

## **The Canadian Round of the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition: Team Preparation, the National Value of the Event, and its Place in the Curricula of Law Schools in Canada**

### **ORIGINS OF THE COMPETITION**

The origins of the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition were outlined by the late Richard R. Baxter<sup>1</sup> who recollected that it stemmed from an in-house moot competition at the Faculty of Law of Harvard University. According to Judge Baxter that competition began when a number of individuals who, after having returned from the programme of international legal studies at Cambridge University, decided that arguing a hypothetical case problem which could well become an issue before the International Court of Justice would be an effective method of encouraging active participation by students whose interests lay in the study of public international law. The apparent success of the mooted event at Harvard gave birth to its expansion beyond the walls of that university. Other sources<sup>2</sup> appear to have picked up the history of the Jessup from a later date. They suggest that it began in 1960, when the student international law societies of three American law schools—(Harvard, Yale and Columbia) sponsored what was then called the International Law Moot. In 1962, after the law faculties at other universities had expressed a desire to take part in the event, the Association of Student International Law Societies (ASILS) was created to sponsor and administer the programme, which was rapidly developing into a national competition within the U.S.A. In addition, the name of the event at that time was changed to its present title in honour of Philip C. Jessup, the great American international legal scholar and judge of the International Court of Justice.

As the number of team entrants in the annual Jessup Competition increased, the ASILS resorted to the use of regional competitions throughout the United States, each of which was administered by a selected individual at a law faculty chosen by the Association. The

---

<sup>1</sup>The information from Judge Baxter is based upon notes taken during an informal talk he gave to the Student Section of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council on International Law held in Ottawa in 1978. That particular meeting of the Student Section was devoted to The Jessup Moot. The information relayed by Judge Baxter at the meeting may have been based upon personal experience, for he was a professor at Harvard before being appointed to the International Court of Justice and, for a number of years, he was closely affiliated with both Harvard University and the University of Cambridge.

<sup>2</sup>This information was kindly provided by Cynthia Huber, then Executive Secretary of the ASILS. In an enclosure to a letter of 25 October 1979, she listed, ostensibly from a number of sources, various pieces of information concerning the Jessup Competition.

winning team of each regional competition advances to a semi-final event held in Washington, D.C. The winner of the semi-finals is the champion of the American Division, and that team competes in a final competition against the winner of the International Division. The latter is composed of teams, each of which represents a participating nation, who also moot one another in Washington in an event held concurrently with the American Division. A final moot held between the champion U.S. and international teams determines the overall winner of the competition. Several years ago, the American Society of International Law (ASIL) became a co-sponsor of the moot and the semi-finals and finals of the competition were, and continue to be, held in conjunction with the Annual Meeting of the ASIL.

Canada became the first foreign country to compete in the Jessup Competition<sup>3</sup> when, in 1969, a team from the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto took part in the North Eastern Regional of the American Competition.<sup>4</sup> However, it was not until 1972, when the U.S. Department of State lent its assistance to the programme, that an International Division of the Jessup Moot began.<sup>5</sup> In 1973, the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto (which, up to that time, had continued to participate in the Jessup by entering nearby regional rounds in the U.S.A.) hosted the first Canadian Round of the Jessup.<sup>6</sup> From that time, Canada has always held a national competition of its own to determine which team will represent the nation in the International Division of the Jessup Competition.

The performance of Canada in the Jessup Competition has been admirable both at home and in the United States. The national event has grown each year to the point where there have been teams from seventeen Canadian law faculties (from both civil and common law jurisdictions) participating<sup>7</sup> and, in addition, Canada has dominated the International Division in the past years.<sup>8</sup> Teams from the University of Toronto, for example, stood first in the International Division (1977 and 1978) and once won the championship (1976).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup>Brown, Craig, "The Jessup Mooting Competition as a Vehicle for Teaching Public International Law", (1978) 16 *Can. Y.B. Intl. Law* 332, at 333.

<sup>5</sup>*Supra*, footnote 2.

<sup>6</sup>*Supra*, footnote 4.

<sup>7</sup>Seventeen teams took part in the 1981 Canadian Round hosted by the Law Faculty of the University of Calgary (Feb. 19-24).

<sup>8</sup>*Supra*, footnote 2.

<sup>9</sup>*Supra*, footnote 4. To date, the teams from the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto have won the Canadian Round each year, except for the 1980 Canadian Round which was won by the team from the Faculty of Law of the University of British Columbia. Toronto regained its traditional place by standing first in the 1981 Canadian Round.

## OPERATION OF THE COMPETITION

Each year, the ASILS requests a leading specialist in public international law to draft a complex case law problem dealing with contemporary international legal issues of major significance. That problem is the focus around which the moot activities of the regional, international and final competitions are centered.

Once the ASILS receives the problem it forwards the text to the various regional administrators throughout the U.S.A. and national administrators in other countries whom it has chosen to act as co-ordinators for the first level of the competition. The duty of each administrator is to adopt a system to choose a team to represent its region or nation in the Washington finals. The preferred method of so doing is to organize a moot competition between interested teams.<sup>10</sup>

The Canadian Round, particularly in recent years, has become a very serious and challenging affair for law students. Indeed, if one were to exclude the national competition in the U.S.A. with its vast network of regional competitions, one could safely predict that the Jessup moot programme held in Canada is presently the largest and most competitive one of any nation. This is so partly because of the number of teams that are involved, but primarily because of the high quality of research, writing and advocacy which every team must now display in order to become a serious competitor for the championship of the Canadian Round.

## TEAM PREPARATION

Ideally speaking, a team should be prepared to begin working on the moot from the time the problem arrives at its law school. This can be anywhere from late September to early October, and depends upon when the problem is actually completed by its author and given to the ASILS, when that Association sends it off to the Administrator of the Canadian Round, and when he, in turn, forwards it to Canadian law faculties. As the Canadian Round is held between the end of the following February and late March<sup>11</sup> students have five to six months for

<sup>10</sup>The winning team of each American Regional Competition is determined by a moot competition. The situation in other nations, however, is not always conducive to such a format. Because of the size, economic circumstances, etc. of a number of nations, not all hold state-wide competitions to select their teams for the International Division. Miss Huber's information (*supra*, footnote 2), for example, relates that in 1979, of the 21 committees which participated in the International Division, only 9 (Australia, Canada, India, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Taiwan, the United Kingdom and West Germany) held state-wide regionals to select their representatives.

<sup>11</sup>The latest date during which the Canadian Round can be held is approximately 3 weeks before the Washington semi-finals and final. This allows the winning Canadian team to be registered as a participant in the finals and to get its memorials sent in by the final deadline date. It also gives the winning Canadian team a small amount of time to incorporate into its memorials and presentations anything of value it has learned in the Canadian Round. During the past few years, the date usually chosen by Canadian administrators has been one which fits into the above-mentioned requirement and which is best suited to the convenience of the host school (e.g., a portion of the reading week of the host school has, for at least the past two years, been the chosen date of the Canadian Round because it ensures that facilities such as classrooms, seminar rooms and lounge areas are available to participants without detrimentally affecting the everyday operation of the law faculty).

preparation. This is less time than it, at first glance, appears, for included therein are first term examinations and the Christmas break.

As the rules require the preparation by each team of a memorial (factum) for both the applicant and the respondent in the case, and as teams, during the competition itself, must moot twice for each side, the time available may be divided into the period for research and writing and the one for the preparation of argument for delivery before the Bench. The team each year from the Faculty of Law of the University of New Brunswick has chosen to commit the majority of its time (from the date of receipt of the problem to the deadline date for the submission of memorials to the Canadian Administrator) to research and writing. Only the final weeks before the moot are reserved for the preparation of oral argument.

Within the time period allocated for the preparation of memorials, the time, again, must be divided into segments during each one of which a particular goal towards the completion of the project must be met. Unless there is a particularly long period of time between the end of the Christmas break and the deadline for the submission of memorials, a team is well advised to have the greater part of its research work completed before its members embark upon their final preparations for Christmas examinations. In essence, this means that a search through the literature, the compilation of an index of legal references, a breakdown of the problem into its various issues, virtually all necessary readings, and reports concerning each aspect of the problem must be completed by the beginning of December. This necessitates not only a considerable amount of work, but also a good deal of organization by the team even in the first term of the academic year. Care must be taken to ensure not only that none of the proverbial stones have been left unturned, but also that the research of each team member does not become either an unprofitable departure from the required direction of study or an unnecessary journey into areas already covered by the work of other colleagues.

The vast majority of the research work should be completed during the September to December time period if the first part of the new year is to be devoted to the writing of memorials. Time in January and February which is reserved for the Jessup should be devoted almost exclusively to that function because it is the culmination of the lengthy preparatory and research efforts, and that fact must be reflected in the final written product so that due credit can be given to it by the markers of the memorials. As each memorial can be only twenty-five pages in length,<sup>12</sup> the team must synthesize the results of its research and it must organize its arguments for the applicant and the respondent in a way which expresses concisely, accurately and effectively the case to be

<sup>12</sup>See the Rules of the International Division (1981) Rule V. C. 3, and the Summary of Official Rules for the 1981 Canadian Round, Rule II. D. 1. (b). The 1981 rules are essentially the same as those of the past few years.

presented, Judgments must be made concerning what issues are to be emphasized and minimized, which are to be rejected, and in what order argument is to be made. As every lawyer or academic is aware, the process of formulating a coherent thesis which covers adequately and completely the issues of a complex situation often necessitates a return to research materials and a revision of basic ideas and concepts. The teams of students writing the memorials for a Jessup Competition face the same problem, and sufficient time must be allocated to permit them to engage in the trial-and-error method of formulating their written submissions.

Once the memorials have been completed, the members of the team can then turn their attention to preparing oral argument. At the Faculty of Law of the University of New Brunswick, the tradition has been to allow the students on the team to prepare argument for whichever side (applicant or respondent) they feel most capable of supporting and then to take part in a series of six to eight practice moots which are patterned on the courtroom format which they will encounter in the actual competition itself. After the team has had the opportunity of preparing and delivering a number of moots, each team member, by secret ballot, conveys his or her opinions about who amongst them are best capable of representing the team in the advocacy portion of the competition and how many team members should deliver argument before the Bench.<sup>13</sup> The faculty advisor receives the ballots from each team member and, on the basis of the vote and in accordance with his own observations, the number of advocates and the individuals who will so act are determined. Any member of the team who is not chosen to act as an advocate is expected to assist at counsel table during the moots in the actual competition, and is also expected to act in place of any advocate on the team who, because of illness or other circumstance, is unable so to act. In addition, team participants not chosen to act as advocates must sit as judges of the practice moots which continue until a few days before the actual event takes place.

### THE VALUE OF THE CANADIAN ROUND

A number of the benefits resulting from participation in the Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition have been outlined and alluded to in articles by Professors Brown<sup>14</sup> and Slosar.<sup>15</sup> For law

<sup>13</sup>The rules (*ibid.*, Rule IV. B. of the International Division Rules and Rule II. B. of The Summary of Official Rules for the Canadian Round) provide that a team may be composed of a maximum of five and a minimum of two students. Between two and five students may argue before the Bench, but in any given moot, two students must speak. As eligibility for an advocacy award demands that a student moot at least twice, most teams restrict the number of advocates to between two and four members.

<sup>14</sup>*Supra*, footnote 4, at 333.

<sup>15</sup>Slosar, Stanislas "Proces Simule en Droit International: Leçons d'une Courte Experience", (1979) 10 *Rev. Droit Univ. Sherbrooke* 369. Professor Slosar was the Administrator for the Canadian Round in 1979, which took place at the Université de Sherbrooke. In order to give readers of that institution's law journal an idea of the challenge which the Jessup Competition presents to its participants and of the quality of work produced by students to meet that challenge, the Jessup problem for 1979 and memorials of good quality written in support of both the applicants and the respondents were reproduced. See, (1979) 10 *Rev. Droit Univ. Sherbrooke* 293-368.

students, it permits them to engage and develop skills in organization, team work, legal research and writing, and advocacy. In addition, it permits them to put to actual use, on a national (and for the winners, an international) level, all the skills which they have been developing during their years of legal study. And such skills are displayed in front of the most qualified of critics — lawyers, academics and judges<sup>16</sup> who are renowned in both Canada and the world.

But the event is not only of value to the student participants. It is, for example, of benefit to Canadian international lawyers because, in recent years at least, the Canadian Round has constituted what is most probably the largest yearly meeting of the nation's international law community<sup>17</sup> next to the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Council on International Law (CCIL). Further, it provides for all who participate in the event an opportunity to focus their attention on a topical issue of public international law. For the Canadian legal community in general, the Jessup Competition serves as the only national moot competition in the nation<sup>18</sup> and, in addition to placing the study of public international law in the eyes of the legal community, it provides a forum which permits both legal systems in Canada to meet and interact with one another<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup>In the 1980 Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition, held at the Faculty of Law of the University of New Brunswick, forty-four judges participated. Ten were either practitioners or members of Federal Government Departments, such as External Affairs, twenty-three were university professors, most of whom were experienced in the study of public international law, and eleven were members of the Bench (judges from different provinces were represented in addition to two judges from the Supreme Court of Canada — L'Hon. Juge Julien Chouinard and The Hon. Mr. Justice William McIntyre). For the 1981 Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition held at the Faculty of Law of the University of Calgary, fifty-five judges were listed as participants, along with six alternates. Of that total number (61), twenty-three were practitioners or Federal or Provincial Government representatives, twenty-five were university teachers, two were law students and eleven were members of the Bench (judges from seven provinces were listed as being represented, in addition to a Judge from the Supreme Court of Canada — The Hon. Mr. Justice R. Martland).

<sup>17</sup>At the Awards Banquet for the 1981 Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition, Professor Gerald Morris, President of the CCIL, stated that the Executive of the Council had voted to lend its support to future Canadian Rounds in light of its increasing size and importance.

<sup>18</sup>Another national moot competition may come into being. On 22 April 1980, Mr. Charles Baker, the Moot Court Administrator of the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto wrote to all Canadian common law schools proposing the establishment of a competition which would give interested law students an additional chance to moot and which would "give law students from across Canada a chance to moot a domestic law topic of national importance." By way of another letter from Mr. Baker dated 9 August 1980, the author was informed that plans to hold a national moot court competition had been abandoned "because the Gale Cup Organizing Committee is seriously considering expanding their [sic] competition to encompass law schools from across Canada." An invitation to the Faculty of Law of the University of New Brunswick to participate in an expanded Gale Cup Moot Competition was extended by a letter dated 28 November 1980 signed by R. Ross Dunsmore of the firm of Hicks, Morley, Hamilton, Stewart and Storie of Toronto. The case to be mooted was the Federal Court of Appeal decision in *Attorney-General of Canada v. Labatt Breweries of Canada Ltd.* (1980), 104 D.L.R. (3d) 646, Trial decision found in (1978), 84 D.L.R. (3d) 61. The author is not aware of schools other than the regular past participants (six Ontario law schools and McGill) whose participation might have expanded the 1981 Gale Cup Moot Competition from a regional to a national event. In order for it to be truly national in character the event must center around a problem which is germane to both the civil law and the common law jurisdictions in Canada, and in addition, the facilities must provide for the needs of English and French-speaking participants.

<sup>19</sup>The Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition, in past years, has encouraged participation of both English and French-speaking law schools by providing facilities for simultaneous translation when necessary. The increased participation of both language groups has been encouraging.

The value of the Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition in the curricula of law faculties throughout Canada automatically follows. Not only does it provide law faculties with an enriched mootting programme, but it also provides for their students of accomplishment and ability a challenge which simply cannot be met by any form of in-house activity. Also, when one examines the effort expended by students in the pre-moot preparatory stages of the event, its value not only as an instrument for the instruction of public international law becomes evident,<sup>20</sup> but so too does a more important function become manifest: that of giving law students the very best training in the task of legal methodology which is useful regardless of the area of legal study which they will ultimately pursue. Indeed, a good argument can be made for stating that participation in the Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition represents for law students in an LL.B. programme the most challenging and intense effort they will ever have the opportunity of facing in their years of law school study.<sup>21</sup>

### **INCORPORATION OF THE JESSUP MOOT INTO THE CURRICULA OF CANADIAN LAW FACULTIES**

The value of the Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition is restricted by the degree to which an essentially American-based event can be incorporated into the curricula of law schools in Canada. As both the academic and mootting challenge it presents are so obvious as to be virtually unquestionable, the immediate problem with which any faculty is faced is that of determining whether and where such a challenge fits into a particular curriculum and if some form of course credit should be granted to it.

As mentioned in the preceding section, the competition engenders not only a high level of skills at research in particular areas of public international law and in advocacy, but it also develops organizational and teamwork skills and, most importantly, functions as a most valuable exercise in every aspect of legal methodology in general. It does not seem difficult, therefore, to visualize participation in the Jessup Competition as fitting within either a faculty's course programme of public international law or its mootting programme, or both.

At the University of New Brunswick for example, the Faculty of Law has formally accepted the Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition as a part of its mootting programme, which consists, on the

---

<sup>20</sup>Refer, once more, to Professor Brown's article, *supra*, footnote 4.

<sup>21</sup>Words to that effect were conveyed to the author by Professor Hugh Kindred of the Faculty of Law of Dalhousie University during the 1981 Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition where both attended as judges of the Moot and as faculty advisors for their respective faculty teams. It is an opinion which the author heartily endorses.

primary level, of a second-year compulsory moot for all students and, on an advanced level, of a third-year in-house moot and an external moot with the law faculties of Dalhousie University and the University of Maine. Because of the level of the competition and the work load involved, the Jessup was included as the faculty's third advanced-level moot, even though second year students of promise (who have not necessarily completed their compulsory moot) are potential candidates for it.

Even though the Jessup Competition is listed in the U.N.B. Faculty of Law Calendar as a mooted course, its affiliation with the traditional academic programme is evident by the fact that the general public international law course is a prerequisite or a co-requisite for it. Therefore, in fact, if not in title, the Jessup Moot is recognized as an advanced-level course in both mooted and in public international law.

At the University of Saskatchewan, the College of Law has seen fit to include the Jessup Competition as a seminar course in public international law.<sup>22</sup> This appears to give recognition primarily to the academic function of the exercise which students must undertake to compete the event, and the same appears to hold true at the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto where students can choose to obtain their credit for the general course in public international law by Jessup participation instead of by the traditional procedure of evaluation.<sup>23</sup>

It seems that the question of granting credit for participation in the Jessup Competition has produced as diverse a number of solutions as has the issue of determining how it is to be incorporated into the curricula of law faculties. At the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto, for example, students who are interested in participating in the Jessup Moot are given the opportunity to prepare the moot by arguing it as a voluntary in-house mooted competition. The students who are chosen to be on the Jessup Moot are then picked from amongst the number who have mooted the problem, and those students then have the option of obtaining credit for a general introductory course on public international law. The course is either a full year course (2 credit hours per term) or a term course (3 credit hours), and instead of an examination or paper, evaluation in it is based upon a submission of one or both memorials written for the Jessup.<sup>24</sup> At the College of Law of the University of Saskatchewan, on the other hand, Jessup team

---

<sup>22</sup>This information was kindly provided in discussions with Professor Brian Slattery of the Faculty of Law of the University of Saskatchewan while attending the 1981 Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition. Professor Slattery acted as a judge and as a faculty advisor for his faculty's team.

<sup>23</sup>This information was kindly provided in discussions with Professor Gerald Morris of the Faculty of Law of the University of Toronto while he was attending the 1981 Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition. Professor Morris attended the Moot in his capacity as President of the CCIL and to act as a judge in the event.

<sup>24</sup>*Ibid.* Confirmed by telephone conversation of 13 March 1981 with Marie T. Haxter, Assistant Dean and Director of Admissions for the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto.



participation appears to be only a portion of a smaller two hour term credit course. That course is in seminar format which, each year, is developed around the Jessup problem. Any students who desire to take the course enroll in it and complete research projects in order to obtain academic credit. From that group of students, the Jessup team of up to five members is chosen, and the responsibilities lie upon them to write the memorials and to prepare themselves for mooting.<sup>25</sup>

The University of New Brunswick is a law faculty which exemplifies yet another form of approach. While recognizing the traditional academic nature of study which the Jessup Competition engenders, it (as previously mentioned) has chosen to create a mooting course, the description of which allows the granting of two credit hours in one term to the maximum of five team participants who carry out the project of representing their faculty.<sup>26</sup> Such an approach was adopted because it was recognized that the work on the Jessup Competition was at least equal to that of the two other advanced-level moots for which a two-hour term credit was given. In addition, a description of the courses was drafted to comply with an interpretation of Rule IV.B. of the International Division of the Jessup Competition. The Rule was drafted by the ASILS and governs the composition of teams. The relevant portion of it follows:

A team shall be composed of not less than two and not more than five students, who alone have researched and written the memorials.<sup>27</sup>

On the end of the spectrum furthest from those law faculties which have taken the approach of the University of Toronto toward granting credit for Jessup participation are those which refuse to accord any formal credit to their students who participate in the competition. The rationale for such an approach which seems to be most prevalent is that mooting programmes *per se* should receive no credit on the ground that they are not part of what is referred to as the academic nature of university education. Oftentimes coupled with this is the argument that participation in the Jessup Competition by and of itself offers ample kudos, and that academic credit for it merely repeats both the incentive to take part and the reward for having done so. As most of the legal world outside a student's law faculty does, indeed, grant recognition to Jessup participation, there may be a certain amount of truth to the latter statement. The former one, however, does not seem convincing when one examines the considerable amount and high degree, of academic

---

<sup>25</sup>*Supra*, footnote 22.

<sup>26</sup>Students for the team representing the Faculty of Law of the University of New Brunswick are chosen by inviting the preceding year's Jessup team to interview any interested applicants. On the basis of the interviews, previous academic performance and the recommendations of the past year's Jessup team members, the faculty advisor chooses the members of the new Jessup team. The interviews and final team choice take place in early September, before the Jessup problem for the new year arrives.

<sup>27</sup>*Supra*, footnote 13.

work required to moot each year's Jessup problem in a competent fashion. Taken as a whole, the arguments made to deny granting credit for Jessup participation seem to disregard the realities of the situation.

Those law faculties which do not grant credit to their Jessup participants in a formal sense may very well mitigate the harshness created by their firmness of principle by granting credit for independent research projects affiliated with aspects of the Jessup problem, or by finding other related means of so doing. Given the contemporary and debatable nature of the legal issues contained in each year's Jessup problem, such a method of incorporating credit for participation in the Jessup Competition is certainly a credible and justifiable solution to what may be a very thorny issue in some faculties. In addition, such an approach might also be used in those instances where a student, for a second year, is accepted as one of the Jessup participants from his faculty. As the Jessup problems differ considerably from year to year, there seems to be no reason to suggest, should a student be chosen to moot it in his second and in his third year of law school, that the work would be repetitious in nature or unworthy of some form of credit a second time.

## CONCLUSION

The origins of the Jessup Competition and its spread in popularity throughout the United States of America and the international community provide strong testimony to support a contention that the aims and functions of the moot are both useful and proven ones. The operation of the competition, though American-based, supplies three ingredients which make it potentially valuable as a part of the curriculum of any law faculty in Canada:

(1) a single, complex and timely case law problem which has a significance that makes it relevant to a number of law faculties in many nations;<sup>28</sup>

(2) a competition for law students that is truly international in both relevance and participation; and

(3) a system of governing rules which permit the moot to be accommodated into the requirements of both a national competition in the Canadian civil law/common law system, and into the curricula of the majority of the country's law faculties.

The team preparation which is required bespeaks the value of the competition as both an academic and a mooting exercise, and the diverse number of ways in which various Canadian law faculties have

---

<sup>28</sup>The cover page of the 1980 and 1981 Jessup problems relate that, in 1979 and 1980 respectively, "teams from 200 law schools in 32 nations participated in the competition." The information on the number of participating countries for 1979 appears to be somewhat at variance with the fact that, for that year, only 21 states were listed in the information provided by Miss Huber (*supra*, footnote 2) as participants.

incorporated the event into their course curricula suggests that the aims and functions of the Jessup Competition comply with those of most law faculties.

It is doubtful that the Canadian Round of the Jessup Competition can meet with the needs, directions or interests of every law faculty, and it is equally doubtful that any given law school will automatically participate in the event every year (*e.g.*, dates of the event may be inconvenient, economic circumstances may limit participation or student interests in the study of public international law or the mooted of it may preclude involvement by any law faculty for various lengths of time). Nevertheless, the large number of law faculties which have participated in the Canadian Round in the last few years suggests that there has developed a national commitment to the event which has made it a permanent and significant part of Canadian legal education.

**DONALD J. FLEMING\***

---

\*B.A. (Mt.A.) LL.B. (U.N.B.), LL.B. (Cantab.). Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of New Brunswick.