

# Dalhousie Law Journal

---

Volume 8 | Issue 1

Article 6

---

1-1-1984

## The Faculty of Law, University of British Columbia, 1970-1981

A. J. McClean

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.schulichlaw.dal.ca/dlj>

 Part of the [Education Law Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](#).

---

### Recommended Citation

A. J. McClean, "The Faculty of Law, University of British Columbia, 1970-1981", Comment, (1984) 8:1 DLJ 185.

This Commentary is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Schulich Law Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dalhousie Law Journal by an authorized editor of Schulich Law Scholars. For more information, please contact [hannah.steeves@dal.ca](mailto:hannah.steeves@dal.ca).

# Notes and Comments

---

A.J. McClean\*

The Faculty of Law,  
University of British  
Columbia, 1970-1981

---

The period from 1957 to 1970 was from any perspective a period of rapid expansion and development in Canadian legal education. The years from 1970 until 1981 were by contrast a time of consolidation. In part that flowed almost naturally from the hectic pace of the 1960s; in part it flowed from financial restraints which became increasingly stringent in the latter half of the decade.<sup>1</sup> Not surprisingly the experience of the Faculty of Law at the University of British Columbia reflects, in varying degrees, the national pattern.

## I. *The Student Body*

The Faculty was founded in 1945. In its early years enrolment was swollen by classes made up in large measure by veterans of the Second World War. By the mid-1950s the number of students was hovering around 200, and it increased only by five to ten students a year in each of the next ten years. However, there were major increases in the latter half of the 1960s so that by the academic year 1970-71 the total enrolment in the Faculty was 620. Eventually it was decided that enrolment should be limited to 700. For the last number of years, therefore, the first year class has been somewhere between 235 and 250 students, and the second and third year classes somewhere between 225 and 235. During that same period the number of women students has also increased significantly, so that now in any year the number of women is between 30 and 35% of the total enrolment.

Some regret the fact that the total numbers were allowed to reach 700; in their opinion it would have been preferable to have had a

---

\*Professor, Faculty of Law, University of British Columbia. This is an impressionistic rather than a carefully researched and documented account of the Faculty in the years 1970-1981. It is, of course, a personal and not a collective or a Faculty impression.

1. Unless a contrary intention appears from the context, "decade" refers, somewhat inaccurately, to the period 1970-1981.

student body in the region of 500. However, for a number of reasons the placing of a limitation on enrolment was not seriously debated in the Faculty until the numbers had in fact almost reached the 700 mark. In some measure the lack of debate may have been due to the sudden increase not having been fully anticipated. Even if anticipated, there may have been some inertia in reacting to it. And many members of Faculty took the view that while there was no other faculty in the province the Faculty of Law at U.B.C. was obliged to take well-qualified students up to, and even beyond, its powers to handle them comfortably. The increasing enrolment was not however accompanied by a sufficient corresponding increase in the financial support afforded to the Faculty. The result was that through much of the decade the Faculty was inadequately housed and seriously under-staffed.

From the early 1970s students who have been admitted to the Faculty have fallen into one of three categories: regular applicants, mature applicants and native students. A regular applicant must meet the standard criteria for admission, that is the completion of a prior degree (or all but one year of a degree programme), and the submission of a Law School Admission Test score. These two criteria are applied according to a fairly rigid formula, and the incoming classes selected on a rather mechanical basis. Mature applicants include those who are older than the average student, and who do not meet all of the standard academic requirements. The Faculty has a broad discretion in deciding whether or not to admit these applicants; factors which are taken into account in exercising that discretion include such things as an economically or culturally deprived background, or work experience thought to be relevant to the study of law. Native students who do not meet the standard admission requirements may also be admitted on a discretionary basis. In general these students must have completed at least two years of university work, have written the Law School Admission Test, and have attended the summer programme of legal studies for native people offered at the College of Law at the University of Saskatchewan.

It is difficult to measure the effectiveness of any admission programme so far as it operates to deny admission to applicants. It is possible to arrive at some judgment about the quality of the student actually admitted. The Faculty's experience with mature students has varied. In some cases, judged by examination results, the Admissions Committee has selected well, and in others poorly; in

all probability no other result may be expected from the selection procedure that is followed. In the early years of the native student programme there were some unhappy experiences. The selection process may not have been as rigorous as it might, and the Faculty may not have made the adjustment to the teaching of native students that needed to be made. Both the selection process and the running of a native student programme in the Faculty were placed on a sounder footing in the latter part of the decade, and in terms of examination results the programme now seems to be working well.

However, the vast majority of the students are admitted on the basis of the standard admission requirements, and it is on their performance that the admission process needs to be primarily judged. The rather mechanical approach to admissions has been the subject of some criticism. It is said that it does not fully assess all the qualities required of a lawyer. No doubt that is true, but it is doubtful if these can be effectively measured, and at least arguable that a university faculty in selecting its students should not necessarily be looking for all of the qualities which would make up the complete lawyer. However, it may well be that the process does not select students on the basis of some of the attributes — intelligence, intellectual curiosity, commitment and effort — which a university should be looking for. But amongst those who make the criticism there is not necessarily any consensus on what other attributes a student should have, or on the ways in which, once identified, those attributes could be reasonably accurately measured and assessed.

This type of criticism is often linked to what are perceived to be deficiencies in the students admitted. It seems to be agreed that there was some shift in the general character of students as the decade progressed. The law student of the early 1970s was the undergraduate of the late 60s, and many of them brought to the study of law the iconoclasm of that generation. Sacred cows were challenged, and full opportunity taken of a new curriculum that had been fashioned at the beginning of the decade.<sup>2</sup> However, as the 1970s progressed, attitudes in some measure changed. Many students appear to be much less interested in the intellectual challenge of courses which are not immediately related to the practice of law. There is a complacency on the part of some students, fostered in part by the opinion that the difficult thing about

---

2. That curriculum is discussed below.

the study of law is the obtaining of admission to a law faculty. The existence of such an attitude is said to be demonstrated by an analysis of examination results. The vast bulk of the student body end up with an overall average mark somewhere between 64 and 72 or 73%. That, it is suggested, indicates that some students, who appeared on admission to be outstanding, are quite content to do enough to ensure that they run no risk of failing, but do not commit themselves to the study of law as fully as they might. Another inference is of course that the rigour of legal study may have turned out to be a better test of their ability. The critics also point to the almost non-existent failure rate in first year. No-one would suggest that there should be a pre-determined number or percentage of students who should fail. On the other hand, the system of marking in the Faculty does permit a student to pass by attaining a prescribed over-all average, but with marks in some subjects which are either extremely low or even failing. In the middle of the decade Faculty considered a proposal to change the basis on which a student successfully completed a year. No changes were made in the existing system, mainly because the majority of Faculty thought that if a problem existed it was, relatively speaking, so small it did not justify major surgery. More recently, the issue has resurfaced, and a study is now underway into the Faculty's marking and promotion system, particularly as it affects the first year.

Those concerns, however justified, should not be allowed to detract from an over-all significant improvement in the calibre of students. Some of the severest critics of the Faculty in the profession, while questioning the ability and commitment of some students to apply themselves to the practice of law, would admit the increased intellectual ability of the Faculty's graduates. Most of those who taught for any length of time before and then during the 1970s would agree that the quality of the average student has increased significantly, whether that be judged by examination results, or by all of the other range of contact that a faculty has with its students. Even allowing for what may be a less rigorous approach to marking, there are fewer marginal and there are considerably more good or outstanding students than there used to be. The long "tail" that characterized the first year classes of the 1960s has well nigh disappeared. There are also many students who display qualities of intellect and commitment in a variety of ways, in class, in research done in courses and seminars, in moot courts, in Law Review work and in legal aid. There may be need for further

improvement; that should not blind us to the fact that considerable improvement has taken place.

## *II. The Curriculum*

The curriculum in the Faculty mirrors that introduced in the curriculum changes that were made in common law Canada in the late 1960s. The new curriculum broke with the then traditional pattern in two ways. First, it substituted for a virtually totally compulsory set of courses in the second and third year a virtually totally optional programme. At the University of British Columbia all of the first year courses remain compulsory.<sup>3</sup> In the second year a student must take a moot court, and in either second or third year take a course on Evidence and do at least one major piece of writing, either in a seminar or as a piece of directed research. These compulsory courses make up about one-eighth of the required number of units that need to be taken in order to complete the second and third years. Second, the new curriculum added a range of courses which encouraged students to look at law from a perspective other than the financial and commercial, and to consider law in the light of other disciplines. Thus courses on law and poverty, consumer protection, law and psychiatry, criminology, and empirical methods of research were added to the curriculum, and a renewed emphasis was placed on some more traditional courses such as jurisprudence or legal philosophy.

During the decade three developments of some significance took place. In chronological order they were the development of a number of clinical courses, a general review of the curriculum, and the establishment of a Japanese law programme. They did not, however, result in any departure from the structure of the curriculum as it was established at the beginning of the decade.<sup>4</sup>

If one accepts at all the distinction between the academic and the practical, the new curriculum was still an academic enterprise; it did not purport to teach the application of legal concepts, either in real or simulated situations. Some greater emphasis on the "clinical"

---

3. At present those courses are: Introduction to Legal Process, Constitutional Law; Criminal Law and Procedure; Torts; Contracts; Real Property; Legal Writing and Moot Court.

4. Three other initiatives failed to bear fruit. No progress was made on proposals to establish Law and Medicine and Law — M.B.A. programmes. A proposal to offer the LL.B. programme on a part-time basis as far as the second and third years were concerned was rejected by the Faculty.

approach appeared in the middle of the decade. Courses entitled “Clinical Criminal Law”, “Clinical Family Law”, “Trial Advocacy”, and “Clinical Term: Education in Legal Practice” were introduced, and many of the existing seminars began to develop either a real or simulated clinical element. All of the clinical courses are popular with students. Virtually all third year students take the course on “Trial Advocacy”, an offering whose format was substantially revised in the academic year 1979-80. The clinical term, by its nature, can accommodate only a limited number of students. The course is described in the University Calendar as follows:

. . . Open to a limited number of students in second or third year. Students will work in a model law office under the supervision of practising lawyers. The students will act for clients and be involved in interviewing, counselling, negotiating, and appearing on behalf of clients before courts and tribunals. Students will be expected to read a selection of materials on various aspects of legal practice and engage in simulations.<sup>5</sup>

In setting up this course the Faculty had to make a choice between two fundamentally different philosophies: the provision of legal services to the poor, with the incidental benefit of offering practical legal experience to students, or the provision to a student of a training in the application of law, with in all probability the result that some legal services to the poor would be provided. The Faculty opted for the latter of these two alternatives. Two consequences flowed from that decision. First, the clinical term has a strong conceptual and reflective element in it; it is very much an educational exercise. Second, it made it extremely difficult to get financial support for what is, relatively speaking, an expensive mode of education. But for the generosity of the Law Foundation of British Columbia the programme would not have survived in its earlier years, and although it is now almost fully funded as part of the operating budget of the Faculty it is still to some degree dependent upon Law Foundation aid. The lack of funding also affected the location of the clinic. It had been planned that it would operate in the downtown core of Vancouver. Instead it had to be located in the Law Faculty building at the University. At the time it was thought that this might mean that it would attract relatively few clients; in fact that has turned out not to be the case. It has,

5. To anticipate comment, the dangling “engage in simulations” could perhaps be better phrased.

however, put a pressure on the physical facilities of the Faculty, for the present building was not designed with the clinic in mind.

The second major development with respect to the curriculum took the form of an overall review in 1980 and 1981. That in the end turned out to be in the main a process of consolidation. The major philosophical debate which took place related to the question of whether there should be established in the second and third years a group of compulsory courses, sometimes referred to as a core curriculum. That option was rejected, in part because there were those who were philosophically opposed to it, and in part because the vast majority of students already select the courses that might well have been included in the core curriculum. The review ended up doing two things. First, it engaged in a much needed tidying-up process. Many courses introduced in the 1960s or early 1970s had ceased to be taught. Course descriptions had ceased to reflect the current content of the courses. Courses introduced in the decade had not always been properly integrated into the existing curriculum. The review thus offered the opportunity to eliminate obsolete courses, to re-draft descriptions so as to reflect what is currently being taught and to rationalize the curriculum as a whole. In addition, provision was made for a number of courses in various areas in which what is taught from year to year can be varied as an instructor sees fit. This introduced a most desirable element of flexibility in what, on paper at least, was a rather rigid curriculum. Second, a major change was made in the first year. Two criticisms had been levelled at the first year programme. All of the courses were taught in sections which were between 50 and 65 in number. That was thought by some members of Faculty to inhibit effective teaching, and was a surprise to many incoming students who had memories of the smaller classes of the upper years or graduate courses in Arts and Science. The other defect in the first year curriculum was the lack of emphasis on writing. A student had to prepare a moot court factum. In the legal writing programme a small group of students, usually eight in number, were allocated to each member of Faculty. Each student was required to do four writing assignments during the year. Not surprisingly, the amount and the quality of the work demanded varied considerably between the thirty or so Faculty who were responsible for the programme, and, equally unsurprisingly, there was considerable student complaint about the uneven nature of it. The (by no means novel) changes implemented in the academic year 1980-81 tried to meet both of



these criticisms. In each first year course there are two small sections, no greater than 25 in number, and every student in first year takes a course in one of the small sections. That means that, with a student body of 240, the other three sections in each course are in the region of 60 to 65. The legal writing required of a student is then done in conjunction with the course in which the student is in a small section. It is too early to make a final judgment on the success of the programme. It would seem that in general no particularly novel teaching technique has surfaced in the small classes. The student attention to, indeed some would say obsession with, legal writing assignments has had on occasion a noticeable deleterious effect on class attendance and preparation for class in other courses. On the other hand, there is undoubtedly greater uniformity in what students are asked to do, they themselves treat the exercise much more seriously, and the quality of the work that is done is extremely good. To that extent the objective of emphasizing the writing aspect of the first year programme has been fully realized.

The third major initiative, the establishment of a Japanese law programme, got under way just at the end of the decade. The programme was funded in its early stages by the Law Foundation of British Columbia and the Ohira Fund. In 1981 the Max Bell Foundation of Canada made a grant to the Faculty of \$275,000 to support a three-year research project and to assist in the making of an appointment in the field of Japanese law. Dr. Malcolm Smith, who was the Ohira Visiting Professor in 1981-82, was appointed for a three-year period as of July 1, 1982 with responsibility for teaching and directing research. Significant progress has already been made on both these fronts and all the indications are that the programme will expand and flourish in the 1980s.

The putting of a curriculum on paper and its implementation in practice are of course two entirely different matters. The latter depends on such things as teaching techniques, modes of assessment and student attitudes, this a factor of added importance in the case of an optional curriculum.

Until the mid-1960s most members of Faculty would probably have claimed to teach by one or other variant of the "case method". The common factor in those modes of teaching was that no-one purported to deliver a formal lecture, and that some form of dialogue took place between instructor and student. Students did little writing during the course of the academic year, and

performance in most courses was assessed by a single final examination. By the early 1980s several changes had taken place. The "case method" is still widely used in the first year; in the upper years the mode of teaching leans more towards the lecture than the inquisition, the dialogue being spontaneous rather than compelled. That change may have been due to a student resistance to the case method teaching, and to a Faculty perception that the repetition of that technique in the second and third years was not necessarily an effective way of dealing with some of the materials that are now included in the curriculum. The single final examination is still in general use. In some cases, however, it has been supplemented or replaced by a paper or a series of papers written during the term. That latter development, the increase in the number of seminars, the opportunity offered to students of doing individual research projects, and the revision of the first year legal writing programme have all meant a desirable increase in the amount of writing that students are required or may decide to do.

Student attitudes have also changed during the decade. Even those members of Faculty who supported most strongly the introduction of a mainly optional curriculum in the second and third year appreciated some of its potential weaknesses. Some fears have to a degree been realized. For example, there are indications that student choice on occasion places excessive emphasis on instructor and schedule rather than on the nature of a course or its relationship to a planned curriculum. On the other hand, and contrary to the fears of some of the opponents of the optional curriculum, students did not flee from the courses that might be regarded as having a more professional element. In part that might have been due to the influence of the Law Societies' recommended list of courses. As the decade progressed it probably also owed something to the shift, noted earlier, in the character of the student body. It became more conservative and more concerned with what it perceived to be courses that were practical. And it may well be that there was no longer among Faculty members an interest in all of the variety of courses introduced at the beginning of the decade. Nonetheless, the enthusiasm for the wider offering of the new curriculum has not totally waned. The demand for clinical courses is still high, and, if it varies in the "non-practical courses", this may be because of a judicious student assessment of what courses they wish to take.

### III. *The Faculty*

In general this is not the place to chronicle the activities and the comings and goings of individual members of Faculty. To that rule one exception must be made. George Curtis was the founding Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of British Columbia, and retired in 1971 after serving in that role for twenty-six years. He saw the Faculty through its early years, when it coped effectively with large numbers of returning veterans, through the quieter years of the 1950s and then through the more turbulent years of the 1960s. The law and the legal profession are indebted to him for the part he played in helping to lay the foundation of the modern system of legal education not only in the province but also in Canada. In common with other faculties decanal appointments are now for a fixed term, and the third Dean since Curtis' resignation took office in July 1982.

Over the decade the size of the Faculty did not keep pace with the increase in the number of students. The decision that the total student body would be limited to 700 was based on the assumption that the Faculty complement would be fifty. In 1970 the number of full-time members of Faculty was thirty-one, in 1981 forty-three. In the mid-1970s the authorized establishment was forty-six and in one year there were in fact forty-four full-time appointees. At present the authorized establishment is forty-three, and given the current economic climate it is unlikely to increase. In these circumstances the Faculty still relies heavily on members of the profession, who teach not only "clinical" courses, but also seminars and substantive law subjects.<sup>6</sup> The "Lawyer in Residence" programme, funded by the Law Foundation of British Columbia, also provides another teaching link between the Faculty and the profession. Each year a practising member of the profession is appointed to the Faculty, and teaches a full set of courses in his area of expertise. This has obvious advantages over the use of the profession as part-time lecturers; it also has some advantages over a full-time appointment, for in that case the experience in practice which the appointment initially brings recedes year by year. The programme appears to work well, and a series of Lawyers in Residence have enriched the

---

6. These honorary lecturers are paid an honorarium, described on one occasion as a University euphemism for paying less than the minimum wage.

life of the Faculty and have helped cement ties between town and gown.<sup>7</sup>

If the establishment and the numbers on the Faculty did not change dramatically, there was a marked difference in Faculty mobility in the first and second halves of the decade. At the beginning of the 1970s there was an urgent need to make appointments in order to cope with increased enrolment. In common with other Canadian faculties, the Faculty expanded its traditional catchment areas beyond Canada, the United Kingdom, and on occasion Australia and New Zealand, to include the United States. But even when for a number of years five or six appointments were made each year, the total Faculty complement showed only modest gains. Persons with good legal ability were in short supply, and the legal academic was wooed not only by other law faculties, but also by government, law reform commissions, industry and the profession. Resignations only too easily offset appointments. In addition, many faculty took extended leaves of absence to work for government, law reform commissions or on government special commissions. Such leaves were mixed blessings. Even where the leaves were unpaid, so that money was available for replacements, it was often difficult to make acceptable appointments. More seriously, the Faculty had on occasion to forego the possibility of making a desirable permanent appointment because an established place had to be held for a person on leave. And sometimes, at the end of the day, the leave converted itself into a resignation. However, the Faculty also derived considerable benefits from these leaves. Contacts were built between Faculty, government and the profession which are of lasting value, and the experience gained by those who did return to teaching added an invaluable element to their abilities as teachers and as writers.

In the second half of the decade the pattern of Faculty recruitment and mobility changed noticeably. The demands of government tapered off. Law faculty expansion across the country came to something of a halt. As a result, proportionally more teachers were seeking fewer available positions. By 1981 appointments were usually being made only to replace Faculty who had resigned. These new appointments have almost invariably been of Canadians. That owed more to the fact that the expansion of Canadian legal

---

7. Unfortunately, the Law Foundation has been forced, because of financial exigencies, to suspend its support for the Lawyer in Residence Programme.

education had produced a crop of first class applicants rather than to any government policy on a preference for Canadian nationals or Canadian residents. The benefits that can flow from this relative stability are starting to be felt. It provides some continuity in teaching so that there is no longer each year a major re-assignment of teaching responsibilities in order to accommodate large numbers of new personnel. Teaching has benefited from people being able to stay with a subject for a number of years and develop some expertise in it. In due course that frees up more time for research, and provides the experience necessary to begin to carry out what some would see as the prime responsibility of Canadian law faculties in the next twenty years, the production of a Canadian legal literature. By the end of the decade the Faculty was just at the stage where some tentative steps were being taken to contribute to that endeavour.

#### IV. *Graduate Study*

The Faculty has an interest not only in its own graduate programme, but also in the number of its LL.B. graduates who proceed to graduate study either in Canada or abroad. For many years it was customary for students in the graduating class to continue to do graduate work. In the late 1960s and early 1970s at least three or four students a year would do so. In recent years the number has fallen to probably no better than an average of one student a year. There are a number of reasons for that decline. In the past, students going to the United States were funded by fellowships from the American law schools; in recent years the number and relative value of fellowships available have declined. The main source of funding for students going to England have been Commonwealth and S.S.H.R.C. (formerly Canada Council) Fellowships. They are, of course still offered, but the increasing cost of spending a year in England makes them less attractive. During the decade more funds became available for graduate work in Canada, particularly through the establishment by the federal government of the Duff-Rinfret Fellowship programme.<sup>8</sup> But in British Columbia at least reasons other than financial ones obviously contributed to the decline in the number of those doing graduate work. Many students regard graduate study as laying the foundation for a teaching career. If the

---

8. Scholarships offered by the Law Society of British Columbia and by the Law Foundation of British Columbia are also available to British Columbia students.

law faculties are making few appointments, students do not see why they should devote a year to, what, in some senses, may turn out to be a futile endeavour. More significantly the establishment of a system of clerkships in the superior courts has proved to be an attractive alternative for our better students.

If explicable, the decline in the number of students doing graduate work is nonetheless regrettable. The profession as well as law faculties benefits from the presence among its members of those who have done formal study beyond the first degree. Those students who do graduate work abroad are exposed to other ways of thinking and learning about the law, and on their return inject an element into their own legal system which may help to guard against excessive provincialism. Canadian law faculties themselves can now offer good, if small, graduate programmes. Indeed, the development of graduate work is essential to their maturity. Law faculties are therefore under an obligation to encourage their own students to continue to do graduate work, either in Canada or abroad. We at the University of British Columbia have perhaps not been doing this as energetically over the past few years as we ought to have done.

The Master of Laws programme in the Faculty itself presents a more encouraging picture. Students who take the programme are required to do 18 units of work, 10 of which are represented by a thesis, 2 by a graduate seminar taken by all the students and 6 by courses, seminars or directed research offered in the Faculty, or in other graduate departments in the University. When the programme was first established it was decided that it would emphasize three areas of law: international law, labour law and natural resources. That degree of specialization never materialized, and the Faculty is now prepared to accept students in any area of study provided it has the personnel and other necessary resources. For many years there were not more than two or three students per year who took the degree. There were not sufficient funds to provide fellowships for students, and in any event Canadian students often preferred to do their graduate work in other countries. As the 1970s progressed, graduate work abroad became less attractive for some of the reasons discussed earlier. More money became available for graduate work in the Faculty, through University fellowships and Law Foundation of British Columbia fellowships, and, for graduate study in Canada generally, through the establishment of the Duff-Rinfret fellowships. The enrolment in the graduate programme has therefore increased so that now there are in the region of ten full-time students

and two or three part-time students enrolled in any year. Students come not only from Canada, but also from the Commonwealth (England, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand, India, Kenya, Nigeria and Ghana) and from Western Europe. The growth of the programme has had its attendant difficulties. In particular, at the moment there is a marked shortage of space, both for study in the library and by way of offices or common-room facilities in the Law building itself.

#### *V. Facilities — Building and Library*

In 1953 the Faculty moved into a new building designed to accommodate a student body of 200. By 1970 it was housed in that building, in two World War II army huts and in a converted wooden medical research laboratory. The amount which the University could afford to allocate towards the building of additional facilities fell \$500,000 short of what was needed. A campaign was therefore mounted to raise this amount. The response, particularly from the profession in the province, was excellent, and in the end an amount slightly in excess of the target was raised. When it came to the construction of the new facilities it was decided that the 1953 building, although in need of renovation, was too valuable to be demolished, and so the old and the new had to be blended into a single building, containing Faculty offices, classrooms and the library. Aesthetically the result did not meet with approval. Functionally, after the initial teething problems of settling in, it suits its purpose. But in the 1980s the Faculty is again cramped for space. Some of its activities — for example, as we have noted, the legal clinic — were never envisaged as operating from the present building. Space therefore is at a premium, and it is probably only a matter of time before the Faculty once again overflows into temporary space. Unfortunately, in the history of Canadian universities 'temporary' has not meant for a short period of time.

The Faculty has always had the good fortune of having an excellent working library, with a wide coverage of Canadian, American and Commonwealth materials. In 1970 the collection stood at 58,700 volumes; by March 31, 1981 it had risen to 120,262. As well as increasing its collection, the library also made considerable progress in automating many of its procedures, for example in relation to acquisitions and cataloguing. However, by the end of the decade the library was beginning to feel the combined

effects of inflation, of the drop in the value of the Canadian dollar, and of financial restraints. The pressure first began to be felt in the purchase of serials, themselves probably the strongest part of the collection. The general University library system found that each year an increasing proportion of its budget was needed to purchase serials, and it was clear that if the trend continued unchecked it would not be long before no other type of acquisition could be made. A limit was therefore placed on the proportion of the University library budget which could be used for the purchase of serials, and the law library, in a modified way, felt the effect of that decision. But for a grant from the Law Foundation of British Columbia the impact of the decision would have been much more severe.

#### *VI. Relations With Other Bodies*

Any law faculty has a wide range of relationships with other bodies, both academic and professional. On the academic side, the most significant development in the 1970s was the establishment of links with the new Faculty of Law at the University of Victoria. The two faculties have not established any formal structure of relations, but on an informal basis there are continuing contacts between them, ranging from routine inquiries to, on occasion, the exchange of teaching personnel.

The Faculty has also had excellent working relationships with the two professional bodies in the province. The Law Society of British Columbia was, of course, very much involved in the establishment of the Faculty. In the early days, the relationship between the two bodies was fostered by the fortunate fact that the Secretary of the Society was an honorary lecturer in the Faculty. As both the Faculty and the Society grew and the issues they had to deal with became more complex, it was decided that some more formal links should be set up. The Dean of the Faculty attends all meetings of the Benchers, and two representatives of the Benchers attend Faculty meetings, in each case as observers. This procedure was designed to ensure that one body was not contemplating action which would be of interest to the other without the other being aware of what was happening. In 1973, the links between the Faculty and the Society were strengthened when Professor R.G. Herbert was elected a Bencher of the Society. He has been continually re-elected since, and in 1980 was Treasurer of the Society. Relationships with the



British Columbia Branch of the Canadian Bar Association have always been of a more informal nature, although the Dean does sit ex-officio as a member of the Provincial Council. Although informal, the links have nonetheless been close. In particular, members of Faculty take part in the affairs of, and from time to time act as officers of, many of the various sub-sections of the Association.

The Faculty has always played a role in continuing legal education in the province. In the early 1950s, the Faculty inaugurated a series of refresher lectures, delivered annually. In the late 1960s, a more formal structure for delivering legal education in the province was established, and a Director of Continuing Legal Education was appointed in the Centre for Continuing Education in the University. In 1976, a Continuing Legal Education Society was incorporated, the founding members being the Law Society, the British Columbia Branch of the Canadian Bar Association, the Faculty of Law at the University of Victoria and the Faculty of Law at the University of British Columbia. The Society's offices are in the Law Society building, and representatives of both faculties sit as members of a Board of Directors. In recent years, the range and nature of the Society's programmes has increased significantly, and members of Faculty continue to be regular participants in them.

Finally, any chronicler of the history of the Faculty in the period from 1970 to 1981 would be very much remiss if he did not acknowledge the support accorded to the Faculty by the Law Foundation of British Columbia. The Foundation made a grant to the Building Fund; it has supported teaching by funding the Lawyer in Residence programme and the legal aid clinic, and by a grant of \$100,000 in aid of the establishment of the Walter S. Owen Chair of Law; it has funded both undergraduate and graduate scholarships; and it has made several generous contributions to the library. Particularly as financial restraints have tightened, the support of the Foundation has been of inestimable value to the Faculty.