

Episode 12: The Making and Unmaking of a Great Canadian Law Firm

Date: November 25, 2024

Guest Speaker: Adam Dodek

Interviewers: Zach Auger & Stephanie Katajamaki

TRANSCRIPT

Zach Auger: Hi everyone and welcome to the *OLR* Podcast, Episode 12. My name is Zach Auger—

Stephanie Katajamaki: —and my name is Stephanie Katajamaki.

Zach Auger: And we are two Associate Editors on the *Ottawa Law Review*. Today we will be speaking with Professor Adam Dodek about his fascinating new book, *Heenan Blaikie: The Making and Unmaking of a Great Canadian Law Firm*, which was published in October 2024.

Stephanie Katajamaki: *Heenan Blaikie: The Making and Unmaking of a Great Canadian Law Firm* uncovers the dramatic trajectory of one of Canada's most renowned law firms. Founded in 1973, Heenan Blaikie grew into a powerhouse, attracting top legal talent and political heavyweights. But behind the scenes, issues such as weak governance, workplace bullying, and discrimination led to the firm's downfall in 2014.

Zach Auger: Adam Dodek is a Full Professor at the University of Ottawa Faculty of Law. He has taught public law, constitutional law, legal ethics, professional responsibility, and torts.

After graduating from McGill University and Harvard Law School, Professor Dodek clerked at the Supreme Court of Israel. He then passed the California bar and clerked at the US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Returning to Ontario, he clerked for Justice L'Heureux-Dubé at the Supreme Court of Canada. He also practised at BLG on Bay Street before returning to academia.

Professor Dodek has authored more than 50 academic articles and book chapters. His research focuses on public law, the legal profession, the judiciary, and legal ethics. Most recently, he was appointed Chair of CanLII's board of directors.

Stephanie Katajamaki: Alright, so hi Professor Dodek, and welcome back to the *OLR* Podcast!

Adam Dodek: It's great to be here. Thanks so much for inviting me.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So, before we get into it, congratulations on publishing this book, we really enjoyed reading it. And yeah, let's dive right into the interview.

Adam Dodek: Super.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So, we want to start by talking a bit about your career, so that our listeners can understand your perspective in writing this book. You worked on Bay Street for a number of years before transitioning into academia. Can you tell us about your career and how you got here?

Adam Dodek: Sure. So, I sort of spent the first ten years after law school trying to figure out what country I wanted to live in, what sort of law I wanted to practice, whether I wanted to be a lawyer who did some teaching or a teacher who did some lawyering. And I like to think, you know, I'm I guess, a Gen Zer, and I had more of a career path of a millennial. I had five jobs in my first five years out of law school, I was clerking in three different countries, practicing, et cetera, trying to figure out what I wanted to do. And then finally, in 2008, I made the move to academia, and I've been here at the University of Ottawa for 17 years. So that's sort of my career path.

Zach Auger: Awesome. And yeah, your career has also led you to be the author, co-author, and editor of many books, with topics ranging from the Canadian Constitution to solicitor-client privilege. But this book is a bit different. You've previously described it as a "law and society" book. Why did you decide to write a book like this on the rise and fall of Heenan Blaikie?

Adam Dodek: So, I wouldn't have been able to do a project like this ten or fifteen years ago. Over the course of my career—and you know, in law, like we study cases, we study the Constitution, we study rules that are made by appellate courts. And we tend to strip away the facts, and that gives the message that people don't matter, and the facts don't matter. Whereas over the course of my career, I've increasingly realized: people do matter, and they really matter in law.

And so I've tried, in my teaching and then in my writing, to tell the stories of people involved in important cases or involved, in this case, in law firms. So this is a story—a style or a genre—of narrative non-fiction, or literary non-fiction. So I didn't realize to what extent there would be so many interesting people who worked at Heenan Blaikie, from Pierre Trudeau to Jean Chrétien to Marcel Aubut, Jacques Bouchard, Joe Groia—all these really interesting people. And so the book centres a lot around people against the background, say, of law and society... of what's going on in society at the time.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So on that, like, on it being about society. It's also not the first book that's been written about Heenan Blaikie. Norm Bacal, a former co-managing partner at Heenan Blaikie, also wrote a book on the firm in 2017. Where did you see the gap between what he wrote and what you set out to write?

Adam Dodek: Well, first of all, Norm's book was extremely helpful to me in researching what ultimately became my book, and Norm himself was very cooperative and very helpful to me. He interviewed; he sat down for a couple of on the record interviews. Norm's book is just about Heenan Blaikie and about his career... and my project was always going to be broader. I didn't have a particular stake in Heenan Blaikie. I never worked there. I knew some people that had worked there, but not that many. And my plan was always going to be... to use Heenan Blaikie as a case

study about challenges and changes in the Canadian legal profession and in society from 1973 when the firm was founded, until 2014 when the firm collapsed.

Zach Auger: Awesome, and yeah, this book clearly took a lot of research. You mentioned that you interviewed over 180 former Heenan Blaikie employees—everyone from articling students to senior partners for this book, and that's a huge task. So how'd you manage gathering the research for this book on top of being a professor, maintaining a personal life, and all the other things that you do?

Adam Dodek: So part of the great privilege of being a law professor, or being a professor, is you get to choose the projects that you work on. And so I spent a significant amount of time as part of my job, outside the classroom, working on this book for eight or nine years. Now, I wasn't working on the book for eight or nine years; the project spanned eight or nine years. There was a pause or a hiatus when I became dean of the faculty in 2018, and you may recall that in 2020 we were hit by a global pandemic.

So I had planned to return to the project in the summer of 2020, but probably like you and like many of the listeners, I had plans for the summer of 2020 that didn't quite work out. So I returned to it when I completed my term as dean at the end of the summer of 2021. But for me, it was really a labor of love... and I really enjoyed spending time meeting people, meeting those 180 plus former Heenan Blaikie lawyers who all have their own story, and then meeting 40 plus other members of the legal profession who I spoke with.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So a lot of those members from the legal profession that you would have spoken with, they're all your colleagues, right? Like the legal profession is relatively small—in Canada at least. Did writing the book have an impact on any existing relationships you had with people who you interviewed?

Adam Dodek: It wasn't so much impact on existing relationships; there were maybe four or five former Heenan Blaikie lawyers that I knew. Most of them I would have been introduced to by a mutual friend who sort of vouched for me as a good guy, a serious academic. But I think what surprised me was the extent to which I made relationships out of this project, and that there are people who I only met through researching this project that became professional acquaintances, even friends, and that hopefully will have survived the writing of the book.

Stephanie Katajamaki: Right, so was it difficult to get fellow lawyers to open up about what might have been a really difficult time in their lives with the collapse of Heenan Blaikie?

Adam Dodek: Yes and no. I'll start with the no. Some people who I contacted just didn't want to talk about it. They said you know, they just wanted to put the experience behind them and move on and not revisit, not revisit it. And that's a common approach to trauma, to dealing with a negative situation, to moving on from a place of work. But most of the lawyers that I contacted, and I would say between 80-85%, were willing to speak with me. And that's an incredibly high response rate, if you think about when you're contacted by a polling group or somebody that wants to take 20 minutes of your time to complete a poll, to complete an interview. Usually, you know, you have to

contact a hundred people to get five who will participate. For me, it was the opposite. And so people were incredibly generous with their time and willing to sit down with me for—I asked for 30 to 45 minutes, and many people spent an hour, hour and a half talking to me. So I really saw the generosity in the legal profession in this project.

Zach Auger: What did you find was the most surprising thing about the research?

Adam Dodek: The most surprising thing... well, there are always a number of unexpected things in research. That's what makes research interesting and exciting. I guess one of the things that surprised me was how many people still felt that despite all of these problems at the firm, all of the dislocation that they suffered, and the real financial and emotional cost. And to be clear, over 250 partners lost their equity in the firm, which meant they lost their investment of several hundred thousand dollars that they were then on the hook to the bank for. Some people had to get a second mortgage, refinance that loan, some people even had to sell their house—this was a serious financial hit.

For other lawyers, they were dislocated. Imagine spending the first two, three years of your career trying to build your practice, getting to know the other lawyers in the firm who are going to send you work, and then suddenly you have to go somewhere else where you don't really know anyone and start again. So people had a lot of reason to be angry. A lot of people were also making much more money at their new place of work than they were at Heenan Blaikie, which was never the most profitable firm.

But I was surprised by the extent to which people reflected back and said, "I really miss that time", "it was really special", "those were the best years of my professional career". And that really surprised me. And that's sort of the reason I chose in the conclusion—I had one lawyer write to me and reflect on their experiences, and what he said was:

Roy and Peter built Heenan Blaikie into the iconic and venerable Canadian institution that it became. Most of us were fiercely proud and felt privileged to have started our careers in Montreal and seen them both in action. The two of them successfully built Heenan Blaikie and nurtured it over the years with their personal DNA. The sense of teamwork, excellence in our practice, personal growth, integrity, collegiality, and true partnership is what I remember fondly. And not the greed of insecure lawyers which brought down the institution. We lived and breathed what it meant to be a lawyer and partner at Heenan Blaikie, and I actually remember being incredibly happy going to work every day. In many ways I feel badly for those who did not experience that fulfillment. It's not something you can buy.

So there was a specialness at Heenan Blaikie that I hope I've succeeded in capturing in the book. And that sense of loss by many of the partners, many of the lawyers who worked there is certainly one of the most surprising things I found in the research.

Zach Auger: That's great, thank you.

Stephanie Katajamaki: I think that passage also really speaks to the family culture of the firm. That's kind of the sense I was getting with it.

Adam Dodek: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Zach Auger: So let's dig into the book itself. Heenan Blaikie started with the infamous “handshake agreement”, which you describe as “romantic and reckless”. Could you explain to the listeners a little bit more about the handshake agreement, and what it symbolized for Heenan Blaikie?

Adam Dodek: So Heenan Blaikie was founded by three relatively young men in their mid-30s in Montreal on a handshake: Roy Heenan, Don Johnson and Peter Blaikie. On a handshake, what that means is they didn't have a written agreement. Many of your listeners may have taken biz orgs, and you learn about partnerships and partnership agreements, what tends to be in a partnership agreement... you don't need a formal agreement—a written agreement—to have a partnership. The law sort of backstops it.

What it meant for these three men and their law firm was this was a conscious decision. They obviously were well schooled in the law, and they consciously chose not to have a written partnership agreement. And they said that theirs was going to be firm built on trust, not on a contract. And they also said that they had been in other law firms where there were fights over the negotiation of the partnership agreement and disputes, disagreements about the partnership agreement itself, and they said they wanted to spend their time fighting the competition, not each other.

I say that this was romantic because this became, it's really... even in 1973, it was an old school notion of how people conduct business or how people work together. It was not the norm. It had been the norm until the 1950s or 1960s in smaller Canadian law firms, but certainly by 1973 it was no longer the norm. So it was romantic to believe that the entire structure of a law firm could be based on trust. There's something incredibly admirable about it, but ultimately it was reckless. As lawyers, I don't think lawyers would advise their clients to enter into a business without having a written agreement. And ultimately, the lack of a written partnership agreement—and a serious partnership agreement—it took 25 years until they actually had a partnership agreement. By that time, the firm was over 250 lawyers, it was a complex organization, and they had a bare bones partnership agreement of thirteen pages.

And I've seen other partnership agreements of big national firms, one of which is part of the record that went to the Supreme Court of Canada in the mid-2000s, and they are 60 or 70 pages. There are some firms that have partnership agreements over 100 pages. So that's why it was reckless, because it was not a prudent way to conduct business and ultimately, the lack of a rigorous, detailed partnership agreement hurt the firm when it was going through crisis in 2011, 12 and 13—ultimately contributing to its dissolution in 2014.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So your book doesn't just focus on the firm itself—it also describes what was going on in Canada more broadly at the time. Why did you think it was important to situate the rise and fall of Heenan Blaikie within the broader social, political and historical contexts of

Montreal, Quebec, and Canada? I know you mentioned some of the people that formed part of the story.

Adam Dodek: Well, I did that because law firms are part of society. We tend to think of ourselves, as lawyers or as law students, as sort of in silos or in isolation, but we're part of society and we both contribute... impact society and we're also impacted by societal forces, by what's going on in trends in social media, trends in the economy. As lawyers and law firms, we're impacted by that. And so telling the story of the growth of this business, firm, law firm, institution against the background of developments and changes in Canadian society from the 1970s through the 2010s, I thought was an important way to situate it and fully understand what was going on at this law firm in the context of what was going on in Canadian society at the time.

Zach Auger: And so the book mentions that the firm's family style culture was very attractive to many of its employees. Can you tell us more about the "family culture" at Heenan Blaikie?

Adam Dodek: Yeah, so one of the most surprising things to me when I interviewed all of these lawyers was the number of times that people said to me, "it was like a family", "working at Heenan Blaikie was like a family", "my colleagues were like a family", and I found that quite unusual. I had worked at two large law firms before, one in San Francisco and one in Toronto. The one in Toronto, I still, you know, 25 years later, have very good friends from that time there. I've worked in other really positive environments. I've worked in some not so positive environments. And I've had friends that have worked in law firms for 25, 30 years, had really fulfilling careers... I would have never described any workplace I'd been in as "like a family", or my... I would describe some colleagues as friends, but not like family members. And I hadn't heard friends of mine describe their workplaces that way.

So I found it was very unusual, and I think it also related to something very special that was created at Heenan Blaikie, and it was both, I would say, its superpower and its kryptonite. It was what made the firm special and even great, right? So the subtitle of my book is "the making and unmaking of a great Canadian law firm". And some people take issue with the adjective "great." Heenan Blaikie was one of the largest, but it wasn't *the* largest law firm. It was not *the* most profitable. It was not in the top of its class in a whole lot of practice areas, like corporate. It certainly was in labor and employment. But I think it was great in that it created something great. It created something distinct, and that was its culture. Ultimately, I think it was also its kryptonite and helped explain or contribute to its downfall as well.

Stephanie Katajamaki: I'm sure that there's lots of students that are really drawn to this idea of working at a firm that feels like a family. In Heenan Blaikie's case, it really contributed to the firm's downfall. Like you said, it was its kryptonite in some ways. Do you think that all firms with a family culture are doomed to fail, or is there maybe a way for a firm that brands itself as a family to succeed?

Adam Dodek: That's a great question. In many ways, that's an unanswered question at the end of the book that I sort of—that I pose. And let me try my best to answer it here, because I've been

reflecting on it since the book was published. I think that it is possible to create and sustain a special culture, but there are a number of challenges. For Heenan Blaikie, one of the biggest challenges was this special culture was created and cultivated in Montreal when there were three, ten, twenty, thirty, forty lawyers, and expanded to Toronto and Vancouver when it had seventy, eighty lawyers. But by the time it had 250 lawyers, it was already, I think, starting to erode.

And I think that's the challenge when—the culture of any organization, when it's small, is the culture of the individuals and the relationship between the individuals. As it grows, you have to be deliberate in nurturing and sustaining a special culture. And you also have to live your values, and sometimes that means making hard decisions and putting your values over the dollar, putting your values over profit. And for Heenan Blaikie in the 2000s, and certainly into the 2010s, they put profit over their special family culture—to the firm's ultimate detriment.

And ultimately, part of the great strength of the family culture, or “it was like a family”, was the casualness of it. You could be yourself. So it wasn't quite like, oh, you're at home and you can just, you know, sit down on the couch in sweats or in pajamas, but you didn't have to wear a tie or necessarily a jacket at work, you could leave at 5:00 or 6:00pm to go to a child's music recital or soccer practice, and you didn't have to make up an excuse to do that. And the firm was run like a family business, and that meant very loose... lack of policies, lack of sort of professional rigor, and that's the aspect that I think ultimately led to its downfall.

So to get back to your question, is it possible to sustain a sort of special culture, whether that's a family culture or some other aspect? I think it is. It really requires strong, strong leadership from the top, and it requires living your values. Not just sort of saying them and talking about them, you know, at the holiday party and in memos, but people see what's really going on in an organization, and they have to see especially the people at the top living those values.

Stephanie Katajamaki: Right, so you mentioned growth in there. I want to go back to that idea. Do you think there's a way to balance having that family-like culture with still having a growth mindset and furthering your business?

Adam Dodek: I think it's really challenging, and growth puts stress on culture. And for Heenan Blaikie, like in other large businesses—I mean, we talk about law as a profession, and law is also a business, and I don't think it's an either-or proposition. We tend to debate: is law a business? Is law a profession? To me, that's a sort of false debate; not a useful debate. It's clearly both. But as any business grows, it puts stress on your culture. As new people come in, as a lot of new and rapid growth... as what happened in Heenan Blaikie, right? It grew from about 250 lawyers—from 1973 to 2000, grows from three to 250, and then from 2000 to 2010 it almost doubles... just over the course of a decade. So it takes 25 years to get to 250 and then ten years to get to 500. That put a lot of stress on the firm and its values, and I think contributed to the erosion of the values. And if you don't—one of the, I think, the lessons is, again, you really have to be deliberate in sustaining a special culture. It's not just going to happen.

Zach Auger: And from your observations, how did other law firms change the way they operated after seeing what happened to Heenan Blaikie? Do you think this book is a cautionary tale for other firms?

Adam Dodek: Well, I think the book is most certainly a cautionary tale. But I would sort of reverse your question—which maybe is my prerogative as a professor—which is it wasn't so much that other firms saw what happened to Heenan Blaikie and changed their operations, it's that Heenan Blaikie was too late in seeing what other firms had done in changing their operations, and, in a sense, was a decade too late in coming to the realization that they needed to be more professional, that they needed to be more strategic, and coming to those realizations too late ultimately led to Heenan Blaikie's downfall. I think that it was a huge—the downfall and the collapse was a huge wake up call to large law firms across the country, and I think a lot of partners woke up and started asking questions of their management that they didn't necessarily ask before. They were asking certainly, could this happen to us? How do we know this couldn't happen to us?

Stephanie Katajamaki: I like that. I like that answer. So many law students, you know, we dream of owning our own firms one day, and we hear these somewhat scary stories of firms that are doing great, but also some that aren't doing so well. And the skill set that's required to run a successful law firm isn't really something that people necessarily learn in law school, or even as young associates. As someone who has worked on Bay Street and studied the business of law, where do you think that students should learn this skill set?

Adam Dodek: So I've already mentioned that I think law is both a profession and a business. I think we're really good in law school in teaching about the profession aspect, specifically about the skills that you need as a lawyer, and we're not so good on the business side. I think that there are experts in the university environment, specifically at the business school—there are a remarkable number of lawyers who teach at business schools across the country. We happen to have here at the University of Ottawa, we have a program in family businesses at the Telfer School of Management. Small law firms are like family businesses, small partnerships.

So I think that there would be opportunities for law schools to partner with experts, whether that's in other faculties, or whether that's outside the law school, to teach the business side. I certainly also think that that's something that law societies could do. And now, certainly in Ontario, there's now a mandatory course for sole practitioners, whether that's people coming right out of articling, or whether that's people who are moving out of a law firm environment to start their own law firm. I think that there would be a great audience for a certificate program in running your own law firm. And again, that could be put on by a law school, a business school, a continuing ed program, bar association, etc.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So we shouldn't start with a handshake?

Adam Dodek: Not so much. I think, in all seriousness, I think that if you're starting a law firm, you need to go to a lawyer. You need to think about it from the perspective of being a business person, starting a business and getting—the same way you would go to an IT professional to set up a

website or set up your IT system, and maybe get some marketing advice, get some accounting expert—you should go to a lawyer to help draft a partnership agreement with your partners. And you should celebrate that with a handshake, but... maybe it's another classmate of yours who is a corporate lawyer, but acting like the client that you are and the small businessperson that you are when you found a firm.

Zach Auger: You described Heenan Blaikie as having a lot of flash, including several high-profile lawyers and former judges. They had a Paris office, and it was important to them to get a Bay Street address. I'm sure for prospective clients, these were seen as really attractive qualities. What kind of purpose do you think they serve in a law firm generally?

Adam Dodek: Well, I want to separate maybe the—when we talk about flash—from high profile people to actual flash, like the quality and location of offices. I think there's an attraction... I mean, the hiring of Pierre Trudeau in 1984 put Heenan Blaikie on the national map. Very few people outside of Montreal had ever heard of Heenan Blaikie until 1984 when Pierre Trudeau joined the firm. It was on national news two nights in a row, at a time when a very high percentage of the population would watch the nine o'clock news and the ten o'clock news. So suddenly, people knew the name Heenan Blaikie, and they knew it as Pierre Trudeau's law firm.

Pierre Trudeau didn't bring in a lot of business to Heenan Blaikie, but he brought them legitimacy, and he also contributed to that feeling of specialness that we've talked about. So many of the lawyers who I interviewed, and this would have been in 2016-17, had fond memories of encounters they had with Pierre Trudeau, who passed away in 2000. So they were talking about encounters they had probably in the 90s, so 25 years before, and they remembered having lunch with him in the food fair or the dining hall at the bottom of the building, or skiing with him at Whistler at a firm retreat. So individuals, high profile individuals, former Supreme Court judges, former prime ministers, can attract business to a firm, can attract positive PR, positive attention.

The other sort of flash—Heenan Blaikie had beautiful offices. At a time, you know, I remember visiting their offices when I was working on Bay Street... between 2002 and 2003. And at that time, most Bay Street firms were very traditional, small “C” conservative. Dark wood paneling, sort of Group of Seven knock off style; really classic, old Canadian art—very dark. I remember going to Heenan Blaikie's offices, and they were bright and white, and they had this modern art, which I subsequently learned was new Canadian artists, including, like, a purple bicycle when you got off the elevator. I just thought it was a purple bicycle... turns out it's a work of art. But they were different, and that contributed to the feeling that people were working in a different environment.

As far as the Bay Street address, that's really interesting, because, as I talk about in the book, when Heenan Blaikie had to move from its location at 200 Bay Street in Toronto because they had outgrown that office, they couldn't really renovate... there was a big debate about where they should move to, and a lot of people at Heenan Blaikie felt they had to be on Bay Street for the address, for the business legitimacy. And I'm not sure, especially post-COVID, how much that matters these days. One of the most prestigious, profitable, national law firms, Davies Ward Phillips & Vineberg,

moved off Bay Street. It had no impact, really, on their business, but other major firms have not followed them.

So with the flash, a lot of clients don't like going into fancy offices because they see that they're paying for that. So it has a sort of mix. I think that the geography of one's work environment really matters, and a lot of people I spoke to felt that they were—it was part of the specialness of working in Heenan Blaikie. They knew Roy Heenan had this remarkable art collection. It was his art, his bicycle that was in the Toronto office, and I have a catalogue of his art that was on display from the Heenan Blaikie offices in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver, at an art gallery in Fredericton. So it contributed to that special environment, but there's a tension with clients not wanting to pay for big, fancy, expensive office space.

Stephanie Katajamaki: So firms often want to attract “rainmakers” by putting them in senior management positions, but these people may not always be the most qualified to make their business decisions. This is something we saw happen with Heenan Blaikie. How do you think law firms can balance these two things?

Adam Dodek: Yeah, this is something strange that law firms have done for a long time. But it's not only them. We see this in academia as well. People that are chosen to be deans come from, overwhelmingly, come from the ranks of the professoriate, right? So, you know, I'll pick on myself as an example. To be a dean is like the managing partner of your faculty; it's like being a managing partner of a law firm to a great degree. It is a management job. It's not like—it's not a higher academic job. In the same way, like, being a managing partner of a law firm is not—and you bring in more business—it is you manage the operations of the law firm.

Very few managing partners have qualifications in management; very few deans, like myself, have any qualifications whatsoever in management. Deans, except in the Faculty of Management, don't have MBAs. Managing partners, very few of them have MBAs, or any business or managerial experience. So it's a really strange phenomenon; it's because of, I would say, the self-governing nature of law firm partnerships, similarly to academia. But there's been a resistance to, I would say, the professionalization of bringing in professional managers, people who have been trained, educated, and worked in professional management roles, to bring those in to run law firms.

Stephanie Katajamaki: Do you think that firms should start looking to hiring outside CEOs to manage these business aspects in their firms?

Adam Dodek: Absolutely, and we've seen firms doing that. We saw firms starting to do that in the 2000s or early 2010s. And again, this is an example where Heenan Blaikie was behind the times. Heenan Blaikie had come to that realization that they needed a professional manager, and in 2013—the end of 2013—they had hired a professional CEO. By that, I mean a professional non-lawyer CEO from England who had run a large London law firm. He was supposed to start at Heenan Blaikie as the CEO in May 2014. Now, the firm collapsed in February 2014. So it's one of the many what ifs at Heenan Blaikie. If they had come to that realization a year earlier, if they had been able to

hire him a year earlier, would that have made a difference? I don't know. Again, one of the many what ifs.

Zach Auger: Thanks so much, Professor. Now, just before we wrap up, what is the best way for students to get a copy of the book?

Adam Dodek: Okay, so there aren't many, like, great deals as students. Here's a great deal. The book is co-published by UBC Press and the Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History. If you haven't heard of the Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History, it's a great organization. As it sounds, it promotes Canadian legal history. It also supports the publishing of books, and every year, they adopt one book that all members get for free if they're members. They adopted my book and, as students, you can join the Osgoode Society for 25 bucks—and you're not going to get a better deal on the book than that. If you want to get additional copies for gifts, for family, friends, et cetera, you can get directly from UBC Press, Indigo, Amazon, your local bookseller, et cetera.

Stephanie Katajamaki: On the topic of books, do you have any more on your radar? What's coming up for you?

Adam Dodek: I do have another project on the radar that I'm really excited about. I told you how I'm interested in telling stories about people, and I believe that people matter. So I've got a project that I'm working on with a number of students from my first year small group who are graduating this year. And the project's called *Heroes, Villains, Crusaders and Passengers: Stories of the People Behind Some of Canada's Biggest Constitutional Cases*. And I bet that many of your listeners don't know who Oakes was, or Roncarelli, or Sparrow, or Van der Peet. They might know the *Sparrow* test or what happened in *Van der Peet*... they probably know the *Oakes* test. But I'm telling the story with these students about who these people were and why we should care about them. And that's a really fun project, it's been great to do that work on it with these incredibly talented students, and hopefully that will come out in 2025-2026.

Stephanie Katajamaki: That sounds really exciting, I'm really interested to read that once it's out, hopefully soon. Just before we wrap up, are there any concluding thoughts you want to offer the listeners before we end?

Adam Dodek: No, just—I wrote the book with students in mind, with non-lawyers in mind. Yeah, lawyers are going to be interested in this, but I think for students to see both, sort of, part of the history of the profession that they're entering, and also some... hopefully some practical advice or lessons that—things that they should be looking for as you embark on a legal career and after, you know, possibly after seven, eight, nine years, think about becoming a partner in a law firm.

Stephanie Katajamaki: Great. Well, thank you so much for being with us today.

Adam Dodek: Thanks so much. This has been a great treat.



Stephanie Katajamaki: This concludes this episode of the *OLR* Podcast. We would like to thank our guest Professor Adam Dodek for speaking with us today. Also, thank you to the *OLR* Podcast Committee for preparing the questions for this episode, editing, and transcribing the episode in English and French. Thank you all for listening!