

**Response to the Provost Study
of Accessibility and Career Choice
in the University of Toronto
Faculty of Law**

CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION



April 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Response to the Provost Study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the University of Toronto Faculty of Law

PREFACE	- i -
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. CURRENT COMPOSITION OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION	3
III. SPECIFICS CONCERNING THE PROVOST'S STUDY	5
A. Scope of the Study	5
B. The Literature Review	9
C. Evidence of Financial Need	12
D. Career Choice	14
V. CONCLUSION	15

PREFACE

The Canadian Bar Association is a national association representing 38,000 jurists, including lawyers, notaries, law teachers and students across Canada. The Association's primary objectives include improvement in the law and in the administration of justice.

This submission was prepared by the National Standing Committee on Equality of the Canadian Bar Association, with assistance from the Legislation and Law Reform Directorate at the National Office. The submission has been reviewed by the Legislation and Law Reform Committee and approved as a public statement of the National Standing Committee on Equality of the Canadian Bar Association.

Response to the Provost Study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the University of Toronto Faculty of Law

I. INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the Canadian Bar Association Standing Committee on Equality (CBA SCE), this paper is respectfully submitted for presentation to the Governing Council of the University of Toronto to address the *Provost Study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the Faculty of Law*¹. The CBA SCE is persuaded that significant increases in tuition fees, unless they are substantially mitigated by other programs which will encourage entrants to come forward, will harm us all in our efforts to ensure that the student body of law firms, and therefore of the Canadian legal community in the future, is reflective of the society which it serves.

Based on the methodology proposed by the Provost and approved by the University of Toronto's Governing Council, the Provost's study seeks to make the case that increasing tuition fees, even substantially, will have no adverse effect on the diversity of background of students attending the Faculty of Law.

The study comprises the following sections:

- The results of a literature review on accessibility and career choice²;
- Data reflecting accessibility based primarily on admissions statistics from the Faculty of Law and including data on financial aid; and

1 Shirley Neuman, Vice President and Provost, University of Toronto, February 24, 2003.

2 While information on the literature review is summarized in the body of the Provost study, the complete review conducted by Professor Emeritus David Stager is included as one of the study's appendices.

- Information on patterns of career choices by University of Toronto law graduates, based on data received from the Law Society of Upper Canada.

In reviewing the Provost's study, the CBA SCE wishes to raise several concerns. These are in addition to the concerns already expressed in February by the CBA SCE on the methodology employed by the Provost³. The CBA SCE's principal current concerns are the student composition of the Faculty of Law, the importance of law schools contributing to diversifying the composition of the legal profession and the importance of supporting law students in their choice of a career, whether it be in a large law firm, in a small law firm or in public interest law.

In our view, just as the premise of the methodology study was poorly grounded, the Provost's study is on an equally shaky footing and provides insufficient evidence to support a conclusion that there will be no negative impact on accessibility and career choice, particularly if tuition fees are increased to the levels proposed.

In fact, properly read, the Provost's study confirms that the Faculty of Law currently faces significant challenges in maintaining the *status quo* in terms of the student composition of the Faculty of Law.

It is also our contention that the increase in tuition fees will erode efforts to create a legal educational environment and legal practice that is reflective of the population it serves, or indeed a profession that has the capacity to meet the service needs of a diverse community. The least that can be said is that increasing tuition fees at this time will contribute in no way to increasing the racial and

3 See, *Canadian Bar Association Standing Committee on Equality Concerns on Increasing Tuition Fees at the University of Toronto Faculty of Law*, February 14, 2003.

cultural diversity of the legal profession or the numbers of those interested in seeking careers in smaller or less urban law firms or in public interest law.

II. CURRENT COMPOSITION OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

It is common knowledge that the legal profession is predominantly white and male⁴. Despite their numbers in the general population, individuals from subordinate racialized groups make up only 5% of Canada's legal profession, Aboriginal peoples 0.8%, women 30% and people with disabilities an indiscernibly small number⁵.

There is also evidence in the public domain on the barriers individuals from these groups face in attracting lucrative articling and associate positions as well as becoming partners and receiving comparable remuneration after many years in practice. For example, data from the Law Society of Upper Canada indicates ongoing challenges facing women and individuals from subordinate racialized groups in attracting articling positions⁶. In some cases, a significant number of students have complained about the inaccessibility of lucrative positions in large law firms while others have questioned the rate of call-back based on gender and racial characteristics⁷. These concerns are also supported in more recent articles by Michael St. Patrick Baxter and Professor Camille Nelson which provide evidence on the barriers faced by African-Canadian lawyers in securing opportunities in large firms⁸.

4 See, Professor Michael Ornstein, *Lawyers in Ontario: Evidence from the 1996 Census*, Law Society of Upper Canada 2000, and, Racial Equality Working Group, *Racial Equality in the Canadian Legal Profession*, Canadian Bar Association.

5 *Ibid*, Ornstein at 11 and 20. The figures for women are based on data related to the Province of Ontario.

6 See, *Concerns Regarding Discrimination in Attracting Articling Positions*, August 2000, and *Articling Student Feedback Report 2001*.

7 For example, see *Barriers and Opportunities Within Law: Women in a Changing Legal Profession*, Fiona Kay et al 1996, and, *Survey of Black Law Students, Black Articling Students, and Recently Called Black Lawyers*, July - August, 1992.

8 See, respectively, *Black Bay Street Lawyers and Other Oxymora*, 30 Canadian Business Law Journal, 1998, and, *Towards a Bridge: The Role of Legal Academics in the Culture of Private Practice*, paper presented at the University of Ottawa Faculty of Law Conference on Future Directions for Legal Education, 2000.

Further, evidence from the 1996 Census compiled in a report by Professor Michael Ornstein for the Law Society of Upper Canada indicates significant earning differentials between white lawyers and those from subordinate racialized groups as well as between male and female lawyers. Such differences in earnings are evident throughout their careers. For example:

- White lawyers between the ages of 25 and 29 earn approximately \$6,000 per year more than lawyers from subordinate racialized groups (\$28,000 v. \$33,900). This gap increases to approximately \$33,000 for lawyers between the ages of 35 and 39 (\$58,000 v. \$91,200) and to \$40,000 for lawyers between the ages of 40 and 49 (\$70,000 v. \$110,000);
- Male lawyers between the ages of 30 and 34 earn \$7,900 more than women lawyers (\$54,800 v. \$62,700) This rises to \$16,300 for ages 35 to 39 (\$79,100 v. \$95,400), \$35,000 for ages 40 to 49 (\$84,600 v. \$120,900); and
- Wage differentials between white lawyers and those from subordinate racialized communities is quite dramatic in the peak earning years of 50 to 54, with whites earning \$70,000 more. In terms of gender differences among the same cohort, men earn \$65,000 more than women⁹.

Reports prepared by the Law Society of British Columbia support these disturbing conclusions¹⁰. These factors now have and will likely continue to have a negative impact on the ability of certain groups of lawyers to find employment in law firms that provide significant remuneration. The continued inability of individuals from these communities to engage successfully in all aspects of the legal profession will limit the choices of some law school students. This is likely to have a

9 See, Professor Ornstein, *Executive Summary* at i and ii respectively.

10 See, *Addressing Discriminatory Barriers Facing Aboriginal Law Students and Lawyers*, April 2000, and, *Lawyers with Disabilities: Identifying Barriers to Equality*, 2001.

deleterious impact as individuals from these communities may understandably be reluctant to accumulate significant debt, even if provided with increases in financial aid. That greater reluctance is certain if the greater financial aid is not concomitantly greater and itself certain from the outset.

III. SPECIFICS CONCERNING THE PROVOST'S STUDY

It is essential to highlight these points before examining the Provost's study on accessibility. The sources mentioned above are not referred to at all by the Provost, though the data discussed in these reports and studies are critical to any examination of student concerns, career choice and affordability of legal education. It is rather unusual to approach a study on accessibility and to decontextualize the fundamental issues affecting students, particularly their personal characteristics and how individuals from specific social groups have succeeded in the practice of law. By omitting reference to this information, the Provost study ignores the well-known history of disparate outcomes in legal practice, including articling, for specific groups and appears to operate on the assumption that once in law school all are equal. This masks deeply entrenched societal and systemic inequalities and evades a critical point on the likely deleterious impact that increasing tuition fees will have.

The CBA SCE has specific concerns about such an approach to studying accessibility in terms of (a) the scope of the study, (b) the literature review, (c) evidence of financial need and (d) career choice.

A. Scope of the Study

Consistent with the issues addressed in the CBA SCE critique of the Provost's methodology, there are significant deficiencies in this study as well. The study's overview, and the study itself, provide no insight into:

- what influences students' career choices;

- the perceptions of current and, particularly, potential future students; and
- the personal characteristics of students (eg., gender, race, Aboriginal status) and their articling experiences and career choices.

There is in the report no information on current or future students with disabilities or persons with disabilities in the legal profession.

In terms of what influences student career choice, the study has ruled out any survey of former, current or potential future students as being ‘biased’ and has, instead, relied on evidence based on the conduct of former students who are now engaged in the practice of law. While this approach is useful to determining what individuals actually do, it does nothing to assess what has motivated such choices. As such, it evades the question of whether or not the high costs of legal education have influenced career choice in any way, particularly in encouraging individuals to choose career paths that may not be their primary interest but have been selected for predominantly financial reasons. (This is particularly relevant in light of the results of the literature review as well as of the data on the places of articling or employment for law students and graduates, that is discussed further on.)

The Provost’s dismissal of students’ perceptions as being biased is a rather abrupt and unsubstantiated claim. Rather than being dismissed outright, student perceptions should have been studied, particularly given the data provided by two studies cited by the Provost (*From Paper Chase to Money Chase: Law School Debt Diverts Road to Public Service* and the study reported in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal*); and also the evidence on graduates’ career choice which indicates an increasing number of graduates who have moved away from securing employment in “non-law” careers and small law firms and have selected large law firms. (This issue is also discussed later on in this critique.)

Such an approach would have either substantiated the Provost's gratuitous claim regarding bias when measured against actual behaviour or made the claim impossible to advance, but it would certainly have provided valuable insights into attitudes that correspond or not with career choice. Given the significance of the tuition increases proposed, it is difficult not to see the preference for the gratuitous claim of bias as more than a little facile¹¹.

The failure of the Provost to study student perceptions is a fundamental issue that is at variance with the current accessibility methodology being considered by other Ontario law schools.

This is understandable, and flows naturally, one would have thought, from the clear evidence that students are already increasingly seeking articling and employment in large firms.

Further, in failing to consider students' perceptions, the Provost's study has rendered it impossible to assess whether increasing tuition fees will affect individuals' perceptions as to whether they will be able to afford to attend law school or even to seriously consider law school as a viable option. The Provost states in her summary of the literature review that, in her opinion, knowledge of student financial assistance programs can play a significant role in ensuring accessibility¹². By so stating, the Provost acknowledges the importance of student perceptions of the true net cost to them of tuition in the choices they make concerning law school and career. Such perceptions are not "biased"; they are normal.

However, as stated in the CBA SCE critique of the Provost methodology, the issue the University is facing is the affordability of a legal education that is incrementally increasing its costs up to \$22,000 per year. This issue has not been considered at all within the methodology and there is no discussion on it in the

11

See, Neuman at 3.

study. Nor is there any information on the amount of financial support that will be necessary to maintain the current composition of the Faculty of Law and where the sources of this funding will come from. This is despite information that current contributions to the University of Toronto have declined¹³ and that a significant increase in financial aid will likely be needed once tuition fees escalate to \$22,000 per year.

As such, it is impossible to assess whether or not the offering of undetermined amounts of financial aid, in programmes of undetermined accessibility and of undetermined certainty for the applicant, will ensure accessibility to the Faculty of Law. It is also difficult to assess whether or not potential students will be willing to invest in an educational career at such a high cost if their career opportunities are, or even are merely perceived to be, dramatically limited as is the case for women, Aboriginal peoples, persons with disabilities and individuals from subordinate racialized groups.

There is no correlation of the data the Provost presents on the basis of race, gender, etc., and students' educational choice, particularly in terms of potential articling and employment, where it is overwhelmingly evident that individuals from these groups have historically faced barriers, are aware of such experiences and likely take such factors into consideration when choosing educational routes to future careers. The study cited, Paper Chase, provides some interesting insights on this matter; it also provides some discussion on the critical question whether accumulated student debt leads to job preference or job preference leads

12 See, Neuman at 3.

13 See, *University of Toronto Facts and Figures 2002: Overall Fundraising Achievement, 1996-1997 to 2000-2001* which indicates that monetary and in-kind gifts from alumni appear to have peaked in 1998-99 at approximately \$140,000,000 with \$115,000,000 monetary and \$23,000,000 in kind gifts. These figures dropped in the following year (1999-2000) to approximately \$118,000,000 total and \$107,000,000 monetary; and a decrease in total contributions in the following year (2000-2001) with approximately \$112,000,000 which reflected a slight increase in monetary gifts with approximately \$110,000,000 and a significant decrease in in-kind contributions. In addition to the decline in alumni contributions, there has also been the reported loss of \$400 million in investments. See Andrew Willis and Paul Waldie "U of T Loses \$400 million on markets", *Globe and Mail*, February 20, 2003. While this article has been disputed in a letter of clarification to the *Globe and Mail*, the signatories to the letter admit to significant losses and state: "The article states that the University lost \$400 million, but the actual loss, after making allowance for withdrawals from the funds, is closer to \$320 million." See *Clarifications to the Globe and Mail Article of February 20, 2003*, Michael Moran *et al.*, University of Toronto Asset Management Corp., February 21, 2003.

to willingness to accumulate debt.

This is a question which the Provost study does not answer, largely because it fails to seek data from any student cohort (former, current or potential) and relies instead on statistical data indicative of the result of student choices, with no exploration as to the reasons for these choices.

B. The Literature Review

It is worthy of mention that most of the material in the literature review undertaken by Professor Stager, is dated well before the current upswing in tuition fee increases and that almost all studies examined identify a negative impact based on student's race and, to a lesser extent, gender.

Like the Provost study itself, the literature review does not examine perceptions of undergraduate students who may have been deterred from studying law because of high tuition fees.

The literature review by Prof. David Stager does confirm that a number of the sources cited identify negative challenges for people of African and Latino descent as well as for anyone interested in public interest law. This is evident in the following ways:

- At page 37, there is reference to a study entitled *Minority Students and Debt: Limiting Limited Career Options* conducted by Professor Marilyn V. Yarborough (Professor of Law and Dean at the time of her study). This report indicates that black students have more difficulties finding employment with large law firms and are 2.5 times more likely to enter the public service;
- At page 40, similar concerns are cited by Lewis Kornhauser and Richard L. Revesz who, in their study *Legal Education and Entry into the Legal Profession: The Role of Race, Gender and Educational Debt*, note "...that for African American and Latino women, loan

forgiveness had an important impact: more than a third of those taking for-profit jobs would have selected the alternative as a result of the loan forgiveness.” This study goes on to note that (a) “... women are more likely than men to enter law school with not-for-profit career plans, but law school disproportionately shifts their preferences toward for-profit jobs.” (b) “debt burden is not an important determinant of career choice, except for African American and Latino women ... (and that) (a)fter adjusting for other factors, African American and Latinos, both male and female, are more likely to take not-for-profit jobs”;

- On page 42, some of the results of the study published in the Canadian Medical Association Journal are included in a summary of the *Effects of rising tuition fees on medical school class composition and financial outlook*. Such information indicates that “(m)ost (U.S. investigators) have found that debt is a small but significant influence away from a career in primary care, but others have reported no such effect. (However), among Canadian medical students, financial considerations were reported to be much more important, in terms of specialty choice and practice location, for those at schools with high tuition fees...”¹⁴.

There is confirmation at page 45 of a shift in university education being seen as less accessible to low-income groups. The literature summary here acknowledges that trends over the past three to four decades indicate that “... rising educational costs (including costs other than tuition) impose greater financial need on small, specific groups of students, including those with disabilities, single parents, from remote areas, etc., and who need specific aid programs in response”¹⁵.

It is also instructive to note the studies, news articles and reports Professor Stager has not included in his literature review. Some of these include: *The Economic Value of Higher Education; Student Response in Higher Education: An Update to*

14

See, Neuman, inclusion of Professor David Stager's *Accessibility and Career Choice Review: A Review of Related Literature*, October, 2002, Prepared for the Office of the Vice-President and Provost, University of Toronto.

*Leslie and Brinkman; Graduates taking longer to pay back student loans; College Choice and Family Income: Changes Over Time in the Higher Education Destinations of Students from Different Income Backgrounds; The Impact of Increased Loan Utilization Among Low Family Income Students; College Price Barriers: What Government has Done and Why it hasn't Worked; Another Look at the Demand for Higher Education: Measuring the Price Sensitivity of the Decision to Apply to College; Price Response in Enrollment Decisions: An Analysis of the High School and beyond Sophomore conduct; and A Mortgage Without a House: A Study of the Financial Burden of Social Work Students*¹⁶.

These articles were included in a paper entitled *Challenging tuition fee policy: Discussion Paper*¹⁷ which was available at the time of the previous Provost's study on tuition fees¹⁸. This paper summarizes the above-noted literature to point out the negative impact of tuition fees on student career choices as well as on student educational choices. It strongly suggests that the "sticker shock" of tuition fee increases offsets the offering of financial assistance however much that assistance is publicized. In fact, one of its research sources is based on a study of students at the University of Toronto Faculty of Social Work which indicates that "...nearly one in every five students felt that it was a realistic possibility that they may be unable to complete their education due to tuition constraints. A greater number, close to 70%, considered the tuition constraints to be a significant hindrance to further studies. Also, close to ¾ of students said that school tuition

15 See, Neuman, inclusion of *Tuition Fees and Accessibility to Law School* at 44 - 45.

16 See, respectively: L.L. Leslie and P.T. Brinkman, *Washington: American Council on Education* 1988; G. H. Heller, *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 68 (November/December 1997); Elaine Carey, *Toronto Star*, December 13, 1998; McPherson, M.S. and Schapiro, M.O., *Williamstown MA, Williams Project on the Economics of Higher Education Discussion Paper No.29*, 1994; Thomas T. Mortenson, *Iowa: American College Testing Program*, 1990; M. Mumper, *State University of New York Press*, 1996; Savoca, E., *Economics of Education Review*, 9(2) 1990; E.P. St. John, *Research in Higher Education*, 31(2), 1990; and C. Allen, et al, *University of Toronto Faculty of Social Work*, 1998 (unpublished).

17 Vilko Zbogor, December 22, 1998.

18 See, *Report of the Provost's Task Force on Tuition and Student Financial Support*, University of Toronto, 1998.

was the most significant barrier they faced when it came to their pursuit of higher education."¹⁹

C. Evidence of Financial Need

Issues concerning financial need are at first discussed on page 5, where there is data on the financial needs of 'Blacks' and Aboriginals. The study makes the preface that the numbers for these groups are quite small and, as such, that any statistical inference is unreliable. (The study does not indicate the numbers or the percentages). The very fact that the number for each group is small, though, and raises worries as to statistical reliability should mean something about current accessibility.

While the report lauds itself on having such a high percentage of African-Canadians at U. of T. who take the LSAT, it does not examine why so few African-Canadians take the LSAT. Could it be that law school fees are already too high? This is indeed the contention of a number of African-Canadian students who have lodged a human rights complaint regarding the current costs of legal education.

The study notes that the Faculty of Law has increased its proportion of "visible minorities" over the study period, but nowhere provides any data to this effect. It is therefore not possible to learn who is part of this group or the percentage of these students who likely require financial aid. It is clear from the data on African-Canadians and Aboriginal students, that individuals from these groups tend to require financial aid; however, it is not possible to discern whether they are disproportionately represented among the "visible minorities" being mentioned.

In terms of students from families with low incomes, the data on pages 14 and 15 indicate that the numbers are small, with 17.3% of students in the low-income

19

See, Zbogor at 21.

areas compared to 33% of students with family incomes above \$90,000 and 33.5% of students who have not reported their family income. Given that individuals from this latter group do not seek financial assistance (if they did, they would have to disclose family income), it is safe to assume that these individuals are financially well-off. It appears, then, that over 66% of students in the Faculty of Law come from families with incomes above \$90,000 per year as compared to 17% with incomes less than \$60,000 per year.

This data supports the concerns expressed by the CBA SCE, in its critique of the Provost's methodology, that 38.7% of youth aged 18 to 21 from wealthy families attended university compared to 18.8% of youth from poorer families and that post-secondary education threatens to become increasingly divided along class lines. Given the intersections between race and family incomes, these divisions will likely be along the lines of race as well.²⁰

While the Provost's study promises financial aid to ensure that educational opportunities in the Faculty of Law will be no less accessible than they are now, there is no data in the report which identifies the level of financial aid that will be needed; nor is there any comment on the proposed targets for how these funds will be attracted and secured. This makes these promises ring much more hollow than they would had the study gone into these details.

We believe that these are significant omissions. Even if they did not indicate an undue eagerness to get to the conclusion that tuition fees can safely be increased significantly, they rest on the unexamined assumption that there will be no difficulty in raising whatever funds turn out to be required. This may be the case; however, evidence from the *University of Toronto Facts and Figures 2001* indicates that the rate of financial contributions from alumni, one key source or revenue to support University programs, has decreased from its 1998-99 high and that, in particular, total alumni contributions have fluctuated from 1997 onward

with an apparent decrease in contributions. Along with the significant loss in investments, the University may well be in a difficult position, once it has increased tuition fees, to provide an appropriate level of financial aid to ensure accessibility.²¹

Given the availability of this information in the public domain, it is disappointing that the Provost's study does not address these factors and does not provide any indication as to how the Faculty of Law will ensure the ongoing availability of financial aid in the amounts that may be required to meet the dramatic increase in tuition fees.

D. Career Choice

Data on career choice begins on page 23 of the Provost's study, where it is noted that most U. of T. students choose to article in large firms and most graduates choose to start their careers in large firms. Over the study period, this trend has increased, with far less numbers going to small firms.

The decline in students in taking articling positions in small firms has occurred most dramatically from 1997, when it stood at 49.4%, to 2000 when it stood at 38.3%. The corresponding increase of students who have accepted articling positions in large firms was from 30.9% in 1997 to 47.1% in 2000. These are quite dramatic shifts in student choices which may support the contention of increasing tuition fees influencing career choice. Unfortunately, this is not possible to determine conclusively without exploring directly with these students the reasons behind their articling choices, a course of study the Provost has declared to be of no use due to individual biases.

In terms of career choices, there are notable decreases in the number of graduates accepting employment in "non-law" (career choices outside the traditional law

21

Supra, note 13.

firm model) and small law firms. For the former, 49.4% accepted employment in 1997 but only 31.9% in 2000; for the latter, 34% accepted employment in 1999 but only 29.4% in 2000. While small-firm career choices have fluctuated over the study period (27.8% in 1995, 16.7% in 1996, 34% in 1999 and 29.4% in 2000), career choice of large firms has steadily increased from 20% in 1995 to 38.7% in 2000. “Non-law” career choices, have steadily and significantly decreased (52.2% in 1995 to 31.9% in 2000)²².

In terms of the impact of student career choice on the practice of law across Ontario, there is no examination of geographical impact, though it is evident that all large firms are located in the large urban centres. There is also a decline in the numbers working in ‘Non-Firm Settings’, a category that is not defined at all and may or may not include public interest law. While the report cites the ‘flight’ from Legal Aid, it attributes this primarily to the poor funding of legal aid and does not address the ‘graying’ of the legal aid system of LAO and legal aid clinics. In any event, it seems obvious that debt burdens make it impossible for students to choose legal aid as their path of choice.

IV. CONCLUSION

The information included in the Provost’s study is troubling on a number of points which are discussed above. Given its omissions of key information, the assumptions it appears to make and the outcomes it projects with too great an ease, the study should not be relied upon as a basis for increasing the tuition fees for the Faculty of Law. Many students, if provided the opportunity, would likely make the assertion that tuition fees are already too high and that this has a dramatic impact on their career choices.

It is for this reason that students across Canada are working together to pressure governments for a tuition freeze. It is for this reason that numerous professional associations representing doctors, dentists, engineers and others are lobbying both federal and provincial governments to create an environment conducive to an affordable post-secondary education and access to graduate studies.

The issues of accessibility to the University of Toronto Faculty of Law cannot be discussed in a vacuum. There are societal pressures and realities which, along with increased tuition fees, may have the cumulative effect of impeding diversity within legal education and within the legal profession. It may also reduce the availability of legal services to an increasing diverse community, one which is becoming more pronounced in terms of economic capacities which have clearly discernable intersections with race, gender, physical ability and Aboriginal status.

To support the argument for tuition fee increases, the Provost is relying on the fact that the Faculty of Law has increased and will increase financial assistance to ensure no erosion of the *status quo* in terms of its composition. The Provost appears to have no hard information on which to make such a rosy prediction and anyway never once considers that the *status quo* is part of the problem. Given the current composition of the legal profession, it will never be a diverse profession if law schools do not increase the number of Aboriginal students, students from subordinate racialized groups and students with disabilities. In doing this, it must also ensure that it does not erect barriers to their career choices.

Raising tuition fees to the amounts proposed by the University, unless substantial mitigating programs are securely and reliably in place, will not help in this effort.