

# EXTRA-CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS / TORTS (LAWG 101)

## Learning Objectives and Reading List Fall Term 2007

*Professor:* Lara Khoury  
3690 Peel, bur. 302  
(514) 398-6610  
[lara.khoury@mcgill.ca](mailto:lara.khoury@mcgill.ca)

---

*To know the dates at which each subject will be dealt with, please refer to the Updated Schedule posted on myCourses. This schedule will be constantly updated.*

### INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE

- The Course's Syllabus
- Conaghan and Mansell, *The Wrongs of Tort*, ch. 1

#### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand generally the subject of extra-contractual obligations;
2. Situate the subject within the first-year curriculum;
3. Understand generally the transsystemic approach;

\* \* \*

### INTRODUCTION TO THE NATURE AND FUNCTIONS OF EXTRA-CONTRACTUAL LIABILITY

- Article 1457 CcQ
- Law Commission of Canada, *Restoring Dignity*
- Trigger, *The Children of Aataentsic*
- Viney, *Introduction à la responsabilité*
- Englard, *The Philosophy of Tort Law*
- Posner, *Economic Analysis of Law*
- Brierley & Macdonald, *Quebec Civil Law*
- Keating, "Personal Inviolability"

#### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Situate the subject of extra-contractual obligations within the two systems covered in this course;
2. Discuss the relationship of civil liability with morality and crime;
3. Describe modern conceptions of the role and nature of civil liability and the historical factors which led to them.
4. Describe the different categories of analysis available in approaching extra-contractual obligations.

\* \* \*

## **INJURY – INTRODUCTION**

- Art. 1621 CcQ
- Art. 49 of the Quebec *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (annexed to the CcQ)
- *Pappadatos v. Sutherland*
- *McIntyre v. Grigg*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Have an opinion on whether punishment is an appropriate objective of extra-contractual liability;
2. Take position on whether money awards can and should be punitive.

\* \* \*

## **INJURY – RESTITUTIO IN INTEGRUM?**

- *Jim Russel v. Hite*
- *ter Neuzen v. Korn*
- *Ouellet v. Tardif*
- *Curateur Public v. Hôpital St-Ferdinand*
- *Augustus v. Gosset*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Identify the different interests protected by the law of civil liability;
2. Understand generally how damages are determined;
3. Critically discuss the question of compensation of non-pecuniary damages;
4. Discuss how the nature and role of civil liability are reflected in the assessment of damages.

\* \* \*

## **INJURY – LIMITS TO RECOVERY**

- *Page v. Smith*
- *MacKay v. Essex Area Health Authority*
- *McFarlane v. Tayside Health Board*
- *Suite v. Cooke*
- *Bevilacqua v. Altekirk*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand how, despite the general concept of *restitutio in integrum*, recovery of damages is sometimes limited;
2. Describe the types of losses that are characterized as problematic and even non-recoverable;
3. Realize how the definition of injury may be linked to cultural norms and concerns.

\* \* \*

## **THE OBLIGATION TO ACT WITH CARE – ARTICULATING THE OBLIGATION**

- Art. 1053-1057 CcL-C
- Art. 1457-1469 CcQ
- *Donoghue v. Stevenson*
- Baker, *An Introduction to English Legal History*
- Holmes, *The Common Law*
- Van Gerven & al, *Tort Law: Scope of Protection*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the role of the concept of duty in civil liability;
2. Determine whether this duty is generalized in both legal traditions;
3. Begin to understand what kind of behavior is likely to attract individual liability in private law;
4. Understand the effect of the notion of duty on the limits of civil liability.

\* \* \*

## **LIABILITY FOR ONE’S WRONGDOING – WHO IS THE REASONABLE PERSON?**

- Conaghan, *Tort Law and the Feminist Critique of Reason*
- Herbert, “Fardell v. Potts”
- Viney, *Les conditions de la responsabilité*
- *Oeuvres des terrains de jeux v. Cannon*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to critique the reasonable person standard, in particular the helpfulness of its abstract nature

\* \* \*

## **LIABILITY FOR ONE'S WRONGDOING - THE MEANING OF FAULT**

- o Posner, *The Learned Hand Formula*
- o Keating, "Personal Inviolability"
- o *Bolton v. Stone*
- o *Wagon Mound 2*
- o *Labelle v. Gatineau*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the reasonable person standard;
2. Understand the role of foreseeability in the assessment of fault;
3. Understand the role of economic approaches in the determination of reasonableness;
4. Compare these approaches with those centered on probability, gravity of injury and the "burden" of being careful.

\* \* \*

## **THE DEFENDANT'S ABILITIES AND CONTEXT**

- o *McHale v. Watson*
- o *Ginn v. Sisson*
- o ♦N. Kasirer, "The *Infans* as bon père de famille"
- o *ter Neuzen v. Korn*
- o *Roberge v. Bolduc*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the role of capacity in civil liability with the particular example of children's liability;
2. Understand the role of character, context, abilities and community standards in the assessment of fault.

An ♦ indicates supplemental readings which, although necessary for a strong understanding of the material, need not necessarily be covered prior to the particular session. Ensure that you read them at some point.

\* \* \*

## **FAULT'S RELATIONSHIP TO SPECIFIC NORMS**

- *Waldick v. Malcom*
- *Canada v. Sask. Wheat Pool*
- *Morin v. Blais*
- *Roberge v. Bolduc*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to understand the impact of already defined community and statutory standards in the assessment of fault in private liability.

\* \* \*

## **MODIFICATION OF FAULT – INTRODUCTION**

- Articles 1457 (3), 1463 CcQ
- Articles 1054 (7) CcL-C
- Brierley and MacDonald, *Quebec Civil Law*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the concepts of liability for the act of another and for the deeds of things in general;
2. Understand how the concept of fault is modified in these contexts;
3. Understand the notion of vicarious liability, ie, the liability for the acts of another that can arise in an employment context.

\* \* \*

## **VICARIOUS LIABILITY**

- *Ira S. Bushey v. United States*
- *Qc. Asbestos Co v. Couture*
- *Le Havre des Femmes v. Dubé*
- *Bazley v. Curry*
- *Jacobi v. Griffiths*
- *Blackwater v. Plint*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Appreciate the social and economic dimensions of the subject;

2. Critique the different requirements for vicarious liability;
3. Appreciate the role of fault in vicarious liability instances;
4. Assess the different roles of precedent, policy and principle in common law decisions.

\* \* \*

## **INDIRECT LIABILITY**

- Articles 1459-1462 CcQ
- Articles 1054 (2) and (6) CcL-C
- *Gaudet v. Lagacé*
- *Ginn v. Sisson*
- *Parental Responsibility Act*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the idea of parental liability for their children's acts;
2. Discuss the type of behavior on the child's part likely to attract parental liability;
3. Understand the justifications for limiting and extending liability for the deeds of others;
4. Understand how legal principles and social policies are intertwined in this field of law.

\* \* \*

## **REVISION SESSION**

*Please, revise all of your notes and materials from the beginning of the year onwards.*

\* \* \*

## **LIABILITY FOR INJURY CAUSED BY A THING**

- Articles 1465-1467 CcQ
- Canadian Encyclopedic Digest: extract on Act of God
- *Rylands v. Fletcher*
- *Doucet v. Shawinigan Carbide*
- *City of Montreal v. Watt and Scott*
- ♦ Conaghan and Mansell, *The Wrongs of Tort*, Ch. 6 (124-159)

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the historical development of liability for the deeds of things in Quebec civil liability;
2. Identify the rule in *Rylands v Fletcher* and the justifications it offers for strict liability;
3. Understand how the rule has developed and is applied today;
4. Parallel *Rylands v Fletcher* and the Quebec developments related to art 1054 (1) CcL-C;
5. Identify the different models of liability that exist in Quebec cases and how they are reflected in the current regimes of art 1465-1467 CcQ.

\* \* \*

## **NUISANCE – REGULATING THE NEIGHBOURHOOD**

- Article 976 CcQ
- *Drysdale v. Dugas*
- *Appleby v. Erie Tobacco*
- *Canada Paper Co. v. Brown*
- *Miller v. Jackson*
- ♦ Conaghan and Mansell, *The Wrongs of Tort*, Ch. 6 (124-159)

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the different elements and considerations on which liability is assessed in this context and the remedies liability leads to;
2. Discuss whether liability in this field is based on the idea of risk or that of fault.

\* \* \*

## **PRODUCTS LIABILITY**

- Articles 1468-1469 and 1473 CcQ
- European Council Directive 85/374/EEC
- Howells, *Comparative Product Liability*
- Van Gerven et al., *Tort Law: Scope of Protection*
- *Lambert v. Lastoplex*
- ♦ Zimmermann, “Comparative Law and the Europeanization of Private Law”

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the general issues involved in product liability;

2. Appreciate the historical evolution of the relevant regimes in each tradition;
3. Compare the European initiative to create a unified product liability scheme across Europe with that of the CcQ and identify the potential problems that such regimes may lead to.

\* \* \*

## **MEDICAL LIABILITY—THE PROTECTION OF THE PATIENT’S INTEGRITY**

- Article 10 CcQ
- Article 1 *Charte des droits et libertés de la personne*
- *Malette v. Shulman*
- *Reibl v. Hughes*
- *White v. Turner*
- *Parenteau v. Drolet*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the articulation of the tort of battery in medical liability and its application
2. Understand the different ways in which the law protects or limits the role of the patient in medical decisions
3. Discuss whether the law seeks to protect consent as part of each individual’s right to dignity or autonomy, or rather focuses on the bodily injury that follows from the breach of these rights.

\* \* \*

## **MEDICAL LIABILITY—MEDICAL PRODUCTS**

- *Buchan v. Ortho Pharmaceutical*
- *Hollis v. Dow Corning Corp.*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the difficulties in proving causation in the manufacturer’s liability context
2. Understand the difficulties in tracing a link between manufacturer, physician and patient and discuss how these difficulties should be resolved.

\* \* \*

## **ESTABLISHING A CAUSAL LINK - THE CONDITIO SINE QUA NON (“BUT FOR”) TEST**

- Articles 2803-2804 C.c.Q.
- *Barnett v. Chelsea*

- *St-Jean v. Mercier*
- *Gburek v. Cohen*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the causation issue and its general difficulties;
2. Understand the different approaches to the assessment of causation;
3. Understand the impact of the burden and standard of proof for causation.

\* \* \*

### **INHERENT UNCERTAINTY IN THE CONNECTION (I&II)**

- Article 2849 C.c.Q.
- *Snell v. Farrell*
- *Laferrière v. Lawson*
- *St-Jean v. Mercier*
- *McGhee v. National Coal Board*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Identify the situations in which there may be inherent uncertainties affecting the establishment of causation and the mechanisms available to remedy these difficulties;
2. Understand the limitations of the current approaches to causation in cases involving uncertainty;
3. Discuss the impact of the notion of increase of the risk of harm should have in the determination of causation;
4. Discuss whether loss of chance should be labeled as injury

\* \* \*

### **INHERENT UNCERTAINTY IN IDENTIFYING THE WRONGDOER**

- Article 1480 CcQ
- *Cook v. Lewis*
- *Sindell v. Abbott Laboratories*
- J. Weinstein, “Ethical Dilemmas in Mass Tort Litigation”
- ◆ Excerpts from *Fairchild v. Glenhaven Funeral Services* posted on *myCourses*
- ◆ The European Group on Tort Law, “Principles of European Tort Law”

## Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Understand the causation problem arising when the identity of the wrongdoer is unknown;
2. Identify and critique the different avenues available to deal with the uncertainty regarding the identity of the wrongdoer;

\* \* \*

## **REVISION AND EXAM PREPARATION**

This class will be devoted to any questions that you may have on the subjects covered in the course of the term; the completion of the discussion on issues that we did not have the time to cover during our weekly meetings; and the preparation for the up-coming examination.

Therefore, in preparation for our last meeting, please, undertake the following:

- Complete the readings you did not have the time to do during the term
- Revise the compulsory material and your notes

## Learning Objectives and Reading List Winter Term 2008

### Subjects

1. Acts and Omissions – A “Duty to Rescue”?
2. Delineating a Duty of Care
3. To Whom, For What, How Did It Happen? Giving Shape to Liability
4. Approaches to Relational Loss
  - a. The Suffering of “Secondary Victims”
  - b. Injury to Economic Interests
5. Causation
  - a. The Scope of the Risk
  - b. Directness vs. Foreseeability
  - c. Complication of the Story: Multiple Wrongdoers and Multiple Causes
  - d. Subsequent Events and Aggravation of Injuries
  - e. Placing the Victim/Plaintiff under Scrutiny
    - Predispositions of the Victim
    - Victim’s Behaviour
6. Fundamental Rights and Civil Liability
7. The Limits of Private Law

---

*Week 1* (Please, see the syllabus & updated schedule for exact dates)

### **ACTS AND OMISSIONS – A “DUTY TO RESCUE”?**

- Article 2 of the Quebec *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms*, L.R.Q. c. C-12
- *Eaton v. Moore*
- *Crocker v. Sundance Northwest Resorts Ltd.*
- *Murphy v. Little Memphis Cabaret*
- *An act to promote good citizenship*, R.S.Q., c. C-20, articles 2 & 12
- W. Van Gerven *et al.*, Tort Law: Scope of Protection
- *Childs v. Desormeaux*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

4. Determine whether the law expects us to take positive steps to protect others from harm
5. Determine whether, if we fail to come to the aid of someone, we have breached an obligation recognized by law

6. Have an opinion on the ways in which the law encourages “rescue” and on the ways it suggests that its preoccupation is not with being “good” but rather with “liability”?

### *Week 2*

#### **DELINEATING A DUTY OF CARE**

- *Donoghue v. Stevenson* (vol. 1)
- *Home Office v. Dorset Yacht Co. Ltd.*
- *Anns v. Merton London Borough Council* (excerpt)
- *City of Kamloops v. Nielsen* (excerpt)
- *Syl Apps Secure Treatment Centre v BD*

#### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Describe what the words of 1457 and *Donoghue* suggest as to the nature and scope of the individual obligation to take precautions or to act reasonably
2. Determine what is emphasized in the reformulation of *Donoghue* in *Anns* (and *Kamloops* in Canada)
3. Describe how the House of Lords work with the notion of “duty of care” in *Dorset Yacht*
4. Have an opinion on whether duty is conceived of as “relational” (my obligation to behave properly to someone else), or as “prescriptive” (my obligation to behave properly)

### *Week 3*

#### **TO WHOM, FOR WHAT, HOW DID IT HAPPEN? GIVING SHAPE TO LIABILITY**

- *Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad*
- *Wrongs of Tort* (Please, read the whole excerpt, but pay a particular attention to pp.11-19).

#### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Identify the two approaches to delineating the scope of liability that can be found throughout the law of civil liability and which are embodied in the 1928 New York Court of Appeals *Palsgraf* judgment
2. Articulate how Cardozo J. and Andrews J. understand the problem presented by the case, what principal question each one asks, and how it is possible to justify (and challenge) their approaches and answers
3. In addition to focusing on the substance of the case, discuss how the style of writing and argumentation influences your sense of the “right” answer.

### *Week 4*

## **APPROACHES TO RELATIONAL LOSS – THE SUFFERING OF “SECONDARY VICTIMS”**

- *Régent Taxi v. Congrégation des petits frères de Marie*
- Art. 1056, CCLC (vol. 1)
- *Augustus v. Gosset* (vol. 1)
- *Hôpital Notre Dame de l'Espérance*
- *Page v. Smith* (vol. 1)
- *Alcock v. Chief Constable*
- Wrongs of Tort (Please, read the whole excerpt, but pay a particular attention to pp.34-42)

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Explain why Common law is so concerned with limiting the possibility of recovery when someone is hurt or killed as a result of another's wrongdoing and the people who suffer loss go beyond the immediate victim.
2. Characterize and respond to mechanisms employed to circumscribe liability that relate to the foreseeability of the victim
3. Have an opinion on whether the quality of the relationship at stake does (implicitly) play a significant role in assessing liability in Civil law although this system doesn't restrict the kinds of relationships that will qualify for potential recovery (note the language of “another” in the Article 1457) and therefore is much more open in principle to relational losses.

### *Week 5*

## **APPROACHES TO RELATIONAL LOSS CONT'D – INJURY TO ECONOMIC INTERESTS**

- *Elliot v. Entreprise Côte Nord*
- *Weller v. Foot and Mouth Disease*
- *C.N.R. v. Norsk Pacific Steamship*
- *Fraser v. Westminer Canada Ltd*
- *Stychin, Principled Flexibility*
- *J.E. Construction v. G.M. du Canada*
- Wrongs of Tort (Please, read the whole excerpt, but pay a particular attention to pp.34-42)

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Explain why economic loss by a “secondary” victim (who has suffered no physical or property injury), as emotional loss, is viewed with concern
2. Explain how the duty of care is delineated in this context
3. Explain how the Civil law guards against “inappropriate” claims for “pure economic loss”

### *Week 6*

## CAUSATION – THE SCOPE OF THE RISK

- 1607 C.c.Q.
- Hart & Honoré at 9-13
- *Palsgraf v. Long Island Railroad Co.* (read again)
- W. Van Gerven *et al.* at 1
- *In Re Polemis and Furness, Withy & Co.*
- *Overseas Tankship v. Morts Dock & Engineering (Wagon Mound 1)*
- Wrongs of Tort, pp. 62-72

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Discover that it is not enough to establish only a factual link; rather the law may limit or expand liability based on a sense of whether it is appropriate to hold the defendant responsible for the outcome of the wrongdoing. Some injuries may not be understood to be the “direct” result of the fault; alternatively, the characterization of the injury as “unforeseeable” may suggest that no connection in law can or should be established between the defendant’s wrongdoing and the plaintiff’s loss;
2. Comment on the flexibility that exists in the language of the law, allowing for decision-makers to play an important role in shaping the appropriate allocation of responsibility in each case;
3. Express an opinion on whether it is fair that compensation might be denied a victim because the injury that happened was one that could not be foreseen by the defendant who, after all, has acted wrongly;
4. Express an opinion on whether it is just and/or consistent to demand that a defendant compensate a plaintiff who, because of an individual susceptibility, suffers more than another person would have.

### *Week 7*

## CAUSATION - DIRECTNESS VS. FORSEEABILITY

- 1607 C.c.Q
- Starck, H. Roland, & L. Boyer at 435-449.
- *Brisson v. Potvin*
- *Morrisette v. McQuat and Sons*
- *Joly v. La Ferme Ré-Mi*
- *Hughes v. Lord Advocate*
- *Smith v. Leech Brain & Co., Ltd*
- G. Viney at 300-305
- *Wrongs of Tort*, pp. 62-72

### Objectives

See week 6.

### *Week 8*

## CAUSATION - COMPLICATION OF THE STORY: MULTIPLE WRONGDOERS AND MULTIPLE CAUSES

- Art. 1478 C.c.Q.
- *Q. v. Minto Management*
- *Deguire v. Adler*
- *Caneric Properties, Inc. v. Allstate Compagnie D'Assurance et Ville de Montréal*

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Discover that it may be appropriate to restrict an individual's responsibility given the intervention of another wrongdoer or the existence of a number of established and co-existing "causes";
2. Identify the mechanisms the law employs, when confronted with multiple causes or wrongdoers, to overcome hurdles both of factual connection and of the appropriate scope of responsibility;
3. Discuss how the way in which intervening acts/faults are characterized has significant implications for the extent of a defendant's responsibility;
4. Identify what factors appear important in the assessment of "causation" or, more accurately, the appropriate allocation of responsibility as among multiple defendants.

### *Week 9*

## CAUSATION - SUBSEQUENT EVENTS AND AGGRAVATION OF INJURIES

- *Athey v. Leonati, supra.*
- *Jobling v. Associated Dairies*
- *Price v. Milawski*
- *J.E. Construction v. G.M. du Canada* (Read again)

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Finish discussing the objectives scheduled for last class (Class 9) with regard to the issue of multiple negligent causes of the injury by looking at the third possible response of the law to such situations: the breaking of the chain of causation (*novus actus interveniens*);
2. Discuss how the way in which intervening acts/faults are characterized has significant implications for the extent of a defendant's responsibility by looking at instances where the multiple contributive causes of the injury are faulty and non-faulty events. To your opinion, should the court
  - a) hold the defendant nevertheless liable to compensate the *whole of the injury*?;
  - b) reduce the liability of the defendant to take into account the participation of the non-faulty event in the production of the damage?;
  - c) consider the chain of causation broken by the occurrence of a non-faulty and exonerate totally the defendant?;

*Week 10 - 1*

## **CAUSATION - PLACING THE VICTIM/PLAINTIFF UNDER SCRUTINY**

### **Predispositions of the victim**

- *Smith v. Leech Brain & Co., Ltd.* (read again)
- *G. Viney, Les conditions de la responsabilité* (read again)
- *Athey v. Leonati* (read again)
- *Marconato v. Franklin*
- *Corr v. IBC Vehicles*
- *Blackwater v. Plint*

### Objectives:

At the end of this class, you should be able to determine whether the plaintiff's predisposition is relevant to the allocation of responsibility

*Week 10 – 2 (There are no classes on Week 11)*

## **CAUSATION - PLACING THE VICTIM/PLAINTIFF UNDER SCRUTINY**

### **Victim's behaviour**

- Art. 1478 (2) C.c.Q.
- *Gaudet v. Lagace* (read again)
- *Hydro v. Girard*
- Contributory Negligence Act, S.O. 1924, c. 32.
- *Crocker v. Sundance Northwest Resorts Ltd* (read again)
- *Waldick v. Malcolm* (read again)

### Objectives:

At the end of this class, you should be able to:

1. Determine whether the plaintiff's behaviour is relevant to the allocation of responsibility;
2. Discuss what it means to act "negligently" as a victim;
3. Determine whether it is ever the case that a victim acts so as to accept another's harmful behaviour and its consequences.

*Week 12*

## **FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIABILITY**

\*\* Please, wait for instructions before undertaking the readings for this class, as we might not have time to cover all of the planned topics.

### **Fundamental Rights**

- *Seneca College v. Bhaduria*
- *Béliveau St-Jacques v. Fédération des Employées et Employés de Services Publics*
- *Curateur Public v. Hopital St-Ferdinand* (Read again)

- Cotler, “Remedies against.... Perspective”

### Objectives

At the end of this class, you should be able to, briefly:

1. Discuss whether the private law of extra-contractual obligations can and should respond to violations of the fundamental rights held by every human being;
2. Assess what interactions are possible between legislative schemes meant to protect individuals in particular contexts and the “common law” (whether in the Common or Civil law systems in Canada) of interpersonal obligations?

### *Week 13*

### **THE LIMITS OF PRIVATE LAW**

\*\* Please, wait for instructions before undertaking the readings for this class, as we might not have time to cover all of the planned topics.

- *Prud’homme v. Prud’homme*
- Osborne, *The Law of Torts*
- *Knight v Imperial Tobacco Canada Ltd*
- *Dobson v. Dobson*
- *J. (L.A.) v. J.(H.)*

### **CONCLUSIONS**

#### *Optional materials\*:*

- *Wrongs of Tort* – chapter 8 (“*Concluding Thoughts*”)
- Radé, “Être ou ne pas naître”
- P. Jourdain, « Loi anti-Perruche... »
- Abel, *A Critique of Torts*

\*Optional materials: You are encouraged to read these texts, but their reading is not required for the examination.

### Objectives

At the end of this *term*, you should be able to reflect, again, on the questions with which we began the year:

1. What assumptions and values are reflected in this area of private law concerned with restoring an appropriate and “just” equilibrium between two individuals whose lives have become intertwined?
2. What limits can you identify in the law of civil liability that define its self-perception and sense of power?
3. What might lie beyond the reach of the private law of civil liability?

### *Second hour*

### **REVISION**

(Another revision session will be scheduled closer to the examination).