

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CONVOCATION

IN PUBLIC SESSION

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2016 - 9:00 a.m.

OSGOODE HALL, TORONTO

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CONVOCATION ATTENDANCE

Treasurer - Paul Schabas

Robert P. Armstrong	Lee Ferrier
Vern Krishna	Gavin MacKenzie (ph.)
Harvey Strosberg	Marion Boyd (ph.)
Gisèle Chrétien	Suzanne Clément
Seymour Epstein	Jan Richardson (ph.)
Gerald Sheff	Catherine Strosberg
Paul Copeland (ph.)	Neil Finkelstein (ph.)
Patrick Furlong	Gary Lloyd Gottlieb
Ross Murray	Julian Porter
Judith M. Potter	Heather Ross
Clayton Ruby (ph.)	Gerald A. Swaye (ph.)
Bradley H. Wright	Raj Anand
Peter Beach	Fred Bickford
Jack Braithwaite	Christopher D. Bredt
Robert Burd	John Callaghan
Paul Cooper	Dianne Corbiere
Cathy Corsetti	Janis Criger
Teresa Donnelly	Ross F. Earnshaw
Robert Evans	Rocco Galati
Howard Goldblatt	Joseph Groia
Michelle Haigh	Carol Hartman
Jacqueline Horvat	Brian Lawrie

1	Janet Leiper	Jeffrey Lem
2	Michael Lerner	Marian Lippa
3	Virginia MacLean	William McDowell
4	Susan T. McGrath	Isfahan Merali
5	Malcolm Mercer	Barbara Murchie
6	Sandra Nishikawa	Gina Papageorgiou
7	Susan Richer	Jonathan Rosenthal
8	Raj Sharda	Andrew Spurgeon
9	Joanne St. Lewis	Sidney Troister
10	Jerry Udell (ph.)	M. Anne Vespry
11	Peter Wardle	Laurie H. Pawlitza
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

## INDEX

MATTER:	PAGE NO.
TREASURER'S REMARKS	5
EQUITY AND ABORIGINAL ISSUES COMMITTEE	16
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPETENCE COMMITTEE REPORT	18
AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT	69
UPDATE ON WORK OF THE GOVERNANCE TASK FORCE	86
PROFESSIONAL REGULATION COMMITTEE REPORT	91
TRIBUNAL COMMITTEE REPORT	101
SECRETARY'S REPORT	104

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 --- Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m.

2 -- TREASURER'S REMARKS:

3 TREASURER SCHABAS: Good morning,  
4 everybody. I'm keenly aware that many of us did either  
5 not sleep much or sleep well last night, but perhaps  
6 the distraction of the busy couple of days of  
7 Convocation and committee will be welcome to us today.

8 Welcome to Convocation. Welcome to  
9 those of you on the phone and those of you watching and  
10 joining us by public webcast.

11 I want to start by recognizing that  
12 we're here together in Toronto, which is Mohawk for  
13 "Where there are trees standing in the water," and  
14 thank the First Nations people -- Mr. Rosenthal,  
15 perhaps you could put your phone down --

16 MR. ROSENTHAL: It's not me.

17 TREASURER SCHABAS: Somebody on the  
18 telephone needs to put their phone on mute. Can we put  
19 them on lecture mode?

20 Thank you. So as I said, I want to  
21 thank the First Nations people who lived and live on  
22 these lands for sharing them with us and to acknowledge  
23 that we're meeting on their traditional territories of  
24 Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation. I also  
25 acknowledge the Haudenosaunee peoples and recognize the

1 long history of the First Nations in Ontario and the  
2 Métis and Inuit peoples.

3 So let me review the instructions for  
4 the phone system. Once we determine who is on the  
5 phone, we will be placing those calling into the  
6 meeting in what we call lecture mode. So we will be  
7 muting you. It is star 6 from our end. And I would  
8 ask you all to star 6 your phones as well. And when  
9 you do -- when we do come out of lecture mode and if  
10 you wish to speak then you can press star 6 to take  
11 your phone out of lecture mode as well.

12 So let's just take attendance then,  
13 Mr. Varro, of who is on the telephone. I understand  
14 that Mr. Banack may be on the phone, is that correct?  
15 Apparently not. Ms. Boyd?

16 MS. BOYD: Here.

17 TREASURER SCHABAS: Mr. Copeland?

18 MR. COPELAND: Present. The sound  
19 quality is really bad.

20 TREASURER SCHABAS: Okay. Well, I hope  
21 that's not a reflection of me. We'll do our best.  
22 Mr. Finkelstein?

23 MR. FINKELSTEIN: Yes, I'm here.

24 TREASURER SCHABAS: Mr. MacKenzie?

25 MR. MacKENZIE: Yes.



1 and his stature in the community on a recent trip to  
2 Thunder Bay. On behalf of Convocation I want to extend  
3 our deepest condolences to their families.

4 As you will recall from my report in  
5 September, I've created a Treasurer's Appointments  
6 Advisory Group to establish a process for making  
7 external appointments and to manage the process of  
8 selecting appropriate candidates for consideration for  
9 Convocation's approval.

10 The group, which includes Raj Anand,  
11 Suzanne Clément, Cathy Corsetti, Will McDowell and Gina  
12 Papageorgiou has begun its work.

13 In a related development, we have  
14 received an urgent request from the Minister of Justice  
15 to provide the names of individuals for the Law  
16 Society-nominated positions on the federal Judicial  
17 Advisory Committees for Ontario, which need to be  
18 repopulated following the reforms to the appointments  
19 process.

20 We have begun our outreach on this and I  
21 would encourage all benchers to consider appropriate  
22 individuals and to contact me or Sheena Weir with your  
23 recommendations. We have also posted this on our  
24 website. You will recall that earlier in the summer  
25 messages also went to stakeholders and others around



1 the appointments process, so this is also my way of  
2 making a public call for any applications, which we  
3 need to receive no later than November 14th.

4 I'll be speaking more about this process  
5 and some issues around that when we go in camera later  
6 in the meeting.

7 TAG hosted Access to Justice Week from  
8 October 17 to October 21st. By all accounts, the week  
9 was an extraordinary success. There were five events,  
10 nine partners, 40 sessions, 151 speakers, 633 attendees,  
11 957 tweets, and coverage from 25 media outlets,  
12 including the Law Times, Radio Canada International and  
13 the front page of the Toronto Star. There were  
14 5 million impressions, that's print radio and on-line  
15 media, the number of times content about the week was  
16 displayed or broadcast.

17 So this media attention was terrific, it  
18 help legitimize the work of those on the front lines,  
19 and helped make access to justice a relevant issue to  
20 the public.

21 The Attorney General made a Ministerial  
22 statement in the house commending it, as well as the  
23 opposition and the third party critic, underscoring the  
24 importance of the event. Letters of support from the  
25 Chief Justice of Canada, the Federal Justice Minister

1 and others were also received commending the Law  
2 Society and the Law Foundation of Ontario for their  
3 support of TAG.

4 The events through the week resulted in  
5 engagement with the public, as well as tech, business  
6 and social sectors, in addition to our justice system  
7 partners.

8 There was a great deal of interest in  
9 our Public Perceptions of Access to Justice in Ontario  
10 study, a poll that was conducted on-line by Abacus  
11 Data. TAG commissioned that study in order to identify  
12 where and how to direct public legal education  
13 resources, how to better engage the public in  
14 meaningful access to justice improvements.

15 The report concluded that Ontario's  
16 justice system faces two major challenges.  
17 Perceptually, it is seen as unfair, inaccessible and  
18 intimidating to most of the province's residents.

19 Beyond the perceptual challenges,  
20 affordability is, of course, the primary obstacle  
21 preventing access to justice. The largest barrier  
22 cited by Ontarians who have sought legal advice is the  
23 prohibitive expense of a lawyer or paralegal, and the  
24 majority of all Canadians say they have little or no  
25 confidence that they could currently afford either.

1                   This study and the data sadly confirms  
2                   what we have been hearing anecdotally and identifies  
3                   areas where we should direct our energies in terms of  
4                   increasing awareness of existing resources and  
5                   developing new responses that will boost public  
6                   confidence.

7                   We all have work to do. TAG and its  
8                   partners are going to use this study to continue to  
9                   facilitate and develop effective initiatives that will  
10                  hopefully result in meaningful change.

11                  Their report is included at tab ten,  
12                  along with the Minister's statement.

13                  I want to congratulate Sabrina Delhon,  
14                  Law Society staff who supported the event, and all of  
15                  the partners for a very successful week. I also want  
16                  to again note and recognize the ongoing support of TAG  
17                  by the Law Foundation.

18                  As part of our commitment to access to  
19                  justice in Ontario I have decided to form a Legal Aid  
20                  Working Group. The working group will be chaired by  
21                  John Callaghan and will include benchers from both the  
22                  Government Relations Committee as well as the Access to  
23                  Justice Committee.

24                  The membership of the group is as  
25                  follows: John Callaghan, Chair, Suzanne Clément, Paul

1 Cooper, Julian Falconer, Avvy Go, Howard Goldblatt,  
2 Janet Leiper, Marian Lipka, Susan McGrath and Susan  
3 Richer.

4           The group will explore opportunities for  
5 robust and sustainable legal services for Ontarians.  
6 It is intended to be a constructive and supportive  
7 voice for Legal Aid in the province.

8           The working group will create a work  
9 plan and will report to Convocation as appropriate  
10 beginning in 2017. You will find the terms of  
11 reference at tab 12 of BoardBooks.

12           Once again, I seem to have quite a bit  
13 to say at the beginning of the meeting. Let me tell  
14 you a little bit about some outreach which I think will  
15 interest you.

16           A number of us attended the Federation  
17 of Law Societies Annual Conference, which was held in  
18 New Brunswick on October 20th to 22nd. The conference  
19 focused on challenges presented when considering the  
20 continuum of legal education, and we had many of the  
21 law deans from across the country in attendance, where  
22 we all agreed that it was an important forum and  
23 opportunity for the academics and the legal  
24 professionals to exchange ideas and come together, and  
25 we agreed that this was an important step forward and

1 that we needed to keep communicating with one another.

2 I also attended a Presidents' Forum, a  
3 strategic planning session for the Federation, and the  
4 Federation's Council meeting.

5 It was a first meeting for me at the  
6 Federation and it was an interesting introduction to  
7 the Federation. I think we built a number of bridges  
8 with a number of organizations and other law societies.  
9 We will have a more detailed report in December through  
10 our representative on council, Ross Earnshaw.

11 I should say that the benchers who  
12 attended with me included Mr. Earnshaw, Mr. Wardle, Ms.  
13 Haigh and a number of staff.

14 At the end of September I had my first  
15 meeting with the Treasurer's Liaison Group and the  
16 Early Careers Round Table. The major topic of the  
17 discussion was the recommendations of the PD&C  
18 Committee and the future of the LPP. I found them to  
19 be excellent vehicles for engagement with the  
20 profession and got a lot of feedback from them.

21 Since we last met I have attended a  
22 number of annual meetings and conferences. I'm not  
23 going to give you chapter and verse on them, but they  
24 included the OBA, the Canadian Association of Black  
25 Lawyers, The Criminal Lawyers Association, The

1 Federation of Asian Canadian Lawyers and the Federation  
2 of Ontario Law Associations, or as it's now known,  
3 FOLA.

4 I want to congratulate Sandra Nishikawa,  
5 who was presented with the Lawyer of Distinction Award  
6 at the Federation of Asian-Canadians 10th annual  
7 conference in Toronto.

8 -- Applause.

9 TREASURER SCHABAS: The award recognizes  
10 an Asian-Canadian legal professional who has practised  
11 law for ten years for significant accomplishments in  
12 the law and for service to the legal profession, areas  
13 of social justice and/or the Asian community. So  
14 congratulations, Sandra.

15 Also on October 28th I attended the  
16 Thunder Bay Law Association Conference and later that  
17 day visited Lakehead University and the Dean and did a  
18 question and answer period with the law students. I  
19 did the same thing yesterday at the University of  
20 Ottawa with Professor Adam Dodek.

21 There are upcoming events: Tomorrow,  
22 Remembrance Day. I hope many of you can join us for  
23 the Remembrance Day ceremony in the rotunda, which  
24 begins at 12:30, and to be gowned.

25 November 17th is Louis Riel Day;

1 November 24th will be an information session for the  
2 new Coach and Advisor Program, beginning at 5:30 p.m.  
3 It's really an information session and reception, and  
4 there will be the welcome reception for the newly  
5 licensed paralegals on December 1st.

6 A reminder that nominations for the Law  
7 Society Awards are open. The deadline is January 27th.  
8 Those include the Law Society Medal, the Lincoln  
9 Alexander Award and the Laura Legge Award.

10 Paralegals are eligible for the William  
11 J. Simpson Distinguished Paralegal Award. And both  
12 lawyers and paralegals are eligible for the Shirley  
13 Denison Award.

14 Information on the process is on the  
15 website and I want to encourage everyone from all  
16 communities, practice areas, firms and regions across  
17 the province to submit nominations.

18 The deadline for that, as I mentioned,  
19 is January 27.

20 --- CONSENT AGENDA:

21 TREASURER SCHABAS: So with that we will  
22 turn to the agenda. And first item of business is the  
23 Consent Agenda found at tab 1.

24 The Consent Agenda is moved by Ms.  
25 Clément, seconded by Mr. Burd. Are there any comments

1 or questions on the Consent Agenda? Hearing none, all  
2 in favour? Any opposed?

3 On the phone? Is there anyone opposed  
4 to the Consent Agenda on the telephone? Hearing  
5 nothing, we can put them back on lecture mode.

6 So we're going to go a little out of  
7 order to accommodate Ms. Donnelly, who has to leave  
8 later this morning, and deal with the Equity and  
9 Aboriginal Issues Committee and the Human Rights  
10 Monitoring Group.

11 -- EQUITY AND ABORIGINAL ISSUES

12 COMMITTEE:

13 MS. DONNELLY: Good morning, Treasurer.  
14 I have the Human Rights Monitoring Group request for  
15 intervention.

16 The motion, found at tab 4.1 of  
17 BoardBooks, is at page 229 and it is that Convocation  
18 approve the letters and public statements in the  
19 following cases: Ramón Cadena Rámila from Guatemala.  
20 Letters of intervention and a public statement are  
21 presented at tab 4.11; and Jamshed Yorov from  
22 Tajikistan, letters of intervention and public  
23 statement are presented at tab 4.1.2.

24 The request for interventions fall  
25 within the mandate of the Human Rights Monitoring Group



1 and there are no concerns about the sources of  
2 information used for the reports.

3           The first request for intervention  
4 relates to the harassment of Ramón Cadena Rámila of  
5 Guatemala. He is a well-known human rights lawyer in  
6 Guatemala. Reports indicate that in August of 2016  
7 armed men ransacked his house in Guatemala City and  
8 that his family and security guard were forced to wait  
9 on their knees outside the home while it was ransacked.  
10 Ramón Cadena Rámila was away from the home at the time.

11           The Law Society of England and Wales  
12 notes that attacks on human rights lawyers in Guatemala  
13 have intensified in the last few months. They are  
14 concerned, as is the Human Rights Monitoring Group,  
15 that the attack on Mr. Cadena's property reflects a  
16 pattern of systemic intimidation and harassment carried  
17 out against human rights lawyers for their work in  
18 Guatemala.

19           The Law Society of Upper Canada has  
20 intervened previously in cases of lawyers and judges in  
21 Guatemala, and most recently in June of 2014.

22           The second request for intervention is  
23 in relation of the arrest of Jamshed Yorov of  
24 Tajikistan. Jamshed Yorov is a lawyer in Tajikistan  
25 who represented the deputy chairman of a banned

1 opposition party, the Islamic Renaissance Party of  
2 Tajikistan.

3 In June of 2016 the deputy chairman was  
4 sentenced to life in prison. In August of 2016 Jamshed  
5 Yorov, his lawyer, was arrested and detained on  
6 suspicion of dissemination of a state secret.

7 Jamshed Yorov is the third Tajik lawyer  
8 representing members of the Islamic Renaissance Party  
9 of Tajikistan who has been arrested. One of those  
10 other lawyers who was arrested was Jamshed Yorov's  
11 brother, and the Law Society of Upper Canada intervened  
12 in his brother's case in January of 2016.

13 The motion is moved by me and seconded  
14 by Ms. St. Lewis.

15 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you. Any  
16 discussion? Any discussion on the phone? Hearing  
17 none, all in favour? Anyone opposed? Anyone opposed  
18 on the telephone? Motion is carried, thank you. Thank  
19 you, Ms. Donnelly.

20 The report of the Professional  
21 Development and Competence Committee. Mr. Wardle.

22 -- PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND  
23 COMPETENCE COMMITTEE REPORT:

24 MR. WARDLE: Thank you, Treasurer. The  
25 report of the committee is found at tab 2 of

1 BoardBooks, starting at page 17. And the motion before  
2 Convocation this morning is found at page 19 of  
3 BoardBooks.

4                   So by way of background, as you know,  
5 the Professional Development and Competence Committee  
6 submitted a report to Convocation in September  
7 recommending that the Law Practice Program established  
8 as part of the Pathways Project be ended after the  
9 third year. And that report also recommended a number  
10 of enhancements to the licensing process arising out of  
11 one of the primary initiatives coming out of our  
12 strategic plan.

13                   Those enhancements had been developed  
14 last year between 2015 and 2016 and originally came  
15 before Convocation last spring.

16                   I just want to pause for a moment to  
17 remind benchers that there are currently 14 members of  
18 the PD&C Committee and that last year's committee was  
19 close to 27 benchers.

20                   As a result, I think it's fair to say  
21 that many of us in this room have played some role in  
22 the decision making that led to the September report  
23 and I think it's also fair to say that over the last  
24 few years just about everyone in the room has had some  
25 involvement in one way or another with our licensing

1 process.

2 As you know, the current committee  
3 worked to a very short deadline in August and September  
4 of this year to develop the September recommendations.

5 As part of our meetings in the summer,  
6 the committee considered a wide range of issues  
7 relating to the LPP and the enhancements. I think it's  
8 fair to say that there was a great deal of dialogue and  
9 debate and a productive discussion by all concerned,  
10 but at the end of the day, as you know, the September  
11 recommendations were not unanimous.

12 In the September report there was a  
13 consultation period for written comments by  
14 stakeholders, and you'll recall that period was very  
15 short because of our time constraints, and we did  
16 expect to receive a number of comments and indeed we  
17 did.

18 We received approximately 125 written  
19 submissions and a further petition from over 100  
20 individuals. We heard from a wide variety of  
21 organizations; from the usual suspects such the  
22 Advocates' Society, the OBA, FOLA, Criminal Lawyers  
23 Association, AJEFO, various equity-seeking  
24 organizations, Law Students Association, I could go on,  
25 but we also got a much wider group of submissions than

1 we normally do when we go out for any form of  
2 consultation.

3           And we heard from practitioners, LPP  
4 mentors, LPP candidates, academics, university law  
5 schools, the Office of the Fairness Commissioner and  
6 more. Even the Ministry of the Attorney General. And  
7 by and large, those submissions were thoughtful,  
8 respectful of the committee's work, and offered  
9 interesting insights and intelligent commentary on the  
10 issues we face and that this organization continues to  
11 face in connection with the licensing process.

12           None of the submissions raised any  
13 significant issues which we had not considered at the  
14 committee in our deliberation; however, on balance, we  
15 received a perspective on the debate which was new and  
16 which we felt we had to consider in going forward.

17           So I want to outline for Convocation  
18 very quickly just a few of the themes which emerged  
19 during the consultation process. The first theme was  
20 that it's simply premature to draw conclusions about  
21 the LPP at this point in time. Many submissions made  
22 the point that the program was new, was innovative, and  
23 that because the LPP itself, at least the course  
24 component of the LPP, was considered by the committee  
25 to be a good program and we acknowledged that in our

1       September report, it's simply too early in the program  
2       now really as we're just entering the third year.

3                 And as part of this theme we heard from  
4       numerous LPP mentors, that is, members of the  
5       profession who have participated in the LPP, either in  
6       Ottawa or at Ryerson, and candidates who have been  
7       impressed with both the training program and the  
8       candidates themselves.

9                 The second theme was that it's defeatist  
10       for the Law Society to end a new program because of  
11       perceived second tier status, so the submission was put  
12       to us that the Law Society should put more resources  
13       into promoting the program and let it run longer than  
14       simply giving up at this stage.

15                Some of the comments were that the root  
16       of the issue was the traditional articling program,  
17       which itself has created the second tier status for any  
18       alternative. Others suggested that it should be left  
19       to the candidates themselves to select the route to  
20       become licensed. Still others suggested that while  
21       it's preferable to have a single pathway, it's  
22       premature to end the LPP before developing a plan for  
23       next steps.

24                And that brings me to the third, and  
25       probably the most important of the themes that emerged

1 from the consultation, and that was we heard from a  
2 large number of organizations that before we make a  
3 decision to end the LPP, we need to have a concrete  
4 plan in place to deal with candidates who will no  
5 longer have that path to licensing.

6 As you know, we have about 200 plus  
7 candidates who are presently being served by the LPP in  
8 Ottawa and at Ryerson. We currently accept as an  
9 organization that these 200 plus candidates meet our  
10 licensing requirements and are practice ready.

11 So what will happen to this group of  
12 candidates in the future? You'll recall in September  
13 we gave some suggestions about the way forward, but the  
14 committee simply did not have the time to develop a  
15 comprehensive plan.

16 In the submissions there appeared to be  
17 a broad consensus that the Law Society needed to  
18 develop a broader-based plan to move forward, looking  
19 at the licensing process as a whole.

20 The fourth theme was that we should  
21 consider making the LPP, or some version of it, the  
22 only pathway to licensing. A number of mentors who  
23 have worked as both articling principals and  
24 LPP mentors expressed the view that the LPP is actually  
25 a far superior form of transitional training, and,

1 again, many of the submissions, particularly from  
2 equity-seeking organizations stressed that, long term,  
3 there should only be one pathway to licensing.

4           Some of the submissions suggested  
5 abolishing articling, although we had not asked that  
6 question and it was not raised in our September report.

7           The final theme I will mention is that  
8 we did hear from a number of individuals and  
9 organizations, including the Law Students Association  
10 and the Advocates' Society, who supported the September  
11 recommendations either in whole or in part, but I  
12 should be clear that this was the minority view.

13           The committee reviewed all of the these  
14 recommendations carefully and I read every single one  
15 of the submissions. Again, although none of these  
16 themes were new, the perspective we gained was  
17 invaluable and it reminded us of what we already know,  
18 and that is that our stakeholders care very deeply  
19 about the future of the licensing process. There is a  
20 great deal of anxiety in the profession about the  
21 future and this is a subject which engenders passionate  
22 debate.

23           Ultimately, the committee concluded that  
24 those submissions that stress the need for us to  
25 develop a long term plan for the entire licensing



1 process before making any decision on the LPP were  
2 persuasive. Again, as in our September  
3 recommendations, this was not a unanimous view, but it  
4 was the view of the majority of the committee.

5 And so you will see at BoardBooks on  
6 page 19 a revised, much simpler recommendation, set of  
7 recommendations for approval by Convocation.

8 Essentially those recommendations have  
9 three components. First, that the LPP be continued and  
10 extended for two more years, and this is consistent  
11 with the original motion of Convocation which set up  
12 the LPP in 2012, that that is that we were to review it  
13 during the third year, but it could be extended for  
14 another two years if Convocation so approve.

15 Second, that Convocation withdraw from  
16 consideration, at least for now, the licensing  
17 enhancements that were part of the September report.  
18 It's not that we're going to put them away and forget  
19 about them, and I'll come back to this in a moment, but  
20 for the time being they will be shelved.

21 Third, that Convocation direct an  
22 analysis of the licensing process be undertaken for the  
23 purpose of making long term recommendations for an  
24 appropriate sustainable licensing process.

25 Now, these recommendations are based on

1 the outcome of the consultation. It reflects the fact  
2 that the committee has listened to the views of  
3 stakeholders, and I don't apologize for that. The  
4 licensing system, while it is our responsibility and  
5 we're tasked with making the ultimate decisions, it  
6 affects every participant in the justice system, so  
7 it's important that we listen and that we reflect on  
8 what we're hearing.

9           So before I finish, I want to give you a  
10 couple of thoughts about the way ahead. First, what  
11 this review of the licensing process is going to look  
12 like is left in the motion completely undefined. Our  
13 committee is going to consider it and come back to  
14 Convocation with a concrete plan in the first quarter  
15 of 2017.

16           Second, the committee is not ruling  
17 anything out at this stage. This is going to be a  
18 wide-ranging, long term review of the entire process  
19 from beginning to end. We're not going to continue to  
20 tinker or make piecemeal changes with one piece of the  
21 puzzle at a time.

22           And that's really the basis for our  
23 recommendation that we not proceed with the  
24 enhancements at this point. We really need to look at  
25 the big picture and not tinker, and we don't want to

1 make small decisions now that will affect the longer  
2 term review.

3 Third, many on the committee continue to  
4 have concerns about the sustainability and fairness of  
5 the LPP, so those issues are not going to go away. We  
6 may, however, now have an opportunity to look at the  
7 LPP not in isolation or compared very narrowly to  
8 articling, but as part of the bigger picture. And the  
9 same is true of articling itself.

10 Third, we have to find a better way of  
11 engaging our stakeholders early. One of the  
12 difficulties with the current process, and both Howard  
13 as the previous chair, and me as the current chair of  
14 PD&C, is that we have been forced to artificial  
15 deadlines where the committee works away essentially in  
16 isolation for a period of time, produces a report, that  
17 report goes out to the various stakeholders, they  
18 express concern and apprehension, and then it comes  
19 back to the committee that decides to go in a different  
20 direction.

21 That simply -- that approach simply  
22 doesn't work with a problem as complex and has as many  
23 pieces as this one and involves so many stakeholders,  
24 so we have to do this differently in future.

25 We also have to give ourselves the time

1 to do the job properly without rushing. The committee,  
2 as I said, had a limited mandate in the spring and even  
3 over the summer and a very narrow, limited deadline to  
4 adhere to. We will take our time next time around, and  
5 if that means that the LPP has to be extended again,  
6 that's what we will do.

7 So I just want to end by saying that I  
8 was initially apprehensive about what may seem to some  
9 in this room to be a U-turn on the part of my  
10 committee. On reflection, I'm convinced that this is  
11 the best way forward. I continue to have reservations  
12 about the Law Practice Program, as did many on the  
13 committee, but it simply did not make sense to end it  
14 at this time without a longer term plan, and all of us  
15 have been informed by the debate and the discussion and  
16 the views of those we've heard from.

17 So I actually think we have arrived,  
18 although perhaps in a circuitous fashion, in a very  
19 good place.

20 So that's my introduction to the motion.  
21 I'm not sure that I found a seconder, but I'm sure --  
22 I'm sure Mr. Goldblatt will second the motion. So I  
23 move the motion, seconded by Mr. Goldblatt.

24 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you.

25 Discussion? Ms. Papageorgiou.

1 MS. PAPAGEORGIOU: This is my first time  
2 speaking at Convocation. I'm a little bit nervous.

3 First thing is I would like to say I'm  
4 wearing a pantsuit in honour of Hillary Clinton.

5 -- Applause.

6 MS. PAPAGEORGIOU: I want to thank the  
7 committee for all of the work that they've done on  
8 their research and also their tremendous flexibility in  
9 responding to the concerns. I definitely support the  
10 motion, but I feel that I need to speak up and explain  
11 why.

12 There are a few things. First of all,  
13 when you look at the -- the four things I want to talk  
14 about are the superiority of the program, the public  
15 interest, the financial implications and access to  
16 justice and how all of this is implicated by what we do  
17 here.

18 The superiority of the program. The  
19 first report that was done, it was pretty clear when  
20 you look at it that you have a program that's -- began  
21 and only been in operation in two years. They have  
22 only had two years to put something together, and yet  
23 the report clearly shows when you compare articling to  
24 the current LPP, which only had two years, it was  
25 superior in satisfaction ratings, in the mastery or

1 skills competencies, and also in the student themselves  
2 saying whether one gave them great -- was of good value  
3 to them. In all the ways that we measured at this  
4 early stage, the LPP appeared to be superior.

5 Now, our obligation is to govern in the  
6 public interest and I cannot understand how we could  
7 think about moving away from a program that actually  
8 trains people, it looks at this early stage, in a  
9 better and more consistent way than articling.

10 I've thought about the financial  
11 implications because everyone says, well, it's so  
12 expensive, and then I went and I looked at the -- I  
13 looked at our annual report -- not our annual report,  
14 our budget. Just let me find it. Just give me a  
15 moment.

16 Every year the Law Society earns more  
17 money through licensing fees and that money comes from  
18 new licensees. I checked, and the projected increase  
19 in the budget just from licensing fees is about four or  
20 five million dollars. There will be more and more  
21 lawyers entering the legal profession and I can be  
22 pretty well certain that we're going to have that  
23 additional money every year as there are more and more  
24 lawyers entering the profession.

25 Why can we not, as a Law Society, say to

1 ourselves we expect this additional income. We're  
2 going to now commit that we're going to take this  
3 additional money and we're going to put it into the  
4 licensing process and we're not going to overburden  
5 these law students who are graduating with a tremendous  
6 amount of debt already, we are going to -- because what  
7 we're doing is we're getting more money from these new  
8 graduates and then we're charging them for their  
9 training, and I just think it's not acceptable and I  
10 don't think it's in accordance with the objective of  
11 access to justice.

12 As these new graduates end up graduating  
13 with more and more debt, they are far less able to  
14 enter into any kind of a practice that would serve  
15 people who cannot afford lawyers. So I feel that what,  
16 and I hope that what the committee will do is that they  
17 will take a good hard look at articling and the LPP,  
18 and try to find a fair and sustainable way to train and  
19 licence new lawyers that is not punitive of the new  
20 lawyers and that encourages access to justice.

21 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Ms.  
22 Papageorgiou. Mr. Cooper.

23 MR. COOPER: Good morning, Treasurer,  
24 Mr. Wardle, and members of the PD&C committee, I  
25 appreciate everything that you've done and all the hard

1 work that you've done.

2 I stood up at Convocation, it wasn't  
3 that long ago, at our last Convocation, and I briefly  
4 spoke. I had concerns and I felt that they were  
5 important. They were important to our members on the  
6 front line.

7 I tried and I attempted to articulate  
8 that the LPP program is an excellent program. It's  
9 qualitative. I was dismayed at the recommendation, and  
10 I have not sat on PD&C since coming to Convocation, I  
11 was dismayed that the report contemplated that soon at  
12 hand would be the demise of this qualitative program.

13 Seeing I come from outside of Toronto, I  
14 come from the Central East region, I come from a  
15 practice at the front lines. On the front lines and on  
16 the ground are members of our profession who are trying  
17 to get this regulatory body's attention. They did so  
18 in the last election. We must listen to them.

19 In the simplest terms, we understand our  
20 mandate is the protection of the public, but also, we  
21 fail to understand that the best way to serve the  
22 public, ensuring that they are protected, is to ensure  
23 as a priority that we support our members on the front  
24 line in all matters. Our membership needs to help and  
25 we have been doing this during this Convocation.



1 There's been wonderful new initiatives that have been  
2 brought to Convocation and are now in -- on their way  
3 to assist the members of our profession.

4 We need to help our membership, we need  
5 to help because we have the highest quality of  
6 education and knowledge of the law of those on the  
7 front lines; they're showing it every day to the  
8 public. And we have the highest standard of  
9 professionalism in the practice of law in this  
10 province. Those are the ones that are practising, and  
11 they got there in a certain way.

12 Maybe we forgot that we had gone through  
13 a different type of process, a process that included  
14 Bar Ads, a process that we did not end up bearing the  
15 brunt of the full costs during our time when we wanted  
16 to become members of this profession and licensed by  
17 this body.

18 We must believe, and we must hear our  
19 membership, that we are to act, when we protect our  
20 members we protect the public.

21 Before I decided to run for Bencher I  
22 spoke to a lot of people outside of Toronto, that's  
23 where I practice. I spoke to those on the front lines  
24 and again I went back between last Convocation and this  
25 Convocation, reaching out to those for what their views

1 were. And you've heard the views of those that have  
2 made submissions and they are not different than those  
3 on the front lines.

4 Our colleagues want the LPP, they  
5 recognize it is a qualitative program and they are  
6 supportive of it. They're also supportive of  
7 articling. I'll let you know that I've heard that as  
8 well.

9 I support this motion and I thank Mr.  
10 Wardle and his committee for having an open mind so  
11 that we can review what is at hand through a holistic  
12 approach.

13 And in that review I just want to say  
14 the following: I hope that it includes a look at  
15 costs, and what I spoke about last time is what do we  
16 define as fairness. We can no longer load the  
17 students, the future members of our profession, future  
18 members of this Law Society, with the brunt of the  
19 cost. We owe the public the duty to ensure that these  
20 candidates come through, are licensed, and their  
21 practices are sustainable to help the public.

22 We know that from this year's budget,  
23 between the costs to our members for fees and  
24 insurance, that there is a reduction, a substantial  
25 reduction from last year's budget, substantial

1 reduction that's approximately two times the cost of  
2 this program, but for some reason we keep on talking  
3 about scarce resources and we should be downloading the  
4 costs on students. Again, remember what we went  
5 through and the benefit that we had. How soon do we  
6 forget that.

7           We also have to look at promoting the  
8 LPP as a true and respected option, equal to articling  
9 and maybe being part of articling. I hope you consider  
10 that. I hope you consider that it is a great pathway  
11 to licensing and that it is a proactive way to ensure  
12 the public is protected, as opposed to spending money  
13 after people are licensed without the quality of this  
14 type of education and learning, where we'll spend money  
15 to try to discipline them, that costs a lot, and look  
16 at the entire process, including articling, and again  
17 hear from those on the front line. This is an issue  
18 that does include the concept of access to justice, an  
19 obligation that we must undertake.

20           I end by saying there's a difference  
21 between regulating in the public interest and  
22 regulating in the barriers to entry. That is what we  
23 do, in my view, if we try to stop the LPP program.  
24 Thank you.

25           TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Mr.

1 Cooper. Mr. Bredt.

2 MR. BREDT: Notice I'm treading  
3 carefully. I for one, Treasurer, like the idea of  
4 having a room where I can actually make it intact to  
5 the podium.

6 So, Treasurer and members of the  
7 committee, I want to thank you for the report, most of  
8 which I support.

9 Let me start by saying that ensuring  
10 competency is at the core of our regulatory mandate,  
11 but in my view, the bottom line is that we're not doing  
12 a particularly good job at this core competency,  
13 particularly on entry to the profession, and I'm  
14 pleased and I support the fact that PD&C is committed  
15 to a comprehensive review of this area.

16 In these remarks I want to speak to two  
17 key points. First, what is the principle that should  
18 guide us as we embark on this process and, secondly,  
19 what are the specific steps that the Law Society should  
20 be taking to ensure competency on entrance to the  
21 profession?

22 Let me deal with the first point. What  
23 is the principle that should guide us as we reform our  
24 approach to competency? The answer to that question  
25 should be obvious, we regulate in the public interest,

1 and the public interest in this area is clear.

2 We should only licence to practice  
3 individuals who are competent to provide services in  
4 the areas in which we licence them to the public. And  
5 I state the obvious at the outset, because the public  
6 interest is often different than the interest of the  
7 stakeholders.

8 Some of the stakeholders here, two  
9 groups I'm going to mention, first of all, law  
10 students. Let's be frank about it, the overriding  
11 interest of law students is to get called to the bar.  
12 If you spoke to every law student, they'd say let's  
13 have no barriers to entry here. We should all practice  
14 law. As soon as we get admitted to law school, we  
15 should pass through law school and we should get called  
16 to the bar.

17 Let me be clear: It is not in the  
18 public interest to allow any student admitted to law  
19 school to practice law, unless they're competent to do  
20 so. I note the "term admitted to law school" rather  
21 than "graduated from law school," because I say, to be  
22 frank, law schools don't fail anybody these days.  
23 Essentially, once you're admitted to law school, most  
24 people pass out --

25 -- Laughter.

1                   MR. BREDT: The current assumption at  
2 the law school as part of -- as here at the Law  
3 Society, appears that we should be working hard to  
4 ensure that each and every one of the law students that  
5 are admitted to law school should be licensed.

6                   I say what should guide us here, and I  
7 am strongly of the view that we should be working hard  
8 to ensure that no one is licensed unless they are  
9 competent to serve the public in the areas which we  
10 licence them to practice.

11                   The second group of stakeholders is  
12 primarily the practising bar. As I hear frequently,  
13 that we licence too many lawyers, that the Law Society  
14 should take steps to limit numbers. Again, I don't  
15 agree. Our role is to ensure that the individuals we  
16 license to practice are competent. If there are a  
17 large number of competent lawyers, that's in the public  
18 interest. It's in the public interest because it  
19 assists with access to justice, and I urge the  
20 committee, as they move forward with this, to ensure  
21 that they're guided by the public interest and not  
22 necessarily by the interests of our stakeholders.

23                   So I turn to my second point, which is  
24 what are the specific steps that the Law Society should  
25 be taking to ensure competence on entry to the

1 profession. And I say there's four phases of entry to  
2 the profession. You've got academic training, you've  
3 got practical training, you've got admission and  
4 licensing and you have the early years of practice.

5 Let's start first with academic  
6 training. I agree with the committee's original  
7 proposal to institute a competent exam that tests  
8 standard knowledge that must be passed prior to  
9 entering into our licensing process. And I say that  
10 because it's obvious to me that our current approach is  
11 not effective.

12 Our current approach is the Federation  
13 specifies substantive areas that must be covered at law  
14 school. The reality is we take no steps to ensure the  
15 substantive areas are actually covered.

16 I could give you a myriad of examples.  
17 You could take criminal law from one professor and you  
18 get a course on Marxism and the law; you can take a  
19 criminal law course from somewhere and you learn some  
20 criminal law. Our licensing process does nothing to  
21 ensure that you actually learn something about criminal  
22 law.

23 I say we should stop telling the law  
24 schools what to teach and we should, instead, tell them  
25 what we are going to test, and that's a much more

1 effective approach to regulation. Our current process  
2 assumes that everyone graduating from law school has  
3 the necessary substantive knowledge. We know that's  
4 not the case, and in order to properly protect the  
5 public, we need a comprehensive test of substantive  
6 knowledge and we need it now.

7           Secondly, practical training. Once  
8 we've ensured adequate substantive knowledge, we need  
9 to ensure proper practical training. Now, I know  
10 there's a number of Benchers here who would like to  
11 abolish articling. I don't support that. I don't  
12 support any move to abolish articling. Why not?  
13 Firstly, it's obvious that no one is ready to practice  
14 after three years of law school. A period of practical  
15 training is necessary to protect the public interest.  
16 And by practical training, I mean training in practice,  
17 not training at law school.

18           Second, I say look at the other  
19 professions. You can look at engineering, accounting,  
20 medicine; all require a period of practical training  
21 before the student is licensed. I recognize that the  
22 articling experience can be uneven, and I'm a good  
23 example. I mean, I clerked, I had no practical  
24 training during my articles at all, but fortunately I  
25 was hired by a law firm and I wasn't a regulatory issue



1 because in my early years of practice I was provided  
2 with adequate supervision and given some mentoring.

3           This leads to my broader point. For a  
4 majority of students who article with a firm and get  
5 hired back or start practice in a supervised  
6 environment, we do not have a significant regulatory  
7 risk. Our real area of regulatory risk is for those  
8 students who article and then decide to practice as  
9 sole practitioners in an unsupervised environment.  
10 That's our real regulatory risk. And we need to ensure  
11 that those practising in an unsupervised environment  
12 have the practical skills necessary to run a sole  
13 practice and receive some supervision in the early  
14 years.

15           In fact, I supported the institution of  
16 the LPP for that very reason, and I think when you look  
17 at what the committee's report has said, many of these  
18 people go on to practice in unsupervised areas and they  
19 probably get better training at the LPP than they would  
20 in regular articles or sole practice.

21           Let's not throw the baby out with the  
22 bath water by abolishing articling, which works well in  
23 most cases to address the problems in a minority of  
24 cases.

25           Third part, admission and licensing. A

1 key problem with our licensing is that we provide an  
2 unlimited licence to practice in all areas of law. So  
3 my friend, Paul Cooper, and I are both licensed to  
4 practice real estate. Now, I know Paul may be  
5 competent to practice in real estate, but I surely am  
6 not.

7 Our regulatory model is to give everyone  
8 an unlimited license to practice and essentially rely  
9 on lawyers not to take on matters that they are not  
10 competent to handle. I say frankly to Convocation this  
11 model does not adequately protect the public interest.  
12 We need to start to look at limited licensing. Once  
13 the scope of practice is limited, we will be able to  
14 move in a more focused manner on practical training.

15 If you're only licensing someone to  
16 practice real estate, you don't have to worry about  
17 whether they're competent to do family law or criminal  
18 law.

19 Final area of practice is what I call  
20 the early years of practice. Here again we need to do  
21 a better job of protecting the public interest. We  
22 need to recognize the regulatory risk is largely those  
23 practising in unsupervised environments.

24 If I at BLG attempted to do a real  
25 estate deal one of my partners would shut me down

1 pretty quickly. Part of the problem that we have is  
2 that with the debt loads of these students who  
3 graduate, when they start off as sole practitioners  
4 there's incentive to take on all sorts of work,  
5 including work that they don't have any practical  
6 training or experience in.

7           So in the early years of practice we  
8 need to look at some form of mandatory supervision or  
9 mentoring for those in an unsupervised environment and  
10 this needs to be combined with a limited licence.

11           So, in summary, I say I support the  
12 committee's decision, first of all, to move forward  
13 with a comprehensive review of the licensing process.  
14 I think that's -- that is the appropriate thing to do  
15 and we should have done it long ago.

16           I agree that we should retain the  
17 LPP while this process is ongoing. I do disagree with  
18 the decision to postpone a comprehensive substantive  
19 exam that should be passed prior to entry to the  
20 licensing process, because to me it's obvious that this  
21 is a step that we need to take and we should take it  
22 sooner rather than later. Thank you, Treasurer.

23           TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Mr.  
24 Bredt. Mr. Groia.

25           MR. GROIA: Thank you, Treasurer. I

1 find myself in the somewhat unusual position of having  
2 been part of the strong majority in September who  
3 supported the end of the LPP program and now being in a  
4 somewhat small and lonely minority who continue to have  
5 that view.

6           What I want to do this morning is to  
7 try, as quickly as I can, to give you the reasons that  
8 led the committee in September to recommend that  
9 LPP needs to come to an end, and it needs to come to an  
10 end, in my respectful view, today.

11           I provided for your consideration some  
12 materials because I believe we are at a crossroads. In  
13 my view, this is not an articling crisis, but rather  
14 it's a crisis of the profession itself. And I've also  
15 given you, because it was just released yesterday, a  
16 report prepared by Prism showing the trends in the  
17 employment expectations for lawyers in the province of  
18 Ontario.

19           And, put simply, what we are facing over  
20 the next ten years is the reality that we are going to  
21 have 1.6 new lawyers called to the bar for every job  
22 that will be available for them to take.

23           So in my view, the evidence that is in  
24 the material before you is clear and overwhelming that  
25 there is ample reason for us today to discontinue

1 supporting this program, and I'm going to give you in  
2 my short remarks three categories of reasons for doing  
3 so.

4 I believe that the program harms the  
5 candidates who are coming up for licensing. I believe  
6 it harms the public interest because of the effects of  
7 the program on the public, and I believe it hurts the  
8 profession.

9 I want to start, though, by taking you  
10 back to 1954 and *Brown v Board of Education*, which  
11 many, many years ago was the result of the Supreme  
12 Court of the United States recognizing that separate  
13 but equal pathways in education never works.

14 The second thing I want to do is take  
15 you back to 2012, and I've provided for you in the  
16 materials at tab 2 the report of the minority of the  
17 Articling Task Force, and I say with some reluctance or  
18 perhaps hesitation that the fears of the minority have  
19 come to pass with the results of the LPP program.  
20 Those fears were that it would create two tier  
21 licensing, and there's ample evidence to support that  
22 conclusion, that it would do so at great expense, and  
23 I'm going to take you briefly to the costs of this, and  
24 it would cause harm to the public interest.

25 Perhaps the best evidence of why

1 LPP does not work comes from Dr. Ali's report at tab 3  
2 and Diana Miles' report at tab 4.

3           What we are told is that two-thirds of  
4 the LPP candidates do not want to be there. That they  
5 have searched for an articling job, 99 percent of them  
6 have searched for an articling job unsuccessfully, so  
7 they have gone to the LPP as the second choice.

8           Even more compelling is that 318  
9 candidates who couldn't find an articling job think so  
10 little of the LPP program that they won't join it, and  
11 they would prefer to sit on the sidelines for another  
12 year in the hope that one day they will be successful  
13 in articling.

14           There are three ways, in my view, that  
15 the LPP harms the candidates themselves. The evidence  
16 of second tier perception is overwhelming, and  
17 notwithstanding our best hopes and wishes, that's not  
18 going to change. So we are creating, if we continue  
19 this program, another 500 candidates who will go  
20 through the rest of their professional life with a  
21 stigma that comes from the fact that they went through  
22 the LPP program, and that evidence can be found at tab  
23 4, page 29, and tab 5, page 329.

24           Secondly, the LPP imposes a crushing  
25 financial burden. This program costs around 3-million

1 dollars, which results in a payment of \$1900 per  
2 candidate to support the program, and the cost of the  
3 per candidate ranges as high as \$70,000 per candidate  
4 in the Ottawa program in one year.

5           The third way that it really hurts the  
6 candidates is that they find themselves with unpaid  
7 placements. We know that somewhere in the  
8 neighbourhood of three percent of all articling  
9 students are not paid and we know somewhere in the  
10 neighbourhood of 30 percent of all LPP candidates work  
11 for free at a time when they're already burdened by  
12 this enormous financial debt.

13           And there's also terrible hire back  
14 numbers coming out of the LPP program. What we are  
15 told as we did our work as the committee is that  
16 roughly 34 percent of LPP candidates in the first year  
17 and 32 percent of LPP candidates in the second year  
18 expected to be working upon being called to the bar,  
19 and that compares to almost 50 percent of articling  
20 candidates who were expecting to be employed.

21           Secondly, in my view, the LPP program  
22 harms the public interest in these ways. There are  
23 competency concerns that we have to address that are  
24 before you in the material on the table today because  
25 we know that 52 percent of all LPP candidates failed

1 the Bar Ads on their first writing. That was in the  
2 first year, and the second year results were not that  
3 much different.

4                   Articling candidates had a 15 percent  
5 failure rate, so three and a half times as many LPP  
6 students could not successfully pass the bar on the  
7 first writing.

8                   We also know that most of the LPP  
9 candidates who do find employment do so as a sole  
10 practitioner. The evidence before you at tab 5 shows  
11 that roughly 41 percent of all LPP candidates will hang  
12 up their own shingle, as opposed to six percent of  
13 articling students who will go out immediately into  
14 sole practice.

15                   Similarly, in terms of them finding jobs  
16 as associates, almost half of the articling students  
17 end up working as associates, 16 percent of the LPP  
18 candidates end up as associates.

19                   We know from the work we've done at the  
20 committee that the majority of complaints that we  
21 receive come from soles and smalls, and here we are  
22 putting another 41 percent of these candidates from the  
23 very first day they are lawyers practising on their  
24 own. And we know from the Prism work that that problem  
25 is going to continue and exacerbate over the next ten



1 years.

2                   Lastly, in my view the LPP program harms  
3 the profession. There's a million dollars a year  
4 burden that the profession is asked to pay to subsidize  
5 the program and from a practical standpoint, the  
6 suggestion that we would ask all lawyers to pay to have  
7 additional candidates be called to the bar through a  
8 program that, in my view, creates artificial job  
9 placements simply cannot, I believe, be supported.

10                   I listened to Mr. Wardle's comments  
11 about the responses we received and I wanted you to  
12 have a selection of them, so I've given you at tab 7  
13 the response of the CLA, which supports the ending of  
14 the LPP program. At tab 8 you have the Advocates'  
15 Society, who has a similar view, but they want to  
16 continue the LPP program while we study these issues.

17                   The Equity Initiatives at tab 9 sets out  
18 the divergent views of that group, some of whom want to  
19 terminate LPP and some of whom want to continue it.  
20 Lastly, the Attorney General at tab 10 raises concerns  
21 about the continuation of the program and also the  
22 extent to which the LPP will provide a reasonable or  
23 meaningful alternative to articling.

24                   So, in conclusion, I support the  
25 committee's willingness to take a good hard look at all

1 of these issues, I don't believe, however, we need any  
2 further evidence to conclude that the LPP program is  
3 not the solution, it adds to the problem, it does so at  
4 great expense, and for me the most troubling aspect is  
5 it does so on the backs of young candidates who will  
6 forever when they're asked where you did you article,  
7 they will have to say I went through the LPP program,  
8 and that will cause the stigma to continue.

9 So I will vote against the motion to  
10 continue LPP, but I will support the balance of the  
11 recommendations. Thank you for your consideration.

12 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you very much,  
13 Mr. Groia. Mr. Galati.

14 MR. GALATI: Thank you, Treasurer, and  
15 I'll be two minutes. I don't want to repeat anything  
16 that's said. I support much of what Mr. Groia put  
17 forward and these will be my two minutes, and out of  
18 respect for Mr. Bredt, make my pitch for abolition.

19 John Sopinka once said that the greatest  
20 threat to our civil liberties in Canada is political  
21 correctness. I want to talk about the couple of  
22 elephants in the room as we grapple with this  
23 multifaceted problem that really don't bluntly get  
24 addressed.

25 That is, historically for the last 50

1 years, the legal profession is known to have a healthy  
2 racist exclusionary practice against whatever  
3 racialized group that is coming to the profession at  
4 the time. So you talk to any Jewish lawyer in the city  
5 who came through in the 50s and 60s, they will tell you  
6 you can't get articling jobs. You talk to any of us  
7 who are Italian, up until 30 years ago we'll tell you  
8 the same thing.

9                   When I was in the Department of Justice  
10 I was ranked 48th on the matching program. 47 people  
11 had to say no thank you before I was hired as an  
12 articling student. 1987 at the Department of Justice,  
13 while 26 percent of the city were Italian-Canadian and  
14 16 percent of the profession were Italian-Canadian,  
15 there were two of us who were Italian-Canadian in the  
16 regional office. So this is nothing new.

17                   We are trying to address two problems  
18 that really are irreconcilable. One is the notion that  
19 every graduate of a profession is entitled to a job.  
20 That's just nonsensical. Why are we obsessed that  
21 every law graduate get an articling position? That's  
22 just not tenable.

23                   But, for me, the bigger problem, the  
24 real elephant in the room and the real barrier that  
25 causes all the problems, is articling itself.

1           So I say that if you abolish articling  
2     and put in a rigorous bar exam, and I take Mr. Bredt's  
3     comments to heart and I agree with him, with the  
4     follow-up competency and mentoring in the early years  
5     of practice, then you do something that a lot of us  
6     unfortunately don't want to see. You level the playing  
7     field.

8           I'm not a politically correct person  
9     that buys the notion that all privileged law graduates  
10    would necessarily float to the top in a level playing  
11    field and that all unprivileged law graduates or  
12    racialized law graduates are going to sink to the  
13    bottom. I say give them all the same rigorous exam, do  
14    what a lot of jurisdictions do and have a healthy  
15    failure rate of 40 percent, and if we believe in the  
16    market, then they proceed forward into the market and  
17    then we regulate them from there.

18           But it's the articling really that is  
19    the barrier. That's the disguised racialized barrier  
20    that causes the inequities, in my respectful view.

21           And there is a myth. There is no total  
22    enveloping symmetry between being racialized and  
23    underprivileged. My small, modest office has a policy.  
24    We only hire, whether it be articling students or  
25    juniors and staff, racialized persons who are obviously

1 bright and who have obviously not landed a job because  
2 of race. But I don't hire people who I don't think are  
3 going to be competent or who are not competent, and we  
4 should not be shy to address those. Those are the  
5 blunt issues, whether you're white or a visible  
6 minority, the issue is competence.

7           So what you want to do is -- what I  
8 would like to see is an elimination of that preliminary  
9 gate of exclusion, which is the articling program in  
10 itself.

11           And so I know nobody is going to second  
12 it, I can't support this motion for one reason, because  
13 I know we'll just languish and fester on this. If the  
14 LPP is extended, we just won't deal with these blunt,  
15 compelling issues, and they have to be dealt with, not  
16 in this politically namby pamby correct way that they  
17 have been historically handled, and we've gone around  
18 competence, but we haven't really dealt with the racial  
19 exclusion issue and the levelling of the playing field  
20 for graduates of law school.

21           So I would -- I would suggest an  
22 amendment to the motion that when it goes back to the  
23 committee the abolition of articling outright also be  
24 on the table because it's not clear to me that it was.

25           TREASURER SCHABAS: I think it is,

1 Mr. Galati. Mr. Wardle made it very clear everything  
2 is on the table. So I don't think you need to --

3 MR. GALATI: Well, I heard a comment  
4 from Mr. Wardle that while some people, you know,  
5 advocate for abolition, it was not a study.

6 MR. WARDLE: I think --

7 MR. GALATI: Maybe I misquoted.

8 TREASURER SCHABAS: Mr. Wardle, do you  
9 want to clarify that, please?

10 MR. WARDLE: I think I made it very  
11 clear that the motion was for a long term review of our  
12 licensing process from beginning to end, all pieces of  
13 the puddle -- puzzle, including articling --

14 -- Laughter.

15 MR. BREDT: I say we pass out the  
16 puddle.

17 MR. WARDLE: All I can say is it's that  
18 Marxism in the law course I took in law school.

19 So I want to make -- I want to say to  
20 Mr. Galati, you know, we could spend all day here on  
21 pro and con about articling and whether it should be  
22 abolished. It's a discussion that we have had before  
23 and some of us still have bullet holes in our shirts  
24 from the last discussion, but I want to make it clear  
25 to everyone that the new review will include everything

1 and we're not going to leave -- we're not going to have  
2 any preconditions and we are certainly going to look at  
3 articling.

4 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Mr.  
5 Wardle. I would observe that it seems the longer this  
6 discussion goes on, the longer the speakers' list seems  
7 to get. I optimistically put down 60 minutes for this  
8 topic. I would observe that while I know it's often  
9 difficult in comments for people to delink a number of  
10 issues, but I would appreciate if the comments could  
11 specifically focus on the motion that's before us.  
12 This is not a day to have a debate about articling,  
13 articling is not part of this motion, and without  
14 wanting to inhibit people's comments, I'd ask them to  
15 focus on the motion that's before us so we can get  
16 through this topic. We do have the budget to deal with  
17 as well today and some other issues.

18 With that, the next speaker is  
19 Mr. Wright.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you, Treasurer. The  
21 committee in September recommended terminating the  
22 program for the reasons that were given four years  
23 earlier about putting it in place in the first place.  
24 I opposed it in the first place because to me it seemed  
25 like giving in to the law schools that had hugely

1 increased enrollment and stopped failing anybody, as  
2 Chris pointed out earlier. So we ended up with close  
3 to a thousand new people coming at us and the  
4 profession could not absorb them, and to let them off  
5 the hook we created the LPP.

6 It is a second tier arrangement, and  
7 that's not fair. But we have a problem internally  
8 whereas the excess of graduates is being imposed on us  
9 externally. And the interior problem was the abolition  
10 of the Bar Admission Course in the first place.

11 Most of you weren't here when that  
12 debate occurred, but at the time of that debate, and  
13 it's important for people to understand this, at the  
14 time of that debate, we heard from external credible  
15 commentators that the bar admission course and  
16 articling in Ontario was the best pre-call preparation  
17 in the world. Naturally we abolished it.

18 One of the reasons given is that it was  
19 too expensive. Well, law schools knew that the  
20 students were prepared to pay the \$4,000 in costs, so  
21 they just added it to their tuition fees. It's more  
22 expensive to become a lawyer now than ever in history.

23 The law schools for the most part,  
24 Lakehead may be an exception, and there's the odd  
25 course, but for the most part they're frankly not



1 interested, and they're quite proud to say they're not  
2 interested, in training lawyers for private practice.  
3 They say that's our job, and we did it when we had the  
4 bar admission course. The bar admission course gave  
5 you access to local practitioners, materials that high  
6 in the various courses that you took, which you clung  
7 to like gold because they were so full of practical  
8 stuff that law school didn't give us. As Robert  
9 Kennedy said, law school prepares you to be an appeal  
10 court judge, not a practising lawyer.

11 Another reason given privately at the  
12 time of the vote to abolish the bar admission course is  
13 that the large firms were tired of losing top students  
14 to Boston and New York. That they could go straight  
15 there, skip the bar admission course, skip articling,  
16 and go right into a high paying job, but I'm not sure  
17 what that has to do with public interest in Ontario.

18 The bar admission course gave all of us  
19 something we didn't get at law school. It also  
20 introduced us to local practitioners that, even if you  
21 went into sole practice, you could then call for  
22 advice. We're trying to do something about that with  
23 the mentoring initiative, but it's inadequate by  
24 comparison.

25 My take on the LPP is that it shouldn't

1 carry on in the way it currently is. Instead, it  
2 should be expanded to everybody. Everybody should take  
3 the LPP, it should be restructured as a proper bar  
4 admission course and people can get practical training  
5 that they don't get at the law schools and access to  
6 tremendous materials.

7 Now, most of the people who want to  
8 abolish articling, I could be wrong, but in my  
9 observation, they tend to come from larger firms.  
10 Well, no wonder, you've got hundreds literally of  
11 mentors up and down the hall that you can access, but  
12 for the vast majority of lawyers who don't get hired  
13 into the larger firms, they don't have that access.

14 The bar admission course helped. It  
15 forged relationships that helped. So going forward on  
16 this, I understand the concept that we can't just  
17 abolish the LPP without something in place, but what we  
18 need to put in place is an expansion of the LPP, a  
19 resurrection of the bar admission course, whether it's  
20 four or six months can be determined. If everybody  
21 goes through, the cost per student will come down and  
22 it will lose its stigmatizing feature.

23 After that, articling should continue  
24 because even that classroom and workplace experience  
25 will not equal articling. Again, we've heard over and

1 over that while there are some students who decry their  
2 articling experience, the vast majority have always  
3 reported that they learned a lot and it was very  
4 beneficial. Same thing with the bar admission course,  
5 at the time we heard that the vast majority of students  
6 found it very beneficial.

7 If you'll permit me, Treasurer, two very  
8 brief additional comments. One is I'm wearing a blazer  
9 and grey flannels, but it's not in honour of Donald  
10 Trump.

11 -- Laughter.

12 MR. WRIGHT: Secondly, the work of TAG  
13 and others that you alluded to in your opening remarks,  
14 Treasurer, is to be commended, but the problem with how  
15 we talked about it is the unspecific nature of our  
16 terminology, when we say that there is an access to  
17 justice problem, we all get lumped in under that.

18 The public, the profession, the Benchers  
19 need to know that there is no access to justice problem  
20 on the side of the bar filled by the nearly 50 percent  
21 of the practising bar who are small firm solicitors.  
22 90 percent of the accounts we send out in the year are  
23 in the tens or hundreds of dollars, and when we do real  
24 estate the fee we charge is a microscopic percentage of  
25 the asset that we are ferrying through the process.

1                   The problem is on the courtroom side,  
2                   and that needs to be made clear so we can focus our  
3                   energies on identifying proper solutions to real  
4                   problems and not attacking things that are not  
5                   problems. Thank you.

6                   TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Mr.  
7                   Wright. Mr. Lerner, bearing in mind my urging all of  
8                   us to not engage in a broad debate about the history of  
9                   licensing.

10                  MR. LERNER: First of all, I've listened  
11                  to Mr. Wardle and I've listened to Mr. Groia and, quite  
12                  frankly, they both may be right. The problem is I  
13                  don't want to see us revert to 2012 and undo all the  
14                  work that has been done for the past four years or five  
15                  years to get us to this stage.

16                  There is a group of people that nobody  
17                  has spoken about today, and that's those people  
18                  contemplating going into the profession. How are they  
19                  going to be impacted if they become part of the problem  
20                  that existed in 2012, that there were insufficient  
21                  articling positions.

22                  So I support this motion, but I am  
23                  hopeful that what we will do is we will come up with  
24                  some solution that will address the problem as it  
25                  existed in 2012, and that is insufficient articling

1 positions. Somehow we have to come up with a solution.

2 As Mr. Bredt has said and others have  
3 said, all we can give to a graduate of a university law  
4 school is the opportunity to be a lawyer. If they all  
5 have that opportunity and they all have to meet the  
6 same standard of competence, then who can quarrel with  
7 what we do?

8 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Lerner. Mr. Goldblatt.

10 MR. GOLDBLATT: Treasurer and  
11 colleagues, I will be brief, but I felt that I had an  
12 obligation to Convocation to speak on this matter  
13 because, as Mr. Wardle has indicated and as you're  
14 aware, I was the previous chair of Professional  
15 Development and Competence, and the initiative that  
16 came forward, first of all, in April and ultimately  
17 part of what Mr. Wardle brought forward in September  
18 began under my watch, so I consider that I have some  
19 skin in the game, to put it in the vernacular.

20 I would like to direct Convocation, as  
21 the Treasurer has indicated, to what the motion is for  
22 consideration. And to focus on paragraph 3 of that  
23 motion, which everybody has spoken to and which  
24 everybody appears to agree with, and that is that there  
25 be analysis of the licensing process to make long term

1 recommendations for an appropriate sustainable Law  
2 Society licensing process.

3           And everybody who has spoken to it has  
4 agreed with that, but they've had various views as to  
5 what that might be, and what the committee's  
6 recommendation is and one that I'm quite pleased to  
7 second and support is that we stop tinkering at the  
8 edges, that we take a look at what everybody wants to  
9 do and the public interest and the interests of the  
10 profession and the interests of the students that are  
11 coming in and for one time, one would hope, but maybe  
12 perhaps I'm being a little bit too optimistic as I was  
13 before 7 p.m. last night, for one time try and come to  
14 grips with what the issues are and address them in a  
15 long term, sustainable and viable way.

16           So to deal more specifically with some  
17 of the recommendations that I propose, Mr. Bredt has  
18 addressed them, I think they are still good  
19 recommendations. I think they have a lot of validity  
20 to them, but to put them in place at this point, the  
21 earliest would be the spring of 2017 for the first  
22 exam, and then the May or June of 2018 for the second  
23 exam, is unnecessary, expensive and tinkering with the  
24 process that requires a focused committed review, and  
25 that's what the proposal is, that's what the motion

1 suggests, and it's a motion that I am proud to support.

2 One other comment, Mr. Groia is an  
3 extremely effective advocate, however I think that,  
4 with all due respect, some of the statistics are not  
5 accurate.

6 And just as a last comment, if you look  
7 at the submissions of the Attorney General and look at  
8 page 3 of those submissions and look at the last three  
9 paragraphs on that page, you will see that the Attorney  
10 General, in fact, supports exactly what this motion  
11 recommends. Thank you, Treasurer.

12 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you,  
13 Mr. Goldblatt. Mr. Sharda.

14 MR. SHARDA: Two concerns that I'd like  
15 to raise. When I was viewing the webcast in the  
16 lounge, because I was a bit late, Mr. Wardle, I thought  
17 I heard him say that we didn't want to be bound by  
18 unofficial timelines and that this could go on for a  
19 while. That's what I understood. Mind you, I only  
20 heard voices and the face froze and he was staring at  
21 me --

22 TREASURER SCHABAS: I think what he  
23 said, Mr. Sharda, was that --

24 MR. SHARDA: There is a two year  
25 extension.

1                   TREASURER SCHABAS: Well, there is going  
2 to be a two year extension, that's what he said, but I  
3 think his comment on timelines was the concern that  
4 last spring, and again this fall, the committee seemed  
5 to be working under what was described as artificial  
6 deadlines.

7                   MR. SHARDA: Right. So my concern is  
8 that if we're extending for two years and we don't have  
9 a proper timeline on when assessment or conclusions  
10 need to be made, then we're going to be in perpetual  
11 expansion.

12                   I don't see that here, I see the first  
13 timeline, which is by the first quarter of 2017, to  
14 have some objective, but I think if we're going to  
15 extend to 2019, then at least by the end of 2018 we  
16 need to have some concrete decisions made so that we  
17 don't fall into the same problem that if we do decide  
18 to cancel, then all of a sudden we get the pushback,  
19 well, geez, you only gave us one year, we don't know  
20 what to do.

21                   So I think that's not clear from this.  
22 Maybe that's why paragraph 4 was developed, but that's  
23 my concern. Because what will happen is next year we  
24 will have another two year extension because we haven't  
25 got there yet, and that's my concern on that point, as



1       opposed to --

2                       TREASURER SCHABAS:  Mr. Sharda, maybe I  
3       can just tell you that from my standpoint this is very  
4       much a matter of priority, it's in our strategic plan,  
5       and I would hope that we would have recommendations  
6       for -- broad recommendations well before the date  
7       you're even expecting, which is the end of 2018.

8                       MR. SHARDA:  We all had hope last night  
9       too.  My concern is that we need to have some concrete  
10      timelines.  I'm not saying make them artificial.

11                      As part of that assessment, I think at  
12      least by the end of 2017, mid 2018 or somewhere before  
13      so that we can safely say to the people coming through  
14      the pipeline, look, this program is not going to be  
15      available to you, make your decisions accordingly.  
16      That's my concern on that point.

17                      On the other point about sole  
18      practitioners, I remember when I looked at the first  
19      picture of the LPP graduating class and visually it was  
20      quite stunning to see the racialization of that  
21      picture, and that's something that we have raised.  I  
22      attended the focus groups when we did those articling  
23      pictures, that was one of the primary concerns we had.

24                      I see it on the practice end.  I'm in  
25      Brampton, there's a huge South Asian lawyer population,

1 and a large majority of them go into sole practice, and  
2 the skills that you're thinking are filtering out  
3 aren't filtering out. It's just not there. So you may  
4 have hopes that it's happening, but it's not.

5 So that's my comments, but I do want  
6 some timelines so that we don't have the same debate  
7 two years or a year from now. Thank you.

8 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you,  
9 Mr. Sharda. Ms. Horvat. You're the last one on the  
10 list before I go to the telephone.

11 MS. HORVAT: I'm going to be very, very  
12 brief. I simply want to say that I support this motion  
13 for all of the reasons articulated by Mr. Wardle and  
14 Mr. Goldblatt, and I also want to point out that we  
15 have been talking about this since 1972, that's before  
16 I was born, so it's time that we get this right and  
17 this motion gives us the mandate to do that.

18 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you.  
19 Mr. Lerner, would you please mind taking us out of  
20 lecture mode? Is there anyone on the telephone who  
21 wishes to make any statements about this? Hearing no  
22 one, I know Mr. Wardle has asked to just have a brief  
23 reply.

24 MR. WARDLE: So assuming the motion is  
25 successful, I think I deserve costs against Mr. Groia.

1                   BENCHER: I'll help you out, Joe.

2                   MR. WARDLE: Perhaps a peppercorn.

3                   Two quick points. First, just to  
4 address Mr. Sharda's point, we are coming back to  
5 Convocation with the plan in the spring. I hope it  
6 will have some timelines. What my comments were  
7 intended to say is we shouldn't put ourselves under  
8 artificial deadlines, that's all I was intending to  
9 say. This is a priority for this group, it's part of  
10 our strategic plan and we're already talking about what  
11 the next steps will look like. So that's the first  
12 point.

13                   The second point really arises out of  
14 some of very early comments, starting with Ms.  
15 Papageorgiou, about the financial consequences of the  
16 current Pathways Project. The committee is very  
17 cognizant of the fact that the current financial  
18 arrangements can be seen as unfair. You will recall  
19 that that was one of the issues that was raised in our  
20 September report.

21                   We will continue to look at that issue  
22 and that may be something that we come back to you on  
23 sooner rather than later.

24                   TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you, Mr.  
25 Wardle. So we have the motion by Mr. Wardle, seconded

1 by Mr. Goldblatt. All in favour? Opposed in the room?  
2 On the telephone, any opposed on the telephone? The  
3 motion is carried. Thank you.

4 Before we move to the morning break, I  
5 just also want to say a few words. I want to start by  
6 thanking Mr. Wardle and the committee, I want to thank  
7 Mr. Goldblatt and his committee before it, so that way  
8 I'm thanking most of the people in the room for their  
9 hard work on this issue today.

10 I know Mr. Wardle's committee spent many  
11 days on this in the past few months, reviewing a  
12 challenging issue and reviewing what we know is a huge  
13 number of responses to the proposals that were made in  
14 September.

15 What is also clear from the responses,  
16 from their work and from the comments we have heard  
17 today from all sides is that there are concerns about  
18 our licensing process and we have to fix them. We have  
19 to come up with a defensible, long term solution that  
20 addresses our main objective, which is to ensure that  
21 we are licensing lawyers competent to practice law.  
22 That's our objective. We're going to have to think  
23 innovatively, we're going to have to consult broadly,  
24 we're going to have to get outside of Osgoode Hall and  
25 outside of the legal profession and learn what other

1 groups do within this country, maybe internationally as  
2 well.

3 I'm looking forward to a work plan  
4 coming forward soon. We have timelines that will  
5 address this and will reflect the importance of  
6 resolving this quickly and also doing it right.

7 So with that I think everybody should  
8 feel free to be commentating and speaking to Mr.  
9 Wardle, to myself and anybody else about this, because  
10 this is clearly an issue of priority for us over the  
11 next little while.

12 With that we'll take the morning break  
13 and we'll come back and deal with the budget.

14 --- Recess taken at 10:35 a.m.

15 --- On resuming at 11:00 a.m.

16 TREASURER SCHABAS: All right. Could  
17 everybody come back to order, please. Susan McGrath  
18 has raised a concern about the water glasses on the  
19 table. Keep them off the wood, save our beautiful  
20 table. There are some napkins around, there's also  
21 blotters, so thank you for that, Ms. McGrath.

22 We're back in session and the next item  
23 is the Audit and Finance Committee report, Mr. Bredt.

24 -- AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT:

25 MR. BREDT: Good morning, Treasurer and

1 Convocation. What we have before you is the budget for  
2 this year, and if you go to BoardBooks at tab 3, and  
3 the motion itself begins at page 43, I believe, let me  
4 just check. 42.

5                   So let me just provide a bit of  
6 background. There's a lengthier budget document which  
7 incorporates tables, graphs and other narratives, and  
8 you may recall that in previous years budget material  
9 became heavy and so forth, and what we've tried to do  
10 this year and a shout-out to my former co-chair, Mr.  
11 Wardle, who, when he was co-chair, worked with staff to  
12 try to have much more readable, understandable budget  
13 materials, you see in the bar graphs and so forth that  
14 are there.

15                   We also have a three year financial plan  
16 and the 2017 budget. This is a culmination of a budget  
17 process that was approved by Convocation in May. I  
18 want to acknowledge the input of the Audit and Finance  
19 Committee since then. The previous members of the  
20 committee, including my co-chair, Mr. Wardle, worked on  
21 this prior to the new committee, and we also had a  
22 budget information session in September.

23                   We approached the budget with the  
24 following goals. First, to ensure that the Law  
25 Society's core functions are appropriately resourced in

1 order to achieve the mandate established by the Law  
2 Society Act. Second, to provide resources for the  
3 strategic plan, and there's a number of new initiatives  
4 that are incorporated into this budget.

5 We're also incorporating responsible use  
6 of the fund balances to mitigate the annual fee  
7 increases and we have fund balance policies that guide  
8 us in that regard, and we are continuing with the idea  
9 that there's a three year budget forecast going out.

10 So bottom line is the approach that  
11 we're taking in the budget this year is going to result  
12 in a 50-dollar increase in annual fees for paralegals  
13 and lawyers. The fee that we had in place last year of  
14 \$1866 has been in place for three years, and the  
15 paralegal fee of \$996 has been in place since 2013.  
16 And though we prided ourselves on keeping the fees flat  
17 for the past number of years, in light of some of the  
18 strategic initiative we thought it was now an  
19 appropriate time to raise the fee.

20 Looking at the bigger picture in terms  
21 of fees for the profession this year, Treasurer, you  
22 will see that while the fees are increasing by \$50,  
23 there is also an opportunity for a 50-dollar credit if  
24 you enroll in an authorized payment plan, so the fee  
25 would remain flat. And we also note that last year --

1       sorry, last Convocation we approved an insurance levy  
2       which will result in a reduction of \$400. So, overall,  
3       the amount that the profession is going to pay this  
4       year will be less than it was last year.

5                       Now, let me look at the major budgetary  
6       assumptions and factors. So the first point is the  
7       profession continues to grow and the 2017 budget  
8       incorporates an annual increase of 700 in the number of  
9       lawyers and an increase of 550 in the number of  
10      paralegals, and what that means is that the revenue  
11      will be increasing, and we based the revenue based on a  
12      full-time equivalent of about 40,200 lawyers and 5600  
13      paralegals.

14                      To some extent, while we try to achieve  
15      economies of scale, obviously with the growth of the  
16      profession it does result in increased expenditures.

17                      The 2017 budget also includes a salary  
18      and benefit provision of three percent to provide for  
19      merit adjustments, funding increase, employee benefit  
20      cost and compensation for lag in the market over the  
21      past three years, and we adhere to expected market  
22      rates for 2017 and it gives us some flexibility to  
23      accommodate operational changes.

24                      I note that when some people raise  
25      questions about this, a three percent increase does not



1 mean that every staff member is going to get a three  
2 percent increase. What this is is an overall envelope  
3 that allows our staff to manage within that envelope.  
4 In some cases people will not get increases, in some  
5 cases there might be new hires, in some cases people  
6 might move up and get a more significant than three  
7 percent increase.

8           Lawyer Compensation Fund grant limit has  
9 increased to 500,000, again, a step that we took at our  
10 past Convocation, and that has resulted in part because  
11 of greater claims and we've -- as a result of that  
12 we've had to increase the amount of the Compensation  
13 Fund levy.

14           For the 2017 budget, the CPD projection  
15 reflects status quo in the range of about 50,000  
16 attendees. The lawyer and the paralegal licensing  
17 process fees have been kept unchanged for 2016. Budget  
18 for capital expenditures includes a provision of  
19 2.1 million, representing the initial investment in the  
20 modernization of the Society's licensee database. And  
21 part of that is we have had the same database for many  
22 year. That database cannot enable the Society to move  
23 forward to the next level in terms of providing service  
24 to the members and providing information to us, and we  
25 felt it was time to invest in a new database to achieve

1 some of those operational efficiencies.

2 I note just in terms of the overall fees  
3 that we're recommending to Convocation that fees for --  
4 in other law societies range from 2,057 in B.C. to  
5 \$2520 in Alberta, so our annual fees here are, in fact,  
6 at the low end of the fee spectrum. So that's it with  
7 respect to the fees.

8 With respect to the LibraryCo budget,  
9 you'll see the budget is also before you. This will be  
10 incorporated into the materials. There's an ongoing  
11 review, and what we've done in this year is we've  
12 agreed to increase the funding as requested, but we've  
13 made clear that on a go forward basis that until the  
14 transition process is in place that we will not be  
15 increasing the overall funding in accordance with  
16 inflation.

17 We've also determined as part of our  
18 budgeting process, as we did with the Federation where  
19 every year as the number of lawyers increased, the  
20 amount of payments to the Federation increased. As  
21 part of our budget process on a go forward basis, we're  
22 looking to say, well, look, how much is necessary and  
23 we'll fund what is necessary, as opposed to these per  
24 capita fundings.

25 So I'm not going to go on at any other

1 length, Treasurer. I expect there may be some  
2 questions. In closing, I want to thank the staff, Rob  
3 Lapper, Wendy Tysall, Fred Grady and the other members,  
4 for their support through the budget process. I want  
5 to thank the other members of the Audit and Finance  
6 Committee, including the members of the Audit and  
7 Finance Committee who were there when the work got  
8 started earlier this year. And I also want to thank  
9 the Benchers who came to the budget information session  
10 for the input they had into it.

11 The motions are set out, they're there  
12 in the materials at page 42, and so I would move those  
13 motions, seconded by Suzanne Clément.

14 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you. So the  
15 one motion is at page 42 and the LibraryCo motion is a  
16 separate motion at page 37.

17 MR. BREDT: Okay.

18 TREASURER SCHABAS: Any discussion,  
19 comment? Yes, Mr. Evans.

20 MR. EVANS: Thanks, Treasurer. My  
21 question to you and the committee is whether we are  
22 doing anything to try to make sure that all lawyers are  
23 paying equivalent support for our libraries by way of  
24 law associations.

25 Many lawyers choose not to belong to law

1       associations and thereby avoid paying towards the  
2       library in their local association, and more is left to  
3       all the other lawyers to make sure that the county law  
4       libraries are adequately funded.

5                       And I think the first step along this  
6       way is to ask in the annual members' return what is  
7       the -- what county law association are you a member of  
8       or represents your area, and that way we can get some  
9       information as to how many lawyers are not in the law  
10      association and how much money we are short because of  
11      that. So I would like to urge the Benchers and  
12      administration to follow through.

13                      TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you very much  
14      for that. Mr. Bredt.

15                      MR. BREDT: So I think that's something  
16      that would be helpful to raise with LibraryCo board as  
17      part of the issues that they're going to be considering  
18      on the transition. There is a number of issues like  
19      that, who has access to the libraries, who's paying for  
20      them and so forth.

21                      TREASURER SCHABAS: Mr. Lerner.

22                      MR. LERNER: I would just like an  
23      explanation as to what paragraph A at the top of page  
24      38 means.

25                      MR. WARDLE: That there will be no

1 further increase to the Law Society --

2 MR. BREDT: Just for the benefit of  
3 those who are not as adept as Mr. Lerner in navigating.  
4 Paragraph A says, "There will be no further increases  
5 to the Law Society contribution to LibraryCo beyond the  
6 2017 amount unless there is an agreement between the  
7 LibraryCo shareholders, the Law Society Federation on a  
8 transition plan and the resources necessary to effect  
9 that plan."

10 So this is part of the overall  
11 discussion. When the transition process began, there  
12 was an understanding that the funding of Libraryco  
13 would be held flat pending the transition, and the  
14 transition process should come forward whereby the  
15 actual demands and needs of the profession would be  
16 addressed and we would fund that.

17 So the old process essentially was there  
18 was a flat fee. The flat fee kept increasing every  
19 year because as we called new people the funding went  
20 up, and what the committee said and what was set out at  
21 the time was, look, we should fund the libraries in  
22 accordance with what their needs are and I think  
23 everybody understands that the libraries play an  
24 important role.

25 But the idea is a bit like we did with

1 the Federation. The way we used to fund the Federation  
2 was there is a flat per capita fee. So every year  
3 their funding went up, but we didn't get an explanation  
4 from the Federation as to what the money was going to  
5 be used for and what money was actually required.

6 I think the point that is being made  
7 here, and to be clear to Convocation, is that the  
8 result of the Libraryco review may well result in an  
9 increase in funding to libraries, if the needs of the  
10 profession are such that they require increased funding  
11 and they put together a plan as to what's necessary and  
12 so forth, we will fund that.

13 But the old process whereby there was a  
14 flat amount that could be used, however without any  
15 sort of accountability we didn't think was part of a  
16 good budget process.

17 TREASURER SCHABAS: Ms. Horvat.

18 MS. HORVAT: Just on Mr. Evans'  
19 question, the libraries are funded by the levy of \$194  
20 for every lawyer licensee, not by the association.

21 MR. EVANS: Treasurer? I understand  
22 that, I understand we all pay the same amount to the  
23 Law Society, but many lawyers do not belong to the law  
24 associations and those of us who belong pay \$50, \$75 or  
25 \$100 to our associations to support the library, and

1 many lawyers are not paying anything through the county  
2 associations to the support of the libraries. So  
3 therefore --

4 MR. BREDT: What I would say, I  
5 understand that the way it works in the local is that  
6 some people belong to local associations and they pay  
7 additional fees. And in addition to the libraries --  
8 but they also get educational programs, they get to  
9 participate, there's all sorts of programs that are  
10 made available.

11 So I think if -- you know, to be  
12 diplomatic, I think both of you are correct in the  
13 sense that there is a flat funding that we provide to  
14 the libraries to support all of that. The local law  
15 associations, in addition, can have other programs that  
16 are funded through the local law associations and I  
17 think it's a fair statement that some local law  
18 associations are much more active and presumably charge  
19 greater fees or accumulate greater fees because they  
20 have more people who participate. Some are less  
21 active.

22 And so certainly from the Law Society's  
23 perspective and our committee's perspective, our view  
24 is the law library should be funded to provide the  
25 services that are necessary for the profession to

1 practice law and we will work with LibraryCo through  
2 the transition process to identify what those needs are  
3 and ensure that they're adequately funded.

4 MR. EVANS: And make sure all lawyers  
5 pay equivalent.

6 TREASURER SCHABAS: Are there any other  
7 comments or questions on the budget? Mr. Gottlieb.

8 MR. GOTTLIEB: Through you, Mr. Schabas,  
9 to Mr. Bredt. Mr. Bredt, as a sole practitioner that  
10 basically uses generic software programs, including a  
11 generic database program, which I then make appropriate  
12 adjustments to --

13 TREASURER SCHABAS: Mr. Gottlieb, I  
14 think you should move close to the microphone. I doubt  
15 anyone on the phone will be hearing you.

16 MR. GOTTLIEB: I guess I'm mired in the  
17 old days, Treasurer, where we didn't have to do it this  
18 way.

19 As a sole practitioner, as I said, I  
20 rely on a generic program and for years I've used a  
21 generic database program. Now I'm learning a new  
22 generic database program and I will make appropriate  
23 adjustments to it to suit my purposes. The programs  
24 cost next to nothing compared to the 7 million that  
25 we're going to be spending for a new database program



1 for the Law Society, so I'm astounded when I see a  
2 figure like this, it might be justified, but a question  
3 I have is, number one, is this program getting  
4 developed from scratch? Is it impossible to find a  
5 program that would suit our purposes that appropriate  
6 adjustments be made to it that would cost us a lot less  
7 than this?

8 MR. BREDT: I thought you were going to  
9 ask me an easy questions like, you know, how to do  
10 Anton Piller orders, so what I would say about this is  
11 that the Audit and Finance Committee, the questions you  
12 asked there were good questions and we raised was is it  
13 not possible simply to update the existing software?  
14 And the answer that we got, and there was an IT expert  
15 who staff had consulted, was that the database simply  
16 was based on an old platform that after twenty years is  
17 simply not -- it's not feasible, it no longer has the  
18 capabilities to do the types of things that we need to  
19 do.

20 So it was clear that at some point we  
21 needed to move onto a new platform. I guess it's a  
22 little bit like moving from Microsoft 7 to Microsoft 8  
23 or whatever.

24 As part of that, the decision was  
25 made -- the database program will obviously use

1 existing software, but it's like any sophisticated  
2 organization like this, you have to customize it. So  
3 the committee also raised questions about, well, look,  
4 you know, these software development processes are a  
5 fraud and, you know, they can be difficult and so  
6 forth, and the idea being here is that it's going to  
7 take some time, it's not something that we're just  
8 going to buy off the shelf, we're going to have  
9 existing software, it has to be customized to deal with  
10 the needs of the Law Society, and certainly we at the  
11 committee thought that this was a good investment  
12 because, long run, we think that it will facilitate the  
13 communications between the Law Society and its members,  
14 but it will also give us as Convocation the ability to  
15 generate information that the old program simply  
16 doesn't have the capability to deal with.

17 We felt it was time to invest and, you  
18 know, obviously whenever you're investing in new  
19 software you can't guarantee that there's not going to  
20 be a few bumps along the road, but I can assure you  
21 that our committee is going to be asking those kind of  
22 questions as the project goes forward.

23 TREASURER SCHABAS: Ms. Vespry.

24 MS. VESPRY: Thank you, Treasurer. I  
25 have a couple of questions. The first about page 38B,

1 as opposed to A.

2 The paragraph reads, "In future, the Law  
3 Society will fund and report legal information and  
4 library support expenses in the same way it treats  
5 program expenses and contributions to external  
6 organizations, not through a separate levy." So we  
7 will not be seeing that show up as a per member levy,  
8 it will be part of the general budget?

9 MR. BREDT: Correct.

10 MS. VESPRY: Will it remain its own line  
11 item in the general budget?

12 MR. BREDT: Yes.

13 MS. VESPRY: So we'll still be able to  
14 find it.

15 MR. BREDT: Absolutely.

16 MS. VESPRY: A little bit further on, I  
17 believe it's page 52, yes. Major Budgetary  
18 Assumptions. The middle of that list, the contribution  
19 to the Parental Leave Assistance Plan has been reduced  
20 to zero. I understand that this is because of  
21 declining utilization, but declining utilization  
22 doesn't say to me zero utilization.

23 MR. BREDT: So what I would say is in  
24 past -- the first question that Ms. Vespry asked is  
25 LibraryCo will be a line item, so everybody will see

1     how much money is going, and we would be coming and  
2     saying, well, we budgeted \$7 million last year, we're  
3     going to budget seven and a half million this year, and  
4     here's why. There's increased demand for access to  
5     this database or whatever. So it will continue there,  
6     it just won't be a separate item on the actual account.

7             The second question that you raised is  
8     what's happened is as part of the funding of the  
9     Parental Leave Assistance Program, funds are put aside,  
10    and so funds have been put aside to fund this program  
11    in previous years which haven't been utilized. The  
12    funds are there to meet what the expected demand is and  
13    we just didn't need to top it up this year, which is  
14    why that item was raised there.

15            MS. VESPRY: But those funds are not  
16    being set off --

17            MR. BREDT: They're not being set off.  
18    The funds are there and to the extent that people apply  
19    and are accepted, there's adequate funds in the budget  
20    to fund then.

21            MS. VESPRY: Thank you. My last  
22    question, and this may be just that I couldn't find it  
23    in the budget. We've got an income labelled licensing  
24    program and I could not find an expense with exactly  
25    the same label.

1                   There was an expense for the department,  
2                   but there isn't an expense that says licensing process,  
3                   or if it is I couldn't find it.

4                   MR. BREDT: So it would be -- on the  
5                   expense side of the equation there's expenses that are  
6                   related to PD&C, Professional Development and  
7                   Competence. Those expenses would include the licensing  
8                   process.

9                   MS. VESPRY: But is it broken down to  
10                  show just the licensing process? That's the part that  
11                  I couldn't find.

12                  MR. BREDT: I think somewhere. I  
13                  haven't committed all the material, but I think that  
14                  there is somewhere in the materials a part that looks  
15                  specifically at PD&C and breaks down what the expenses  
16                  are within that department.

17                  MS. MILES: There is and I will provide  
18                  it to Ms. Vespry.

19                  MR. BREDT: Thank you.

20                  TREASURER SCHABAS: Are there any other  
21                  questions in the room? Any questions or comments on  
22                  the telephone? Hearing none, then we will put -- we'll  
23                  do two separate motions.

24                  The first motion to approve the budget  
25                  at page 42, moved by Mr. --

1                   MR. BREDT: Probably we should do the  
2 LibraryCo budget first, Treasurer, because that's  
3 incorporated in the second motion.

4                   TREASURER SCHABAS: As you wish. We'll  
5 do the LibraryCo motion first. Moved by Mr. Bredt,  
6 seconded by Ms. Clément. All in favour? Any opposed?  
7 Any opposed on the telephone? Motion is carried.

8                   And we'll go to page 42 to approve the  
9 budget. Same mover and seconders. All in favour in  
10 the room? Any opposed? Any opposed on the telephone?  
11 Thank you. The motions are carried. Thank you, Mr.  
12 Bredt.

13                   Ms. Leiper has to leave shortly and  
14 she's going to give us a brief update on the work of  
15 the Governance Task Force.

16                   -- UPDATE ON WORK OF THE GOVERNANCE TASK  
17 FORCE:

18                   MS. LEIPER: Thank you, Treasurer. On  
19 September 22nd, 2016, Convocation approved a Governance  
20 Task Force in line with the strategic funding goal to  
21 review the Law Society's governance structure,  
22 including achieving the goals of transparency,  
23 inclusiveness, effectiveness, efficiency and costs, and  
24 where appropriate, obtain the opinions of experts.

25                   Le 22 septembre 2016, le Conseil a

1 approuvé la création d'un groupe de travail sur la  
2 gouvernance, conformément au but suivant du plan  
3 stratégique.

4 Examiner la structure de gouvernance du  
5 Barreau à l'égard de la transparence, de l'inclusion,  
6 de l'efficacité, de l'efficience et des couts, et au  
7 besoin, obtenir l'opinion d'experts.

8 You set us a mandate which includes a  
9 wide-ranging discussion of governance issues, from  
10 practical process issues to researching best practices  
11 and looking at how we are structured. We have been  
12 asked to report back as we gather research and as our  
13 work progresses.

14 So here we are. The Governance Task  
15 Force has had its first meeting and today we want to  
16 give you some idea of how we oriented the issues, what  
17 you might expect over the first few months of our work,  
18 and how you might play a role.

19 I'm going to speak very briefly about  
20 context, principles and work plan. Context. We are in  
21 a period of rapid change in the profession in Ontario.  
22 Licensing processes, of course, are on our agenda  
23 again; access to justice is a growing concern, digital  
24 disruption, which affects many other sectors, is also  
25 now a factor in the regulated legal professional

1 services space. Questions of how we will effectively  
2 regulate entities are all significant policy concerns  
3 for our term and beyond.

4 The independence of the lawyer and  
5 paralegal professions that are foundational principles  
6 will not change, but how we protect and deliver on  
7 these foundations is really what you've asked us to  
8 consider, and signs of change have already been  
9 signalled by the Law Society.

10 So we have increased our consultative  
11 processes on any number of policy decisions. We use  
12 both traditional and social media to do so. We have  
13 reached out into the province as part of our work and  
14 this has been appreciated and noticed. We have opened  
15 up Convocation through webcasting and we reflect a more  
16 diverse bar than ever before, one that will continue to  
17 change and demand more from us.

18 We know likewise that the public will  
19 have greater expectations of us and we need to be  
20 responsive. We need to be future-oriented, be aware of  
21 the realities of those entering our professions and  
22 respond to the complex issues facing legal service  
23 providers and the public. That's our context.

24 Les principes. So with an awareness of  
25 this context, the group began our first meeting



1 discussing principles, and some of those are embedded  
2 in the mandate that I just read: Transparency,  
3 inclusiveness, effectiveness, efficiency and costs.  
4 These are reinforced by section 4.2 of the Law Society  
5 Act, which requires we act in a timely, open and  
6 efficient manner. We also talked about principles of  
7 equity, evidence-based policy making and ongoing  
8 engagement.

9                   So this morning one of the things that  
10 we wanted to say to Convocation is that these are the  
11 principles that will guide our work and our reporting  
12 to you.

13                   Preliminary work plan, plan d'action.  
14 So we have started to consider a list of issues. Our  
15 next meeting in November will be to continue with  
16 deciding on an appropriate work plan.

17                   Nous entendons travailler en même temps  
18 sur deux grades catégories de questions: d'abord, des  
19 questions pratiques de procédure qui peuvent entraîner  
20 des changements aux politiques ou aux règlements  
21 administratifs, mais vrais vraisemblablement pas de  
22 vastes études ou recherches et dont l'échéancier sera  
23 plus court, ou qui devraient être abordées le plus tôt  
24 possible.

25                   Il s'agira par exemple de voir si

1 l'évaluation des membres du conseil d'administration  
2 est justifiée ou utile dans notre structure, et  
3 d'envisager un outil d'autoévaluation à cette fin, qui  
4 porte sur les besoins de formation des conseillers et  
5 leur rôle dans le Barreau, tel que noté dans le plan  
6 stratégique 2015-2019; nous avons la chance d'avoir  
7 amorcé le travail avec le personnel sur ce sujet.

8                   So we plan to work concurrently on two  
9 broad categories of issues. The first are practical  
10 process issues that may require policy or by-law  
11 change, will not likely need extensive study or  
12 research, and should or can be accomplished in a  
13 shorter time.

14                   One such example is exploring whether  
15 evaluation of benchers as board members is useful in  
16 our structure and considering a self assessment tool  
17 for this purpose. This would relate to benchers'  
18 education needs and our role in the Law Society as  
19 noted in the strategic plan, and staff have begun  
20 preliminary work on this idea already.

21                   The other category, longer term, will  
22 look at how Convocation, the Treasurer's office and  
23 committees are constituted and do their work. The  
24 potential for election reform and even whether our  
25 historic name continues to be the best description of

1 what we do and how we should be naming ourselves to the  
2 communities that we serve.

3           Throughout all of these conversations we  
4 plan to seek out research, consult as appropriate, and  
5 find the best methods for the particular issues. We  
6 will ask the questions, look for best practices, and  
7 bring our recommendations to you. So we will also try  
8 to report to you on an ongoing basis, briefly, but as  
9 we go along so that Convocation is aware of the work,  
10 because it involves all of us. Merci beaucoup.

11           TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you,  
12 Ms. Leiper. Any -- I'm willing to have any brief  
13 questions relating to the process that she's set out,  
14 if any, at this time. Seeing none, thank you very  
15 much.

16           Mr. McDowell, Professional Regulation.

17           -- PROFESSIONAL REGULATION COMMITTEE

18           REPORT:

19           MR. McDOWELL: I'm here to propose a  
20 rule amendment. I'm tempted to say it is the best rule  
21 amendment, people tell me, but if you turn up page 251  
22 of BoardBooks.

23           So this deals with the circumstances in  
24 which a regulatory meeting can be held, as opposed to  
25 an invitation to attend or an ITA.

1                   So in 2006 the regulatory meeting was  
2                   authorized by Convocation and the criteria are there at  
3                   paragraph 6. But you'll see that at 6(C), one of the  
4                   requirements was it is not in the public interest to  
5                   deal with a matter by way of an invitation to attend  
6                   given its confidential nature because the conduct of  
7                   the licensee has been the subject of comment in a  
8                   public forum, and there's some elaboration of that.

9                   So I guess at the instance of PAC, the  
10                  committee has considered and agreed that a regulatory  
11                  meeting should be capable of being held, even when  
12                  there is no public notice about it, when there's no  
13                  public component to it, because in the perfect  
14                  circumstances, having a meeting which is held in public  
15                  to counsel or admonish a licensee is a very effective  
16                  tool and is thought to be more effective than a private  
17                  ITA.

18                  So that is the proposed motion at the  
19                  top there, paragraph 3. Do I have a seconder?

20                  MS. STROSBERG: I will second.

21                  MR. McDOWELL: Thank you.

22                  TREASURER SCHABAS: It was  
23                  Ms. Strosberg?

24                  MR. McDOWELL: It was Ms. Strosberg.  
25                  Happy to take any questions, but it's a pretty narrow

1 measure.

2 TREASURER SCHABAS: Any comments or  
3 questions in the room? Yes, Ms. Papageorgiou?

4 MS. PAPAGEORGIU: I have a question in  
5 general about the process. Should I come up there,  
6 should I go up there?

7 TREASURER SCHABAS: Yes, please.

8 MR. BREDT: I was kind of looking  
9 forward to Gina unplugged.

10 MS. PAPAGEORGIU: So this is my  
11 question. Just the process that we have at PAC, I hope  
12 you don't mind that I'm going to mention you, Janis.  
13 Janis Criger sent around an e-mail some three, four  
14 months ago about PAC's process and asking that the  
15 process at PAC where you're deciding what to do with a  
16 licensee, whether they're referred forward, should be  
17 changed so that it becomes devoid of information that  
18 would allow people to know the personal characteristics  
19 of the people being evaluated and deciding which stream  
20 they're going to go down.

21 The reason for this, as we know in the  
22 Racialized Task Force as well as all the Harvard  
23 studies, there is a very strong unconscious bias. I  
24 guess my question is, as we look at -- you're making  
25 changes now, have you considered that particular issue,

1 because that issue I believe was also e-mailed to the  
2 committee.

3 MR. McDOWELL: So, Ms. Horvat, with your  
4 permission, has generously agreed to let me duck this  
5 question.

6 TREASURER SCHABAS: Sure. I would note  
7 that it's not really part of the motion. I'm aware  
8 that this issue was raised at Professional Regulation  
9 Committee and presumably is something that the  
10 Professional Regulation Committee, among many other  
11 things, may be looking at.

12 MR. McDOWELL: I think that's right. If  
13 it's a question about present practice I would defer to  
14 my colleague.

15 TREASURER SCHABAS: I'm not sure we need  
16 to. Briefly, Ms. Horvat. I don't think we need to go  
17 very far on that. I don't mean to suggest there's no  
18 merit to Ms. Papageorgiou's comment, but it's a little  
19 bit of a diversion.

20 MS. HORVAT: I'm happy not to speak.

21 TREASURER SCHABAS: Okay. Ms. Ross was  
22 next.

23 MS. ROSS: Thank you. Treasurer, to  
24 Mr. McDowell then. These are just process questions  
25 and, just for the sake of the record, the regulatory

1 meeting you've noted obviously is going to be a matter  
2 of public record. Who will be conducting the  
3 regulatory meetings, could you advise us that on the  
4 record?

5 And, secondly, will the fact of  
6 regulatory meetings that are being scheduled and will  
7 be held going to be posted, for example, on the Law  
8 Society's website where the public and the media would  
9 normally think to look?

10 MR. McDOWELL: I believe, subject to  
11 some tinkering, that the regulatory meetings will be  
12 held before a discipline panel.

13 TREASURER SCHABAS: Actually, they're  
14 held -- the members of PAC conduct them, Mr. McDowell,  
15 and they're not posted in advance. There can be  
16 scheduling difficulties about them, but after they have  
17 taken place there is a public summary of the regulatory  
18 meeting, including the name of the licensee, and it's  
19 published in the ORs. Ms. Ross?

20 MS. ROSS: Sorry, so if they're only  
21 published after the fact, how does that address our  
22 principle position to be transparent and open to the  
23 public, if the public and journalists, for example,  
24 only learn about them after the fact?

25 TREASURER SCHABAS: I'll ask the present

1 chair of PAC to answer that question.

2 MS. HORVAT: Regulatory meetings are  
3 only held if the licensee agrees to them and there's an  
4 agreed statement of fact that they agree to and the Law  
5 Society agrees to, and it's that statement of fact that  
6 gets published in the ORs. The actual regulatory  
7 hearing is held before a panel of any three Benchers,  
8 it's generally three members of PAC. They're generally  
9 held in this room and they come in and we discuss the  
10 issues with them.

11 There's no finding of any sort of guilt  
12 or liability and there's no admission of any guilt or  
13 liability, apart from what is in the agreed statement  
14 of facts, and that's what a regulatory hearing is.

15 TREASURER SCHABAS: Regulatory meeting,  
16 actually.

17 MS. HORVAT: Sorry, regulatory meeting.  
18 It's the same as an ITA, apart from the public  
19 published component.

20 TREASURER SCHABAS: Any other -- sorry,  
21 Mr. Galati, I think you had your hand up.

22 MR. GALATI: I watched the whole  
23 election last night so I didn't get much sleep. I'm  
24 not sure I'm understanding this amendment. So what is  
25 not being -- what's different here than from the



1 previous --

2 MR. McDOWELL: Well, the ITA was held  
3 privately. So it used to be unless a judge or a court  
4 or a newspaper had said the conduct of this lawyer, for  
5 example, was inappropriate that the meeting would be  
6 used.

7 MR. GALATI: Thank you.

8 TREASURER SCHABAS: Mr. Evans.

9 MR. EVANS: Thanks, Treasurer. I think  
10 Ms. Horvat answered part of my question, that the  
11 invitation to attend -- to the licensee could be  
12 declined by the licensee, but I'm wondering if it would  
13 be appropriate to have a notice to attend rather than  
14 just an invitation to attend so the attendance by the  
15 licensee could be mandated by PAC and perhaps  
16 streamline our adjudication process by having some of  
17 these matters dealt with more expeditiously.

18 MR. McDOWELL: I guess the concern would  
19 be the idea that if this is a voluntary process in  
20 which there is no admission or finding of liability,  
21 that's a little bit different.

22 TREASURER SCHABAS: It's a different  
23 issue than what's before us now, which is an invitation  
24 to attend. So it's, again, not really related to this  
25 motion.

1                   Is there anybody else in the room who  
2                   has any comments or questions? On the telephone, any  
3                   questions? Hearing none, again, this is moved by Mr.  
4                   McDowell, seconded by Ms. Strosberg. All in favour?  
5                   Anyone in the room opposed? Anyone on the phone  
6                   opposed? The motion is carried. Thank you.

7                   Now, Mr. Mercer, you were going to  
8                   address another Professional Regulation Matter.

9                   MR. MERCER: This is a report for  
10                  information for Convocation.

11                  As Convocation is aware, in June the  
12                  Advertising Fee Arrangements Working Group provided an  
13                  interim report containing both issues raised and  
14                  attemptive directions suggested. Input was sought by  
15                  the end of September. I want to tell you that we've  
16                  now received nearly 80 submissions from 20  
17                  organizations and 59 individuals, including from  
18                  lawyers, paralegals, firms, the academy, insurers and  
19                  associations representing lawyers, insurers and injured  
20                  people; not the same organizations, to be clear.

21                  It's clear from the review of the  
22                  submissions thus far received that there are a number  
23                  of different perspectives on the advertising fee  
24                  arrangements issues. It's clear within the professions  
25                  how people do business, how people attract clients,

1 effect their views on how -- what arrangement should be  
2 allowed. It's clear that insurers have issues and  
3 perspectives; the same is true for organizations of  
4 injured people.

5 That makes these issues always difficult  
6 because where we have alignment within the professions  
7 and with the public life is easier. Where we have a  
8 number of different perspectives, issues are more  
9 challenging.

10 From a preliminary review, it appears  
11 that there are some questions that are more  
12 straightforward than other questions. I suppose that's  
13 no great surprise. There are some areas where there is  
14 relative alignment and relative consensus. There are  
15 other areas where that's not true and, of course, the  
16 spectrum goes further than that.

17 What I want to tell you with respect to  
18 the work of our group is that we're meeting -- we've  
19 already met once to review the submissions received.  
20 We will be meeting again this week. My expectation is  
21 that we will attempt to delineate those issues which  
22 can be dealt with more easily than others and that we  
23 will bring forward recommendations through the  
24 Professional Regulation Committee to Convocation, not  
25 all at once, but as we're able to move them forward so

1 that we don't end up many months from now with a big  
2 report. What we want to do is to move deliberately,  
3 thoughtfully and promptly as we can.

4           The other thing that I want to note is  
5 that one of the points raised in our June interim  
6 report is that by-laws, professional conduct rules and  
7 commentary and changes to them are only part of the  
8 puzzle. We currently have the Professional Regulation  
9 Division charged with investigating, where appropriate,  
10 compliance with our existing rules. Much of the work  
11 of PRD is unseen, with thousands of matters dealt with,  
12 sometimes with guidance, direction and diversion, but  
13 over hundreds of matters going forward into the  
14 disciplinary process each year.

15           As a result, there is much activity, but  
16 much which is unseen. That's why I want to tell you  
17 what is happening at a high level within PRD in respect  
18 to these issues.

19           The Law Society Act, as you know,  
20 requires investigative confidentiality. That makes it  
21 difficult for us to observe what's happening and for  
22 the profession and the public to observe what's  
23 happening, but I can report that one of the early steps  
24 taken by our new executive director of Professional  
25 Regulation has been to form a strategic priority team

1 within PRD to undertake investigations in this area  
2 with a view to ensuring coordinated and policy focused  
3 attention is brought to bear. This proactive approach  
4 reflects the significant importance placed by the Law  
5 Society on this area.

6 I hope to report further in the new  
7 year.

8 TREASURER SCHABAS: Thank you very much,  
9 Mr. Mercer. Anybody wish to ask any questions of  
10 Mr. Mercer on this update? Any questions on the  
11 telephone? Hearing none, we'll move forward. Thank  
12 you, Mr. Mercer.

13 The Tribunal Committee, Ms. Murchie.

14 -- TRIBUNAL COMMITTEE REPORT:

15 MS. MURCHIE: Thank you, Treasurer. I  
16 too have rule amendments for Convocation's approval,  
17 and Mr. Wright is here as well in the event there are  
18 questions of a significant nature.

19 But let me take you through them first  
20 so that everyone has a chance to review and understand  
21 what is going on here.

22 The Tribunal Report is at page 254 of  
23 BoardBooks and the motion that I am moving is at page  
24 257. These amendments, we're seeking approval for  
25 amendments to the Hearing Division and Appeal Division

1 rules of practice and procedure, and the amendments  
2 come out of the ongoing implementation of the  
3 Tribunal's new electronic case management system and  
4 they're also a result of the ongoing efforts to  
5 streamline the rules and make them more accessible to  
6 the public as we go forward.

7 In terms of the particular rules, you'll  
8 see they're set out on page 257, the key issues and  
9 considerations.

10 First of all, there's changes to the  
11 rule and forms for the notices of application. That's  
12 rule 9, and the forms have been simplified and there's  
13 a provision for information sheets that is -- that  
14 allows for personal information that's not relevant or  
15 necessary for publication to be filed separately with  
16 the Tribunal office.

17 There are separate notices of  
18 application for each type of proceeding that references  
19 the statutory test, and you'll see the change notices  
20 at pages 265 to 270 of BoardBooks, if you just want to  
21 get an idea of what they look like.

22 The rule also provides that the Law  
23 Society will electronically file the notice of  
24 application and the information sheet and it provides  
25 that the notices of application will be served first

1 and then filed with the Tribunal, which is a change  
2 from the current practice.

3 The information sheet is a separate  
4 information sheet with personal information, as I said,  
5 and it's not -- there's no intention to post it or make  
6 it public.

7 The next rule is rule 10, it's a rule  
8 respecting service and there's simply simplified  
9 language there. It also provides for e-mail service  
10 without consent.

11 There are some amendments to rule 21 on  
12 interlocutory suspensions. It provides that  
13 interlocutory suspensions are to be set up as a  
14 separate type of proceeding, so this ensures personal  
15 service of the interlocutory suspension motion or  
16 application and it also allows the Tribunals office to  
17 collect consistent statistics, because right now  
18 there's two methods, really, of seeking an  
19 interlocutory suspension, so it's difficult to track.

20 The next set of amendments relates to  
21 rule 2603 and the form of orders, and the type of --  
22 the order format is set out at rule 2603 and it's  
23 simplified. It enables the orders to be published and  
24 it makes summaries unnecessary.

25 I can -- I thought I had written down

1 the page of it, but you'll see that the form for the  
2 order is -- sets out what exactly is required and so  
3 that there will be consistency throughout. And I've  
4 lost it here. My apologies, Treasurer.

5 TREASURER SCHABAS: 293.

6 MS. MURCHIE: 293. Thank you very much.  
7 Okay, you'll see the order, the form of the order that  
8 all of the adjudicators will be asked to complete  
9 there.

10 There's also amendments to the appeal  
11 rules and there's a correction on the time to perfect,  
12 it's rule 1.2, and you'll see those changes on page 336  
13 of BoardBooks.

14 The motion that I'm moving, seconded by  
15 Ms. Merali, is at page 257, and as I've said, happy to  
16 entertain questions or Mr. Wright is here if there's  
17 more comprehensive questions.

18 TREASURER SCHABAS: Any questions in the  
19 room? On the telephone? Hearing nothing from the  
20 telephone, I'll put it to a vote. All in favour?  
21 Anyone opposed? Anyone opposed on the telephone?  
22 Motion is carried. Thank you, Ms. Murchie.

23 Ms. McGrath, the Secretary's report.  
24 You're speaking on behalf of Mr. Varro.

25 -- SECRETARY'S REPORT:



1 MS. McGRATH: Thank you, Treasurer. The  
2 amendments -- the motion is found at pages 365 and 366  
3 of BoardBooks, and these changes come about as a result  
4 of the changes to the LawPro policy dealing with  
5 seconded lawyers. These are -- and it's primarily to  
6 exclude claims brought by corporations against seconded  
7 lawyers where they are --

8 TREASURER SCHABAS: Sorry, Mr. McDowell  
9 is still feeling the effects of last night.

10 MS. McGRATH: I can see that.

11 MR. BREDT: As are we all, Treasurer.

12 MR. McDOWELL: I was just shoving it  
13 under the table.

14 TREASURER SCHABAS: Don't stamp on your  
15 iPad just yet. Sorry, Ms. McGrath, go ahead.

16 MS. McGRATH: Thank you. The change to  
17 the LawPro policy dealing with seconded lawyers  
18 excludes claims brought by corporations against  
19 seconded lawyers where the claimant meets a definition  
20 of corporate employer under the policy, and to extend  
21 the \$250 for claim defence only coverage for claims  
22 against seconded lawyers brought by corporate  
23 employers.

24 The changes, and if you want to look at  
25 the tracked changes page to see exactly where they are,

1 if you turn to page 370, the change to section 9.1.4 i,  
2 indicates that the change will be to employers --  
3 employed by employers who are not a licensee or  
4 licensee law firm, so that's an addition.

5 And then the changes to 5.1 and 5.2 you  
6 will find on page 373 of BoardBooks, and that  
7 essentially indicates that licensees who are seconded  
8 to corporate firms shall continue to be employed by  
9 their original partnership or association and their  
10 coverage will continue.

11 And then 5.2, change indicates what the  
12 definition of licensee firm would be, and that's just a  
13 basic housekeeping change. So if anyone has any  
14 questions.

15 TREASURER SCHABAS: Do you have a  
16 seconder?

17 MS. McGRATH: Ms. Criger.

18 TREASURER SCHABAS: Ms. Criger, all  
19 right. Any comments or questions on this by-law  
20 amendment? Any questions or comments on the telephone?  
21 Hearing none, all in favour? Any opposed? Any opposed  
22 on the telephone? Motion is carried. Thank you, Ms.  
23 McGrath.

24 Can we just -- there seems to be some  
25 sound. Oh, it's the radiator.

1                   So that concludes the public portion.  
2       We have a few matters in camera, so we will now go in  
3       camera.  
4       --- In public proceedings adjourned at 11:54 p.m.

5  
6

7                   I HEREBY CERTIFY THE FOREGOING  
8                   to be a true and accurate  
9       transcription of my shorthand notes  
10       to the best of my skill and ability

11  
12

---

13                   SHARI CORKUM, C.S.R.

14                   Computer-Aided Transcript  
15

16  
17

18  
19

20  
21

22  
23

24  
25