

JUSTICE - ILAG

LEGAL AID NEWSLETTER

No. 22

November & December 2011

R. Smith

WELCOME

RESEARCH

Professor Alan Paterson, Strathclyde University and Chair of ILAG and Roger Smith, Director of JUSTICE and member of the ILAG Steering Group have received a grant from an English based foundation, the Nuffield Foundation, worth £51,500 for research into the issue which is very topical in a number of jurisdictions: face to face legal services and their alternatives. This is in the context of a government proposal to replace traditional advice services by cheaper telephone 'hotlines' for England and Wales. A number of jurisdictions will be attracted to the same position and the idea behind the research is to look at what is – and can be – done with hotlines, websites and other forms of communication that does not depend on direct personal contact.

Though precipitated by the proposals to cut funding, another pressure for change comes from the development of the web and new forms of delivery for legal services. The idea is to find the groups and problems for which new forms of delivery can work – and how. The project will also seek to identify the groups and problems for which it will not work. A crucial element in the work will be to see if prejudices stand up. Does the evidence indeed suggest that hotlines and websites are fine for the young and the well educated but fail for those unfamiliar with technology and with language difficulties? Or, is it more complicated? And, if you run a hotline, how best should you organise it? There are wider questions too that go to the context of these issues: how are paid for legal services changing and what lessons does this suggest?

The project is designed to be collaborative and to seek as much international input as is possible. There will be an international advisory panel of senior administrators and researchers, almost all of whom have strong connections with ILAG, convened by Alan Paterson (comprising

Peter van den Biggelaar, Jeanne Charn, Amanda Findlay, Elizabeth Gibby, Lindsay Montgomery, Merja Muilu and Richard Susskind). In addition, there will be an international reference group made up on a more voluntary basis of anyone who wishes to be on an email list and has an interest in the subject. The reference group will be coordinated by Roger Smith who will work on the project on an escalating basis throughout the next 18 months. We should be able to establish a discussion forum on the website to facilitate broad discussion as the project progresses.

The first stage of the project will be to produce four summary papers by the summer on:

- (i) relevant developments in legal practice and its use of new technology;
- (ii) telephone hotlines;
- (iii) web-based advice and information initiatives; and
- (iv) on-line dispute resolution and mediation.

For this purpose, it will be critical to get together as many references as possible and help with that would be extremely welcome (talk to Roger). On the general legal context, the project has been much influenced by ideas which in the UK are associated with Richard Susskind who has written a number of books with provocative titles such as *The End of Lawyers?* A review of this book is contained in this edition of the newsletter. There is also a review of an American book by Wayne Moore on his experience of running hotlines. Mr Moore has criticisms to make of the legal services movement in the US which will be controversial. However, what he certainly also has is hard experience of running hotlines and telephone assistance lines from the point of view of a semi-commercial, if not for profit, perspective.

The subject of telephone hotlines has the advantage of being relatively self-contained; something which has been explored in a number of jurisdictions and concrete. As a result, we are thinking that we will start with it. Web-based advice could follow as the second paper and then the other two.

The second stage of the project would follow in terms of interviews by telephone, email or skype with people identified as having a particular interest in the issues being considered. This will allow the papers to be brought together in time for discussion at an expert seminar just before, and at the ILAG conference in the summer of 2013 (stage 3). This paper would seek to:

- (a) assess current developments and summarise latest experience;

- (b) evaluate strengths and weaknesses of various forms of delivery;
- (c) suggest criteria for evaluation;
- (d) grapple with issues of cost;
- (e) draw conclusions and make recommendations – relevant both generally and in relation to specific proposals in England and Wales.

Finally, the paper will be written up after discussion and published in an appropriate form in the autumn of 2013.

There you have the bare bones of the project. There will, of course, be a conflict – hopefully creative – between those who look at technology in the hope of slashing the cost of legal aid and those who assert the need for individuals in difficulty to have face to face service. Some of the most interesting questions will begin with the interrogatives ‘how’ and ‘what’ rather than whether. For example, how can web-based provision best be used? What are the best examples? How should telephone hotlines best be organised? How can you integrate web-based and telephone advice into a coherent scheme for the provision of advice? What are the best examples? And, dear to the hearts of some, how can you preserve a commitment to enforce the rights of those who are poor and marginalised through a delivery system which restricts face to face contact?

We know that technology is changing our lives. We know that it will transform commercial legal services. This is your opportunity to participate in a project designed to explore, from a variety of perspectives, how it might transform what, in the UK, we would call legally aided services. Do let us know if you are interested and watch the website for more information.

Roger Smith, Alan Paterson

Rsmith@justice.org.uk, prof.alan.paterson@strath.ac.uk

Delivering Legal Advice over the Phone: What Do We Know?

Marisol Smith, Legal Services Research Centre, London

This article summarises findings from 'Just a phone call away: Is telephone advice enough' by Nigel Balmer, Marisol Smith, Catrina Denvir and Ash Patel which is in press with the Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law 34(1).

Over the last two decades the public sector in the UK has embraced new modes of service delivery, with a shift away from traditional face-to-face provision towards internet and telephone based advice and information. In the legal advice sector, while telephone advice has been a fundamental part of service delivery in a number of subject areas for some time, its prominence is set to increase across the board, as a result of reforms proposed by the Ministry of Justice in 2010. The legislation intended to give these reforms effect, the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Bill currently going through Parliament, proposes a single telephone gateway for civil legal aid services. Although the gateway will be mandatory for only four categories of law in the first instance, there is an expectation that it will become **the** route into legal aid for other categories in the near future, with only limited exceptions.

As highlighted by respondents to the recent consultation on legal aid reforms (of which there were more than 5,000 in total), there is a notable absence of research which compares alternative delivery modes and the implications of an increased reliance on telephone based services. In an attempt to address this lacuna our research used administrative data from the Legal Services Commission (LSC) on legal aid services to examine the similarities and differences between telephone and face-to-face provision for legal advice on housing problems. We looked at the client groups and problem types which tended towards the two channels, the relationship between mode of advice and the outcome of cases for clients, as well as the relationship between mode of advice and advice time.

Our analysis highlighted some key findings of relevance to the development of telephone advice. In particular the research indicated that use of the Community Legal Service (CLA) telephone advice line was not uniform across people or problems. Service users under the age of 18 and people living with an illness or disability were more likely to tend toward face-to-face advice. We also found a number of differences amongst the types of problems being addressed

by telephone based services. For example, clients with homelessness and housing benefit problems tended toward face-to-face provision whereas landlord and tenant issues were more likely to tend towards the telephone. These findings suggest that problem and client groups associated with disadvantage and vulnerability are more often inclined towards advice provided in a face-to-face setting.

Our research also found pronounced differences in the outcome of cases by channel of advice delivery, with a far greater tendency for face-to-face advice to result in what appeared to be more tangible outcomes. For example, where clients were experiencing homelessness or threat of homelessness, face-to-face advice led to an outcome of 'housed/rehoused/retains home' for 37 percent of clients. The comparable figure for telephone advice was 9 percent, where the majority of cases concluded with the client being 'better able to plan or manage affairs'.

Finally, our research findings presented a challenge to the presumption that telephone advice is more efficient than face-to-face alternatives. Simple comparisons suggest that telephone advice is shorter than face-to-face advice, an average of 133 minutes compared to 192 minutes, respectively. However, once account is taken of other variables, such as clients' demographic characteristics, problem types, and most importantly the stage reached in a case (since telephone cases were far less likely to progress to more advanced stages), telephone advice takes on average 14 minutes **longer** than face-to-face advice.

Our findings raise a number of important considerations for the expansion of telephone based services, especially where such expansion is considered a replacement for existing modes of access to advice. Our research suggests that firstly there is a need to understand what drives client preferences towards certain modes; in particular, whether the telephone presents access barriers for the client groups we identify as less frequent users, or whether these groups simply have lower levels of awareness about existing telephone services. Secondly, more needs to be known about how differences in case outcomes arise and whether differences can be attributed to the suggestion that clients with 'simple' or 'less serious' problems are more inclined to access advice via the telephone. Finally, there is a need to better understand the extent to which savings predicted to derive from a shift to telephone advice are premised on accurate calculations of advice time.

Going forward, the analytical approach we adopted could usefully be applied to other administrative data, including services addressing a broader range of clients than the legal aid eligible. Whilst this research fills an important gap in the literature, there is still much to learn.

Indigent Defence: International Perspectives and Research Needs

[by Maureen McGough](#)

Domestic and international researchers, policymakers, practitioners and advocates explore promising international programs and identify research priorities in the hopes of improving of indigent defense in the United States.

The U.S. Constitution guarantees all criminal defendants the right to be represented by counsel. Those defendants who cannot afford a lawyer have the right to have counsel appointed free of charge.^[1] A considerable majority of criminal defendants in the United States fall into this category; yet, there are insufficient resources to meet their legal needs.

The American Bar Association (ABA) has characterized the funding for indigent defense services as "shamefully inadequate" and found that the system "lacks fundamental fairness and places poor persons at constant risk for wrongful conviction."^[2] Public defenders represent the majority of indigent defendants in nonfederal cases, ^[3] but public defender offices are significantly understaffed and underfunded. In 2007, the Bureau of Justice Statistics examined caseloads in public defender offices and found that the majority of offices exceeded the recommended number of cases per attorney under the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice's Standards and Goals and employed insufficient numbers of support staff.

Simply put, indigent defense in America is in crisis.^[4] Given shortages in funding and staffing for public defender offices, there is a critical need to develop evidence-based practices that help guarantee every person's fundamental right to counsel and due process.

A Crucial Collaboration

In 2010, the Department of Justice (DOJ) launched the Access to Justice Initiative (ATJ) to improve access to justice for all Americans, regardless of their means. NIJ and ATJ came together in January 2011 to sponsor a two-day workshop to identify domestic and international best practices for representing low-income defendants and to devise a research agenda on criminal indigent defense in the United States. This collaboration highlighted the importance of using the study of international practices to advise reform of the American justice system.

Though America has developed a legacy of ensuring that indigent defendants are represented in court, the system is far from perfect.^[5] The ABA cites, among other things, the lack of adequate funds for public defender offices, the lack of oversight and standards, the lack of independence from political and judicial pressure, and the lack of formal, systematic training for indigent defense attorneys as posing threats to the quality of indigent defense in the U.S.^[6]

Several jurisdictions outside of the U.S. have developed successful approaches to provide high-quality, accessible indigent defense despite financial constraints. One of the primary goals of the workshop was to determine if any of these practices might be transferable to the United States.

Understanding how other countries have approached indigent defense — the research they have conducted, the policies they have developed, the practices they have instituted, and the political and financial challenges they have overcome — can help practitioners and researchers in the U.S. reflect upon their own policies and practices, offer new directions for research, and inspire innovative suggestions for replacing, modifying or complementing components of the current system.

The workshop's 40 attendees included domestic and international public defense practitioners, researchers, advocates and government officials. In addition to the participants from the United States, attendees hailed from Canada, China, Colombia, Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

America's Legacy of Indigent Defense

The workshop coincided with DOJ's celebration of Robert F. Kennedy's achievements and enduring legacy, which commemorated the 50th anniversary of Kennedy's swearing-in as U.S. Attorney General. In welcoming remarks, Associate Attorney General Thomas Perrelli reminded participants of Kennedy's commitment to developing quality public defense systems and safeguarding the rights of indigent defendants. Perrelli reaffirmed, through the words of Kennedy himself, that indigent defense is a moral imperative: "The poor man charged with crime has no lobby. Ensuring fairness and equal treatment in criminal trials is the responsibility of us all."

Perrelli noted that identifying gaps in research, addressing those gaps and disseminating findings about best practices was critical to solving problems in indigent defense. "Only by having that robust research agenda and asking the right questions about public safety and justice can we most effectively protect the public and ensure that our courts mete out true justice," Perrelli stated.

In her introduction of the workshop's keynote speaker, recently retired Chief Justice Margaret H. Marshall of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, Assistant Attorney General Laurie Robinson emphasized that the issue of indigent defense is a crucial one for Attorney General Eric Holder and she welcomed Chief Justice Marshall as "a champion of the poor and disenfranchised."

Born and raised in South Africa, Chief Justice Marshall was a leader in student-led anti-apartheid efforts. Appointed as the first female Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court in 1999, she led the court in making significant progress in guaranteeing adequate representation for indigent defendants. In her remarks, she challenged participants to work together to identify ways to improve the circumstances faced by indigent defendants. She emphasized the importance of judicial leadership, oversight and independence of public defender offices, active participation from the private bar in indigent defense, and early assignment of counsel in raising the quality of public defense to the caliber of the defense a defendant with means receives.

Workshop Topics and Discussions

Concerns about public defenders' heavy case loads, the lack of time they are able to devote to each case and the lack of money for public defender offices to hire more attorneys were raised by the first panel and were echoed throughout the conference. Participants stressed the need for increased resources for public defenders and several advocated for increased participation in indigent defense by the private bar. They identified a number of other factors compounding the indigent defense crisis, including racial disparities in effective representation and a lack of state or federal entities to enforce defense standards such as the DOJ's *Compendium of Standards for Indigent Defense Systems*.[\[7\]](#)

Panelists discussed the costs borne by indigent defendants in the U.S. criminal defense system and the high costs of death penalty defense. Participants discussed the value of experience in representing indigent clients and the U.K.'s recently implemented experience-based accreditation system requiring that lawyers attain a minimum certification before defending more serious crimes.

The intersection of indigent defense and immigration can be particularly difficult for public defenders to navigate. Panelists discussed the need for public defenders to receive training regarding pleas and verdicts that could affect a defendant's immigration status. Participants also noted that public defenders should be encouraged to consult with immigration lawyers because of the complexity of immigration law. In addition to the participants who discussed working with experts from external agencies, several also spoke about good outcomes and increased efficiency from bringing experts in-house.

Several panelists gave presentations on protecting the rights of juveniles in the court system. Common concerns about juvenile defense in the U.S. included lack of resources, lack of due process for juveniles (particularly unrepresented juveniles [\[8\]](#)) and the over-institutionalization of youth. Participants discussed international human rights standards for juvenile defense, namely the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (which the U.S. has not ratified), and European alternatives to the court system for juveniles.

Participants also discussed the state of indigent defense in indigenous communities. Indigenous communities have distinct needs and there can be tension between preservation of culture and

administration of justice. Panelists highlighted effective indigenous justice programs in Canada as possible best practices, including the Gladue court (which trains court personnel, judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys on the history and unique needs of Canada's Aboriginal communities) and using restorative measures, such as sentencing circles, whenever possible.

Near the end of the meeting, participants broke into groups based on individual expertise. Each group prioritized specific, actionable measures aimed at improving indigent defense in the United States. They provided detailed recommendations to NIJ and ATJ on the main issues affecting indigent defense and suggestions for drawing on practices from other countries.

The research priorities identified by participants included:

- Studying the cost of implementing national indigent defense standards and the potential cost savings that could result from that implementation.
- Researching how competition, particularly the involvement of the private bar and paralegals in the provision of services, might improve the system.
- Looking at systems of partnerships between tribal and federal systems, especially in the pretrial and post adjudication services areas.
- Comparing places in the juvenile justice system where counsel is waived to places where it is not to study the cost effectiveness of providing counsel and to determine whether providing counsel produces benefits for public safety.

Among participants' suggestions for international programs and practices to assess for transferability were Canada's Gladue court and adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child as well as other international treaties having to do with the rights of children and human rights.

The report that will be generated from the workshop, due to be released in 2011, will be used to inform ATJ's priorities and NIJ's future research agenda on indigent defense, including which international practices may be ripe for a transferability assessment to determine the domestic viability of the practice.

Maureen McGough is an attorney and the National Institute of Justice's outreach coordinator. The article was first published in **NIJ Journal No. 268, October 2011** NCJ 235895

REPORTS

Bangladesh: an update

Ian Morrison

In the May-June 2010 Newsletter I contributed a short article on the development of government legal aid services in Bangladesh and the work being done by the CIDA-Bangladesh Legal Reform Project (BLRP), a bilateral technical assistance project funded by the Canadian International Development Agency. At the time I noted that while there were encouraging signs of a renewed commitment to legal aid on the part of the government of Bangladesh, the advances were fragile and the program still faced huge challenges. While this caution still applies, the reform momentum has continued and even accelerated, in sharp contrast to the bleak reports on legal aid programs in much of the “developed” world. Indeed, the program has developed further and faster than anyone could have predicted even three years ago.

The newly established National Legal Aid Services Organization (NLASO) has moved surprisingly fast on a number of fronts. The financial eligibility ceiling for applicants has been raised twice since 2009 to levels which are realistic in the Bangladesh context (to include incomes up to about \$60 per month). Lawyers’ fees (Bangladesh is a judicare system), which had eroded more than 40% due to inflation from their original level – already too low – were raised and more services and expenses included. The percentage of the Legal Aid Fund actually disbursed has risen (although it has not yet reached 100%). The NLASO has slowly started to monitor and get regular reports from District Legal Aid Committees, which in the past were for all practical purposes unsupervised. New file management systems created by BLRP in its pilot Districts (described in my previous article) have been approved for use in all Districts. Local legal aid committees have been established for sub-District level administrative units (called Upazilas) and additional funds released for local awareness programming. By far the most important development, though, has been the decision to create legal aid offices and assign full-time staff in all 64 Districts. As of December 2010, one lower level staff person has

been assigned to Legal Aid in all Districts and all the new staff persons have gone through an initial training program provided by BLRP. This is just an interim step, though – the real news is that a proposal to permanently assign three staff persons to each District office, including a judicial officer-level Coordinator, has been approved by all relevant ministries and is awaiting final sign-off from the Prime Minister's Office. The proposal is based on the model developed by BLRP and proven workable in pilot Districts. The NLASO is expected to have its first-ever strategic plan in place before BLRP ends in March 2012. After ignoring the NLASO for years, other bilateral and multilateral donor agencies are starting to show interest in the government program.

The opium-dream-like nature of this picture – a legal aid program with more money than it can spend, broader eligibility, huge staff increases, higher payments to lawyers – must of course be tempered by recognition of the extremely low baseline against which the changes must be measured. Nevertheless, the possibility that Bangladesh will soon have some form of national government-funded legal aid system, however modest by the standards of developed economies, remains alive.

REVIEW

Wayne Moore *Delivering Legal Services to Low-Income People*, Wayne Moore, 2011, \$39 from Amazon

The main overall thrust of this book, apparently self-published by one-time director of the Association of American Retired People's Legal Counsel for the Elderly (LCE), is a contribution to debate on legal services in the United States. Mr Moore feels that much provision is stuck in the past and privileges old ways of doing things over innovative approaches that have developed since the 1970s. That gives the book a national context and one imagines that Mr Moore is out deliberately to ruffle of few feathers in what he sees as the legal services' establishment.

However, the book is much more than a polemic. Mr Moore has been responsible for running various schemes for the LCE over a quarter of a century. He knows about legal aid telephone hotlines because he has actually run them and, interesting for a British reviewer, he has run them for an organisation which may be a 'non profit' but which is a fairly commercially oriented members' organisation. So, he has worked in a context where services are accountable not to

some grey government bureaucracy but to a bunch of members who are going to want service for their money.

For an English reviewer, the most interesting chapter in the book is the one on legal advice. This opens with the bold statement: 'the key issue in the delivery of legal advice is whether face-to-face advice leads to better client outcomes than telephone advice'. This resonates particularly because our government is planning massive cuts to the scope of legal advice to be offset by minimal investment in some form of telephone service, the exact nature of which is still obscure. In this context, therefore, Mr Moore is prospectively a useful source of honest reflection on what works and what does not. His reflections go right to the core of the project for which ILAG has just received funding to evaluate the potential role of non 'face to face' services and to establish what developments are occurring around the world.

Mr Moore is refreshingly commercial and hard-headed. He reckons that you expect 1700 cases a year to be handled per full time equivalent attorney. And he prefers part-time staff for hotlines as they are 'more productive, because maintaining the same level of service for more than four hours is too exhausting' though he acknowledges that part-timers require more management. He is straight into the question of quality control. You need supervisors who periodically listen in; you can ask, as routine, callers to repeat the advice they have received; you should send out a letter confirming the advice and 'the best quality control method, but one that significantly increases costs, is to place a follow-up call to those advised to take some action'.

Mr Moore's list of structural requirements for design of the system include:

- * call-queuing or call-back processes that insure a steady flow of calls;
- * dedicated staff who become efficient at providing quality advice;
- * entry of case notes directly into a computer during the conversation with the client;
- * streamlined quality control system involving review of electronic case notes;
- * ready access to legal resource materials;
- * efficient process for generating follow-up letters
- * proper evaluation.

He has an interesting section on best practice which should be read by those who think that hotlines can be safely run on a rough and ready basis. He states that 'one of the major debates among hotlines is whether it is better to require callers to hold for the next advocate or collect contact information for a callback'. He is a big fan of same day callback systems. Callers were told to expect the call and he says that they lost only 7 per cent on ringing their number back. He is clear on the advantages of humans over tapes. Now there is praise for evolution.

NEWS

These reports are largely compiled from news articles on the internet on the basis of a simple search under the words 'legal aid'. Readers must, just as buyers, beware of authenticity. The links worked at the time of writing but some will fail after a period of time.

This section is compiled by **Paul Ferrie** of the *University of Strathclyde*. If you would like to suggest news articles for inclusion in this newsletter or have any comments please contact Paul by emailing paul.s.ferrie@strath.ac.uk

Australia:

Young people, Indigenous and regional Queenslanders to benefit from community legal education initiatives – Legal Aid Queensland – 15/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

The cruelty and injustice of a poorly funded legal aid system – The Sydney Morning Herald – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Aid in talks with welfare service – The Standard – 24/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Canada:

Hon. Roy McMurtry Announces Results of Pioneering Study of Civil Legal Services in Ontario – Market Watch – 21/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Reasonable Doubt: A call to arms on legal aid funding in B.C. – Straight.com – 25/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Trial lawyers plan rally to demand legal aid funding – Canada.com – 30/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

B.C.'s atrophying legal aid system sinking into dementia – Legal Feeds 01/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Relaxed Qualifying Rules for Ontario Legal Aid Plan – Family LLB – 06/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Aid Ontario launches new legal information website – Legal Aid Ontario – 08/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

B.C. legal aid funding boosted by \$2M – CBC News – 30/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

England & Wales:

Ken Clarke's justice bill passed despite 'attacks' – Access to Justice Action Group – 03/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cut that will hit young is seen as a false economy – The Guardian – 04/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Justice for some: For the poor, access to justice is set to diminish – The Economist – 05/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cuts set to fuel youth crime – Just Rights – 07/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cuts 'will undermine pro bono work' – Law Society Gazette – 07/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cuts 'will stop the most vulnerable getting justice' says report – The Guardian – 11/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cuts undermine constitutional right to access to justice, peers warn – The Guardian – 17/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Access to justice for all, not just those who can pay – ePolitix – 21/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Access to justice threatened by Government's proposal to scrap no-win, no-fee arrangements – Contact Law – 21/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cuts 'will deny poor access to justice', says Lord Woolf - The London Criminal Courts Solicitors' Association – 21/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Aid Bill Threatens Access To Justice – David Alton – 22/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Lords tear into legal aid bill – Access to Justice Action Group – 22/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Lords give legal aid bill 'a good bashing' – The Guardian – 23/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Court of Appeal upholds access to justice for migrants – Richmond Canter Immigration Barrister – 24/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid cuts put women in danger – The Guardian – 24/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid reform prompts further protest from top judges – The Guardian – 29/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Ken Clarke postpones legal aid reforms and tendering – Law Society Gazette – 01/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

The legal aid bill must be cut. Here's how – The Guardian – 13/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Clarke: Legal aid can't be like NHS – UKPA – 19/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid is safe where it matters most – The Guardian – 19/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Lord Tebbit in bid to save legal aid for children's medical negligence cases – The Telegraph – 20/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid alternatives deserve government support – The Guardian - 21/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

McNally tells Lords legal aid bill is in 'pristine' condition – The Guardian – 21/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Cuts to legal aid will push disabled people further into poverty – The Guardian – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Existential conflict over the legal aid system is in the coalition's head – The Guardian – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Govt must support legal aid alternatives, experts claim – The Co-operative Legal Services – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Services Commission turns to border agency for new chief exec – Legal Week – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Virtual lawyer helps drivers in a tight spot – This is London – 23/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Ken Clarke vows to end compensation for criminals injured in prison – Mail Online – 27/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

India:

Lawyers should provide legal aid to the poor – Indian Express – 07/11/12 [\[Read more\]](#)

U.S. looks to India for lessons in legal aid – TrustLaw – 07/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Pak team for legal aid to prisoners – The Times of India – 25/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Indonesia:

Legal Aid for the Public Not Yet Optimum, says DPR – Tempo Interactive – 28/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

New Zealand:

Legal aid pays lawyers \$2.5m – Nelson Mail – 30/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Senior lawyers shun legal aid system – TVNZ – 21/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Northern Ireland:

Exposed: Northern Ireland's £400m legal aid gravy train – Belfast Telegraph – 23/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Pro bono lawyers provide access to justice across Europe – Rights NI – 24/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Court closures 'to save £400,000' – Belfast Telegraph – 25/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Help for domestic violence victims extended – UTV – 30/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Peru:

UNDP praises Peru for facilitating justice access to the poorest – Andina – 24/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Republic of Ireland:

Family Mediation Service and Legal Aid Board to be integrated – Irish Times – 03/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Cases delayed as lawyers take action over legal aid – Irish Times – 08/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

An independent and accessible legal system must be the goal – Irish Times – 12/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Reforming legal services – Irish Times – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Scotland:

Judge calls Cadder ruling 'a bad decision' – STV – 01/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

LawWorks calls for 10 hours a year commitment – Journal Online - 07/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Key 'safeguard' in Scottish law should be axed, says review – Scotsman – 18/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Waiver of right to advice does not require advice: Supreme Court – Journal Online – 23/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

“Sons of Cadder” – Supreme Court rulings on legal advice during police interviews – UK Human Rights Blog – 24/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Cadder bar cases top 1,000 – Journal Online – 05/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Cadder's growing family – Journal Online – 12/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Call centre: team aims to offer post-Cadder solution to 24/7 demands – Scotsman – 12/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Review of legal firm that only lasted for two days – Herald Scotland – 17/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Prisoner video link scheme launched – Herald Scotland – 23/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Further Government funding for housing law advice service – Journal Online – 27/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Buy a divorce ... at a supermarket near you – Herald Scotland - 27/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Rise in solicitors joining police station duty – Scotsman – 30/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Suspects getting instant access to legal assistance – Scotsman – 30/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Sierra Leone:

HRC Discusses Legal Aid for Women's Right – All Africa – 12/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

South Africa:

Legal Aid in fight against women and child abuse – Biz Community – 05/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

United States:

LSC Awards \$3.6 Million in Technology Grants – LSC – 02/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal aid needs help – Suffolk News Herald – 18/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Congress Votes for \$348 Million in LSC Funding – LSC – 21/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Critics Say Budget Cuts for Courts Risk Rights – The New York Times – 26/11/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Aid says cuts make layoffs 'inevitable' – The Charleston Gazette – 20/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Aid Society of Cleveland loses AT&T phone service, claims critical cases jeopardized – News Net 5 – 21/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Legal Aid: One Hour of Sharing Associates' Campaign – Minnesota Lawyer – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Supreme Court Website Provides Civil Legal Help – The Daily News – 22/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Oklahoma Legal Aid expects \$700,000 cut – The Express Star – 23/12/11 – [\[Read more\]](#)

Neighbor2Neighbor: Legal Aid of Napa Valley – Napa Valley Register – 26/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

16 counties get family court grants – News and Tribune – 28/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

U.S. Launches Free Legal Advice Hotline for Detained Immigrants – International Business Times – 30/12/11 [\[Read more\]](#)

Final Note

This newsletter has been compiled by **Roger Smith** of **JUSTICE** in London, UK. If you would like to be taken off the circulation list, add someone to it or contribute content, please contact Roger by emailing rsmith@justice.org.uk.