
COURSE:	LAWS 4303E – Drugs, the User, and the State
TERM:	WINTER 2020
PREREQUISITES:	4th year Honours standing + .5 credit from LAWS 2301 or LAWS 2302 + LAWS 2908, CRCJ 3001 or CRCJ 3002
CLASS:	Day & Time: Tuesdays 6:05PM to 8:55PM (January 7, 2020 to April 7, 2020 inclusive – no seminar is scheduled for February 17, 2020 during reading week) Location: 311 Southam Hall (please double check on the university's website as room assignments are sometimes changed before the first scheduled class)
INSTRUCTOR:	Gregory R. (Greg) Brown, PhD
CONTACT:	Office: A736 Loeb Building Office Hrs: Tuesdays 4:45PM to 5:45PM Telephone: (613) 520-3690 (office) Email: gregoryr.brown@carleton.ca This is the best way to contact me and I am typically diligent in responding, but please appreciate that it may sometimes take 24 hours. For e-mails requiring considerable elaboration, I will often request that you see me during office hours.

CALENDAR COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course explores the state's attempts to control drugs and drug users by exploring different aspects of national and international drug control. The Canadian experience of drug control, viewed from different perspectives, will be explored within a broader socio-legal context.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Throughout the term, we will engage with various, often-contentious, issues related to the state's efforts to regulate the use of substances identified (by the state) as 'illicit' among the population. In furtherance of our deliberations, the broad purpose of this course is to encourage students to challenge common discourses around drug use, prevention, and treatment methods and the criminal prohibition of drugs in society and, in this vein, to think critically about existing and potential drug control regimens in Canadian and international contexts. Our examinations will encompass not only legal, but also social, cultural, political, and economic perspectives related to the legislative control of drugs. Throughout the course we will consider: the philosophy/rationale of criminal law, vis-à-vis the proscribing of specific (selective) conduct by the state; the prohibition of 'illicit' drugs, via the criminal law, versus other existing or potential regulatory regimens; supply-side interdiction (law enforcement) and drug control; the use of drugs ('illicit' and otherwise) in custodial settings; the contemporary 'war on drugs'; drug treatment courts; harm reduction and other approaches to drug use/abuse outside a criminal prohibition model; and recent initiatives throughout Western democracies to legalize cannabis, not only for medical applications, but also for recreational purposes.

This course will follow a seminar format and our sessions will be structured around discussion of each week's required readings. This course is organized on the assumption that learning results from a continuing process of

rational discourse and the application of critical thinking. Students are expected to: 1) attend class; 2) have completed the required readings, have prepared notes, and have formulated questions emerging from the student's deliberations on each of the required readings (to facilitate dialogue among the group); 3) be prepared to consider, inquire, and engage with issues/arguments emerging from the readings and the observations of your colleagues and the instructor. This course is reading intensive, with the expectation that students will closely read and understand approximately 75 pages of scholarly material (on average) **in advance** of each week's session. The readings have been chosen, with much deliberation, to intellectually challenge and stimulate.

REQUIRED TEXTS

There are no textbooks required for this course. All course readings will be available electronically (through the library's online journal database, Google Scholar, CULearn, and/or ARES) or through books placed on reserve at MacOdrum Library. Please note that, although unlikely, additional readings may be added, or some readings may be removed, at the discretion of the instructor. Please refer to CULearn regularly as readings and topics may change.

EVALUATION

Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Department and of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by the instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Department and the Dean.

REQUIREMENT	% OF FINAL GRADE	DUE DATE
Attendance	10%	assessed throughout the term
Seminar Participation	20%	assessed throughout the term
Presentation of Reading	5%	the student's assigned week
Midterm Paper	15%	March 2, 2020
Take-Home Proposal & Presentation	10%	March 23, 2020 (Proposal) March 24 & 31, 2020 (Presentation)
Take-Home Examination	40%	April 25, 2020

In alignment with expectations for a fourth-year course in law and legal studies, please note that spelling, grammar, structure (organization), and comprehensibility (clarity) will be assessed and will account for 20% of the final take-home examination mark.

1. Attendance (10%)

This course will be highly interactive and consists of co-produced learning (involving collaboration between instructor and students) through a series of seminars. Therefore, **students must attend all class sessions**. Student's signatures will be collected each week beginning at the second class of the term. Marks are allocated at 1% each week for weeks 2 through 12 (inclusive). Attendance represents 10% of the overall course mark.

2. Seminar Participation (20%)

Participation is a core requirement of seminar courses. Just attending our sessions is not considered participation. Collegial discussion is essential to the development and articulation of ideas, and, in this regard, our seminars in weeks 2 through 10 (inclusive) will focus, each week, on the examination of a specific topic within the context of assigned readings and related issues that emerge during our deliberations on those readings. These discussions will be directed by student facilitators (see the following section on the presentation of readings) and the instructor. Other class meetings (in weeks 11 and 12) will focus on 'peer-review', in which students will discuss and provide each other with feedback on, and suggestions for, the direction of the take-home examination (see the following section on the take-home examination proposal).

The evaluation of class participation is based on the student's participation in, and fostering of, discussion during weeks 2 through 12 (inclusive) and demonstration of a solid understanding of the assigned materials. Like writing, it is often hard work, requiring preparation and commitment. Students are expected to arrive at each seminar having completed the reading requirements and ready to actively engage in the discussion. For each session (2 through 10 inclusive), students will prepare one insightful question pertaining to each of the session's assigned readings and be prepared to lead a discussion on that question. These questions will demonstrate the student's engagement with the materials and that the student has considered one particularly interesting issue/argument arising from their reading of the materials. These reading questions will be provided (in Word or PDF format) by e-mail to the instructor prior to noon on the date of each seminar and will be relied on throughout the seminar to augment the discussion. Marks are allocated at 2% each week for weeks 2 through 12 (inclusive). For weeks 2 through 10, the breakdown is 1% for in-class participation and 1% for reading question submissions. For weeks 11 and 12, the breakdown is 2% for feedback discussion on your colleagues' final examination proposal presentations. The total of this evaluation component represents 20% of the overall course mark.

3. Presentation of Readings (5%)

Each student will contribute to at least one presentation on a required reading and chair the discussion of that article/chapter during the corresponding seminar session. To facilitate these presentations, a sign-up sheet will be completed during our first session on January 7, 2020 and students will be assigned to work in groups of three. The discussants will provide an overview of the reading, highlight particularly important points, and introduce, and then facilitate, discussion on issues, as they see them that arise from the article/chapter. The discussants are encouraged (but not required) to introduce one other scholarly source of information, of their choice, into our deliberations on the assigned reading. To assist with our discussions, the discussants will come to class prepared with several (perhaps 3 to 5) discussion questions pertaining to their assigned reading, which they will provide to the instructor (in Word or PDF format and by e-mail) before noon on the date of the seminar. Please understand that presentations can take on your own personality, so feel free to be creative! For example, bringing in popular media pieces, Kahoot! (or other) audience participation quizzes, or multimedia sources for illustration (*i.e.* video footage) ... whatever you think will compliment your presentation on, and interpretation of, the topic and stimulate discussion among your colleagues. This component will be graded at 5% of the overall course mark.

4. Midterm Paper (15%)

Students will prepare a midterm paper that presents their observations on, and thoughts in relation to, drug treatment courts. As part of this assignment, students will attend a session of the Ottawa Drug Treatment Court (DTC) on one Tuesday afternoon prior to session 8 of the course (before March 3, 2020). The Ottawa DTC is in session each Tuesday beginning at 2:00PM and is situated in courtroom #8 of the Ottawa Courthouse (161 Elgin Street, Ottawa). The student's critical reflections on drug treatment courts must consider the readings on this specific topic assigned for Session 8 (March 3, 2020). Incorporating further secondary sources is not necessary but further scholarly sources of information are permissible. This paper will be 5 to 7 pages in length (standard formatting) and further information will be communicated well in advance of the due date on specific requirements for this paper. This midterm paper is due by no later than 4:00PM on **March 2, 2020**, deposited to the Law & Legal Studies drop box (4th floor Loeb building). This component will be graded at 15% of the overall course mark.

Late Penalty Policy:

Subject to the granting of an extension by the instructor, any midterm paper or take-home examination proposal (see below), turned in after the specified due date, will be penalized one grade point per day. For example, an otherwise A- midterm paper submitted at 9:00AM on March 3, 2020 will be assigned a B+ grade. This is not done to be punitive, but rather to be fair to all students in the course and to encourage students to develop good time management skills and be proactive in preparing for the take-home examination.

5. Proposal/Bibliography (10%)

Students will prepare a take-home examination proposal that describes how they plan to approach the take-home examination (3 to 5 pages) and that presents at least 8 scholarly sources of support for their approach (1 or 2 pages, annotated or otherwise). This assignment is due by no later than 4:00PM on **March 23, 2020**, deposited to the Law & Legal Studies drop box (4th floor Loeb building). This assignment will be graded at 5% of the overall course mark. The second 5% of the overall course mark in this evaluation component will be allocated in relation to the quality of the student's presentation on their take-home examination proposal (to be presented on either **March 24, 2020** or **March 31, 2020** – a sign-up list will be circulated in our session on March 10, 2020).

6. Take-Home Examination (40%)

To promote further consideration of ideas developed throughout this course and to provide the opportunity for additional higher-order learning in the context of individual interests, a take-home examination will require students to engage with one particular topic (of their choosing), which we have reflected on throughout the course.

Length: 15 to 20 pages (double-spaced, standard formatting)

Citation Style: flexible (APA, Harvard, MLA, Chicago, McGill)

References Required: a minimum of ten (10) peer-reviewed scholarly journal articles and/or academic book chapters

Further information on producing an effective take-home examination will be communicated throughout the term and a detailed rubric explaining how the take-home examination will be graded will be posted on CULearn in the second week of the course. For now, students should understand that the key to doing well on this examination is to present a thorough and well-reasoned analysis of the topic, which you support with contributions from scholars in the field. You are not expected to conduct original empirical research as we do not have the time or resources to administer questionnaires, empanel focus groups, make applications to the Ethics Review Board to conduct interviews, etc. Rather, you are to engage with a particular topic (of your choosing but emerging from one of the weeks of this course) and to present an in-depth and insightful examination of that topic. This component will be graded at 40% of the overall course mark.

The final take-home examination is due by no later than 4:00PM on **April 25, 2020**, deposited to the Law & Legal Studies drop box (4th floor Loeb building). Please familiarize yourself with the university's policy on extensions for take-home examination (see below), as the instructor has no authority over such matters.

Extensions and the Final Take-Home Examination:

Pursuant to university regulations (4.3.2 Deferred Final Examinations), students who are unable to write a final examination because of illness or other circumstances beyond their control may apply to write a deferred examination. **The student must apply for the deferral through the Registrar's Office.** The application for deferred examination must:

Be made in writing to the Registrar's Office no later than three working days after the original final examination or the due date of the take-home examination; and be fully supported in cases of illness by a medical certificate or by appropriate documents in other cases.

Medical documents must specify the date of the onset of the illness, the (expected) date of recovery, and the extent to which the student was/is incapacitated during the time of the examination.

Deferred final examinations are available only to students who have performed satisfactorily in the course according to the evaluation scheme established in the course outline.

SCHEDULE

Please take note of the following important dates for the Winter 2020 term:

January 6	Winter 2020 term begins
February 17	Statutory holiday
February 17 to 21	Winter Break
April 7	Winter 2020 term ends
April 13 to 25	Formally scheduled exam period

Seminar Schedule:

Session 1 will present an introduction to the course (including reviewing the expectations and evaluation criteria), the instructor, and seminar participants. Please access the one assigned reading for Session 1 (available on CULearn in the Week 1 tab) and read it over prior to class. Each week thereafter, we will consider a different topic in seeking to arrive at a better understanding of the various contemporary issues in relation to drugs, the user, and the state. Sessions 11 and 12 will be dedicated to in-class presentation of, and discussion toward improving, each student's take-home examination. During Session 13, I will facilitate a writing skills seminar, which presents the opportunity for students to improve on drafts of their take-home examination.

Please understand that, although unlikely, the schedule may be subject to change at the discretion of the instructor. Similarly, the instructor reserves the right to add, subtract, and/or substitute assigned readings. Students will be consulted before any such proposed changes in course readings. Please be aware that we may be joined in some sessions by guest discussants, who have particular expertise in the issue we are considering that week.

SESSION 1 (January 7, 2020) Introduction**Required Readings:**

(1) Oscanella, E. (2001) *Witch Hunts and Chemical McCarthyism: The Criminal Law and Twentieth Century Canadian Drug Policy*. Vancouver, BC: The Fraser Institute.

SESSION 2 (January 14, 2020) The rationale of criminal law**Required Readings:**

(1) Mill, J.S. (1859/2001) Of the limits to the authority of society over the individual. *On Liberty*: 69-86.

Kitchener, ON: Batoche Books.

(2) Mill, J.S. (1859/2001) Applications. *On Liberty*: 86-106. Kitchener, ON: Batoche Books.

(3) Beauchesne, L. (2011) Setting public policy on drugs: A choice of social values. In (Montigny, E., ed.) *The Real Dope: Social, Legal and Historical Perspective on the Regulation of Drugs in Canada*: 25-58. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Further (Optional) Readings:

(1) Duff, R. (1998) *Philosophy and the Criminal Law: Principle and Critique*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

SESSION 3 (January 21, 2020) Drug prohibition versus other regulatory regimens**Required Readings:**

- (1) Montigny, E. (2011) Introduction. In (Montigny, E., ed.) *The Real Dope: Social, Legal and Historical Perspective on the Regulation of Drugs in Canada*: 3-24. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- (2) de Marneffe, P. (2005) Against drug legalization. In (Husak, D. & de Marneffe, P., eds.) *The Legalization of Drugs*: 107-198. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- (3) Husak, D. (2005) For drug legalization. In (Husak, D. & de Marneffe, P., eds.) *The Legalization of Drugs*: 1-105. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Further (Optional) Readings:

- (1) Global Commission on Drug Policy (2011) ~~War~~ *on Drugs: Report of the Global Commission on Drug Policy*. Geneva, Switzerland: Global Commission on Drug Policy.
- (2) Husak, D. (2002) *Legalize This! The Case for Decriminalizing Drugs*. New York: Verso.
- (3) Husak, D., Sher, G., de Marneffe, P. & Shapiro, D. (2003) Drug Legalization. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 22(1): 21-49.

SESSION 4 (January 28, 2020) Supply-side interdiction: Law enforcement and ‘illicit drugs’

Required Readings:

- (1) *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, SC 1996, C. 19.
- (2) Lynch, O. & Roussell, V. (2013) Policing the ‘progressive’ city: The racialized geography of drug law enforcement. *Theoretical Criminology*, 17(3): 335-357.
- (3) Martin, J., Munksgaard, R., Coomber, R., Demant, J. & Barratt, M. (2019) Selling drugs on dark web crypto markets: Differentiated pathways, risks and rewards. *British Journal of Criminology*. DOI:10.1093/bjc/azz075.

Further (Optional) Readings:

- (1) Lichtenburg, I. (2006) Driving while Black (DWB): Examining race as a tool in the war on drugs. *Police Practice & Research*, 7(1) 49-60.
- (2) Stokes, L. (2007) Legislative and court decisions that promulgated racial profiling: A sociohistorical perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23(3): 263-275.
- (3) Stoud, M. (2014) The Minority Report: Chicago’s new police computer predicts crimes, but is it racist? Chicago police say its computers can tell who will be a violent criminal, but critics say it’s nothing more than racial profiling. *The Verge*. 19 February. [Online] <https://www.theverge.com/2014/2/19/5419854/the-minority-report-this-computer-predicts-crime-but-is-it-racist>.
- (4) Thomsen, F. (2011) The art of the unseen: Three challenges for racial profiling. *Journal of Ethics*, 15(1): 89-117.
- (5) Bacon, M. (2016) Maintaining order in the drug game: Applying harm reduction principles to drug detective work. *Police Practice & Research*, 17(4): 306-316.
- (6) Coomber, R., Moyle, L. & Mahoney, M. (2019) Symbolic policing: Situating targeted police operations/‘crackdowns’ on street-level drug markets. *Policing & Society*, 29(1): 1-17.

Scheduled Guest Discussant: Detective-Sergeant Seth Curtis, Ottawa Police Service, Drug Unit.

SESSION 5 (February 4, 2020) Drug use in custodial settings

Required Readings:

- 1) Mjåland, K. (2016) Exploring prison drug use in the context of prison-based drug rehabilitation. *Drugs: Education, Prevention & Policy*, 23(2): 154-162.
- 2) McKendy, L., Biro, S. & Keown, L.A. (2018) *Overdose Incidents in Federal Custody, 2012/2013 – 2016/2017*.

Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada

Scheduled Guest Discussants: Dr. Leslie-Anne Keown and Dr. Laura McKendy, Correctional Service of Canada, Research Branch.

SESSION 6 (February 11, 2020) The ‘War on Drugs’

Required Readings:

- (1) Cutcliffe, J. & Saadeh, B. (2014) Grounded in evidence or puritanical legacy: A critique of twenty-first-century US drug policy. *Mental Health & Substance Use*, 7(3): 195-206.
- (2) Whiteacre, K. & Pepinski, H. (2002) Controlling drug use. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 13(1): 21-31.
- (3) Jensen, E. *et al.* (2004) Social consequences of the war on drugs: The legacy of a failed policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 15(1): 100-121.
- (4) Mitchell, O. (2009) Ineffectiveness, financial waste and unfairness: The legacy of the war on drugs. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 32(2): 1-19.

Further (Optional) Readings:

- (1) Moore, D. & Haggerty, K. (2001) Bring it on home: The relocation of the war on drugs. *Social & Legal Studies*, 10(3): 377-395.
- (2) Linnemann, T. & Kurtz, D. (2014) Beyond the ghetto: Police power, methamphetamine and the rural war on drugs. *Critical Criminology*, 22(3): 339-355.
- (3) Khenti, A. (2014) The Canadian war on drugs: Structural violence and unequal treatment of Black Canadians. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 25(2):190-195.
- (4) Boyd, G. (2001) The drug war is the new Jim Crow. *NACLA Report on the Americas*. [Online] <https://www.aclu.org/other/drug-war-new-jim-crow>.
- (5) Cardoso, F. (2009) The War on Drugs has failed. Now we need a more humane strategy. *The Guardian*. 6 September. [Online] <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/sep/06/cardoso-war-on-drugs>.
- (6) Kastrenakes, J. (2014) Nobel Prize economists call for end to war on drugs. *The Verge*. 7 May. [Online] <https://www.theverge.com/2014/5/7/5690428/nobel-prize-winning-economists-call-for-end-to-war-on-drugs>.
- (7) Scott, P. (2011) Obama and Afghanistan: America's corrupted drug war. *Critical Asian Studies*, 43(1): 111-138.
- (8) Cummings, A. (2012) All eyes on me: America's war on drugs and the prison-industrial complex. *Journal of Gender, Race & Justice*, 15(2/3): 417-448.
- (9) Bourgeois, P. (2003) Crack and the political economy of social suffering. *Addiction & Research Theory*, 11(1): 31-37.
- (10) Robinson, M. & Scherlen, R. (2007) *Lies, Damned Lies and Drug War Statistics: A Critical Analysis of Claims Made by the Office of National Drug Control Policy*. New York: State University of New York Press.

No seminar is scheduled for February 18, 2020 (Winter term reading week)

SESSION 7 (February 25, 2020) No seminar is scheduled (in lieu of students' attendance at the Ottawa Drug Treatment Court)

Given the requirement for attendance at the Ottawa Drug Treatment Court on a Tuesday afternoon of the student's choice, during the first seven weeks of the course, this scheduled seminar time should be used to continue work on the mid-term paper assignment (due no later than 4:00PM on Monday March 2, 2020).

Required Readings:

None assigned

SESSION 8 (March 3, 2020) Drug treatment courts**Required Readings:**

- (1) Fischer, B. (2003) Doing good with a vengeance: A critical assessment of the practices, effects and implications of drug treatment courts in North America. *Criminal Justice*, 3(3): 227-248.
- (2) Moore, D. (2011) The benevolent watch: Therapeutic surveillance in drug treatment court. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(3): 255-268.
- (3) Tiger, R. (2011) Drug courts and the logic of coerced treatment. *Sociological Forum*, 26(1): 169-182.

Further (Optional) Readings:

- (1) Fischer, B., Roberts, J. & Kirst, M. (2002) Compulsory drug treatment in Canada: Historical origins and recent developments. *European Addiction Research*, 8(2): 61-68.
- (2) Christie, T. & Anderson, J. (2003) Drug treatment courts are popular but do they work and are they ethical and appropriate for Canada? *Health Law in Canada*, 23(4): 70-79.
- (3) Chiodo, A. (2002) Sentencing drug-addicted offenders and the Toronto Drug Treatment Court. *Criminal Law Quarterly*, 45(1/2): 53-100.
- (4) Moore, D. (2011) "Spatio-therapeutics: Drug treatment courts and urban space. *Social & Legal Studies*, 20(2): 157-172.
- (5) Fulkerson, A. (2009) The drug treatment court as a form of restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 12(3): 253-267.
- (6) Allard, P. et al. (2011) *Impaired Judgement: Assessing the Appropriateness of Drug Treatment Courts as a Response to Drug Use in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network.
- (7) Lyons, T. (2013) Judges as therapists and therapists as judges: The collision of judicial and therapeutic roles in drug treatment courts. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 16(4): 412-424.
- (8) Weinrath, M. et al. (2018) Accessing drug treatment court: Do age, race or gender matter? *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 51(4): 619-637.
- (9) Stevens, A. (2012) The ethics and effectiveness of coerced treatment of people who use drugs. *Human Rights & Drugs*, 2(1): 7-15.
- (10) Somers, J. et al. (2012) Drug Treatment Court of Vancouver: An empirical evaluation of recidivism. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 23(5):393-400.
- (11) Tiger, R. (2013) *Judging Addicts: Drug Courts and Coercion in the Justice System*. New York: New York University Press.

Scheduled Guest Discussants: Justice Heather Perkins-McVey, Ontario Court of Justice and Brigid Luke, Counsel, Public Prosecution Service of Canada.

SESSION 9 (March 10, 2020) Harm-reduction approaches and other strategies addressing drug use outside the model of criminal prohibition**Required Readings:**

- (1) Greenfield, V. & Paoli, L. (2012) If supply-oriented drug policy is broken, can harm reduction help fix it? Melding disciplines and methods to advance international drug control policy. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 23(1): 6-15.
- (2) Fafard, P. (2012) Public health understandings of policy and power: Lessons from Insite. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 89(6): 905-912.

(3) Hyshka, E. *et al.* (2010) Prospects for scaling up supervised safe-injection facilities in Canada: The role of evidence in legal and political decision-making. *Addiction Policy Case Studies*, 108(3): 468-476.

Further (Optional) Readings:

(1) Hathaway, A. & Tousaw, K. (2008) Harm reduction headway and continuing resistance: Insights from safe injection in the City of Vancouver.” *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 19(1): 11-16

SESSION 10 (March 17, 2020) The legalization of cannabis and other ‘illicit’ substances

Required Readings:

(1) Maier, S., Mannes, S. & Koppenhofer, E. (2017) The implications of marijuana decriminalization and legalization on crime in the United States. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 44(2): 125-146.

(2) Task Force on Cannabis Legalization and Regulation (2016) *A Framework for the Legalization and Regulation of Cannabis in Canada: Final Report*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

(3) Hughes, C. & Stevens, A. (2010) What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization of illicit drugs? *British Journal of Criminology*, 50(6): 999-1022.

(4) Global Commission on Drug Policy (2018) *Regulation: The Responsible Control of Drugs*. Geneva, Switzerland: Global Commission on Drug Policy.

Further (Optional) Readings:

(1) Jones, J. & Jones, K. (2018) The impact of the legalization of recreational marijuana on college students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 77: 255-259.

(2) Bretteville-Jensen, A. (2006) To legalize or not to legalize? Economic approaches to the decriminalization of drugs. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 41(4): 555-565.

(3) Kalant, H. (2016) A critique of cannabis legalization proposals in Canada. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 34: 5-10.

(4) Laqueur, H. (2015) Uses and abuses of drug decriminalization in Portugal. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 40(3): 746-781.

SESSION 11 (March 24, 2020) Student presentations on take-home examination topic

Required Readings: none assigned

SESSION 12 (March 31, 2020) Student presentations on take-home examination topic

Required Readings: none assigned

SESSION 13 (April 7, 2020) Writing seminar, discussion (open forum), course wrap-up

Required Readings: none assigned

SEMINAR ETIQUETTE

Internet surfing, playing computer games, checking e-mail, and/or text messaging are disruptive to other students. This behavior is also disrespectful toward the instructor. Please also be courteous to your classmates and the instructor and turn off mobile phones before the seminar starts. Mobile computer devices are to be used exclusively for notetaking and reviewing course materials during seminars. The use of recording devices (audio or visual) is not permitted, unless authorized, in advance, by the instructor.

All students will treat their classmates with respect. We may disagree on certain issues; however, we must keep an open mind and consider the differing opinions and points of view of our colleagues. Focus on the issue/argument and not the person.

ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATIONS

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. For an accommodation request the processes are as follows: <https://carleton.ca/equity/wp-content/uploads/Student-Guide-to-Academic-Accommodation.pdf>

Pregnancy obligation

Please contact me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Equity Services website:

Religious obligation

Write to me with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Department of Equity and Inclusive Communities (EIC): <https://carleton.ca/equity/>

Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

If you have a documented disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact The Paul Menton Centre (PMC) at 613-520-6608 or pmc@carleton.ca for a formal evaluation. If you are already registered with the PMC, contact your PMC coordinator to send me your Letter of Accommodation at the beginning of the term, and no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (if applicable). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with me as soon as possible to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Please consult the PMC Website for their deadline to request accommodations for the formally-scheduled exam (if applicable) www.carleton.ca/pmc

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one's own. Plagiarism includes reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source. Examples of sources from which the ideas, expressions of ideas or works of others may be drawn from include but are not limited to: books, articles, papers, literary compositions and phrases, performance compositions, chemical compounds, art works, laboratory reports, research results, calculations and the results of calculations, diagrams, constructions, computer reports, computer code/software, and material on the Internet. Plagiarism is a serious offence. *More information on the University's Academic Integrity Policy can be found at:* <http://carleton.ca/studentaffairs/academic-integrity/>

Survivors of Sexual Violence

As a community, Carleton University is committed to maintaining a positive learning, working and living environment where sexual violence will not be tolerated, and survivors are supported through academic accommodations as per Carleton's Sexual Violence Policy. For more information about the services available at the university and to obtain information about sexual violence and/or support, visit: carleton.ca/sexual-violence-support

Accommodation for Student Activities

Carleton University recognizes the substantial benefits, both to the individual student and for the university, that result from a student participating in activities beyond the classroom experience. Reasonable accommodation must be provided to students who compete or perform at the national or international level. Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. <https://carleton.ca/senate/wp-content/uploads/Accommodation-for-Student-Activities-1.pdf>

For more information on academic accommodation, please contact the departmental administrator or visit: <https://students.carleton.ca/services/accommodation/>

Department Policy

The Department of Law and Legal Studies operates in association with certain policies and procedures. Please review these documents to ensure that your practices meet our Department's expectations. <http://carleton.ca/law/current-students/>