The work does not contain, nor was it meant to contain, case law or commentaries. The book sets out in an orderly fashion all the provisions of the statutes with ready cross-references within the *Code* or other appropriate statute. The words or phrases which have been defined in the *Code* or the *Interpretation Act*[10] are underlined and the definition section is conveniently set out in the right-hand margin. In the left-hand margin the substance of the provision appears together with the classification of the offence which would immediately indicate to the reader whether the offence is (a) summary conviction, (b) hybrid, or (c) section 483 etc. The offences have been appropriately classified into seven categories.[11] To complement all of the work the author has given an excellent index to the *Code*, the importance of which is too familiar to both the students and the practitioners.

The book is well arranged in order to avoid either guess work or oversight on the part of the reader. In the absence of such a book one can easily miss the correct understanding of the law. It is a useful document for anyone involved with the criminal law. Even for serious research, this book is a must as a supplement to case law.

MANU C. PATEL*

[10]*Supra*, footnote 2.

[11]Types: A — Summary Conviction Offences, B — Dual Procedure Offences, C — Absolute Jurisdiction of Magistrate Offences mentioned in s. 483, D — Indictable Offences not mentioned in ss. 483 or 427 with punishment up to 5 years, E — Indictable Offences not mentioned in ss. 483 or 427 with maximum punishment more than 5 years, F — Indictable Offences mentioned in s. 429.1 and, G — Offences mentioned in s. 427 Supreme Court exclusive.

*Barrister-at-law (Middle Temple, London) and a Senior Crown Prosecutor for the Province of New Brunswick at Fredericton.

The Law School Game, revised edition, Christopher Neubert and Jack Withiam, Jr., New York: Sterling Publishing Co., Inc., 1980. Pp. 144. US$ 6.95 (paperback).

The Law School Game is not a "game" *sensu lato* "jest . . . ; diversion, spell of play; . . . hunted animal, quarry, ..."[1] In one aspect of "game" *sensu stricto,* "contest played according to rules & decided by skill, strength, or luck . . . [or] object of pursuit . . .",[2] the authors are describing a game. The "game", of course, is how to get accepted by the law school of your choice.

[1]McIntosh, E., ed., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English,* 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), at 492.

[2]*Ibid.*

This text is based on American data and is primarily aimed at the United States law school market but the comments, observations and suggestions of the authors are equally true for Canadian law schools and their prospective entrants. In North America, one important fact is now universally true:

> Just because you have good grades doesn't mean you'll be able to get into law school — recent figures show that only one out of four applicants is accepted at an accredited [law] school. The winners in this fierce competition all have top grades and they're all bright, of course, but they also know how to play the game. The tactics which have worked for thousands of successful candidates, the real ins and outs of the admissions process, the key facts . . . can make the difference between acceptance and rejection of *your* application, ...[3]

In their beginning chapter "The First Decision" the authors make both valid and erroneous comments. For the affirmative, they are correct in my opinion — nobody should attend law school unless he/she wants to. To satisfy others, because your ancestors studied law, or because you have nothing better to do are poor reasons to subject yourself to such an ordeal for at least three years. If you are not properly motivated, you probably will not last the full three years anyway. But the authors' comments that most students attend law school to become professional lawyers, may not be an accurate statement, for Canada at least. There are many students attending LL.B. programmes in Canada who do not expect to be admitted to any provincial bar. These people intend to do research, enter business careers, or possibly teach. The authors' statements *re* income are accurate for Canada as well as the United States — a law degree is no guarantee of a large income in the foreseeable future after graduation. If in doubt, just ask any lawyer who has been admitted to the bar in the past four years.

In the second chapter the authors discuss the Law School Admission Test (LSAT) and the Law School Data Assembly Service (LSDAS). These are two services provided by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey and the curse of all prospective law students. By a series of multiple choice questions your chances of success at law school and your ability to write are evaluated. I agree with the statements of the authors that "whether the LSAT actually does supply such viable information remains controversial;"[4] we New Brunswick residents are fortunate that this test is optional at U.N.B. This is not the case at other Canadian law schools[5] and all accredited American law schools. For those faced with taking the LSAT, Neubert and Withiam do present useful suggestions and observations concerning preparation and taking of this test. The LSDAS has found limited use in Canada.

---

[3]*The Law School Game*, Sterling, pre-publication pamphlet.

[4]Neubert and Withiam, at 15.

[5]McGill excepted.

The third chapter deals with course selections and other undergraduate experiences. The question of grade inflation and areas of subject specialization may be only of academic interest. From personal experience many of the larger law schools simply feed numbers into the computer and allow this cybernetic monster to select the freshman class.

In the fourth chapter, entitled "The Application", some sections are relevant to the Canadian scene, others are not. For various reasons, Canadian law schools do not permit interviews nor do they send out recruiters or representatives to undergraduate colleges. The authors point out[6] that in many cases an interview may be a negative factor *re* acceptance. The question of regional *versus* national law school is mainly an American phenomenon. The chapter ends with an excellent six point suggestion list on how to handle one's application.

References and recommendations are dealt with in the fifth chapter. Many good points are made in this short chapter which are worth considering in any field of study or work.

The minority situation is covered in the seventh chapter. Consideration of minority applications is a major problem in all aspects of life south of the border. The two recent and well publicized cases: *DeFunis* v. *Odergaard*[7] and *Bakke* v. *The Regents of the University of California*[8] are briefly discussed. As a result of *DeFunis,* individual law schools were permitted to handle applications as they saw fit. The *Bakke* case dealt with a qualified caucasian medical school applicant who was denied entry to medical school because the number of positions open to his classification were filled even though his qualifications were superior to those in the minority categories. As a result of the United States Supreme Court decision, race can no longer be the determining factor in the admission process. It is unlikely that this type of situation would occur in Canada although U.N.B., including the law school, does have a special programme for Native Canadians. Therefore, this chapter is interesting but not germane to Canadian law schools. The same can be said for the following chapter on accredited law schools; this species is unique to American jurisprudence. The text ends with a two page conclusion which is essentially a "pep talk" to "hang in" until you are rejected everywhere if it is your fervent desire to attend law school.

Half of the book is composed of three appendices, which for me are the most useful parts. The first appendix is an alphabetical geographical list of all approved and non-approved law schools in the United States and its territories. For each school there is the usual address and telephone number as well as an enrollment breakdown by year, degrees

[6]Neubert and Withiam, at 41.

[7](1975), 529 P2d 438 (S.C. Wash., *en banc*).

[8](1977), 18 Cal. (3d) 34 (S.C. Cal.); (1978), 98 S.Ct. 2733 (U.S.S.C.).

awarded, joint degree programmes, entrance requirements, tuition and fees, length of school year, numbers of full and part-time faculty and the size of the law library including both volumes and microfilm equivalents. All of these data are for the year 1978.

The second appendix is the Minimum Requirements for Admission to Legal Practice in the United States. Although this appendix was originally published in the *Review of Legal Education* (1970), the same table can also be found in Black's Law Dictionary.[9] One advantage of the reproduction here is the use of larger and more easily readable type than that found in Black's.

The third appendix is a directory of state bar examination administrators which probably is only of use to those who wish to practice law in the United States.

Since the investment in this book is reasonable and modest (US$ 6.95), it could be useful to those planning to attend law school in Canada, as long as one remembers that it is aimed primarily at those wishing to enter American law schools. The same or equally valuable information could be gained by a friend currently attending or recently graduated from the law school of your choice. If the information contained in the appendices is of particular interest or use, this book is one convenient source of such information.

JOHN W. REYNOLDS*

[9]*Black's Law Dictionary*, revised 4th ed. (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1968), at lxxv-lxxx.

*B.Sc. (Wilmington), M.Sc. (Purdue), Ph.D. (Tennessee), LL.B. candidate, Faculty of Law, University of New Brunswick.

Studies in Contract Law, Barry J. Reiter and John Swan (eds.), Toronto: Butterworths, 1980. Pp. xx, 467. $50.00 (cloth).

Most lawyers are familiar with the observation of Sir Henry Maine that "the movement of progressive societies had . . . been a movement from status to contract". [1] Such an *aperçu* was less than fully accurate even in the nineteenth century (witness the rather strained efforts to recast the institution of marriage in contractual terms) and certainly may be more questionable in contemporary society. Contractual arrangements now appear to be founded on and governed less by individual consensus than by legislative and judicial intervention. In short, the

[1]Maine, Sir Henry, *Ancient Law* (10th ed.) (London: John Murray, 1885), at 170.