

Dalhousie Law Journal

Volume 9 | Issue 1

Article 10

11-1-1984

The University of Manitoba Faculty of Law 1966-1984

Clifford H. C. Edwards

Jack R. London

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

 Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)



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

Recommended Citation

Clifford H. C. Edwards & Jack R. London, "The University of Manitoba Faculty of Law 1966-1984", Comment, (1984-1985) 9:1 DLJ 166.

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.

Clifford H.C. Edwards, Q.C.*
Jack R. London, Q.C.**

The University of Manitoba
Faculty of Law 1966-1984

I. The Pre-1979 Years¹

From its inception in 1914, the Manitoba Law School had been the joint responsibility of the University of Manitoba and The Law Society of Manitoba. Its four year programme was intended to combine both academic and practical training so that on its completion the graduating student obtained not only his Bachelor of Laws Degree but also his call to the Bar of Manitoba.

By the early sixties, however, with the burgeoning of legal education in universities across the country, it became clear that an overhaul of the system was necessary in Manitoba. If legal education was to meet the demands of the last half of the 20th Century and the standards being set in Canada generally, then there had to be a tremendous input of resources. This could only come through the University which, in the sixties, was enjoying good government financing.

Thus it was that in 1966 the University of Manitoba and The Law Society of Manitoba signed an agreement whereby the University undertook responsibility for the establishment of the faculty of law and agreed to provide a new building, including a new law library on the main campus of the University. While the Law Society was undoubtedly glad to see the University shoulder the responsibility for the academic side of legal education, it nevertheless had some qualms about seeing the 'centre of learning' removed from a downtown location at the Law Courts to the Fort Garry campus about seven miles away. This concern was also shared by some of the faculty, but the University was undoubtedly in the much stronger bargaining position. If legal education was to be properly funded and if a new building (which was desperately needed) was to be forthcoming, then the University's terms had to be met.

Even in those halcyon days, however, it took the University over three years to provide the new building. In the meantime, on the

*Chairman, Manitoba Law Reform Commission

**Professor of Law, Dean, Faculty of Law, Manitoba Law School, 1979-1984

1. The portion "The Pre-1979 Years" was written by Clifford H.C. Edwards, Q.C., who served as Dean from 1964 to 1979.

third floor of the Court House downtown, the additional professorial staff were cramped into little cubicles built in the stairwells, classrooms were partitioned and support staff tucked into odd corners of the library! Student enrollment increased from an intake of 22 in 1960-61 to 74 in 1964-65, which was the first year of the new three year academic system and the deanship of Prof. C.H.C. Edwards. In fact, from then onwards the intake had to be severely limited and a stringent selection process introduced. With the new building in 1969-70 the first year enrollment was increased to 111 and climbed gradually to around 125 by the mid-seventies. However, the number accepted into first year was never more than about one-quarter of those applying.

It was in this difficult area of how to select students for a faculty for which there came to be such a heavy demand for places that we led the way in some respects. We were the first Law Faculty in Canada to adopt the Law School Admission Test as one of the basic selection criteria. This was a test originally designed by the Educational Testing Service in Princeton for entry into American law schools and subsequently varied for Canadian law schools. Having satisfied ourselves after some very careful study of its reliability and general validity, we decided to adopt it in the late sixties. This was not and never has been our sole criterion for admission, since its score is taken into account along with the candidate's pre-law academic record. In 1968 the Faculty also pioneered the "mature student" avenue of entry. This was for students aged 26 and over who may not have completed the normal pre-law University studies of two years but nevertheless had proven themselves academically and therefore, on account of their age, should not be compelled to spend further time in pre-law courses. Later in the mid-seventies we decided to provide an alternative means of admission for those who, although not quite competitive academically, were obviously desirable applicants by virtue of their non-academic accomplishments or endeavours. Candidates falling into this category are interviewed and selected not only on the basis of the Law School Admission Test and their previous academic record but also on the basis of their demonstrated abilities and accomplishments in whatever vocations they have been pursuing. Still later the Faculty went on to pioneer the half-time student entry. This was designed for those persons who for any reason could not afford the time or money to be a full-time student. Again there was a similar selection process (including one for mature students) and up

to five persons can be admitted each year to take the law course on a half-time basis. Many who have taken this route often decide to switch to the full-time programme later so that while the maximum period allowed is six years, many do complete their studies within 4 or 5 years.

The new building on the main University campus proved most satisfactory in coping with the new demands made upon it, with one exception. When it was designed in the late sixties, the total female enrollment in all three years had never numbered more than half-a-dozen. Although the building did provide for an increase in female enrollment, no one at that time envisaged how great or how sudden the increase would be. By 1972-73 we were admitting 24 women students into first year and by 1978-79 this had risen to 46, which was more than 1/3 of the general admission.

The value of the new building on the main University campus, coupled with the strengthened academic programme, showed itself in the number and quality of the full-time staff that the faculty was able to recruit and develop. In 1964, at the commencement of the new three year academic programme, there were only four full-time faculty. Unlike the eighties, it was no easy task to recruit academic staff in the sixties. With the many lucrative openings at the private bar there were few graduates who were then prepared to spend the extra time and money to do post-graduate work to enter the academic profession where the salaries at that time were much lower than in practice. There was a great dearth of promising young academics right across Canada. In those early years, we were fortunate in being able to recruit distinguished visiting professors from overseas to meet our needs until more Canadians became available from graduate schools. Among those we were privileged to have were such excellent people as Dr. Clive Schmitthoff and Professor A.D. Hughes both from London, England, Prof. G. Battersby of Sheffield, England, and later Dr. Lee Sheridan of Cardiff, Wales.

When our new building came on stream in 1970, our full-time staff stood at 15 and this gradually increased to 24 by the end of the seventies. Between 1972 and 1979, four members of this new faculty, Professors Nemiroff, London, Dilts and Osborne, gained awards for teaching excellence in the University as a whole. During the same period, two other members of the faculty, the late John Sharp and Dale Gibson, won outstanding research awards in the University. These were particularly noteworthy when it is realized

that the number on the full-time faculty has never exceeded 24 and this small number was competing with very large numbers, not only in the Faculties of Arts and Sciences, but also in all the other professional faculties such as Medicine, Engineering, Education and Agriculture.

Distinction was not only evident in the faculty but also in the students. One graduate of the first class under the new system of legal education won the prestigious Viscount Bennett Scholarship awarded by the Canadian Bar Association and did graduate work at Yale University, subsequently returning as a professor in the faculty. In 1971, three graduates from the school gained awards to do graduate work at Harvard University and one of those three has just been appointed one of the youngest judges on record in the Court of Queen's Bench (Family Division) in Manitoba. Over roughly the same period of time another three of the school's graduates were selected for the much sought after positions of clerks to judges of the Supreme Court of Canada in Ottawa.

A large measure of the upgrading of legal education was due to the tremendous improvement of library facilities which the new building and the increased University funding provided. In its location on the third floor of the Court House, the library was housed in a rather large room which, at the maximum, could hold no more than about 20,000 volumes. Students had to rely on access to the Great Library of the Law Society, also housed in the same building but even its resources were limited. In 1967, we were fortunate in being able to recruit Prof. S.S. Hu, a leading law librarian, who with his skill and knowledge was able to use the grants provided by the University to build up a sound and comprehensive law library. At the time of the move into the new building, the collection had increased to approximately 50,000 volumes and now stands at over 110,000 volumes. Over the years it has come to be a library much respected and used by academics, practitioners and judges alike.

In the late sixties and early seventies the faculty, along with other Canadian Common Law faculties, greatly expanded the number of elective courses in its curriculum. This was made possible by two factors. First the Federation of Law Societies agreed to limit the number of required (or core) courses for the recognition of an LL.B. degree to six, most of which were taken in first year. Secondly, with the increase of full time faculty, it was possible to offer a much wider range of elective courses in the second and third years of the

degree programme. Whereas in 1964 the whole of the three year programme was compulsory for all students, by 1970 the whole of third year was elective. Despite initial fears that this would mean that students would miss some of the more 'bread and butter' courses, this never proved to be the case. Indeed with the increased number of persons graduating from the faculty, there was an increased pressure on articling places in the profession. This meant that students took all those courses which they felt would be most useful to them in getting articling places with the result that some of the more theoretical courses tended to fall by the wayside. One sad example of this was in the mid-seventies when a course such as Jurisprudence was being taken by only a handful of students. It is interesting to note that these unexpected effects of the opening up of the curriculum are adverted to in the recent 'Arthurs Report' on legal education in Canada.

On account of the school's original ties with the legal profession, it always endeavoured throughout these years of development to maintain a balance in its legal education. In fact, it is possibly true to say that by and large the faculty do not subscribe to the traditional dichotomy between the academic and practical. It is probably for this reason that the school came to develop one of the most comprehensive moot court programmes in Western Canada, under the very able direction of Prof. Gordon Dilts, Q.C., who had been a very distinguished litigation lawyer at the time of his joining the faculty. The programme is open to all students in second and third years and while it has always remained optional, it is generally taken by almost every student in one of these years. During the seventies, the school, on four occasions, won the Malcolm McIntyre trophy in the moot court competition of all western law schools.

Indeed, the faculty, despite its take-over by the University and move to campus, never lost its close relationship with the profession at large and nurtured this in many ways. For example, although there was a large increase in the number of full time faculty, there did continue to be an involvement in some of the advanced courses of practitioners from downtown who were always willing to make the sacrifice to give of their time and expertise to come out to the faculty to teach or help in any other way they could. This was a two-way street in that members of the faculty took part in continuing legal education lectures for the Bar and also in the Bar Admission course for articling students. Possibly one of the closest

links was formed in 1975 when the Faculty seconded Prof. J. London to be the Director of Legal Education for the Law Society with the special task of reviewing and revising the entire Bar Admission course, as well as developing a comprehensive programme of continuing legal education and public legal education. This liaison was continued in 1977 when, on Prof. London's return to the faculty, Prof. D.T. Anderson was seconded to succeed him as the Director of Legal Education. By this means the Faculty and Law Society were able to ensure the synchronisation of their respective teaching responsibilities and to avoid overlapping as far as possible.

The melding of academic and practical legal education was greatly assisted with the planning of a clinical programme. In 1974 there commenced a course entitled the Lawyering Process with a limited enrollment of ten which was developed and supervised by Prof. J. London. Thanks again to the help of practitioners and with cases supplied by Legal Aid Manitoba, students were for the first time in their 'academic' programme exposed to 'real' fact situations and real clients. Shortly afterwards this was followed by the introduction of other clinical courses in the fields of criminal and family law.

While actual clinic courses for credit did not begin until 1974, the Faculty from the time of its move to the campus did seek to keep its students in touch with the outside world of law by means of legal aid work. In the very first year of its operation in its new building, a legal aid clinic was established. This was supervised by law professors and funded by Legal Aid Manitoba. The clinic was open not only to students from the campus at large, but also to the public generally and was staffed throughout the academic year by second and third year students and during the summer months by two students employed full time under Legal Aid funding. This clinic has proved so useful, not only as an educational tool for students but even more as a service to the community, that it has avoided closure on two occasions when this has been proposed as a restraint measure in the general legal aid programme.

On a wider front, this school made its contribution to the general field of Canadian legal education by hosting, in its new building, the Civil Law-Common Law exchange programme organized by the Federal Government between 1973-75. This is a programme whereby approximately 30 students from Common Law schools across Canada attend a Civil Law school for about two months in

the summer to take civil law courses in French and 30 students from Civil Law schools do the same in a Common Law school for the same period of time. The University of Manitoba was chosen as the Common Law campus for the initial three years of the programme and again thanks to the Faculty and practitioners we were able to put together not only a solid programme of legal studies, but also many social and cultural events which gave our visitors from Quebec an excellent insight into life in Western Canada. All who took part in the programme have commended it over the years as one of the most helpful of the Federal programmes in promoting bilingualism and biculturalism in this country. It would be only fitting at this stage to give recognition to Prof. J. M. Sharp who organized and headed up the programme. He was probably one of our leading professors in this transitional period of the setting up of the new school on campus. He was the first director of the newly formed Legal Research Institute and the first Chief Legal Research Officer of the Manitoba Law Reform Commission. He was showing great promise as legal writer and scholar, particularly in the field of the law of privacy, when his life was tragically cut short at an early age by cancer.

In summary, the general transition of a professional law school to a University faculty and from a downtown location to a University campus was accomplished fairly painlessly. It is probably true that the generation which went through the old system of a combined four year programme would believe to the end of their days that that was the best. However, the more thoughtful of them who were also far-sighted, could see that the time had come for a change and were prepared to cooperate in making that change possible. As Dean at the time of the actual change, I can testify to the cooperation I received from the Benchers of the Law Society, including in particular former Chief Justice E.K. Williams, who had been Chairman of the Board of the old Law School for very many years. Maybe I was looked upon as a very young Dean, who needed all the help I could get (as indeed was true!) so that these Senior Counsel were anxious to advise and assist just as they would a young junior at the bar! In any event, from the very day of appointment, I met no opposition to my plan for a three year full-time programme under the auspices of the University. One person whom I found particularly helpful and understanding in those days on the Law Society's part was Mr. R.G.B. Dickson, Q.C., who has just become Chief Justice of Canada. He displayed great vision and had

a strong desire to see the old Manitoba Law School become a strong academic faculty taking its place among the leading law faculties of Canada. He was supported in this by his other able colleagues from the Law Society on the Board of Trustees of the old school, namely Mr. R.S. Bowles, Q.C. (later to become Lieutenant-Governor of the Province) and Mr. A.L. Campbell, Q.C. With persons of this calibre behind the change, I believe it can be seen why it all went so smoothly and why it has turned out to be so successful in so many different ways.

II. *The Post-1978 Years*²

Cliff Edwards, my predecessor both in office and print, has described the years of transition from the days of the Manitoba Law School to the current era of the Faculty of Law at the University of Manitoba. I will continue his intuitive, first person narrative in this part.

On July 1, 1979 I was appointed Dean of Law at the University of Manitoba. The challenges which lay ahead those next five years were underscored by the publication in May that year of the "Report of the Special Committee on Legal Education", undertaken earlier by Mr. Justice R. Matas at the request of the Admissions and Education Committee of the Law Society of Manitoba and the University of Manitoba Law Faculty. His report, commonly called the "Matas Report" focused primarily on the Bar Admission course and other forms of vocational training. However, Mr. Justice Matas also did a reasonably detailed analysis of the program of the Faculty of Law and provided useful observations and recommendations for the Faculty.

In the context of an otherwise flattering commentary on the Faculty, particularly its teaching program, Mr. Justice Matas focused attention on the need for the Faculty to increase efforts in research and scholarship, to continue to place higher and higher expectations on itself and the students through ever-improving academic and evaluative standards, and to increase both the number of compulsory subjects offered as well as the number of clinical offerings available. He also indicated that some classes employing conventional teaching methods were sometimes unduly large.

2. The portion "The Post-1978 Years" was written by Jack R. London who served as Dean from 1979-1984.

However, he both acknowledged and made clear that simple maintenance of the then current program of the Faculty, let alone its expansion, would be difficult (to say the least) because the funding provided the faculty simply was not sufficient. Indeed, he reported as follows:

“I find the financial position of the Faculty to be a very serious one and would urge the University to reconsider its Five Year Plan if the Faculty is to be able to continue to maintain the desirable standards of legal education it has so far attained and to improve them so that the Faculty may continue to be comparable with those of other Canadian universities.”

Following that report and a number of informal meetings and retreats of the Faculty in the fall of 1979, the administration, faculty and support staff began the process of facilitating the Faculty's next developmental stage. The entire grading process was reformed so as to make more stringent the requirements for progression. Concurrently, the use of grade point averages was discontinued in an effort to reduce the levels of competition that some thought prevalent amongst the student body. Overall, the evaluative process was tightened a notch.

Concurrently, an informal but persistent campaign was begun both within the Faculty and the student body. Its theme was that of “excellence”. Through months and months of sometimes acrimonious debate on whether or not one could define or quantify notions of “excellence”, the message continued to spread. Although anxiety sometimes ran high, there was noticeable change.

Faculty members were increasingly encouraged to engage in research and scholarship activities. There was a dramatic increase in the funding provided to Faculty members for teaching and research assistants. The long dormant major project of the Legal Research Institute of the Faculty of Law, titled “Law in a Cynical Society”, was revived. In addition to the funds which had long since been obtained from the Donner Foundation, substantial operating funds from the Faculty budget were injected in further aid. Credit to the success of that project, and with it a major stimulus to research activities in the Faculty, goes to Professor Alvin Esau who first took the project by the horns, later to be joined by Professor Janet Baldwin. A very sophisticated questionnaire on public attitudes was administered in several Canadian centres, the data analyzed and a very successful international conference on Law and Public Opinion in a Cynical Society was held at the Faculty in November of 1982.

The proceedings, both massive and important, are soon to be published.

In and about that period more and more Faculty members became interested and involved in research which resulted in increasing numbers of quality publications. Professor Esau brought the Faculty another University Research Award and Professor Dale Gibson has been honoured at the University with the title of Distinguished Professor.

At the same time, the Faculty's tenure and promotion regulations were completely revised, most significantly in two ways. First, whereas tenure and promotion previously had been primarily dependent on teaching evaluation, research and scholarship as well as community service were now to play an increased, in fact equal, role in the decision-making. Secondly, procedurally and substantively the regulations were made more equitable, though more demanding.

Though the Faculty has traditionally experienced relatively little turnover in its staff membership, several faces changed in the five-year period. Those who left were missed. But those who came brought with them vitality and energy, not to mention intellect, which have served to stimulate faculty and students alike. Notably, of the last five full and part-time appointments made to the Faculty, three have been female bringing the total of female staff members, other than sessional lecturers, to five in a total full and part-time faculty of 24. One hopes that, if and when further appointments are available, we will continue to attempt to redress the historical imbalance in the number of male and female faculty members, bringing it more closely into line with the current reality of student enrolment now approaching an equal division between the sexes.

On the teaching side, new clinical programs were added and those already in place, enhanced. Notably, a clinical program in Administrative Law was added to those in Criminal Law and Family Law so that at the date of this writing every student in third year at the Faculty of Law who seeks a clinical program is able to satisfy that demand. In the clinical area, credit ought to be given to Professor David Deutscher, who has toiled for many years in developing the Criminal Law program. His efforts clearly now have been matched by Professor Freda Steel who has in a short period of time developed an excellent clinical program in the area of Family Law and Professor Norman Larsen, who in an even shorter period has launched a very successful program in the Administrative Law

area. Clinical legal education continues to be a flourishing and important part of the academic life of the Faculty of Law at the University of Manitoba.

Certainly, no review of this Faculty since 1979 could avoid running headlong into the decision of the Faculty of Law, approved by the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba, to limit its enrolment intake beginning with the 1980-81 academic year. The background to that quite, perhaps most, significant event follows.

From the mid-60's to the late 70's enrolment levels at the Faculty of Law had grown in the same way as they had in every other part of North America. By 1979/80 the Faculty admitted into its first year program 130 full-time and 5 half-time students. Interestingly the Law School building itself had been designed for an enrolment intake into first year of approximately 100 to 110 students. Moreover, the Faculty, like most Canadian law schools, had allowed enrolment levels to rise without adequate recognition by those who dispensed the funds and provided the resources that more was required than was being received.

The Matas Report, to which I earlier referred, had pointed out the apparent deficiencies in the funding available to the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Law Library. Those observations were echoed by the Benchers of the Law Society of Manitoba who approved unanimously a recommendation which was forwarded to the University of Manitoba in terms as follows:

- a. That the University of Manitoba should ensure, as an important priority, strong and continuing support of the Law Libraries;
- b. Should now, in view of the serious financial position of the Faculty, review its intermediate range and long-term financial plans to provide the Faculty what it needs to have standards of legal education at levels appropriate to what the public interest requires, and
- c. Should ensure the Faculty is in a competitive position to recruit and keep top quality staff.'

That same year, at my request, the Benchers of the Law Society of Manitoba, by Resolution formerly passed at a Bencher's meeting, guaranteed that so long as the intake enrolment at the Faculty did not exceed 130 full-time and 5 half-time students, the Law Society would ensure that every graduate of the Faculty of Law at the University of Manitoba would have the opportunity to qualify for Call to the Bar within one year of graduation, whether or not

sufficient articling places were available. In other words, the Law Society undertook to provide an equivalent or alternative program to articling in the event that some students were unable to qualify through that route. In passing the guarantee, the Law Society acceded to the argument that marketplace forces ought not to be allowed to operate to disentitle a law student to a licence to practice law.

On Friday, May 16, 1980 the Faculty of Law Council, after lengthy discussion and debate, passed, without dissent, the following resolution:

“That, the Faculty of Law, reluctantly, by this motion, indicates its preparedness to consider that admissions to first year, for the academic year 1981-82 be limited to 90 full-time plus up to five half-time students, said reduction to be accomplished in two phases. First, enrolment in the academic year 1980-81 will be restricted to not more than 110 full-time plus up to five half-time students, and the remaining decrease will be accomplished for the 1981-82 academic year. It will be in the discretion of the Dean to negotiate the timetable and safeguards required for implementation.”

The Faculty had determined that since all efforts to increase the funding base of the Faculty in any significant way had failed, the only solution to achieving the goals of the Faculty was to reduce the number of students sharing in those resources. The Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba acceded to the request, concurrently guaranteeing that the one-third reduction in intake would not adversely affect present or future funding of the Faculty or the Faculty of Law Library. In effect, the central administration of the University, after lengthy negotiations, guaranteed not to cut resources or funding to the reduced Faculty, but rather to allow that same level of funding to enrich the program of fewer students. Expenditure per student therefore increased by fifty percent. Neither the Law Society of Manitoba, the Manitoba Branch of the Canadian Bar Association, the judiciary, or other members of the community who were consulted objected to the reduction. On the other hand, none advocated it either.

In the result, unhappily for some, a more intimate and enriched program, with the added bonus of increased time for the professorial staff to carry on research and scholarship activities, was bought by denying places to large numbers of students seeking access to the School. Indeed, following the decision the number of applicants not only maintained itself, but since has risen substantially.

It is too early to evaluate in any meaningful way the wisdom or success of the enrolment reduction. However, at the intuitive level most people would observe that the teaching and research program of the Faculty of Law has been enhanced in the result. Smaller classes, lower teacher/student ratios, an ability to provide greater attention to the individual needs of students, clinical experiences for all who seek them, more periodic testing and an increased feeling of common endeavor at a law school of which one can be proud seem to outweigh the negative aspects, like finding a clientele for some smaller enrolment courses.

Some would argue that, in any event, an intake reduction would have been required because of a decreasing market for the graduates of the Law School. Certainly, it was very much in the minds of the Faculty that reducing the numbers of graduates would allow the Law Society of Manitoba to more carefully screen articling placements and improve and enhance the Bar Admission Program through which all graduates seeking Call to the Bar in Manitoba must pass. One has the sense that those developments are taking place, if slowly.

The last word perhaps should be reserved for the seeds most recently planted for future Faculty growth. For at least the last decade the Faculty of Law has struggled with its curriculum. Like all law schools there are several points of view always ready to be argued for and against whatever happens to be at issue: compulsory subject matter; clinical training; increasing writing activities on the part of students; and so on. For more than ten years, several attempts had been made to define our goals and objectives as a Faculty and to design a program which would reflect them. All efforts, other than those which resulted in small housekeeping changes, failed.

But, the reduction in enrolment intake gave new spark to those efforts since one of the reasons for reducing numbers was to allow for a substantial improvement in the curriculum offered to students. Now, it was time to do so.

Under the extraordinarily able chairpersonship of Professor Philip Osborne, the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty laboured many months in designing a new curriculum package to be submitted to Faculty Council. Finally, at Faculty Council meetings held on November 11, 1983 and February 3, 1984, a new curriculum was authorized for implementation as time and resources permitted. The

task of overseeing that implementation will fall to my successor, Dean Trevor Anderson.

There is nothing revolutionary, perhaps even novel, in the new curriculum. But it does represent, for the first time, an almost universal consensus on the part of the Faculty as to the direction in which we ought to move in the years to come. It provides a pattern on which to make, and into which to fit, individual decisions and judgments.

The guiding spirit of the new curriculum, perhaps it might be better called an academic plan for later implementation, was recorded in the "Report of the Curriculum Review Committee on a New Curriculum", in July 1983 as follows:

"The primary principle underlying the new curriculum is that a curriculum should in all years and in each term of every year contain a balance of doctrinal, perspective and clinical courses. The Committee believes that a proper balance between these three kinds of courses will produce the humane and competent professional ready and able to embark either on the practice of law, a career in research or other vocational pursuits. It is believed that these different kinds of courses will develop the amalgam of legal skills and attributes important to a competent lawyer or anyone using legal training as an eclectic base."

In the result, the proposal, when implemented, will ensure that all students must balance their programs between doctrinal courses, perspective courses and clinical courses in each year of study. The Committee had found, in its review, that for too many students at the Law School, their program profiles were very much unbalanced, thereby denying to themselves the value of a generalist undergraduate legal education. Having made that finding on the basis of its empirical work, the Committee, and ultimately the Faculty, accepted as the fundamental principle of curriculum development the achievement of a balanced program for all students, though that would require an increased degree of compulsion.

The new curriculum plan also achieves three other objectives suggested by the Committee, and accepted by the Faculty. The new curriculum will redress what was seen to be an imbalance in favour of private rather than public law in the first and second year program. Secondly, particularly in First Year, there will be fewer subject offerings, though carrying increased credit hours. The Faculty was of the view that the first year curriculum had too many

bits and pieces, consolidation of which would free up student energy and time for larger tasks.

Thirdly, it was decided to introduce a degree of progression into the curriculum in order to develop in the student a sense of achievement by moving year by year from the elementary to the complex, in graduated steps of difficulty; in essence a sense of continuing growth and achievement. It was the view of the Committee and Faculty that the present curriculum and the typical electives selected by students in that curriculum provided no sense of development, merely the collection of more and more doctrinal subject matter of similar complexity, taught in a similar style, evaluated in a similar manner and developing the same kind of skills. Therefore, though more difficult to achieve than the other objectives, there is an announced intention to coordinate the programs of all three years more closely so that the latter builds on the earlier in a far more predictable way than has been the case in the past.

One could mention so much more. Under the supervisory attention of Professor Anderson, the Manitoba Law Journal now has a record of excellent publication. Under his guidance the student body has taken primary responsibility for the Journal and produced a far more attractive and substantive product than was the case under earlier professional management. The world of technology has invaded the Law School in the form of word processors and computers; the representation of the Law School on the Benchers of the Law Society of Manitoba has been increased to include two faculty benchers, one of them the Dean, plus an additional student bencher. Three persons are now appointed by the Law Society to sit on Faculty Council. The interchange and close relationship between the Faculty and the Law Society thereby continues to flourish in a spirit of cooperation and harmony. The Law School continues to be proud of its affirmative action program for native students and is thankful for the many visits of distinguished guest speakers and visitors these past few years occasioned by the formation in 1980 of the Distinguished Visitors Committee.

All in all, the Faculty of Law at the University of Manitoba is alive and well and looks forward to the future with optimism and a renewed sense of purpose.