



North Dakota Law Review

Volume 42 | Number 3

Article 3

1966

A Legal Aid Program for North Dakota

William B. Fisch

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr>

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fisch, William B. (1966) "A Legal Aid Program for North Dakota," *North Dakota Law Review*. Vol. 42 : No. 3 , Article 3.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol42/iss3/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

A LEGAL AID PROGRAM FOR NORTH DAKOTA

WILLIAM B FISCH*

INTRODUCTION

Since the summer of 1965, the State Bar Association of North Dakota, through a special subcommittee on Legal Aid and Defense of Indigents and its standing committee on the same subject,¹ has been investigating the need for legal aid in North Dakota, possible sources for funds to finance legal aid programs in the state, and possible forms which a program might take to meet the need. As a result of these investigations, a proposal has been prepared by the committee for submission to the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity (headed by Mr. Bamberger), for federal funds to help establish and maintain a comprehensive state-wide legal aid program. The program has been approved in substance by the State Bar Association and by the University of North Dakota Law School, and both institutions will be substantially represented on the governing board of the proposed "Legal Aid Society of North Dakota," although the society will be institutionally autonomous and its board will have a broad representational base. It is the purpose of this article to explain some of the thinking which went into the proposal, and to provide a detailed outline of the proposed program. Since the program, if approved, will probably be the first of its kind in the United States, since there is to my knowledge no state-wide, full-scale legal aid program in operation in the country at present, the article is intended not only for the benefit of the members of the North Dakota bar, who already will have had some opportunity to inform themselves about it, but also for readers of the Review in other states and areas of the country

*Visiting Assistant Professor of Law, University of North Dakota; Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Legal Aid and Defense of Indigents, State Bar Association of North Dakota. A.B. Harvard College, 1957; LL.B. University of Illinois, 1960; M.Comp.L. University of Chicago, 1962; member of the Illinois Bar.

1. The special subcommittee is composed of Lyle Huseby and Gordon C. Thompson of Fargo, Leibert L. Greenberg of Grand Forks, and the writer as chairman; the main committee is composed of John Michael Nilles of Fargo, chairman, and Floyd B. Sperry, T.F.X. Conny and Max Rosenberg of Bismarck, Eugene K. Anthony of Watford City, Judge T.E. George of Jamestown, and the members of the subcommittee. The work of the committees was greatly assisted by many other people, of whom President Robert E. Dahl and Executive Director Alfred C. Schultz of the Bar Association should be specially mentioned.

who may be interested in similar programs.

I once heard a distinguished law professor refer to the problem of legal aid as one of "the mere marketing of legal services." At the time I thought the remark ignored the unmistakable fact that there is considerable opposition, both within and without the legal profession, to the idea of a special institution to provide legal services to people who are financially unable to pay a private attorney for them, opposition therefore (so it seemed) to the very fundamental idea that the services of our profession should be generally available to everyone who has need of them. Surely this raises an issue of principle, not simply one of how to achieve an agreed goal. Some reflection, however, and some more direct experience with the problems of legal aid and with the opposition to it within the bar, suggest to me that the professor (if I interpret his remark correctly) was right. Most if not all lawyers agree that everyone should have access to sound legal counsel when he needs it or can make use of it, because most if not all lawyers believe in the law as an idea, as the superior alternative to force and deceit for the governing of man's affairs. And most if not all lawyers agree that if ignorance of the law is to be no excuse for improper conduct or for defeat, everyone must have the opportunity to know the law. The problem is not a theoretical one, therefore, but an intensely practical one—it has to do with the law not as an idea but as a livelihood and professional calling for individual men and women. It is the tradition of our profession that the private attorney is the primary guardian of the legal rights of the private citizen (both as against the government and as against his fellow citizen), and that in order to preserve his role as such he looks best for his livelihood to the clients he serves. It is felt that, within broad limits of concern for ethics and for the viability of the legal system, the private attorney best serves the public good by serving his client. Two propositions are reasonably thought to follow from this tradition, which relate directly to the availability of legal counsel to persons financially unable to pay for it: *first*, the private attorney must not be forced to give an unreasonable portion of his time and energies without compensation; and *second*, he must not be competed against unfairly by the availability of legal services *without* cost to private persons who can afford to pay for them. In the context of the tradition, these concerns are not only inevitable but quite legitimate: a system which is designed to realize principle and conscience but which is economically unviable is of little help. What I think the professor had in mind was this: (1) the problem of legal aid is simply one of devising a concrete program which provides competent legal counsel to those who presently cannot pay for it, without threatening the economic viability of the free legal profession; and

(2) this is not a logically impossible task, as some have thought, but a perfectly feasible one calling only for a little time and thought. It seems to me that this is also the burden of Mr. Bamberger's eloquent speech reprinted above. We think that the proposed legal aid program for North Dakota which will be outlined below meets this test, and we believe that it provides a minimum beginning toward making the performance of the legal profession in North Dakota to live up in this respect to the social significance which its members rightly attach to it. What follows is an adaptation of the subcommittee report, with recommendations as modified by the main committee.

I. THE NEED

There is no legal aid program of any kind now in operation anywhere in North Dakota.² It follows that the need, if any, for legal advice and services among persons unable to pay a private attorney for them, is being met only by individual attorneys or public officials who are willing and able to provide services without charge. It goes almost without saying (for it is a traditional obligation of conscience and profession) that *most* lawyers expend *some* of their time on matters for which there can be no fee, and that *many* lawyers expend *much* of their time on such matters; I don't think the North Dakota bar is to be seriously faulted on this point. From the client's point of view, however, this system has obvious practical defects. In the first place, human nature being what it is (and this is the gist of the tradition of a free legal profession!), the motivation of the attorney to provide his client with the advocate's dedication as well as the counselor's wisdom is inevitably stronger when his livelihood is at stake than when only his conscience is working. In the second place, the inclination of the client to seek out legal advice and service when he needs it or could gain by it is inevitably greater when he knows the attorney will be compensated for his services than when he must rely on the lawyer's charitable inclinations. In the third place, it is precisely the person financially unable to pay a lawyer who is most likely to lack the education, acumen and experience to be able to get by without legal advice. The subcommittee's investigation operated, therefore, on the premise that to the extent there is a need in the state for legal advice and services on the part of persons who are unable to pay reasonable fees to private attorneys for it, the need should be met in the first instance by the availability of full-time, salaried legal aid attorneys committed to serving anyone who meets

2. We exclude from consideration the existing system of appointment of counsel for indigent persons accused of crime. The legal aid program proposed has to do only with legal services in civil matters, and with very minor criminal matters for which appointment cannot now be made.

prescribed financial eligibility standards.

At this point a two-fold question was presented: (1) How many people are there in North Dakota who could not afford to pay an attorney's fee for needed legal services, and where are they located; and (2) In the course of a year how many such people could be expected to need legal advice or service?

(A) Number and Distribution of Persons Financially Eligible for Legal Aid

Any discussion of the number of persons who would be financially eligible for legal aid must obviously have as a foundation some standard of eligibility. We believe that an appropriate standard of eligibility, consistent with the standard budget adopted by the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota (which is a carefully prepared estimate of minimum subsistence needs and does not include medical expenses, which are budgeted separately), would be a maximum family income of \$40/week plus \$10/week for each dependent of the head of family. Thus an unrelated individual could have an annual income of up to \$2080 and be eligible, and a family of four could have an annual income of up to \$3640 and still be eligible. We think that this standard, with some flexibility to account for special circumstances (for example, with reference to substantial capital assets held by the family) can hardly be said to err on the high side; it is probable that in order to fully perform the task of providing legal counsel for persons who cannot afford to pay, the standard should be considerably higher, but we chose the more conservative standard as initially appropriate for a new and untried program.

As sources for statistical information concerning the number of families in the state who might be eligible for legal aid based on the above standard, we used primarily the 1960 U. S. census, which provides figures for 1959 income. In order to arrange the figures in a meaningful way, we took 15 communities in which full or part-time offices might be located (the four Indian reservations—Rolla (Turtle Mountain), Devils Lake (Ft. Totten), Ft. Yates (Standing Rock) and New Town (Ft. Berthold)—and Fargo, Bismarck, Grand Forks, Minot, Williston, Dickinson, Jamestown, Valley City, Grafton, Wahpeton, and Ellendale), assigned to each the figures for counties (or half-counties) closer to it than to any other, and then assigned each office to a larger area which we felt meaningful both in the geographic sense and in terms of an amount of expected work which would keep at least one full-time legal aid lawyer busy. Since the program should attempt, so far as is feasible, to reach everyone in the state who would be eligible for its services, it was valuable to account for every county; however, since it is realistic to assume

that the program will be substantially more successful in reaching the eligible persons in the community in which an office is located than in the remainder of the county of location, and substantially more successful in reaching those within the county of location than in neighboring counties, a calculation was made for the community of location, the county of location, and the area. Eventually, seven areas were mapped out covering the entire state. It is impossible in this space to set forth all of the figures; statewide, the following figures appear: 22,968 non-farm families under \$3000, or 22.3%; and 12,031 farm families under \$2000, or about 25.8%.

Although these are the most reliable figures readily available, there are a number of difficulties. First of all, we assumed that since the average size family is four persons (3.9 or thereabouts), the appropriate cutoff point should be approximately the maximum permissible income for a family of four, or about \$3600. It is not possible meaningfully to extrapolate the census figures between the increments of \$1000, however, so we chose the \$3000 figure used in the census. This is the figure (families with income under \$3000) which seems most often to be used in national discussions about the poverty level. Of course, there may be many families in that category which have less than four persons and so might not be eligible; but it is equally true that many families of larger size would not be included in that category, but which would nonetheless be eligible (for example, a family of eight could have an annual income of \$5720 and still be eligible). Another difficulty lies in the fact that we will be using a scale of eligibility based not only on income but also on capital assets, so that there may be families in the income-under-\$3000 category who would nonetheless be ineligible because of holding capital assets greater than the limit set. While there is no way known to us of estimating the number of persons in the state who would or would not be eligible purely on the basis of capital assets, we believe that this difficulty was more than adequately taken into account in our calculations by two adjustments: first, the adoption of the \$3000 figure in taking census data for non-farm families, and second, the use of the \$2000 figure for farm families, on the theory that farm families are more likely to own capital assets of substantial value than are non-farm families (of course, no such presumption would operate in determining the actual eligibility of a particular family).

(B) Anticipated Number of Clients of Matters in One Year

There is no known method of accurately or even approximately predicting the number of clients who would actually come to a legal aid office, request assistance, and be eligible for it. It is obvious that a number of factors could discourage someone who actually

had a legal problem and would be eligible, from taking advantage of the legal aid office's services: the office may be too far away from the person's home for him conveniently to arrange transportation; he may be convinced that a legal aid office nonetheless represents a profession which he doesn't trust and refuses to consult; or he may feel that however impoverished he may be, he will not accept charity. Furthermore, of course, it is impossible to predict when and where a legal dispute will arise, whether among poor persons or rich corporations.

However, in the absence of actual North Dakota experience in legal aid, it is perhaps useful to look at the past experience of existing legal aid societies in relation to the population of the communities they are serving. The National Legal Aid and Defender Association has reported that in communities of over 100,000 population, active full-scale legal aid societies have averaged about 7 clients (in the office and in fact eligible) per 1000 population annually. In fact, they now suggest that a legal aid society which reaches all of the eligible persons in its community should expect at least 12-15, and possibly as many as 20 cases per thousand population; but we took the more conservative figure, in the hope of beginning with a program small enough to be certain to be kept busy, yet large enough to provide experience for a future re-evaluation and probable expansion.

One difficulty here is that there is no North Dakota community with a population as large as 100,000 (Fargo's being about 60,000). One's more or less instinctive assumption is that the concentration of poor persons will be greater in a metropolitan area than in a small-town or rural area—although in fact the percentage of families having incomes of less than \$3000 is substantially smaller in metropolitan areas than in small-town or rural areas. For example, according to the 1960 census in Chicago 13.7% of the families had incomes of less than \$3000, while in North Dakota the figures were 28.8% state-wide, 13.9% urban, 30.8% rural non-farm and 43.2% rural farm. Probably the fact of concentration has three effects, only two of which really reflect the number of potential clients a legal aid office might have. In the first place, the concentration creates slums which heighten the misery of poverty and which dramatize it to the outside observer, even though in terms of disposable income a greater proportion of the population qualifies as poor in non-metropolitan, non-slum areas; in the second place, the concentration of the poor in compacted urban slums doubtless makes for a more intensive exposure to people and institutions, public and private, which can give rise to legal problems; and in the third place, the concentration of the poor in slums makes it easier, in the purely geographic sense, for a legal aid office to make itself available to people who need it—it is easier for a resident of the South Side

of Chicago to get across town on the bus for 25 cents than it is for a resident of Neche to get to Grand Forks. Nonetheless, any adjustment of the ratio to take account of these factors would of necessity be extremely arbitrary. We believe that since the 7/1000 ratio is now regarded as much too low for large urban centers, it provided us with a reasonable minimum figure for North Dakota

Another, perhaps more meaningful ratio from the experience of other legal aid societies would be that of the number of cases compared with the number of eligible families. In the case of Chicago, where the scale of eligibility has been approximately similar to that proposed here, somewhere between \$3000 and \$4000-year for a family of four, there were 123,000 families having a 1959 income of \$3000 or less, and about 25,000 legal aid cases in 1964, which yields a ratio of 202 cases per 1000 families under \$3000. There were approximately 208,000 families with incomes under \$4000, a ratio of 120/1000 families. We took the ratio of 150 cases per 1000 eligible families as an arbitrary middle figure. Our case-load estimates utilized both the 7 cases per 1000 population ration and the 150/1000 eligible families ratio.³

Table: Estimates of Expected Annual Caseload

Based upon the population and number of eligible families in each community of location, county of location, and area, and applying the above-mentioned ratios from the actual experience of other legal aid societies, we estimate the potential annual caseload for each office very roughly as follows:

		Community	County	Area
Area 1)	Grand Forks	240	335	975
	Grafton	40	125	
	Devils Lake	50	175	
		330	635	975
Area 2)	Fargo	300	375	1050
	Wahpeton	45	165	
	Valley City	65	125	
		410	565	1050

3. In addition to the NLA & DA figure, we used as sources of information the annual and biennial reports of the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota, showing dollar expenditures for welfare and numbers of recipients by county; the former figures are useful for comparing the various counties and areas in the state with one another, and the latter also useful in indicating a number of presumptively eligible persons who at least are willing to take advantage of services available to them at a centralized office. Further, we inquired of the twenty county welfare boards in the state having the largest dollar expenditures for welfare in the most recent biennium ('62-'64) about how many legal problems they have come across among their clients in the course of a year which they would refer to a legal aid office. Of the 11 offices which offered estimates, admittedly very rough and not based upon data regularly compiled, most were of the same order of magnitude as our estimates based upon population and income statistics.

Area 3)	Bismarck	175	240	850
	Mandan	75	165	
	Ft. Yates	6	45	
		<hr/>		
		256	450	850
Area 4)	Minot	215	310	675
	New Town	11	100	
		<hr/>		
		226	410	675
Area 5)	Williston	80	155	675
	Dickinson	80	150	
		<hr/>		
		160	305	675
Area 6)	Rolla (Belcourt)	50	150	300
Area 7)	Jamestown	100	190	525
	Ellendale	15	60	
		<hr/>		
		115	250	525

The final difficulty in evaluating the estimated number of matters a legal aid society could expect in the course of a year, based on the NLA & DA ratios and the guesses of county welfare directors, is deciding how many full or part-time lawyers would be needed to handle the estimated case-load. In all of these estimates, the range of possible cases in terms of consumption of time is vast; a matter could consist of a simple question which can be answered in a five-minute interview, or it could involve a lawsuit requiring months of preparation and weeks of trial. Casual inquiries of the number of new matters opened by a practicing attorney in the course of a year suggest that 200-300 matters per year would keep a lawyer busy full-time. We have operated on the basis of this figure, and believe it to be conservative in view of the fact that the organization we propose would require each lawyer to participate in substantial activities in addition to the handling of clients, both of an administrative nature (just travel between offices takes time) and of an educational nature (participation in community education programs, etc.)⁴

4. In the one instance where the statistical picture suggests that one fulltime man might not be kept completely busy, the Rolla area, we have assigned a fulltime man to the area anyway, in the belief that bare income statistics cannot tell the full story. The Rolla office will serve the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, which is the largest of the four North Dakota reservations in terms of population and the smallest in terms of area. Living conditions there are probably as unhappy as in most of the worst city slums; and with all of the reservations, as with most city slums, the problem is not merely economic, but also racial and cultural. If, as seems rather unlikely, the legal aid attorney does not have enough individual cases to keep him busy, there are other functions he could perform of great value in the relationship between the Indians and the society as a whole. He could advise the tribes in the development of their internal legal system, for example, and could maintain a more intensive community education program (preventive law).

II THE PROPOSED PROGRAM

Legal Aid Committee of the North Dakota Bar Association

It is proposed that a North Dakota Non-Profit Corporation be established, with the purpose of providing full professional legal services gratuitously or at a nominal cost to any person in the State who is financially unable to pay a private attorney for such services. To fulfill this purpose it will hire salaried full-time licensed attorneys who will maintain offices in any community in the state where the need justifies the allocation of man-power full or part-time.

(1) *Initial Number, Staffing, Location and Hours of Offices*

In view of the fact that there is no legal aid program presently in operation, so that there is no North Dakota experience to draw upon in determining how much of a case load could be expected in a given community, it was necessary to base case load estimates on experience of other states and cities in relation to North Dakota statistics regarding number of persons or families having income below certain levels. Based on the statistical data outlined above, we believe that an absolute minimum initial approach to the need would require offices and staff roughly as follows, knowing that subsequent actual experience will probably dictate a reallocation and doubtless an expansion:

Two full-time attorneys to man an office in Grand Forks full time, an office in Grafton one day, and an office in Devils Lake (Ft. Totten) three days and one evening a week;

Two full-time attorneys to man an office in Fargo full-time an office in Wahpeton two days, and an office in Valley City two days and one evening a week;

One full-time attorney to man an office in Bismarck three days, one evening and Saturday morning, and an office in Ft. Yates (Standing Rock Indian Reservation) two days and one evening;

One full-time attorney to man an office in Minot four days, one evening and Saturday, and an office in New Town (Ft. Berthold Indian Reservation) one day and one evening;

One full-time attorney to man an office in Rolla (Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation) full-time;

One full-time attorney to man an office in Jamestown four days, two evenings and Saturday morning, and an office in Ellendale one day a week;

One full-time attorney to man an office in Williston three days and one evening, and an office in Dickinson two days, one evening and Saturday morning.⁵

5. In the establishment of offices as manpower becomes available, an order of priority would be set up: Bismarck, Minot, Rolla, Grand Forks, Fargo, Williston, Dickinson, and Jamestown.

Each office would be open to any person in the State meeting the financial eligibility standards; the allocation of offices and hours is purely a matter of convenience to the greatest number of likely potential clients, although clients should be encouraged to consult the office nearest their home. Secretary-receptionists, qualified not only to type and take shorthand but also to conduct initial interviews when necessary and to act as liaison between the office and the community, would be hired for each office roughly as follows: full time, at Grand Forks, Fargo, Minot, Bismarck and Rolla; $\frac{3}{4}$ time at Devils Lake, Jamestown, Valley City, Williston and Dickinson; and part-time at Grafton, Wahpeton, New Town, Ft. Yates, and Ellendale.

(2) *Types of Matters to be Handled*

The lawyers would be empowered and obligated to handle any matter and provide any service which a private attorney would, with two exceptions: serious criminal cases, for which a court appointment of counsel can be made; and matters in which a private attorney could charge a contingent fee. The former exception includes at present felony cases before District Courts, serious misdemeanor cases before County Courts of Increased Jurisdiction, and appeals to the Supreme Court, but not lesser misdemeanor cases before County Justice Courts and Municipal Courts. The latter exception would be waived upon a showing that two private attorneys have refused the case on a contingent fee basis.

(3) *Financial Eligibility Standards*

It is proposed that all persons be eligible whose family income does not exceed \$40/week for the head plus \$10/week for each dependent and who with his dependents does not have a homestead of greater than \$15,000 in value. This standard would average slightly higher than the basic family budget adopted by the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota. Current recipients of public welfare would automatically be eligible. The standard would allow for adjustment to special circumstances, and to the amount of capital assets held by the family.

(4) *Referral of Ineligible Persons*

An essential part of any legal aid service, both from the point of view of public service and from the point of view of gaining the confidence of the people to be served, is provision for helping persons who are found ineligible for legal aid to get to a private lawyer who can serve them. This must be done on a completely impartial basis, but must include, if the client desires it, the making of an appointment with an outside lawyer by the legal aid

office. There is at present no bar-operated referral service, except in Fargo; and any institutionalized referral system should be operated by the bar rather than by the legal aid society, to avoid any imputation of collusion between particular lawyers and the legal aid society. Pending the establishment of such a system, the legal aid lawyer would have a list of volunteers, on which every member of the bar would have an opportunity to place his name, to which referrals would be made on a rotating alphabetical basis, possibly including a breakdown according to lawyers' special interests if he expresses any. If the client does not wish a referral on such a basis, the legal aid lawyer would be powerless to help any further.

(5) Handling of Disputes Between Eligible Persons

In legal aid work it often occurs that both parties to a dispute are eligible for and seek legal aid. In such a situation it is contemplated that one of the parties be referred to a private attorney whose fees would be paid from agency funds according to the Bar Association's minimum fee scale. A separate budget item would be established to cover this type of expense.

(6) Registration Fees and Handling of Court Costs

A nominal registration fee of \$1 and \$2 would be charged for each matter handled by the agency, subject to waiver in case of extreme need. Further, actual court costs in litigation (filing fees, etc.) would be borne by the client, again subject to assumption by the agency in case of need where the court itself does not waive the costs.

(7) Organization of Program Agency

The agency would be incorporated under the North Dakota Nonprofit Corporation Act, and would be administered by a salaried administrative director. The board of directors would have the usual policy-making powers, approval of the hiring of the director and the attorneys, approval of budgets and major program alterations, and would be composed of the following representatives: one lay representative from each of the four Indian reservations in the state; one lay representative from each of the major communities served by agency offices (initially, Fargo, Grand Forks, Minot, Bismarck, Jamestown, Valley City, Williston and Dickinson); a representative of the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota; a representative of the University of North Dakota School of Law; a member of the judiciary of North Dakota; and a representative of the State Bar Association's Legal Aid Committee and of each of the six geographic districts which comprise the State Bar Association. The lay representatives must be qualified to represent the interests not

generally of the town or city from which they come, but specifically of the poor persons who are to be served by the program.

The Administrative Director should have two legally trained assistants, in addition to the secretarial staff. One, who would be located in Grand Forks at or near the law school, would be responsible for the educational functions of the program, organizing and preparing materials for the community education programs, preparing memoranda of law for the use of the attorneys, preparing pamphlets designed to inform the layman of his legal rights and duties in everyday situations, supervising the research and investigation work of the law students, and perhaps teaching a course in the law school in legal problems of the poor or some other subject suited to his work and his qualifications. The other, who would best be located with the Administrative Director in Bismarck, would be responsible for handling appellate cases before the Supreme Court, preparing and sponsoring legislative proposals for law reform in areas of concern to poor persons as reform appears needed, assisting in the organization of community education programs and orientation programs for new attorneys, and in emergency situations helping man the offices themselves, as well as assisting the Administrative Director in his work of organizing and establishing the offices, keeping and reporting statistical information, assigning attorneys to the various offices on a permanent or temporary basis, keeping up public relations, etc.

(8) *Secondary Programs of the Agency*

It is anticipated that when the program is established the attorneys will be kept more than busy. In order to provide them with research, drafting and perhaps investigative assistance, it is proposed to establish a pool of interested law students who will be available to any legal aid lawyer to research legal problems, draft instruments, pleadings and briefs, and perhaps do factual investigation on particular matters. Their work would be under the supervision of an assistant administrative director, and perhaps some academic credit would be given for the work. This would have the added advantage of exposing the law student to problems of the poor, and of inciting the interest of some to go to work for the agency upon graduation.

As an agency devoted to alleviation of some of the problems of poverty, the legal aid society could do more than simply provide professional legal services in particular matters. One of the primary handicaps which the poor person tends to operate under is a lack of information about his basic legal rights and duties in everyday situations. To meet this need for information, the agency would undertake to organize community education programs in basic legal

rights and duties, designed to provide a series of informal lectures or workshops in each community served, utilizing legal aid lawyers, members of the local bar, and law school teachers as instructors. Subjects would include basic criminal law, family law, landlord and tenant problems, small loans and installment credit transactions, public welfare law, social security, and the like.

(9) *Sources of Funds*

If the program is submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity for a grant under the war on poverty, and is approved, the OEO will provide up to 90% of the cost of the program. The remaining 10% must be provided by the local community, either in kind or in money. At least two methods of in-kind contribution have been considered which would probably aggregate more than the necessary amount: volunteer time of local lawyers, acting as consultants to the legal and lawyers for a few hours each week, and donation of office space and equipment. The most satisfactory way of obtaining money from the local community would be through contributions solicited from the public, perhaps by joining the United Fund in the communities where offices are located. A state-wide campaign would be preferable, but there is no such already operating and a campaign solely for legal aid might well be more costly than it would be worth.

(10) *Cost of Program*

It is estimated that the total cost of the program as proposed, including salaries of the director, attorneys and secretaries, office space and equipment, travel, conflict of interest fund, and court costs and fees fund, would be approximately \$325,000. The items of the budget which could be contributed by the local community in kind would be: Volunteer lawyers' time, about \$11,000 if advantage is taken of all of the useful consultation time; office space, about \$28,000; office equipment, at least \$20,000.