bars, benches, government legal departments and law faculties across Canada moved to one of the most beautiful and intimate Colleges of the University of Cambridge and, for a fortnight of ideal English summer weather, became students once again. The majority of lectures and seminars were presented by the most respected legal minds in the United Kingdom, and a great deal of English law and opinion was presented to interested Canadian listeners. Now, after the second Sum-

mer Conference (held in the United Kingdom and Belgium), the book of the first one has been published. For those who attended the first Conference, the present text will serve as a reminder of a most refreshing and idyllic break from the everyday pace demanded by the legal profession. For others, the selection of presentations for publication, necessitated by page limitations and the unavailability of manuscripts, may convey an inaccurate view of what actually took place. Further, the drafting of manuscripts after the event might very well have altered, in some instances, what was said at the Conference.

There are many inherent difficulties in compiling a text of conference proceedings. First of all, the necessity of having to choose what to omit will invariably result in complaints that something valuable has been lost. Secondly, the Proceedings of the Institute—at least in 1979—were so broad in scope that those who wish to embark upon a serious study of any area of law discussed in them could not rely upon the publication and would have to look elsewhere for material that is more detailed and informative. More to the point, the Institute must decide what the function of its Conferences should be: are they intended to introduce to Canadians the workings of a foreign legal system or are they intended to be used as fora to examine and discuss the relevance of legal developments between the two jurisdictions?

The following are examples of three panel discussions which took place during the 1979 Conference, and they illustrate all three problems mentioned above. They are of particular interest because, although the three panels in question dealt with contemporary legal issues that were of interest to Conference participants (if attendance at the sessions provides such an indication), none of the presentations made by the panelists, for one reason or another, appears in the text of the Proceedings. Two of the panels concentrated upon recent developments at the Third United Nations Law of the Sea Conference and one panel was devoted to the developing law of Human Rights.

In the first seminar, Professor Eliauh Lauterpacht, Q.C., from Cambridge reviewed the latest developments concerning the exploitation of the seabed and the establishment of an international seabed authority, while Sir Ian Sinclair, Foreign and Commonwealth Legal Advisor, outlined the most recent activities on the international front concerning the extent of coastal state jurisdiction. At that seminar, Professor Donald McRae from the Faculty of Law of the University of British Columbia examined the Canadian proposals (and the reaction to them) relating to the development of regimes governing marine pollution and, at the second seminar, presented an excellent discussion of the four offshore boundary line disputes between Canada and the U.S.A. In the second seminar, Dr. Derek W. Bowett, Q.C., then President of Queens' College and one of the prime organizers of the Conference, reviewed the *Channel*

*Islands Arbitration*<sup>1</sup> and, being a participant in it, was able to convey to those present some valuable insights.

The Human Rights seminar brought together, among others, Rosalyn Higgins, Professor of Law at the University of Kent, who discussed the indirect implications of the European Human Rights Convention upon British law, and the Right Honourable Peter Archer, Q.C., who debated whether or not the European Human Rights Convention should be incorporated into the law of the land and, if so, how it should be done. Professor B.A. Hepple, Honorary Professor of Comparative Social and Labour Law at the University of Kent took up the discussion from the previous speaker and, citing arguments and views of which Lord Scarman is a principal proponent, referred to the merits of a Bill of Rights and its effect upon both human rights and the concept of parliamentary sovereignty in the United Kingdom.

The two law of the sea seminars were of value because they displayed a true integration of British and Canadian problems and viewpoints and what was said was of publishable merit. Such an interplay between the two legal systems appears to be sadly lacking in many of the articles in the book, notwithstanding the high station of their authors and the quality of their writings. The human rights seminar, on the other hand, appeared to promote some frustration on the part of the visiting audience because it provided little information of value to Canadian law. Indeed, when mention of a Bill of Rights within a state ruled by the principle of parliamentary sovereignty was discussed, one would have thought that Canada's experiences would have been examined. Instead, there was little, if any, reference to our case law on the subject, and knowledge of the many problems encountered in Canadian courts appeared to be nonexistent. These errors and omissions could have been corrected if one of Canada's constitutional or human rights experts had sat on the panel and, in addition, the British authorities might well have benefited from work and study done on this side of the Atlantic.

The items mentioned above, which exemplify the problems encountered by both the programme of the Institute and the publication of its Proceedings, are reflected in the text under review. The editor has attempted to emphasize the Canadian input into the Conference by choosing as many of the Canadian presentations as possible for publication. This makes the text more relevant to its market, and perhaps its value has been increased by the choice. However, it does appear, to one who attended the Conference, that valuable material has been omitted. For example, the panel discussions on Administrative Law in Canada are represented in the text by articles authored by the Honourable W.Z. Estey, D. Michael M. Goldie, Q.C. and Gordon Henderson, Q.C. The contribution of John J. Robinette, Q.C. who, I recollect, also sat on the

<sup>1</sup>Delimitation of the Continental Shelf (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and the French Republic) (1977) 54 I.L.R. 6.

panel is not represented, nor are the more formal lectures on the topics of "Administrative Tribunals and Inquiries" by D.G.T. Williams, Reader in Public Law at the University of Cambridge and "Judicial Review of Administrative Action" by Professor H.W.R. Wade, Q.C., F.B.A., Rouse Ball, Professor of English Law at the University of Cambridge.

D.J. FLEMING\*

---

\*B.A. (MT.A.), LL.B. (U.N.B.), LL.B. (Cantab). Professor, Faculty of Law, U.N.B.

***How To Fight For What's Right: The Citizen's Guide to Public Interest Law*, John Swaigen, Toronto: James Lorimer & Company 1981, Pp. xxi 150. \$15.95 (cloth) \$8.95 (paperback).**

Neither the lords nor the shogun can be depended upon, and so our only hope lies in grassroots heroes.

Yoshida Shoin<sup>1</sup>.

"How To . . ." books seen all the fad these days. In fact, Books in Print 1981-82<sup>2</sup> lists twenty-nine pages of "How To . . ." books covering the complete spectrum from mere personal self-improvement and desire gratification to the more public spirited community action manuals. It is this latter category with which we are presently concerned.

Obviously, individuals or groups of citizens cannot leave it to others in the normal course of affairs to vindicate or even respect their interests. We are a society in which competing interests are constantly in a pitched duel for ascendancy. One cannot rely on the inherent decency of whatever is the competing interest group to not fully and selfishly promote their cause. Nor can one rely on government departments or agencies whether municipal, provincial or federal, as many government employees no longer seem to pay anything more than even lip service to the term "public servant" which is perhaps passe in any event. Instead, as many

---

<sup>1</sup>Quoted in "Bartlett's Familiar Quotations" (14th Ed) (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1968), p. 740.

<sup>2</sup>"Books in Print 1981-1982": Vol. 3 (New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1981) pp. 2022-2050.