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BRYAN P. SCHWARTZ

I. INTRODUCTION

Bryan P. Schwartz (BPS): About forty to fifty years ago there was the first great transition, from practice being physically downtown and taught by guys in practice, to the academy. Now it looks as though there is a lot of pressure—which incidentally I agree with, but that’s not the point—that we went too far in the purely academic direction, and should move more towards the professional direction. So is the pendulum going to move back to some extent? And of course, your program at Lakehead is the one that’s moved farthest in that direction so far.

Theoretically, if we were to move in the Lakehead direction, what would we actually have to do? Not in excruciating detail, but just a broad understanding of what we do, which I think is a lot less than people think. I think people have the idea that your model is much more radical than it is, but I think for our school, it’s surprisingly incremental.

We’ll start this off by tracing your own odyssey through here. To begin in primordial times, Lee, you were in education before you came to law school. So were you actually a practising teacher?

Lee Stuesser (LS): Yup. I taught high school Geography and History for two years. I have an education degree.

BPS: And what would make an individual, who is interested in teaching younger people, interested in all of a sudden going to law school? Did you want to be a practitioner or did you want to teach law?


1 Lakehead University’s Bora Laskin Law School opened in 2013 in Thunder Bay, Ontario.
LS: I wanted to be a practitioner, as I think most students did, but I was at a time of declining enrolment in Ontario. So the basic reality was, yes, I was very fortunate to get a job. Very fortunate. But when you start looking at the realities, it doesn’t look good. We were north of Toronto by about 100 miles. We looked at the situation and said, “Well, let’s write the LSAT.”

So you write the LSAT and, ok, you did pretty well. Then you start thinking about it and think, “Well, do you want to be a teacher for the rest of your days?” And yes, it was fun with the students, etc. But I’ll give law a try. So that’s basically the story. Did I have an idea that I would be a law teacher? No, not at all. Unlike other people who went in, I think I had a better idea, because I knew I liked criminal law. So I went in to be a practitioner.

BPS: So how did you know you wanted to do criminal law? What exposed you to it?

LS: If I was reading any novels or anything, it was always criminal-related. Fortunately I was a little older. I don’t know how old I would have been when I went into law, probably 26 or 27? So you reach a certain stage where I knew that I didn’t want tax, I knew I didn’t want family, but criminal was always an area that interested me. I was in an era where — some of you at this table will remember Perry Mason² and that type of thing — where he was helping the innocent who were always charged with murder, and it was amazing how many people were charged.

BPS: And always the wrong guy! Amazingly, the guilty guy is always somebody who testifies briefly earlier in the trial.

LS: And I always wanted to be the defense, because if any of you recall from the Perry Mason days, Berger, the prosecutor, was always a really obnoxious character. He was the bad guy.

BPS: I think you mean Burger.

---

² Perry Mason is a fictional criminal defense lawyer who is the main character in works of detective fiction written by Erle Stanley Gardner.
LS: Yes, Burger. So I always wanted to be the defense counsel. But that’s just the impressions that you get with things.

BPS: So any particular reason you came to U of M law school?

LS: Because I was from Manitoba, but also from Saskatchewan, I only applied to Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I figured my marks were pretty good and the LSAT was pretty good, so I would get in, it was just a question of where I wanted to go.

BPS: So that would have been class of...?

LS: We were the class of ’84. So ’81.

BPS: Unfortunately for you, you got to be one of the first students I ever taught!

LS: That’s right! I think it was your first year of teaching!

BPS: I just want you to know that I got better over the years.

LS: You were good then!

BPS: So impressions of the law school at the time: did you have a sense of the balance we were supposed to have between academic and practical, clinical and legal writing skills? Or did you just go with the flow?

LS: I think most students don’t have any idea of this whole notion of practical versus theory. Is it overwhelming in first year? You know, we had some practical exercises, and some of them didn’t seem to make too much sense. I think they just did them for the sake of doing them. I think the one interesting thing – because of my teaching background – I would sit in class and I would watch the teachers. I could critique them; I could see who was better at teaching.

But I must say, I think we had some really good teachers. You know, you were starting out, but we had some very experienced ones — Phil
Osborne\textsuperscript{3} comes to mind; there’s no doubt about that. I mean, he was always great back then. Nemiroff\textsuperscript{4} was always terrifying, but good.

\textbf{BPS:} He was “Scary Gerry.”

\textbf{LS:} Yes, he was. But you know, I learned enough to realize that his bark was worse than his bite and basically he had little time for people who weren’t prepared. So I would always prepare for his class.

\textbf{BPS:} He taught Insurance, right?

\textbf{LS:} No, I missed him for that. I had him for Automobile Insurance. He was on leave for that time, but I had him for another course.

\textbf{BPS:} Because you taught Insurance at Ottawa, right?

\textbf{LS:} Yes, and I used a lot of his approach.

\textbf{BPS:} I’ll throw out a few names of people we’ve actually interviewed: Jack London\textsuperscript{5}...

\textbf{LS:} Jack taught Tax, and was good. Jack, I think, was more of a policy kind of person. He was tax airy-fairy in a way, but he made Tax half-decently interesting, which is, you know, something.

\textbf{BPS:} And you had John Irvine,\textsuperscript{6} way back then?

\textbf{LS:} Oh yeah. And John was a story-teller. One of the things that you see when you look at education, you are told, “You need to teach like this.” I mean, this day and age, we always have learning outcomes and all that kind of stuff, and everyone has to go the same way. But you start looking at the

\textsuperscript{3} Phil Osborne, Robson Hall faculty 1971-2012. He is a Senior Scholar.

\textsuperscript{4} Gerald Nemiroff, Robson Hall faculty, 1968-2008. For his interview, please see page 135 of this issue.

\textsuperscript{5} Jack London, Robson Hall faculty, 1971-88, 1990-94; former Dean of Law at the University of Manitoba; now senior counsel at Pitblado Law. For his interview, please see page 191 of this issue.

\textsuperscript{6} John Irvine, Robson Hall faculty, 1970-Present.
faculty and how they teach differently, they can be equally as effective in so many different ways.

You know, everyone in this day and age wants to do PowerPoint. I have to do PowerPoint. But you know, some of the best teachers I’ve seen don’t use PowerPoint at all. The longer I’ve taught, the less PowerPoint I use. So it’s an interesting transition, but John was a story-teller. And what he would do was come in, of course, from the farm, so the manure would be cleared off at the door. But he would come in and he’d start telling the stories, and you’d learn through stories.

BPS: And it’s funny, because for most of us, the manure starts at the door!

II. REFLECTIONS

BPS: One figure I can’t interview, tragically, was a mainstay player all those years ago, Butch Nepon. Do you have any recollections of him?

LS: Well, I worked with him—and you obviously worked with him, too—Butch was very earnest. He had so many ideas going on in his head, I think one of the problems was getting them translated into simple terms for students at times. So I think, sometimes there was so much going on, it was like, “Butch, give your head a shake. What are you trying to say to the students?” But you know, the thing was, most of the people that I recall, at least as students, they were all committed people. They were here; they were available for you. They had different styles, different personalities; but I think it’s fair to say that they were dedicated academics.

BPS: And by academics, you mean teachers?

LS: Teachers, yes, but scholars as well... in different ways. Gerry, for example, was interesting; he didn’t write very much but he knew his subject thoroughly. Trevor Anderson never really wrote very much, but Trevor knew so much and, of course, would give us all so much photocopying over the years on things. Sometimes people write and it doesn’t make them a scholar; sometimes people don’t have to write and they’re a scholar. I think

---

8 Trevor Anderson, Robson Hall faculty, 1971-2007. He is a Senior Scholar.
we had a couple of those. Trevor, I would say, would be a scholar. Gerry was a scholar as well.

BPS: Transitioning a bit towards your thoughts on academic freedom, my understanding has been that the institution can designate what subject areas you have to cover and there’s a lot of freedom for the individual professor to determine how to present that. As somebody who engaged, throughout his career, in many agonizing fights for academic freedom— including being a leader of the ’95 Strike9—I never quite understood the concept that academic freedom included subject area coverage. What is your opinion on this?

LS: We actually had this debate recently on an issue with Criminal Law and Procedure.

BPS: What was the issue?

LS: Well, the issue is do you teach the course: Criminal Law and Procedure. Well, criminal procedure is a large area, plus a substantive criminal law. And, of course, Barney10 did a good job and wanted to do substantive criminal law. In other words...

BPS: What are the offenses and the defenses that are available?

LS: Yeah. Mens rea, actus reus, defenses and such; whereas I took the view that we should do both and divide it up. We had five credit hours, so two hours would be devoted to criminal procedure and three to the substantive law. And we couldn’t resolve it! Barney didn’t feel comfortable with criminal procedure; maybe the ideal was that we should have divided the course into two and had the criminal procedure people teach procedure. And keep in mind this isn’t a full-bore course into criminal procedure, it’s

---

9 The University of Manitoba Faculty Association, the certified bargaining agent for over 1,100 full-time faculty members and professional librarians at the University of Manitoba, began a legal strike on October 18, 1995. The 23 day strike was one of the longest in Canadian University history and was triggered due to an attack on both academic freedom and tenure.

an introduction to procedure, but the whole point is—and we see in the NCA\(^\text{11}\) (National Committee of Accreditation) for example—they have Criminal Law and Procedure. That’s the requirement they were forcing students from other countries to come and have both criminal procedure and substantive criminal law.

**BPS:** I just had this vision in my mind of someone who goes into court and says—when they call judges now, you don’t say, “M’lord or M’lady” anymore...

**LS:** Your Honour.

**BPS:** Someone just going in and saying, “Your Honour, I’ve got a heck of an argument to make, but I don’t know when to make it.”

**LS:** Or how.

**BPS:** “...or how to make it, because I just took law, but not... procedure.”

**LS:** “Just give me a nod when it’s ok, Your Honour.” (Laughs) But that’s a classic example, isn’t it? If that’s an issue of subject control, then we didn’t resolve it. That often happens, because you want to defend the way that you do it and I wouldn’t want, for example, Barney to teach Procedure. The idea would be that someone else would come in and assist with that.

**BPS:** Lee, traditionally, we law professors are not taught how to teach. The theory seems to be that if you know enough about an area to have—well, to get to be a prof, you must have studied from other people for many years and seen how they do it; you must have acquired a substantial expertise in that area; you now require at least an LL.M. and *de facto* we often seem to

\(^{11}\) National Committee on Accreditation (NCA) is a standing committee of the Federation of Law Societies of Canada. “The NCA applies a uniform standard on a national basis so that applicants with common law qualifications obtained outside of Canada or with civil law training in Canada do not need to satisfy different entrance standards to practise law in the different provinces and territories of Canada.” More information can be found on their website: <http://flsc.ca/national-committee-on-accreditation-nca/about-the-nca/>. 
require a doctorate. But the assumption is then that how you teach is something that can be left entirely to your judgment.

There’s another school of thought that is very heavy on teaching method, that there are universal skills that can be applied across the board. Any views, especially as a former professional teacher in the secondary school system, on whether teaching can be taught? Are there skills that everybody should at least have some exposure to, given some material which suggests how to do it? Or is this something that is more safely left to individual judgment?

LS: You know it’s interesting, because what’s happening in Ontario now is that they’ve done away with the one-year accreditation that you can take, get an honours in physics or whatever you want and then take a one-year Bachelor of Education program. It’s now two years. My own view was, you know, going back to George Bernard Shaw:12 “Those who can’t do, teach” and I added on, after being at Teacher’s College: “Those who can’t teach, end up teaching teachers.”

I found that a lot of the educational stuff is something that is basic common sense, but I would not want to impose upon people a formal teaching requirement of a substantial length of time. What could be of value would be a teaching boot camp for all of the new instructors coming in.

There are certain fundamentals about course planning, course outlines, learning objectives. You know, we learn that just by talking to other people and watching and seeing. That would be the extent that I would say in academia that we should impose. The biggest issue on the teaching part is does the University take teaching seriously. They all say they do, but I have real doubts about that, that they actually do place a high weight upon teaching and that’s probably a later discussion, but it’s certainly an issue.

BPS: Certainly a theme that we’ve explored throughout these interviews and we will definitely come back to it.

---

12 George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950) was an Irish playwright, critic and polemicist who became one of the leading dramatists of his generation.
III. PURSUING A MASTERS / LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP

BPS: So you were the gold medalist at Robson Hall Law School, did you go on and do your Master’s directly after that?

LS: I’m trying to think. No, I was articling. Then I had abridged articles at Myers Weinberg. But I had worked there for two summers as well, fortunately. So during the articling year, I applied to Harvard.

BPS: So what happened during articling that made you want to apply? Was that another “I’ll see how it goes”?

LS: Yes. We’d been to Boston; always liked Boston. No offense to Yale, but you know, who’d want to be in New Haven versus Boston? Especially when you can go to Fenway and such...

BPS: Well...when I went, you got the extra adrenaline rush of never knowing when you were going to be murdered! (Laughs)

LS: Exactly.

BPS: I don’t know if you got that rush in Boston.

LS: Certainly in areas of Boston.

BPS: At a very primal level, I used to see police inside the gated community at Yale and I would always wonder what they were doing inside the gate because we weren’t doing anything and I think they were there for protection. It’s rough outside!

LS: It was one of those ones where—and obviously I’d done well in law school and I was enjoying working with the people at Myers Weinberg—

---

13 Myers Weinberg LLP is a Winnipeg law firm that provides a full range of legal services.
14 Fenway Park, home of the Boston Red Sox.
Hymie Weinstein, Rocky Pollack—just great criminal lawyers, great people. The whole firm was great people. But you say to yourself, “You know, there’s a chance to give it a go.” Was there any long-term plan? No. The dollar at the time was 62¢ USD, so...

BPS: We’re getting back there!

LS: I know. So it was costly, but the wife and I talked about it and we had a child at that time! And a dog! So when we went to Boston, we couldn’t stay near Harvard, because we had a big dog. So I flipped a coin: Cape Ann or Cape Cod. Came up Cape Ann, so I figured, there’s cottage communities. The first place I saw in Cape Ann belonged to teachers going on leave, so we ended up with a beautiful place in Danvers, Massachusetts, and drove into Boston. There wasn’t a plan. When I was at Harvard and talking to the people in Ontario in particular, how naïve a prairie boy I must have appeared! There was myself and a couple from Saskatchewan. The Ontario students had everything planned, from their clerkships at the Supreme Court or Ontario Court of Appeal to this. We had none of that.

BPS: Just do it, and then figure out what’ll happen.

LS: Yeah!

BPS: That’s interesting, because some of our other interviewees have said, at that point, they really weren’t worried about what they would do if it didn’t turn out. How is it different from the students you’ve seen over the last say, ten to fifteen years, because you’ve seen two different provinces, two different continents?

LS: They’re planning, that’s for sure. They seem to have a lot more going on. It was expensive to go to Harvard, that’s for sure. But you know, we’d

---

15 Hymie Weinstein is a senior partner in Myers Weinberg LLP, and is the firm’s longest serving member, having joined in 1972.
16 R.L. (Rocky) Pollack was appointed to the Provincial Court of Manitoba on December 14, 2006.
17 Cape Ann is located approximately 40 miles northeast of Boston. Cape Cod is approximately 62 miles southeast of Boston.
18 Danvers, Massachusetts is located approximately 22 miles northeast of Boston.
already moved from Winnipeg to Guelph and then to Midland, Ontario and then back to Winnipeg; so we were used to moving and we said, “Look, we can do this. What will be, will be.” I also had a firm that was very supportive, and said, “We’d love to have you back, but...”

BPS: “...Go do it.”

LS: Yes, and there’ll always be a place for you, which is great.

BPS: A question that I ask a lot of people in these interviews is: if you could start it all over again, would you still end up being a law professor? Now it seems like you would probably have to have a doctorate in most Canadian law schools. Would you have been willing to invest the extra time and so on?

LS: No, and I often say that to students who are looking at an LL.M, and I’m not sure if you’ve changed yours from a two-year program, but I just look at them and say, “It’s not worth two years. Go to the United States; go for the nine-month program; get your LL.M.” For a Ph.D. at three years—I mean, I had a Master’s in Arts and I looked at that regime to teach — and I said, “For four years or three years? No.” Especially when you have a law degree and you put it in perspective. I’ve got a family; I’ve got a dog. I could be out earning; I’ve got to pay for these things! So the answer to your question quite simply would have been no, I wouldn’t have.

BPS: My sense of you, and a lot of other people from earlier was not only a question of the material cost of doing that, but a certain inclination to be out of the world for a number of years. In those days, we worked in front of word processors and we would have this sort of monkish-existence for a number of years, with an indefinite end termination date, by the way. Work in a very specialized area, doing comprehensive research...I’m not sure a lot of people who wanted to be law teachers—they were probably temperamentally unsuited to that long period of preparation. You’re saying that is probably the case with you?

LS: Well, I’d already done a thesis in my Master’s of Arts. I’d done that two year program and I’d done an advance paper at Harvard and I don’t know if it was Attention Deficit Disorder or what, but I really don’t think I could
zone in on something so narrow. Because that’s what you have to do with a Ph.D., unfortunately. I would prefer to look at things that interest me.

BPS: You know, I’ve never done a systematic study, but just impressionistically I’m not sure that there’s a strong positive correlation between acquiring a doctorate and research productivity once you become an academic. I’ve tried to ask myself what the causal links might be because you would think someone who has put that extra time into becoming a scholar would, on average, be likely to be a very productive scholar. One of my speculations is that there may be some actually surprisingly counter-intuitive effects here.

A Master’s is a result-oriented project, right? I take my courses, do my fairly short thesis and then I’m done. The doctoral thesis encourages you to work with a rolling time horizon, to have a very extensive deliverable, and to adopt a certain perfectionist approach—I need to check out everything; I have to examine literature exhaustively; I have to consider everything—and maybe to some extent, it makes you have a lesser sense of urgency in getting deliverables out the door, a certain perfectionism that may inhibit you being productive. There’s always a balance between the ideal and the good. Is this making any sense to you?

LS: It does. I find sometimes, with the younger scholars, they keep talking about research agendas and I don’t know about you or other people, but when I came to Robson Hall, I had no research agenda. I said to them I would like to write, but if you’re going to tell me what my agenda is for the next three or four years, it won’t work. What happens is through your interest in your teaching—I think of courses or some of the other interests that you already had—you start writing and you start growing, because you have the freedom to write.

The first article—or second, or third—I ever wrote was about insurance, because I was teaching Insurance and that’s what I found interesting. I actually find that creates a livelier mental set, because you’ve got the breadth. I see some people that they’ve researched—and they use it quite often—in their Master’s and then they’ve built on their Master’s into their Ph.D. in the same area and then I’m thinking, “Wow, do you know anything other than”—I mean, the hot topic today is international human rights—“do you know anything other than international human rights?”
BPS: I’ve never thought of it in those terms before, Lee. But if you think of someone who’s vested so much of their life and built up such human intellectual capital to do the doctoral program, then to some extent, people come in with that agenda and they’re going to keep going with it, and they’re also looking to adapt their teaching assignments to the research agenda.

But your story is about someone from perhaps the older school, you came in and it’s like, “I’m the new teacher,” and they usually give me the courses, pretty much based on what the institution needs, not so much what I’m interested in, and then I do research which is geared to what I’m teaching, and rather than trying to adapt my teaching assignments to what it is I’m researching. I guess your model has some advantages. That was more consistent with my own experience, which is it makes you more likely to fall into teacher-scholar mode.

The reason we had scholars teaching is supposedly—and I believe this is the case if things were working properly—it’s better teaching because you had this creative activity and your teaching is also contributing to your scholarship because you’re getting this feeling back in the discussions.

LS: See, the other problem with the Ph.D. mode and legal education—I think Gerry Nemiroff said it—is that there are too many doctors and not enough lawyers to a certain extent. That’s not fair, because there are many very good scholars who are doctors and many good scholars who are not doctors.

One of the problems that happens—and I’ve been seeing a lot with the younger scholars who have been applying for jobs at Lakehead—is that they get into the Ph.D. program and of course, the graduate programs are all supporting them to conferences, all of them always in the same area. So you’re right; by the time they get to the Ph.D., this is where they’re at.

They’re always committed to that track because they’re part of that organization—the example we used earlier was international human rights; so these scholars will join the International Human Rights group—suddenly, it’s the one track that they’ve got. A lot of them, the younger scholars will come in and say, “Well, I’m to be hired as your international human rights expert.” And for a small university, you think, “Yeah, that’s good…but how about Torts? I need someone to teach that.”

BPS: Coming off these tracks or staying on these tracks, which there is such an emphasis, institutionally from the Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council, from universities that tend to assimilate that point of view, that research should be collaborative, and network-based. It’s a very different approach because the kind of research you did—and almost everything that I did—was: pick a topic and write something about it. It wasn’t: I need to line up a bunch of collaborators. My idea of finding was that I need a student to help me find stuff and citations, but it wasn’t working with a whole bunch of other people to get the ideas.

So if you’re on that track, you’re going to these conferences and you’ve made your connections, and funding isn’t an issue, so you’re going to be even more committed to staying in that track.

**LS:** I don’t know if the UM has this, but tenure and promotion...is that still internal or does that go to an external committee?

**BPS:** It goes up the chain, but I can’t think of a time it went up the chain and wasn’t accepted.

**LS:** Ok, see, at Bond,¹⁹ they had developed an extra process, and it wasn’t too bad at Bond because the law faculty there was probably one of the strongest and wealthiest faculties, so we had a lot of power in that committee. But when you look at Lakehead or some of the other universities, they’ve now gone to a centralized model. So there isn’t really an internal faculty decision but more so a submission by faculty members to the central body. The question is: who’s nominating the central body?

The science and research humanities are almost dictated by the grants, that’s their agenda, and it doesn’t fit us that well. Scholarship comes in so many different forms, and if you were a person like myself—I think over my thirty years I’ve had only two or three grants, because I didn’t want to spend my time on the grant things; I wanted to do the writing and do whatever I’m going to be doing—then the centralized tenure and promotion, which is dominated by the social and natural sciences, and grants, is forcing law into a mold which isn’t comfortable. That’s the situation that we are currently experiencing at Lakehead.

---

¹⁹ Bond University is a private not-for-profit university located in the suburb of Robina, Gold Coast, Australia.
BPS: I think the epitome of what you’re talking about, Lee, is the Arthurs Report,\textsuperscript{20} which, of course, was a report done by a committee that was commissioned by the SSHRC.\textsuperscript{21} Basically, it starts off with the question: “Why doesn’t legal scholarship look like other scholarship?” All the recommendations are how to make legal scholarship look like other scholarship. That’s, I think, representative of how often the institutional framework drives the philosophy or ideology at the law school.

So coming back to your own career track, when you came to the University of Manitoba, what was your sense of what was expected of you? Was it mostly teacher with a little bit of scholarship, 50-50, or “I’m a scholar who does some teaching”?

LS: I think the message I got, whether it was right or wrong, was always 40-40-20, with 40% teaching, 40% scholarship and writing, and 20% service. I always thought that was about right. It always felt like you had to do it all. But in terms of the scholarship part, I had a very simple view that I always thought maybe still holds true. I think that if a person in a given year can come up with two good pieces of scholarship—if you keep doing that over the course of thirty years, you’ve got sixty good pieces of scholarship. One of our standard questions we would ask candidates at Lakehead for hiring was “Out of all your publications, what are you most proud of and why?” Because there are some that we know aren’t of the moment, to a certain extent. I mean, they may have been interesting at the time but they didn’t really mean that much.

So that was the notion that I had. There wasn’t an enormous pressure on scholarship, that’s for sure. You mentioned the Arthurs Report—that was part of the whole idea that law schools have to become university-oriented—we had people, Keith Turner\textsuperscript{22} for example; great guy, but I don’t think Keith would really write that much. He was pretty much a pure practitioner. So he wouldn’t be that comfortable in the scholarship mold. But I came from Ottawa, so I taught in Ottawa first and then came here. I had a

\textsuperscript{20} Harry Arthurs’ Law & Learning report of 1983 documented the low productivity of academic legal scholars in Canadian law schools. It recommended creating distinct streams for the academic study of law and professional legal education.

\textsuperscript{21} Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC).

\textsuperscript{22} Keith Turner, Robson Hall faculty, 1957-65, 1970-87.
recognition that there was a need for scholarship and I was comfortable with it.

BPS: Trying to look at scholarship institutionally, one of the things that influences it is who is supporting it, who is sponsoring it, and now increasingly, the law school is embedded in the University, which has its own approach. It has grants, interdisciplinary study and collaboration. Another question I might ask is: who am I writing this for?

LS: Exactly.

BPS: Who are you writing for?

LS: I have no hesitation in saying I don’t write for other academics. My audience are judges and lawyers, and if you like, students. That makes it very unattractive to the social sciences. One of the key things that I have—and you may call me naïve and I probably could do this—was when I was starting out and there was a hot topic or case, I could phone up Don Stuart23 at Criminal Reports and say, “Don, this case just came down, are you interested in a case comment?” or something like that. Don would be hitting to the same audience.

So I wasn’t fixated on the idea of tailoring my papers to go through peer review. So one of the things that I looked at—because you learn over the years—at Bond, the problem was that we had a narrow definition of what scholarship was, and it was forcing us all into that grant-model. I know at Lakehead, they had a broader view of what scholarship was. My own view is that there is room for all kinds of scholarship, just like there’s room for all kinds of teaching, but we shouldn’t all be forced under the same mold.

BPS: If you look at the giants of Canadian legal scholarship from an earlier time, the ones I think of, the ones that wrote the magisterial textbooks—Waddams on Contracts24—if you ask who that’s written for, it’s written for lawyers and judges. It’s not a collaborative project and it’s not

23 Don Stuart (B.A., LL.B., Dipl. in Criminology, D. Phil.) is the Editor-in-Chief of the Criminal Reports for Carswell and Professor of Law at Queen’s University.

interdisciplinary. I just think it’s really good, and very useful to people who are arguing cases and want to know what the law is and make an argument. Hogg on Constitutional Law\textsuperscript{25} was written for lawyers, judges, and students; it’s not that theoretical, not particularly philosophical. Nowadays though, a young person starting out would say, “Is this really what I want to do?” I’ve got to get all of my stuff peer reviewed, so they might say, “Well, you’re just describing a case and analyzing it; I’ve got no theory and no interdisciplinary stuff in here.”

Is the stuff that is written for the public more respected, or is the stuff written for the academy more respected? My intuitive sense is the message while we are embedded in this institution is primarily you’re writing for other scholars, and there may not be the same value put on something that is practitioner or judge-oriented. What do you think?

LS: Absolutely. That’s one of the things that I was trying to do at Lakehead, is to educate the powers that be that there is a difference, that law is different. If you have someone who is writing to judges and lawyers, don’t disparage that and don’t look at it as suddenly not worthy. But that’s part of why a law faculty needs to continue to emphasize that there is scholarship in many different forms.

I could even go further. If you look at David Paciocco\textsuperscript{26} and I when we did our first evidence text, which is now over twenty years ago, our actual audience wasn’t judges or lawyers; it was students. What we wanted to do was explain the law of evidence, to show and work with it and try to state the rules in a simple enough way for students to understand.

And then, of course, what happened was that judges and lawyers started picking it up, because now they understand hearsay because we explained it and we showed it. So of course, the text gets thicker and thicker, as we go through, and I think that’s valuable because you’re actually helping people! But is it valued in the academia and the university? I’m not sure.

\textsuperscript{25} Peter Hogg, \textit{Constitutional Law of Canada}, 5\textsuperscript{th} ed (Toronto: Carswell, 2007).

\textsuperscript{26} David Paciocco is currently a judge of the Ontario Court of Justice. Before this, he was a professor at the University of Ottawa, and wrote \textit{The Law of Evidence} with Lee Stuesser, which is Canada’s leading text in evidentiary law in criminal and civil cases: David M. Paciocco and Lee Stuesser, \textit{The Law of Evidence (Essentials of Canadian Law)}, 7\textsuperscript{th} ed (Irwin Law, 2015).
BPS: We have had discussions within the faculty about whether everyone should be expected to teach theoretical or empirical perspectives. Now, by the way, I’m all in favour of teaching this way; I think I’ve done this throughout my career. It seems to me, though, that there is real value in taking things that judges have said or statutes say, and try and organize it and figure out what it’s actually saying, and distilling it, and seeing where the contradictions are and that it is a useful contribution to society, in and of itself. But I don’t think that’s where a lot of the institutional rewards and incentives are right now.

LS: No, I would agree with you, and as I say, I’m not disparaging the theory part. Go right ahead! Write to other academics. The theory may, in fact, have major ramifications, but much of it may not, just as many of our other pieces of work which may help in terms of explaining the law, may be valuable, it may not be. But that’s a major issue, and we seem to have a younger group coming in who are all heading in that direction. This gets back to the question of where law schools should go. If they are all heading in that direction, what does that do to all of the more practical-oriented subjects?

BPS: One of the things, Lee, that I’ve noticed about your career, is that your texts, the things you’ve written that have been larger projects, have tended to be cited a lot by judges.

LS: Yes.

BPS: And I think there’s your legitimate argument, saying that judicial citation should count as well as academic citations when you evaluate the impact of the work. So you can substitute proof of impact.

But I’m always curious; when you take on a larger project—and you’ve done a lot of books: three on advocacy, six or seven on evidence...

LS: Oh yeah, but those are all different editions and they don’t count.

BPS: Yes, but it’s one line on a CV, but it’s a huge undertaking as opposed to an article that you may be able to pump out in a month or maybe two, if it’s a longer one. But those bigger projects, when people look at your CV, look the same. Is that a problem in that we don’t value books in the same
way that we value particularly, as we say, the black letter law book that judges pick up because they say, “Ok, I need to enter this question; what do the people who don’t have an interest in this area think that the law is?”

LS: You know, it’s a problem, and I’ve seen some of the CVs that the younger people come and show me. I call them bowel movement CVs. We’re training our young academics to write down every...single...thing that they’ve ever done. If they came in and did a guest lecture for you on one topic, suddenly it’s on there. It’s one line, same as the book! They’ve got a successful bowel movement; let’s put it in there! And you end up with a forty-page gobbledegook, and so I try and say, “Narrow it down, and prioritize.”

I’ll look at it, and see, “Oh, look, a peer review,” and then all of a sudden, I’ll see their book, and it’s on page 4! Start with the book! It seems to me that a book is more valuable; it shows that you have got staying power and a long-term thing. I encourage them, too; I say, “Go on CanLii,27 and QuickLaw,28 and see if you’ve been cited. And start throwing in the citations.” That will hopefully show somebody that you’re having an impact in the real world.

BPS: ...with judges and lawyers and academics.

LS: They’re trained that way, the bowel movement way!

BPS: Metrics are pretty important. If you look at the apparently now-defunct Maclean’s annual rankings...

LS: Yeah, I don’t know what happened to that.

BPS: My guess was that it was just too expensive to keep doing it for a fairly small audience, because it was a lot of research on their part. But their primary metric, 50% of the value was citation counts, but it had to be a

27 Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLii) is a non-profit organization managed by the Federation of Law Societies of Canada. More information can be found here: <https://www.canlii.org/en/>.

28 QuickLaw is a Canadian electronic legal research database owned and operated by LexisNexis.
periodical article and the only citations that counted were other periodicals. So if you use that metric, somebody like Stephen Waddams is...

BPS: ...not that interesting. Phil Osborne, or John Irvine, these major scholars at our place; the other major scholar that I’ve mentioned before at UT; they actually rarely show up. They’re basically invisible, whereas if you wrote a theoretical piece, or even a practical one that is cited by many other people, then the count runs up.

LS: We went through that in Australia. Australia has a tendency to adopt the best practice from England, ten years after the fact, when England has realized that their best practice was wrong and have abandoned it. And of course Canada picks up the Australian best practices, and assumes it’s the best practice, so now they’re about thirty years behind what they should be. When I was at Bond, they had the metrics. They were coming in, and they had their formula, which was citation by others and it creates a game: you cite me, I cite you; the buddy system. Actually, I think it crumbled under its own ineptitude.

BPS: What is a citation worth? I mean, you can have a footnote saying this is the literature in the area; here are eight articles. This is the American tradition of extremely extensive citations that even the author may not have read. You can especially run up counts if there is a sense of collegiality, but whether that’s a very good proxy for the actual merit or in fact, what’s being done is questionable.

LS: It’s a problem, Bryan, what’s occurring because we shouldn’t be disparaging black letter law. Black letter law is good because black letter is helping people with the law, applying and understanding the law. You know the interesting thing I find about academia? It’s how intolerant academics are. They’re probably the most intolerant people. Here we are in a law faculty, which should appreciate diversity and the equality of ideas. But you get someone who disagrees with you and suddenly, it’s an era of intolerance. It’s my way or no way. And it’s amazing how that occurs and you hear that with the theoretician...

BPS: ...Your theory is wrong.
LS: Yes, or you have to do it this way or you’re not a scholar. Of course you have other people saying, “Well, we’d like to do it this way,” and they disparage the theoreticians, but usually, there’s such an enormous intolerance, which is just sad.

BPS: Does it also create short-termism, in the sense of citation counts?

LS: Well, I used to take great pride in the fact that I was always cited in the dissent of the Supreme Court. Now I’m starting to be cited by the majority, which worries me.

BPS: There’s a theory that if you live long enough, you will be vindicated; it’s at the end of The Count of Monte Cristo. All we can do is wait and hope. I don’t believe that hope is always realized in the end, so I’m gratified to hear that you’ve achieved something in your time, but I don’t think the world necessarily guarantees it.

IV. CAREER AT BOND AND LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITIES

BPS: In terms of your career—we’re moving way ahead—but when you ran for Dean, I had the sense that people had seen you as the “black letter guy.” In your own practice, I think your scholarship was a lot more diverse than that. For example, I remember reading your piece of jury trials, and it was one of the very few pieces, I think, in the Manitoba Law Journal that did serious empirical study. But your point, I believe, is not everyone should be doing what Lee Stuesser does, which is basically writing for that teaching, practitioner, and judge audience. It’s a valuable thing, but there are other valuable things; so you do your valuable thing, and I will do mine. It takes all kinds was my more benign interpretation of what you were saying.

Now you were a part of the major curriculum reforms that we did at the University of Manitoba law school, were you involved in the time when we did the Osborne-Esau report.

---

29 The Count of Monte Cristo is a book written by Alexandre Dumas in 1844. The quote reads as: “...all human wisdom is contained in these two words, ‘Wait and Hope.’”


LS: No, I was a student. We were beneficiaries of that. We were the last of the large class. We went from 120 to 90 students, and of course, the argument was that it improved the teaching, which really wasn’t the case, but it sounded good. So we were just all part of that. But as a student, we didn’t realize all of that. Like I don’t think any of us realized what was going on. It was a lot of work; it was three or four years to get that so-called balanced curriculum.

BPS: So you worked within that framework for about two decades? Eventually you decided to—I think you just did it as a sessional thing—go and teach at Bond University in Australia...

LS: Mhmhm.

BPS: ...and eventually you moved out there full-time. What caused you to embark on that fresh adventure? The people I’ve interviewed over the course of these studies have all had remarkably long careers at the same place. You are unusual in that after a couple decades here, you went on to explore a whole other vista. Anything you can share with us about why you ended up there?

LS: Let’s be honest, when you’ve been at a place for twenty years as a full professor, it’s very difficult to transfer as a full professor, because universities will look at the cheaper option. Why should we be paying Professor Schwartz his professorial salary, plus an incentive for him to move when we can get some entry-level person at half the salary? So a lateral employment transfer is tough, and I think that’s why a lot of people after you’ve been here six or seven years and you’re a full professor, you’re not attractive.

BPS: We don’t do that anymore. Six or seven years will not get you a full professorship.

LS: When you’ve reached that full professor level you appreciate it, unless there is some special thing. For example, Evar Oshionebo32 in the energy

---

32 Evaristus Oshionebo, Professor of law at the University of Calgary. Prior to joining the University of Calgary he was a tenured associate professor at Robson Hall, receiving the University of Manitoba Faculty Association Merit Award for Excellence in teaching.
area—now he wasn’t a full professor—but still, you could see his movement there because of his special niche. My area, criminal law, was frankly a dime a dozen. There are a lot of criminal lawyers all around. So why Bond? Well, the opportunity was because they were expanding and looking at the Canadian program, with which I was familiar and I had a lot of lateral opportunity.

Let’s face it, the other thing is—and we can all relate to this—is that Bond was not a public university. In fact, Bond’s ethos was not to be public so as to avoid the pitfalls of public institutions: avoiding rule by committee and having committee after committee, to emphasize teaching, and to be a practitioner school. It was going to be a lawyer-oriented school.

**BPS:** Lawyer-oriented as in turning out good lawyers, or bringing in practitioners to teach?

**LS:** Skills mostly. The practitioners could come in, but the academics would be teaching it. But they would also be looking at the skill necessary for a lawyer and focus on those things. It was a very comfortable fit, because I taught Advocacy here, which is a lawyer skill for decades. It was a good fit, the Gold Coast is beautiful, the people at Bond are wonderful, and they had a full transfer opportunity. We were ready; our kids at that time—they’d been to Australia before—were all grown up, and we had no dog! So it was a time to travel.

**BPS:** One of the things it seems to me, in many ways, your own career has engaged with each major shift in Canadian legal education. You came in as we were settling into the academic rather than practitioner model.

When you went to Bond, it was the beginning of a development, which in retrospect was very much underappreciated, and here’s my take on it—you can tell me whether or not you agree or disagree. We had this supply management of legal training for a very long time. There was a small number of Canadian, particularly English-speaking law schools, with an increasing population, so we were pretty much in control on the intake end. I think that led to a certain lack of feedback. We didn’t have competition, or alternatives; everything was in a public university. To some extent, there was a self-replicating ethos. But what people didn’t count on was that you didn’t have to teach Canadian law only in Canada: Bond and a couple schools in
England, and increasingly, schools in the United States that have joint programs.

It turns out that you can acquire most of your Canadian legal education outside of Canada, which basically blew up the supply management system. Then it turns out there is a whole lot of other people from other jurisdictions, mostly going to Ontario, who wanted professional accreditation, and it was that increased supply that led to the pressure on the articling system which ultimately facilitated the new model that you developed, is that fair?

LS: Yeah. We took a very practical-oriented approach to it at Bond. Dealing with the NCA, we said, “What does it take? What do you need?” One time it was a crapshoot; we had absolutely no idea what courses they would require our students to take, and we would tell the students that. We’d say, “You’ve got to take seven. We can predict that it might be these ones, but we don’t know.”

BPS: Constitutional and Criminal were always there.

LS: Anyway, it had to be objective and transparent. The whole problem was that NCA crapshoot. So then they said, “Ok, we require these: Criminal, Constitutional, Admin, and foundations.” I started the discussions with Vern Krishna and said we would teach Canadian Constitutional, and we would teach it the Canadian way. He was worried that they would do the Thomas Cooley\footnote{Western Michigan University’s Thomas M. Cooley Law School.} approach, which would be providing Canadian Constitutional as a two credit hour course.

We said we would do a full-bore, however many credits it would be. I think it was six hours at Bond. And we would do it with Canadian instructors, Canadian assessments—everything along that way. And then it started us down the path of doing all of them. The attraction that we had was our students could do those as elective courses; they have a very rigid core requirement under Australian legislation, but they had enough for five electives, and all their electives would be the Canadian subjects.

But the thing is, in a three-year term—and actually, we would go year-round, so it would only be six semesters over two years—those students not only got an Australian accreditation, they also got a Canadian one. So it was
not like the joint programs in Canada and the States, where it was four years. We actually were doing it in two, for the full-year: Canadian and Australian.

I mean, wow! As for transparency, we could say, “Look, Eric Colvin has taught Criminal Law at Saskatchewan for over twenty years; I’ve taught Criminal Law in Manitoba. We’re teaching it!” It shows, I think, how we should be more flexible. Of course, it became too successful and of course, then they got worried; well, what happens if Lee leaves? And Leicester and Arizona State started doing it, and my response was what you should do is dictate to them: Canadian instructors, Canadian standards, Canadian timeframe. There it is; you can do it. So it was interesting times. We would have almost two hundred Canadians at a given time.

BPS: Yeah, if you add up the English and Australian institutions, with the creation of at least four or five times the number of University of Manitoba students...

LS: Actually, more like six or seven.

BPS: ...six or seven hundred students in total. My sense is that we didn’t really notice as this was happening. Things are changing and then all of a sudden, the pressure came when the Ontario articling system seemed to be at crisis point. But now you’re back! You came back to run for Dean of University of Manitoba law school...

LS: I wouldn’t say run actually, because when I was contacted and asked whether I would be interested, I generally said, “No.” I took the view that I would be willing to be the Dean, but I indicated the vision that I had. It was one of these things where I was very fortunate at Lakehead; I told them my vision and said, “If you don’t like it...” and they accepted.

So I went through the process, put my name in, was prepared to be the Dean, but I didn’t need to be the Dean.

BPS: That was my next question. You didn’t have a general desire to be a dean, you had a desire to accomplish a particular vision and being dean

---

34 Eric Colvin served as Dean of Bond University law school from 1995-2000. He is currently the Head of the School of Law at The University of the South Pacific.
would help accomplish that, but it wasn’t like a long-standing career objective to be involved in administration.

You were a very successful law teacher, certainly; and have gone multiple places. What is the thing that made you do this? You knew the headaches that university administrations can cause.

LS: I think, in fairness, I taught for twenty years here, and I was a student here. This place means a lot to any of us who have been around here. And I didn’t like the direction it was going; I didn’t like it when I was here. I thought we were going in a theoretical direction and I think it was the wrong direction, and so I was prepared to say that we need more balance. You talk about the pendulum [of legal education]; well, the pendulum was over here.

BPS: You mean, theoretical?

LS: Yes, theoretical. And so I looked and said I would be willing to try and bring the pendulum back. I think people who didn’t want me to be the Dean would say, “Look, who wants to bring the pendulum over here? No one wants to go back to the old place.”

BPS: So you wanted to bring the pendulum back to 50-50, a balance between theoretical and practical. As opposed to letting the practitioners run as they did twenty years before you went to law school at Osgoode Hall, the old version of Osgoode Hall when it was downtown and part of the community.

LS: Well, the old version of Manitoba.

BPS: ...or the old version of Manitoba when the practitioners had a lot of impact. Let me just talk about the pendulum. In the United States, there is a very significant literature about hiring bias, and what that literature has found is that, if you look at the elite institutions, almost everybody there would be largely Democrat; there are almost no Republicans. People followed up, like Eric Posner, saying, “What is the relationship between the scholarly literature and the political dispositions of the academy?” And they found that there was a very strong correlation.

35 Eric Posner is a professor at the University of Chicago Law School.
Then there’s a debate about whether that disproportionality is a result of bias, or self-selection, etc. I tried to find out whether you can do a comparable study in Canada and so far, I can’t find empirical evidence like you can in the United States. Is it your impression that faculties of law are equally open to different perspectives? People want to focus on what you did, people on the left versus people on the right? I don’t want to ask any leading questions here, just hoping to do it in this way. Is there equal opportunity to get hired if you’re excellent, regardless of your approach, methods, or politics, or is there some skewing there?

LS: Some faculties are obviously more political than others, but I go back to what I said before: I find it sad how intolerant some faculties are. And it all depends on who is on the hiring committee. In some faculties you end up with groups and if those are the groups that mandate hiring—either theoreticians or practitioners—then suddenly it becomes unhealthy. That is problematic, and happened partly because there was a natural bias in that you hire who you’re comfortable with.

BPS: In social sciences, it’s called an affinity bias: Affinity bias refers to a form of interviewer bias resulting from interviewers showing preference for certain types of people for whom they have an affinity, such as respondents who are similar to them or that they find attractive. People who are similar to us are more excellent.

LS: So if that occurred, you can see that you’re increasing the pendulum in the direction that you’re already headed. But let’s face it, the practitioner pendulum was holding sway for quite a while until the mid-70s and into the early-80s, and then suddenly there was a need for more scholarship and more university academia, and it started heading the other way.

I think we’re now at a point where the pendulum is over in the direction of the theoretician. I’ve been around tables, listening to people hiring, and they say, “Oh, he’s spent five years at Blakes.” Ugh.” And I’m thinking, “Geez, that’s pretty good.” But my take—because I’ve got a practitioner-oriented take—is that’s good but from a theoretician’s point of view, they ask, “Well, what has he published? Has he done any extensive research?” And I think, “Well, no, because he was a practitioner for five years.” So
you’re right; that is occurring. You know, then you start saying, “Well, we need a practitioner representative, a theoretician; that’s the difficulty.”

Hopefully you’ve got people, and I think one of the things that happened in the early 1980s or so, I think you had people who put their egos aside and who had a greater vision and I am find that is a rarer quality now, that people have the vision to look beyond their own self interest, that I think you had in the early 1980s.

BPS: I think it is a real paradox that people might have misunderstood or mischaracterized you at times as “I write practitioner oriented stuff, everybody has to write practice oriented stuff” and as I understood your message when you were running for dean it was, if you are a brilliant theoretician, that is a good thing.

I think you said in your talk, “If you are Gretzky, even if you are not doing anything that immediately needs to be taught, we can hire Gretzky. Gretzky can be a brilliant theoretician as well as a brilliant doctrinally oriented person, but we should hire a diverse range of people on some non-political standard of excellence. Some people will have masters, some people will have doctorates, some people on the left, some people on the right and the collective result will be that students will be exposed to all sorts of different perspectives. It is one that is open to eclecticism.

The paradox we have identified in this interview is that some people who talk of diversity and so forth are actually, I think, intolerant of people who might have a different view of how you teach and what it means to be taught. The ideal is not everybody becomes like Lee Stuesser and teaches like Lee Stuesser, the ideal is that we end up with a bunch of different personalities, a bunch of different backgrounds, and so forth. It seems to me that you were pretty clear on your vision when you ran for dean. My sense was that some people had the view that because you had your own particular perspective on what you thought was valuable in your own career that you were somehow not equally open to other points of view.

V. CENTRALIZATION AND THE LAKEHEAD MODEL

BPS: You were quite clear in your interview that the dean is an advocate for the law school and that we live in a time in which central administrations think that the dean is essentially the advocate of central administration to the law school, rather than of the law school to central administration.
We saw this at the University of Saskatchewan, where the faculty wanted somebody and the central administration wanted somebody else. It is a very difficult question, and it is easy for me because I do not have to live it. I am not a dean and I do not have to live the pressures of central administration and be accountable to them.

LS: Well I am not either.

BPS: Well so it is easy for me to say that the dean should be an advocate for the faculty, but obviously the truth is not on one extreme or the other. The dean is a part of the administrative apparatus and has certain accountabilities and duties there. Have you found that deans are increasingly seeing themselves as adepts of central administration? Did they formerly view themselves as more a part of the faculty?

LS: Yeah I think, especially for law schools at one time, they had strong deans.

BPS: And they were separate from the university in some way.

LS: They were at least regarded with a lot more respect. You would not want to cross them too much on things. That has changed. Centralization, managerialism is sort of the phrasing that they go through. University administrations do not want strong people under them, they want compliant deans. They want you to come within your budget, don’t make waves for the university, support the university. That means if the university has initiatives it is almost like cabinet solidarity, you come in and support the initiative. I have never believed that. I do not think that centralization is good, I actually think it is bad. I think that, to a point, decentralization is the better route.

Lakehead as an example, we had terrible centralization of the physical plant service. I was in favour of giving every faculty say $100,000 and saying “Deans, here is $100,000 for new painting, new rooms, whatever you need it for, because you will be more efficient than you will if you go central.” Well that simply does not fly and as a result the costs just spiral.

My experience is that central does not want strong deans, that is certainly what I saw at Lakehead and I think that it is the same thing here. What they want is a bureaucrat. They want a person who is going to do primarily what they want them to do. They do not want a dean who is going to say “No, that is not right.” or “We are not going to do it” or “We can’t
do it and here’s why.” Isn’t that common throughout the corporate world now?

**BPS:** A very resonant book titled *The Fall of the Faculty*[^38] by a political science prof at John Hopkins describes this dilemma in the American context. Fall of the faculties means academic faculties are not running things anymore, they do not have the respect that they used to. The managerial class are running things now and I do not think that is by any means unique to Lakehead or the University of Manitoba, as it is a very widespread phenomena.

In practice what I think it means for professional faculties like ours is you are drawn towards the imperatives of central administration, the bureaucratic culture, the emphasis on certain kinds of research and controls on raising money and so on and so forth. Because of this you are actually less accountable to the profession itself and my sense is Canadian law schools have not been very swift to appreciate a change in the environment out there.

We have gone from a small number of law schools basically controlling the supply to this much more open market for legal education which has largely been created outside of our borders and we can’t prudently ignore what is happening. Because we in the academy are increasingly embedded, ideologically, in career terms, in the central administration, I am not convinced that we can respond quickly to the changes as they occur. My guess is that sooner or later reality wins and we will have to respond. By respond I do not mean we have to give up being an academic place, I never saw a division between the academic and the practical.

The best teaching to me includes both, and I have said at Law Faculty Council meetings, “I do not think we should view the taking on of more training practitioners as a bad thing, I think it is a great opportunity.” Everything that the profession is doing we can now do, but we can do it with an academic bend. So as academics we should be looking at doing more of it because we can be doing it in a way that is really effective, and is not only practical but also attempting to look at things critically. What is your sense of how well non-law academic schools are responding to the new realities?

LS: I think once again it depends who you are asking. I think the majority are not responding well because it’s their turf. They are comfortable with what they are doing and as you’ve indicated they’ve got a monopoly. You mention a good point about the profession out there because the profession right now is exercising its muscles through the federation and through their required courses, et cetera. They had not done that before. They left law schools alone for fifty years or so until Thompson Rivers and Lakehead came along, and what did we do? I think that is an opportunity actually for law schools to identify themselves, to separate themselves a little bit from the university mold because, you are right, central wants one size fits all. That is the problem, and they are not prepared to allow law schools to be slightly off-centre.

I actually found one of the most important things for a small school is accreditation. Especially for a new school it enabled me to throw accreditation at the university whenever they were trying to do things that would impact us. For example, we all know that physical space is an issue in law schools. In Australia the law schools do not have their own buildings, they basically use whatever room is available and so space is precious.

At Bond I had to fight in order to get a separate building where our law school could have priority. It came down to accreditation because the federation has certain dictates and certain requirements for physical space and you need to recognize that. I was using accreditation to offset the central monolith that was there, so I think the profession is starting to exercise their muscles. There is good and bad in that. You listed before your list of mandatory courses and I could see suddenly them throwing in a bunch of silly mandatory courses, because that is the same thing that happened in Australia. There needs to be a happy medium, but I think this could be an opportunity for deans to assert that we are different and that we have these accreditation requirements. It is an opportunity, whether the deans seize it is another matter.

BPS: I think to some extent the academy has been very strong that we are part of a university we have our own sense of integrity and mission and you do not dictate to us. If I thought they were dictating to us I would be firmly on the side of protecting the law faculty.

If the profession told us to stop wasting our time on perspective courses, and they wanted all mandatory upper year course so that there was no space for students to do exploratory stuff, to investigate subject matters and so on, I would certainly be on the barricades resisting that. But, the challenge right
now is that our students are telling us, and the world is telling us, “the articling student system is breaking down, you are going to have to produce more practice ready lawyers or your students will not be competitive.” So we can say “Oh, this is bad because now the world is telling us what to do” or we can look at it as: if are responsible for more that gives us more opportunities to prepare students in the way we think students should be prepared, which is not narrowly, form filling and purely pragmatic.

We have an opportunity to do more but if we are responsible to cover more of what it takes to make you practice ready we can rise to the challenge. If the world wants people to be practice ready then practice management has to be part of our preparation, as we do not traditionally do a lot of practice management. I think that is a great opportunity. We can ask questions that people go through their whole lives not asking: Why do we bill on the basis of time rather than result? What is the appropriate work life balance?

The profession once you are out there tends to value you in terms of your monetary productivity, but are there other models of valuation that you want to put on yourself and your life? I am not saying we preach one thing or another, but what a great opportunity to get people to go into the profession thinking critically.

LS: I think the reaction of most of the mainstream schools has been concern, as everyone is worried about change. If you step back and look at what Lakehead is doing, it is not revolutionary. When I look at your required courses you could easily do what we are doing at Lakehead. The academia could still be there, in fact the theoreticians could still be there and we could augment them in terms of the teaching.

What does create pressures though is size. You cannot keep increasing your size. Queens just increased by, I think another fifty or so. What we are doing with sixty, making money and offering a tuition that is the lowest in Ontario, it worries them. A lot of schools have fat in the sense that they have reduced the teaching loads of so many of their faculty members. Lakehead has a higher teaching load, and thus less fat.

BPS: And what is the teaching load?

LS: Fifteen credit hours a year instead of twelve, so that is higher but we have smaller classes. You go to some schools and it is less than that, so they
feel threatened by our teaching load because that means they might have to teach an additional course. No one wants to do that.

The experience that I have had with the legal profession that, especially with regard to the integrated performance curriculum, was that the law society did not come with inspectors. Instead, they have asked me “have you done certain things,” I said, “yes, here is what we have done.” They are doing exactly what you said. They are saying “We trust you.”

I think that level of trust is one of the things that is lacking. I did not realize this, I don’t know if you do, but there is real mistrust between the law schools and the law society in Ontario. I do not know the whole history but there is a lot of bad blood between them.

BPS: Is it recent?

LS: No, I think this has been building for ten or fifteen years. The law schools would not give the law society boo and then of course that is part of the Common Law Degree task force and the articling task force. Then the law society started to flex its muscles and started to push back, because the actual relationship with the Ontario schools is pushback, everything was pushback.

Now I think the deans are recognizing pushback is not working and I think some of the schools, Calgary for example, are saying “We can do this. We can do what Lakehead is doing.” They are prepared to be more amenable. I think the bigger thing, Bryan, which is interesting which hasn’t happened yet, is the Government of Canada is quite happy to send seven hundred Canadians or more overseas to study.

As soon as you get private law schools coming into Canada saying “We are going to be a practitioner school. We are going to be a school that will prepare you for the practice of law” and maybe have theory as well, it does not matter, but as soon as you have that, that could really be a game changer. Because suddenly we know that you can fill a private law school.

BPS: You could fill a soccer stadium with the people wanting to get in.

LS: You could charge $20,000 and you are off and running. Forgetting government funding, you don’t even need government funding you just do it with a tuition base and as soon as you do that I think it is going to be a real changer.
VI. IMPLEMENTING LAKEHEAD MODEL AT ROBSON HALL

BPS: Lee, I want to walk you through what you did at Lakehead. It is my intuitive sense that we are unusually well positioned at Robson to turn out students with what I call tier two competency. Tier one would be the minimum to be accredited, tier two would be the point at which the profession basically says you do not have to article.

The reason I think we are unusually suited is firstly, we teach ninety-seven credit hours, I believe most places are at ninety. Second, we have an unusually large mandatory upper year program which probably covers most, maybe almost all of what you do at Lakehead. I want to do this very pragmatically and systematically.

First year law at our school we teach the same mandatory courses that everybody does, which is contracts, criminal law, property, torts, constitutional, legal methods, which is supposed to be an introduction to clinical skills and is primarily memorandum writing and research, and we do legal systems which is an introduction to perspectives and puts the legal system in context and is an introduction to jurisprudence. What would we have to do, we have thirty-three credit hours, what would we have to do to be on par with what you do at Lakehead?

LS: Very little. The one thing that we did, which Bond did, was we integrated skills in all of our courses. In criminal law for example the skill is oral advocacy so our students will do a bail and do a sentencing hearing and an oral argument. You do that a little bit in your methods, at least you used to do that, but we probably do a little bit more. Memo writing would be done in torts. Legal argument writing in constitution. So we had set skills identified for every course. The easy change could occur there, as you still have your small classes I believe?

BPS: We do thirty-five. We have been under some pressure to go from three sections to two, but we have got the smaller classes. You hired, as I understand, people who were comfortable doing those smaller classes and you were in an unusually favourable position from that respect because you could start from ground zero. My sense of it is, if I were an administrator, which is never going to happen, I would try to find a way where I can implement this without asking anyone to go outside of their margin of comfort. Where do you do your legal argument, is it constitutional?
LS: Yes.

BPS: My inclination would be to say that a credit of constitutional will be devoted to doing a mock legal argument, but you as the professor do not have to do it. If you do not want to do it we can bring in a sessional to do it, or we can have one of the three professors do it, or do it in a way in which we are not asking you to do something that you do not want to do, something that you are not equipped to do. We will provide you with the extra resources to do it. At worst it is cutting into the rest of your time. Is that how you do it?

LS: Yeah. In fact, you would not even do it for the one credit. You have certain advantages, first of all you are the only law school in Manitoba. You have over twelve hundred or thirteen hundred lawyers in the city as a resource. You could just beef up your methods. We have thirty-six hours in first year not thirty-eight, Manitoba used to be thirty-eight hours, in other words students can handle more hours.

So one of the easiest things you can possibly do is say, “ok, let’s keep our existing courses the way they are.” Unfortunately that does create the divide between theory and practice because suddenly you have one course which is like writing and methods. We wanted to try to avoid that by integrating the practical elements, by providing the resources, be it one practitioner or two practitioners, having them handle whatever the exercise is going to be and providing the instructor with an opportunity to be involved if they want to be. Please keep in mind that you have to mark these things. There are going to be written arguments that have to be marked. Easiest thing to do is assign skill instructors for those courses and if the instructor wishes to, they can be part of it. You have to look at it progressively.

Probably your objective down the road is to have all the instructors become skills teachers as well, but starting off you are going to have resistance and you are going to find that if you can make life easier by having the skills instructors that would be very easy to do. You do not even need one credit, incidentally, like the bail. What we would do for bail is, sure, I talk about advocacy, just basic principles of advocacy, give information, we would do a demo with defence counsel and crown. We then have them do the exercise and we limited time but we bring in judge practitioners who give feedback and then three weeks later they do sentencing. So we
progressively build on it, but it does not take a lot from the actual subject and would not even require one credit.

**BPS:** Now we are under enormous pressure resource wise. Central administration just subjected us to a four percent across the board cut. On the other hand we do have incredibly cheap tuition by Canadian standards and we did propose a tuition increase last year, but students were very unfavourable to it. My view is students were unfavourable to it because they did not see a connection between increased burden to them and the deliverables.

If you said to them “we are raising your tuition by a thousand bucks.” A thousand bucks times three hundred students would buy you a lot of sessionals. It would not be difficult with even a modest increase if students saw it as getting to tier two competency to use some of that money, maybe hiring one faculty member who teaches the skills stuff or maybe a bunch of sessionals but I cannot see how if we were just adding three credit hours and it was for particular purposes how that would be very expensive.

**LS:** It isn’t and that is the fallacy, because a lot of times people think skill education is expensive, it is not. At Lakehead we have to pay them a certain salary, I think in Manitoba it is lower, something like $7,500 for a course. Yeah it is pretty cheap, but you still have to sell it. You have to show them how it can be done. Just look at it very simply. We hire, because I am involved but say I was not involved, you know what I could get a skilled sessional and two other people involved for less than $5,000 a course. You have all of those courses, and I am not talking about one section I am talking about the full course, one hundred students. You could have say three of these practitioners.

**BPS:** So it would cost you $15,000 to get the people you needed.

**LS:** No crim is five, because all we are asking is that they come in and preside over a bail. Practitioners love to come here to preside over exercises, provide feedback, prepare a problem. It would be a very inexpensive option.

**BPS:** I mean looking at the most cost effective options, suppose you had to hire three sessionals to do this stuff, the cost for us would be about $10,000. For a hundred students the cost per student is $100. If that is what is required, then it is a very inexpensive route.
LS: And that is your first year covered.

BPS: So imagine with a $1,000 tuition increase—which is a lot less than we proposed—what you could do in terms of enhancing us to tier two competency. It seems eminently doable. I think it is doable politically on the following constraints: first, you tell people like me that they don’t have to do something extra, they don’t have to change what they are doing. The faculty will get the extra resources and in doing so would address people’s anxieties about being forced to do a different mold. Second, the faculty stating that they recognize that the world has changed and the specific deliverable that they want to give the students is the ability to avoid having to article. I would think from the students perspective that would be quite attractive.

LS: I think it would be. The one advantage of the Bond model is the integrating and mapping of skills. You map the skills so that you can see what skills you have in second year and what skills are required moving into third year. It is not an expensive approach. The model of methods for example, Methods as a course could disappear if you incorporate it into other courses. The difficulty in Manitoba has always been that you are doing this practical skills thing that seems divorced and as a result the students seem to take it as a second rate because it is not a real course. Suddenly when you are doing a memo as part of torts or a contract draft exercise, constitutional argument, it has more meaning and it is taken seriously.

BPS: Our Methods course is by far the most expensive course right now because we have five people who teach five credit hours in methods. And I am not criticizing those people at all, but from an economic standpoint there is no other course in which we have five full time people.

How do we—and I am trying to think very operationally here—get to be in the position where we can go to the Law Society of Manitoba, the Law Society of Upper Canada, and say “We’re tier two competency just like Lakehead.” How do we know exactly what we have to do so that they say “Yeah, your student’s don’t have to article?”

LS: I think what you do is you go to the Federation, and frankly they have simplified the whole competencies that they have got. One of the difficulties that you will find is it will require courses, you are not only making a decision that the student is competent in law but that they are competent
in lawyering skills. So that means, under the Federation requirements for law, they require wills and estates. We have a mandatory wills and estates course.

**BPS:** We don’t, although almost everyone is takes it.

**LS:** Yeah and maybe you will have some students who will opt out, who do not have to be part of this. We have taken the view that it is all mandatory. It is who we are. It is all in the Federation. It is quite straightforward. You start with the skills in first year, you identify the skills. I think what they would want to see in the second year is, what do we have mandatory in the second year? Advocacy I think you need. It should be a capstone course, which would mean more resources. For example, in our civil practice program we had five practitioners involved as well as an instructor, so it was almost like Methods. That is $35,000 for the one course, but it is a full year course.

**BPS:** Again, going to second and third years, what we would do operationally if we wanted to do what you do, keeping in mind that we are not going to do exactly what Lakehead does. We are doing it in our own way. It is going to be a Manitoba thing. What we would do is go to the Federation of Law Societies, see what they would require for tier two competency, look at our program, and adjust what we have to in order to qualify.

So we would either take on new hires who want to do this sort of stuff, or use additional resources to hire sessionals. The first way to do it could be a modest tuition increase. Nobody would have to change what they are doing. My view is that there is no point in saying that the Law Society of Manitoba should give us this money because we are saving them the burden. That is not going to happen. The Law Society of Manitoba is still going to have to do some professional education for people who come from out of province and out of country so they are not going to go out of business.

In any event, I don’t think you hold up what you want to do based on a complicated negotiation with somebody who is not under your control. You say, “What can we do within our own abilities.” Our own abilities certainly in the future will include a modest tuition increase, which we are not going to get unless we can tell students what they are getting for it. I think what they get for it is the ability to get out of here without articling.
LS: If there is a will there you can easily do it. I think you have to increase your hours slightly. Keep in mind what you do in second and third year, correct me if I am wrong, you reduce your hours in second and third year, don’t you?

BPS: Only modestly. It is sixty-four between the two.39

LS: It is interesting how you start with thirty-three hours and go down to thirty-two in the final two. We go thirty-six, thirty-six, thirty-six.

BPS: The only reason I bring it up is that one of the suggestions is that we go the opposite way. What do you think about that?

LS: What do you mean?

BPS: We go down to ninety because that is what the norm is and that is what students by and large are in favour of. Now I recognize that not every student government speaks for every student but when you sit in faculty council and say “the one thing we can do for sure without increasing tuition is go down to ninety, because the law society requires ninety and everyone will go “Yay!”

LS: I am not sure students would think that way. It depends on how it is sold. Here is the interesting thing, I got lambasted from the faculty of nursing, rightly so, for a comment I made about how hard law students work. They said, “You know what, you have no idea. Our people go for these hours et cetera, et cetera and you are complaining about eighteen credit hours.” Other faculties do have hours that are exceed those of law.

BPS: You mean for teachers or students or both?

LS: For students mainly. You cannot just have everybody planning to do their exercises in the same week. We sit down and we organize it. We sit down and say “week one we have this, week two this” so we all know when the assignments are coming in. You have got to do that if you are going to increase the hours, but I think students are willing to go the extra hours if it is going to get them more.

---

39 Robson Hall requires 32 credits each year in second and third year of law. Please see online: <http://law.robsonhall.com/current-students1/registration/>.
BPS: If they have an extra three credit hours a year but they save themselves a year of articling.

LS: It is six because it is three in the first term, three in the second. So if you added six credit hours you do not have to get into a battle about some of the electives disrupting others. The beauty of what you have got is you are going to keep everything the same, but you are just going to add where you have to.

For example I think one course you would need in second or third year is a course that we have created called ‘The Business of Law’. Most students have no idea about the business of law, so we talk about how to bill, how to deal with clients and all of that stuff. Everyone is raving about it and I have seen the outline from the instructor, it is going to be a great course. That is quite easy to add.

BPS: It is a small incremental change for us already because our baseline is thirty-two to thirty-three so you are adding three credit hours. Again it is going to cost more but my view is students would accept a modest tuition increase if they saw it as giving them the option of tier two competency.

That brings me to the last point. I have raised it a couple of times, as we have a constant debate here about mandatory versus non-mandatory. Nobody seems to have a problem with the idea that you can get specialized in a particular area here. A couple of years ago we talked about becoming certified as a specialist in human rights, a specialist in Aboriginal law, a specialist in business. What if we said you can keep on the old curriculum for anyone that wants it, even loosen it up a bit, allowing you to take whatever you want, but if you want to do this program then it is thirty-six hours a year and you will get a practice ready certification.

I don’t necessarily like that option because I think we have a certain responsibility to ensure that everybody who comes out of here meets a certain standard. Not all of my colleague agree, but certainly as a compromise I can see saying to people, “You don’t have to do this enhanced program, you don’t have to do the tier two competency program, but if you want, you have the option of doing thirty-six hours a year and you end up saving yourself a year of articling and you get to identify that you’re practice ready on your resume, which will help you get a job.” I would think the take up would be at least ninety-nine percent.
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LS: I think I would keep the option to opt out because there are always a few who would do that and that way you avoid that battle quite frankly. It is not unique, the University of Queensland already has that, they have had that for decades. If you want to go into practice you have to take civil procedure and evidence for example, then you are credited you can write the bar or whatever. If you do not take those you simply get your law degree but are not accredited. So they already have that. I don’t know the numbers of who does what. It seems to me bizarre. Why you wouldn’t take those courses and get accredited I don’t know.

BPS: There is an episode of South Park called “The Simpsons Already Did That” about how every plot has already been done by The Simpsons. Of course someone has already done that, so it turns out that my idea of having the option of being practice ready or not, Queensland has already done it. But that is a good thing because I think it is easier to sell ideas when someone else has already done it.

LS: I think everyone is in favour of some practice oriented experience. Our students in this coming year, Lakehead students, half of them are going on placement in the fall term, half of them are going on placement in the winter term, and these are unpaid placements because they are university credit courses. You people already have a lot of credit hours, but there is nothing stopping this from occurring during the summer. There needs to be some sort of practical oriented work in a law firm for periods of time. The beauty of it is you have a large city, Winnipeg. In Thunder Bay I don’t have as many lawyers.

BPS: Now how do you address concerns over control of academic quality if clinical work is supervised by a practitioner?

LS: Well here is my suggestion. To avoid that you call it a placement. It is a work placement. When you look at nursing or medicine or whatever they are not marking, they are generally assessing. Now at Lakehead we have one hundred and eight hours because we have thirty-six, thirty-six, thirty-six. Eighteen of those are the placement. So we are not there worrying about evaluating.

If someone does not do a placement, if they don’t act professionally, they will fail. On top of that we still have the ninety core courses that we assess. We want experience in the law firm, we want an articling experience
if you like, for a shorter period of time. Can you do that here? I think you can do that. I think the Winnipeg firms would be amenable.

We had issues with a lot of the firms wanting to pay and we had to fight them to say “no” and the reason for that is quite simple. Our students don’t have to article, they are getting out a year early. They do not have to pay articling fees that are associated with that and we want them to go to smaller centres where practitioners generally won’t take articling students because smaller firms don’t. It is a big ask and we don’t want to get into a bidding war in terms of salaries et cetera, and university insurance, et cetera, et cetera.

**BPS:** Then they are not really a student. If they start getting paid you want them to produce deliverables to the law firm and we want this to be an educational program.

**LS:** Exactly, and to go back to how do we assess. We have a small staff, but we have a person who would be contacting the firms, contacting the students, ensuring the firms are accredited establishments, just as much as they do for articling if not more.

At the end of the day it is a placement, it is experience based more than anything else. The feedback we were getting from the firms was that they were saying “I am going to have the student sit in on a trial.” And I am just thinking when I was an articling student I had to fight to sit in a trial. They are taking it as a mentorship. They are not looking at it as billable hours because they say “We don’t have to worry about paying this guy.” It is a real change that occurred. You may find opposition from firms that are used to articling here. You can still say “you can still article, you can still do that whole process but would you be willing to take a placement student for three months?”

Students do recognize, as with nursing and medicine and teaching, that placements can be part of the education. With teaching for example, we all went on placements as teachers, we were not expecting to get paid for that, but when we graduated in May, guess what? We can write the bar exam.

**BPS:** How do you get around that?

**LS:** They have to write it. They don’t have to article but everyone has to write the exam.
BPS: One thing that I think we could start doing here, we are already starting to do this coming year, is use the CPLED exams with the instructors concurrence, so that they can administer the CPLED exam. Say you are teaching family, you use the CPLED exam as part of your evaluation and students can say “I already passed six out of twelve CPLED exams.” They are even closer to being practice ready.

LS: You could do that. There is not one way of doing it. You could certainly do it that way but I think there would have to be a practical component. However, it could certainly be abridged over the year of articling.

VII. DEAN OF LAKEHEAD

BPS: The last thing I want to cover was your experience deanng over at Lakehead. You have almost the unique opportunity of starting a law school from scratch. I say almost because Chris Axworthy did that recently at Thompson River. Trinity Western is trying to set something up, but it is relatively unique.

Now you had to fight some battles with central administration distinctively geared with the legal profession. You also had many encounters with the Law Society but you managed to persuade them. It seems to me that being a dean in an academic environment is an exceptionally difficult task emotionally. Most of the people that come into your office are something of a problem, if they are doing fine they are not in your office and you do not hear from them for years because everything is fine.

You came from life as an academic where you could have quite a contained life. There were certain student pressures to teach a certain way and you were quite demanding and did not have any trouble fighting those off. Now you are in an environment where I am guessing you have to deal with a lot of people who are difficult not only because they disagree with you on policy terms but as one often finds in academia, they are difficult people and quite emotional. Is there anything you can tell us about how you survived that, what advice you might give?

LS: Well I don’t know that I did survive all that well. You know it is interesting, Chris, when he left Thompson Rivers, made a comment that

40 Chris Axworthy was the Founding Dean of Law at Thompson Rivers University's law school in 2011. Prior to that he served as Dean of Robson Hall.
his biggest problem was the university and I think that is actually a fair comment for me. Especially smaller universities which are not used to professional programs.

We had constant battles. I mean the battles were focused on the fact that they had a way of doing things that you just shake your head at. Remember, I am not a centralist believer in “Yes we do it that way.” But why are we doing it that way? It does not seem to make too much sense. So we had constant battles from the get go. You have to keep your sense of humour because they were so bizarre, that if you did not keep your sense of humour you would go nuts.

I mean, just to share with you some of the silliness, we had to go to battle to get keys to have access to our building. We would have to be nine to five or else we would have to call security to gain access. It reached a point where I said “Enough is enough. I want a meeting with the President, we are going to sit down and damn it all we are going to get those keys.” We fortunately won that but the university wanted us to go in a certain mold which was difficult. The Law Society has been excellent. The legal profession has been excellent. They have been so supportive. The Law Society has shown nothing but support for us and has not interfered either. That is the other thing. That is the worry that a lot of law schools have, but it has not been an issue for us at all.

**BPS:** What about the other law deans? Do they always see you as threatening? Were they seeing you as subverting the academic autonomy?

**LS:** Yes, it wasn’t so much me that they were worried about because they could always isolate Lakehead. They could always say “That was the northern Ontario solution.” Their biggest worry was that one of the southern Ontario six would jump ship.

The one they were most concerned with, was not Queens, it was not Windsor; they almost isolate Windsor. It was Osgoode that they were worried about because they were the so called experiential school. They were actually worried that if somebody else went down this route they would all have to follow. They were not really receptive to what we were doing but they could live with us because we were isolated and unique.

**BPS:** Yeah, that is like, “We are not really competing for the student market for Lakehead so we are ok for now.” We have interviewed a lot of people who have followed this career arc. Maybe it is a romantic vision but what I
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spout these days is really the old way was better when a dean was doing it as a part of their career, it was not about advancement, “I want to be a Vice-President” or “I want to be a judge.” It was somebody who was giving back as a service at the end of their career, who had the maturity that comes with being beaten up over a lifetime.

Maybe they were not as invested in their own stature, instead trying to leave the world a little better and not being concerned about every slight. That is probably on the whole what you want in a dean. Somebody who is doing it as a service at the end of their career, not doing it as part of the managerial progression. From hearing you describe this whole experience it kind of sounds like the way your career worked out. It is something you did at the end of your academic career, you did not need a job.

LS: I think frankly we have gone full circle because that is what universities don’t want. Universities don’t want someone who doesn’t need the job. Someone who doesn’t need the job can tell administration what they think. The interesting thing, which you may or may not have been aware of, is that of all the universities, Manitoba would not be any different; they all have the senior management crew, and of course the deans are involved in the senior management crew, and they have the administrative arms, well I have been involved in those at Lakehead, the only people who would say that something is not working, the only people who would say that something is wrong, were the deans.

Why? Because all have tenure, what is the worst you are going to do? You are going to remove me from dean? Fine, I am a full professor. All of the other administrators wouldn’t say boo, but that is what central wants. They actually want the person who will be more compliant because they get to control that person a little more. I think I have respect for the president but I would look at him and say, “Brian, I don’t think that is going to work and here is why.” I don’t think too many other people would do that but I would hope that universities would appreciate that.

BPS: I wanted to ask one more question. This has to deal with this whole ability to speak your mind. There is a natural tendency to think everything was better in the old days. We sometimes don’t remember what things were really like and instead “recall” a golden era that is largely imagined. But here is what I remember.

I remember when I started out, and you started out not much later, we would have sometimes very frank conversations on issues at faculty council
and people would be quite assertive in what they thought was right and what they thought was wrong about proposals. I don’t remember any of us being scared about taking a controversial minority position on faculty council having it counted against us at tenure or promotion time. Or that if we were really demanding of the students that bad reviews on the SEEQ would come back and we would not get tenure or promotion. Impressionistically I see a generation of new people who seem quite apprehensive, considering things like, “Well if I say this to faculty council then students will hold it against me and it will show up on the SEEQs and I won’t get tenure” or “I can’t afford to tick off my senior colleague who will hold it against me at tenure and promotion time.” I don’t remember thinking that way in the old days.

LS: I don’t think we did, because we are used to arguing, used to disagreeing. At the end of the day I may disagree, I may not be happy with the decision, but I had my say and I move on. You are not going to get that with administrators these days, they have very thin skins. So if you challenge them or argue against them it becomes personal and suddenly you are marked. That is a change.

When I look at mistakes made I think about Thompson River and how many people they hired in the first year. I guess they needed to because they lost the government funding so they needed more tuition and therefore more classes.

At Lakehead we needed to hire some grey hair and of course we did not have anyone applying to come to Thunder Bay. It is not one of the most attractive places but we needed that experience and that was a weakness that we had. I was very frugal so we would always hire what we needed to cover but not extra and maybe we needed to hire extra because we are still short, there are still not enough, they are still going to be hiring. So there were mistakes made in that regard, but younger faculty are so preoccupied with tenure and promotion for the most part that just drives their agenda. I must admit I did not even think about it until three years in and I said “Oh I guess it is time.” That actually is being foisted on them by the administration, not by myself but by the administration. It is a different atmosphere.

BPS: There are several dimensions to it. One of them is security in your position. Looking back at my career I am still very proud of the fact that I had a great role in the strike of 1995 because the issue really was in effect the preservation of tenure. I know a lot of people just think it is feather
bedding by academics and lack of accountability but I actually have very strong sense as somebody who is always taking controversial positions on large scale issues, not just small issues, that it was very important to have some security.

The other issue I think is a cultural issue. There are certain things that just, I always say, aren't done because they just aren't done. Forget about the formal rules and the job security. What would have been unthinkable for a central administrator, like having career consequences for challenging them, that was unthinkable in the old days even by really strong minded administrators. I don't think people have those unspoken cultural barriers that things aren't done because this is a university. I do not have the sense that the managerial university has the same tolerance for dissent that it might have had culturally a while back.

LS: Yeah, I am not sure about that. My only experience, and maybe it is just Ontario, but the administrations are extremely timid. With respect to faculty members they do not want to do anything. If anything the faculty members have far far too much power.

BPS: You are never going to fire me, let's go?

LS: That's right. If anything Bryan, it's the administrations. They are typical administrators who want to do nothing. The easiest thing is always to do nothing. I was at Bond and we did not have tenure, but I also saw the excesses there when management decides to go after someone who is just speaking out. So it is problematic, I have seen both extremes.

BPS: My sense is that there is a price to be paid for tenure and job security and it does mean at a certain point if someone wants to do the absolute minimum or even a little bit less than the absolute minimum, there is a fair amount of ability to get away with that. The benefit that you are getting from that is you are generally giving daring creative people the ability to do their daring creative thing and yeah, one of the prices you pay for having that measure of freedom is some people will take advantage.

Tenure allows some individuals to keep writing books and making speeches that criticize people in power, maybe the reason for doing so is that they have a certain amount of job security. However, I don’t delude myself, I think it is quite probable that for a certain number of people tenure is like, I can kick my feet up, gone sailing, what have you.
LS: I guess from a dean’s perspective, and we actually had this round table discussion of all the deans at Lakehead, we came to the conclusion that we could do nothing.

BPS: You could change nothing?

LS: We could do nothing. If we had a faculty member who wasn’t doing their job, we could do nothing. It was a very sad conclusion around the table. We had one of our faculty members from another faculty who said, well the person has not done any writing so I am going to put that in their annual report, give a negative assessment on that and the provost said “You can’t do that.” And he said, “Well what do I do because I have eighty percent of the faculty working very hard, but they will gripe.” The response was, “Yeah but if they have not done any publishing, what is the problem?” We had an administration that was not prepared to back up the deans. With tenure there is good and bad. I guess we are always sitting with that, and maybe twenty percent of the faculty is too high.

BPS: Five to ten?

LS: Yeah, there is a percentage who are not doing their job and you should be able to do something with them. The reality is that over the twenty years that I was here in Manitoba there were some members not pulling their weight and we often rewarded them by having them do less.

BPS: The price of freedom is a certain amount of indolence. Earlier in the interview there was something I said we would get back to, a question we have asked a lot of our interviewees about: what is the incentive system? You mention that it is forty-forty-twenty but what is the incentive system? My sense is that the reward system, the credential system, not just in the university but in the outside world, if you are thinking in purely careerist terms I would advise any person to put more into the scholarship because that is where the money is, that is where the recognition is, that is where the reward is.

LS: Yep, that is exactly what has happened. The unfortunate thing is that it is very difficult for the administration to identify poor teaching. Basically, the university structure says that our hands are tied in terms of identifying poor teaching and I think that is true for most universities. If we say to a person, “that person is a poor teacher” how do we prove it? Whereas if there
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BPS: Looking back you have people who were excellent teachers at our place who were also outstanding scholars. It did not seem to be a pattern of someone being a great scholar and as a result not paying any attention to teaching. If you look at people like Phil Osborne, John Irvine, and Barney Sneideman, it seems to be a very high synergy, a group who were all very productive scholars and very excellent teachers.

It seems to me in principle how it should work because as you were mentioning earlier, if it is working properly you are bringing your scholarly insights into the classroom and if you are good at classroom teaching you are getting student feedback which helps your scholarship. I kind of question whether one has to be at expense of the other or if they are mutually reinforcing.

LS: It is interesting because we have new instructors at Lakehead and I was invited to provide advice to them, so I was there to just watch and listen. Lo and behold some of the senior people urged the new instructors to get a research agenda, and I am just sitting there thinking, “Holy these people don’t even know how to teach.” So I spoke up and said, “I don’t think that is the way to do it at all, it seems to me that you should focus on teaching and recognize this. For your first time teaching you probably will have no time to do the research. Give yourself some time.” But the message that central was giving was totally contrary to that and with all due respect to central, I think it is wrong. We should give new people time and tell them to get their teaching first.

BPS: We send the opposite signal now. It is a central university program to give you release time in your early years teaching so you can focus on your scholarship. The message I am receiving from central admin is that research is what is important.

LS: Exactly, but they will pay lip service to the primacy of teaching, you know this whole thing of student experience, as long as it does not cost the university money. I really believed in student experience at Lakehead. That means we had to fight for common rooms, we had to fight for amenities, we had to fight for things for students because the university just did not
get it. The whole package is important and that means having your own faculty of law building, your own library, those things. I insisted when I went there that I had control of the library, that the budget was in the faculty of law, not through the central library. It is all a part of student experience, which I don’t think central likes because it costs them.

**BPS:** To me this is a problem of feedback. We always have enough students to fill our places. I will never forget I had a meeting once where we were trying to find ways to get the best students to come and one of my colleagues actually said, “Well we always have enough students, we always fill the spaces.” On the other hand good scholarship, or recognized scholarship, which are not always the same, brings in money. So central administration of course prioritizes when good teaching does not bring in an extra dime but scholarship brings in a big SSHRC or NSERC grant.

To backtrack a bit, we were talking about credentialing and one of the problems was that period in the 1990s where there just weren't academic jobs. There was that very serious problem where the generation before you was still around and they were not going anywhere for a while and so people who were academically minded said, “Ok I don’t really want to go into a job where I am going to put on the golden handcuffs, because if I am in a law firm for four years I am going to be making way more money than I am going to see working academically and I am academically oriented so I will go do a PhD.”

Once we did that you are now comparing somebody who did a masters and then a PhD with someone who just did a Masters. Nobody wants to say, “A PhD? Come on, you were just spinning your wheels.” So suddenly it became comparing apples and oranges so you have one plus one is four essentially. Masters plus PhD is far and away better than Masters alone. I think it is fair to say that you favour the practitioner-scholar model, but due to demographic conditions that had nothing to do with getting better teachers or even getting better researchers, but simply because they had better credentials, we have strayed from that. So what do you do with that now that you have got it?

**LS:** Don’t forget the other thing is once that has occurred now you have the PhD mills in Osgoode and Toronto in particular, who have to justify why you have to do a PhD so they are pushing to insist upon that type of thing because that becomes the norm. Look I don’t think we should hold a PhD against someone but surely we have to recognize that someone else, through
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a different pathway, has an enormous amount to give to the law school as well. The problem is, once again this whole notion, and I have seen it before, I saw it in Australia at Bond. Don’t forget that Bond was a different mold, but we were forced through federal funding, so you have got to hire PhD. That is almost exactly what had occurred. There were very limited exceptions.

BPS: But you were a private university.

LS: We were getting government funding.

BPS: The power of the purse.

LS: The power of the purse was indicating that you have to do certain things and that was unfortunate.

BPS: And we are now seeing that if you want to go through into central administration, or if you want to do other things, suddenly well wait a minute, you don’t have the basic credentials anymore, you don’t have a PhD.

There are very few Canadian law schools that offer PhD programs, which means people are being funneled through a very small number of schools. I think some of them have very strong ideological perspectives, which means you are tending to reinforce the ideological monism of the academy.

LS: Yes, that is fair. Look at Harvard, I cannot speak of Yale, but let’s face it, the top American schools, when you look at the hiring going on at Harvard they are not all PhDs. They have the self-confidence to go with the best people however they are created. However, for smaller schools, who don’t have that confidence, it seems to be that they have to go this particular route. That route is the indication of quality, which is the PhD.

Look, the PhD is a good thing to have, but what about four or five years of practice plus a great LLM plus marks? I mean in terms of hiring I always looked back at the law school grades, I had to. I think Bryan, you are the one that said this, “If you have a professor that is not smarter than half of the class then you have got trouble.” You would often go back to the grades from undergraduate and it was shocking in some cases. We would often know why people are going into grad school, it is because no law firm was going to hire them.
BPS: Can I ask you about two other names we have not mentioned yet? One because I think it is important to you, and that is Gordy Dilts. I think you have talked in other venues about Gordy Dilts and you took great pride in being largely built in that mold.

LS: Well I think Gordy Dilts was a superb character and you know what, no education background or whatever but he put together the common sense view, which was the advocacy program and did a great job, there is no doubt about that. But he was part of that period, Keith Turner, himself, practitioner oriented. But you know wouldn’t it be wonderful to have a Gordy Dilts around? We have got yourself, we have Bryan, strong academics, what is wrong with having a strong practitioner there as part of the faculty? Not isolated as a clinician over here but part of the faculty. That just makes things so much richer.

BPS: We have gotten rid of the practitioners.

LS: I think that is the problem. Gordy Dilts would never be hired full time now and sure there were too many Gordy Dilts’ and Keith Turners and such in the 1960s and 1970s, sure there were. But now where are they? There are none of them and they brought a wealth of experience. Gordy was just a character. We need characters.

BPS: Cliff Edwards.\(^\text{41}\)

LS: Yeah what can you say about Cliff? I always tell the stories, there is nothing new in legal education because Cliff, and Bryan you remember this, at Law Faculty Council meetings, Cliff would always say, “Yeah we tried that, back in 1973, didn’t work then, won’t work now.” Cliff was a person of integrity. What a wonderful person to have actually created the law school here.

BPS: I think it was ironic to me that people who did not know him from the old days and came onto the faculty viewed him as sort of this stuffy old guy who must be from some upper class environment since he was born somewhere outside of England and was a missionary in Africa. This is a guy that was head of the Law Reform Commission for thirty-three years. This is

\(^{41}\) Cliff Edwards, Dean of Robson Hall 1964-79.
a guy that brought people from all kinds of backgrounds who had never been in legal education before.

Cliff hired people who had radically different political views from his own. Like I said, Cliff was there, Cliff was actually remarkably open to trying just about anything and giving people leeway to try stuff. Yet people would hear the accent or know that he was a fundamentalist Christian and just have all kinds of stereotypes, “Oh he must be close minded or very narrow minded in his perspective on the world.” What was it that he taught?

**LS:** Legal History.

**BPS:** And that was part of the legal systems course?

**LS:** Yes.

**BPS:** What was that like when he was at his prime?

**LS:** You could see he loved teaching. He loved it. He loved history. He was a great teacher. He knew great teaching and he cared about it. And you have to hand it to him, he created the culture that carried through for a long time at Robson Hall.

**BPS:** And yet he would not be hired again. Did he even have a Masters?

**LS:** I think he may have had a Masters.

**BPS:** But he did not have a PhD and if you look at the traditional forms of education I don’t know if there is anything there. The Cliff Edwards of today, just like the Lee Stuesser of today, probably would not have been hired. That does not mean that everybody should be. It is not that I don’t want people to be very successful in traditional scholarly formats, it is just that we do not have an openness to hiring differently educated people.

**LS:** It is interesting, we go right back, it is the lack of diversity and that is actually a message that I had when I was here, which was what is wrong with diversity? What is wrong with having the great scholars here, the great practitioners here? Everyone has got to teach though. I mean I always think there is this pressure to move to teaching-only-hiring and from a dean’s perspective there is a certain attraction to it.

**BPS:** Teaching only hiring?
LS: Basically a person does not have to research, they can do teaching alone. I know a lot of deans are in favour of that but of course that will mean that we will have researchers only and I think that is the negative.

BPS: Yeah, at our place, and what we have heard at clinical conferences, one of which you came to here, is this sort of two tier law school. There are people at a lower rank, lower prestige who deliver more of the teaching and it sort of reinforces the view that if you are only a teacher then I guess I am only a scholar, rather than encouraging this kind of integrated view of the world.

LS: I think there are certain people on the faculty, Lisa and Vivian, they were basically teachers, but what contributing people they were, and are, I mean wow. Once again, what is wrong with a little diversity.

BPS: That is a very interesting approach to it. This has been for me extremely informative, thank you Lee.

LS: It has been nice to see you guys again. It has been an interesting ride to be on both sides. To be on the administration side sometimes you have to give your head a shake because as professors you have it pretty easy. As an administrator, everybody comes to you with their problems.

An interesting thing about students is we have found early intervention with students was critical. We let the word out to all of the faculty, if there is someone not attending, because we have mandatory attendance too, or if somebody is struggling, tell us immediately and we found usually it is the first month or so someone is not doing well. Call them in and ask, “What is going on?”

The fact that we knew that they were attending or not seemed to really have an impact. Some of them, I know one of them in particular sat where you are sitting Bryan and said, “We have certain results coming in, I know you are working, I know you have a family, but you know what, you cannot do both. It is up to you but if you continue to work you are going to fail.” He said, “I have been thinking about that too.” The bottom line is most of our students cannot work. It is nice to see we have these students who, if we had not done anything, they would have crashed and burned.

BPS: I was talking to Gerry about how we gave out tough marks back in the day and the philosophy then was that you are doing the student a favour
because if they are not making it in first year and are just falling over the finish line in future years, then not getting a decent job, they are sinking time and money into that. But psychologically my sense is that it is pretty hard to fail first year. People still fail but the psychology is, they are getting pressure from their family and they don’t really want to be in law school so you shoot me.

**LS:** They want the policeman to shoot them. Suicide by cop. We see the same thing.

**BPS:** We have made it virtually impossible if you stay long enough. If you make it through first year you are going to graduate.

**LS:** Yeah I know, and we have tried to offset that, the error of Manitoba's way, if we could, not only Manitoba, most of the law schools are like that.