

5-1974

The Organized Bar--Yellow Brick Road to Legal Services for the Poor

Lawrence L. Thompson

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/vlr>



Part of the [Human Rights Law Commons](#), [Law and Society Commons](#), and the [Social Welfare Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lawrence L. Thompson, *The Organized Bar--Yellow Brick Road to Legal Services for the Poor*, 27 *Vanderbilt Law Review* 667 (1974)

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.vanderbilt.edu/vlr/vol27/iss4/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Vanderbilt Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Vanderbilt Law Review* by an authorized editor of Scholarship@Vanderbilt Law. For more information, please contact mark.j.williams@vanderbilt.edu.

The Organized Bar—Yellow Brick Road to Legal Services for the Poor

*R. William Ide, III**
*Lawrence L. Thompson***

The proposed Federal Legal Services Corporation Act¹ recommends the establishment of an exclusive mechanism² for the federal funding and regulation of legal services programs. One of the most significant aspects of this legislation is the requirement that there be state bar participation in the formulation and operation of legal services conducted in each state. This requirement results from experience over the past few years demonstrating that the continued viability of any legal services program is heavily dependent on local bar support. Experience has further shown that, within a climate of local bar support, funding problems may be minimized. Bar support, moreover, will produce such additional benefits as the greater involvement of talented members of the bar and easier access to the political process. Not only will this reduce interference with ongoing programs, but it will enhance the standing of the legal services lawyer in the profession and in the community, thereby enlarging his effectiveness to his client.

In Georgia, an extensive effort to cultivate solid bar support produced a fully funded professional legal services program and helped avoid the political strife that so recently has plagued other programs.³ By drawing examples from the Georgia experience, this article will suggest an approach to utilize bar support in building a

* B.A., Washington & Lee, 1962; LL.B., University of Virginia, 1965; M.B.A., Georgia State University, 1972. Member of the Georgia Bar.

** A.B., Harvard, 1967; J.D., University of Virginia, 1972. Member of the Georgia and Florida Bars.

1. H.R. 7824, 93d Cong., 2d Sess. (1974). The Act essentially is designed as a compromise between conservative forces who have opposed the reformist zeal of OEO law reform programs and liberal groups who have sought to preserve federal assistance to legal services in the face of the recent decline of OEO. See, Kilpatrick, *Legal Aid: Half a Loaf Is Better Than None*, Los Angeles Times, Oct. 16, 1973, at 7.

2. In brief, the Act provides for the establishment of a nonpolitical, bipartisan, federal corporation to fund and regulate state legal services programs. The Act places numerous restrictions upon the activities of these federally funded programs and their employees, and the corporation itself has the responsibility to ensure that grant recipients comply with activity restrictions imposed by the Act. See §§ 1006-07.

3. For a full historical discussion of the problems that legal services programs have encountered in the past, especially at the national level, see Rutkus, *The Battering of OEO*, STUDENT LAWYER Nov. 1973, at 21.

strong legal services program. To that end, the article will review the practical problems of organizing a legal services effort such as winning vital bar support, overcoming funding problems, and bringing strong programs to each community. The local participation features of the proposed Federal Legal Services Corporation Act make this discussion particularly relevant to the future problems of legal services programs.

The first step in developing a legal services program is the organization of a small core group of proponents who will undertake the difficult task of founding a program. The establishment of the Georgia legal services program was a direct consequence of the efforts of a small group of young lawyers—Philip Heiner, Jim Elliot, Betsy Neely and Bill Ide—who sought to involve themselves in a law-related civic project. A provocative article on legal aid programs⁴ prompted their decision that such programs could be a valuable way to serve the community. Concerned that Georgia might lack a significant commitment to legal aid, the young lawyers secured permission to establish themselves as a Legal Aid Committee within the Younger Lawyers Section of the State Bar of Georgia. Once organized, this core group decided to study the existing legal aid effort statewide. The inquiry disclosed that the need for services was great, that the provision of existing services was inadequate, and that the vast majority of the membership of the organized bar had no firm opinions concerning either the need for legal services or the wisdom of providing such a program.⁵

DOCUMENTING THE PROBLEM

Once an organizing group has amassed a solid background of information on the legal problems of the poor, its next step must be to educate and persuade decision makers that a full-scale program should in fact be established. In Georgia, the bar's unawareness of the problem underscored the necessity for the preparation and dissemination of an informational report to educate this potential source of invaluable support. The informational report was a major milestone in the development of the Georgia legal service program

4. Shriver, *Virginia Law Weekly*, DICTA, Vol. XX, No. 3 (1967).

5. Three groups, however, had a definite stand on the issue: one, a small group within the organized bar that had founded the inadequately funded volunteer legal services program then in operation; another, a liberally oriented group that favored legal services programs that would engage in wide-spread efforts for social and legal reform; and the last, a small group of conservative attorneys who had negative experiences with other community action programs and viewed legal services to the poor as an initial step on the road to socialization of the legal system.

and was eventually presented to the Board of Governors of the State Bar of Georgia. Not only did the Report intensify the interest of those responsible for its research and drafting, but it also provided hard statistical data for future use in obtaining funds and implementing a concrete program. Equally important, the Report gave its authors a sense of security that they were sufficiently knowledgeable about the problems to move forward with confidence in their efforts to involve the organized bar. Since the Report assumed that the vast majority of the organized bar was vitally concerned with the welfare of society and would respond positively once they were educated to an existing need, much of the Report was calculated to arouse these latent instincts. The Report also attempted to dispel some prevalent myths concerning legal services, such as the oft-expressed paternalistic attitude that "any need among the poor for legal services is being met."⁶

To document this need for legal services, the Report cited national statistics showing the burgeoning demand encountered by existing programs.⁷ For Georgia, the Report found a "distressing disproportion between the actual need for legal services by those who cannot afford them and the present supply of legal services available to them" recommending that "the Bar make an all-out effort to alleviate this problem."⁸ It noted that funded organized legal aid efforts were insufficient and in fact nonexistent in areas of the state other than Atlanta and Savannah.⁹ Statistical surveys showing a dearth of lawyers in the rural areas indicated an inability on the part of the private bar to afford much help. To buttress this conclusion, the Report amassed a significant amount of statistical data revealing an inverse relationship between the number of families with an income under 3,000 dollars per year and the number of attorneys available in a specific geographical region.¹⁰ Analyzed geo-

6. Report of the Younger Lawyers Section of the State Bar of Georgia Committee on Legal Aid Programs 11 (1968) [hereinafter cited as Report].

7. In particular, the Report noted that in the first half of 1967, 220,000 clients received help from OEO offices. *Id.* at 3-4.

8. *Id.* at 1-2.

9. *Id.* at 7-8.

10. A great deal of statistical data was collected. The number of persons per attorney ranged from a high of 2,638 persons per lawyer in the rural Pataula circuit to a low of 298 persons per attorney in the judicial circuit comprising the City of Atlanta. *Id.*, Table 2. The number of poor families—those with annual incomes of \$3,000 or less—per lawyer ranged from a high of 382 in the rural Pataula circuit to a low of 19 in Atlanta. *Id.*, Table 1. While the urban Atlanta area had the largest absolute number of poor families, 35,073, it also had the largest number of attorneys, 1,864 as compared to 260 in the next ranking circuit, Stone Mountain, also a part of the Atlanta Metropolitan Area. *Id.*

graphically, the results demonstrated that lawyers were inclined to concentrate in urban areas where there was an economic base of support rather than in rural counties where a large portion of the population is often indigent.

After illustrating the need for legal services in Georgia, the remainder of the Report dealt with policy matters in the administration of a legal aid program. It briefly explored the principle of strict indigency standards for legal aid programs as a means of preserving fee-generating cases for the private bar;¹¹ cited those opinions of the Supreme Court¹² and the Ethics Committee of the American Bar Association¹³ that found certain solicitation aspects of legal assistance programs ethically and legally acceptable; and examined the overall policy factors supporting the creation of a legal services program.¹⁴ Finally, the Report included arguments designed to allay fears that federal funding of legal assistance programs would result in a radical philosophical approach to the day-by-day operation of such programs.¹⁵ Several times, the Report drove home this theme on a structural basis—that failure of the organized bar to respond to the need for legal services would result in the pre-emption of local control and participation by outside forces, such as the federal government.

The Report concluded with a recommendation that the State Bar of Georgia through its Younger Lawyers Section assume responsibility for ensuring the establishment of legal assistance for the poor.¹⁶ The development of a state-wide legal aid organization and efforts to secure funding assistance were suggested as appropriate actions for the organized bar.

Along with a written report, there are other means of demonstrating to the organized bar the need for legal services. For example, during their initial period of preparation, the young lawyers

11. Report at 12.

12. *Brotherhood of R.R. Trainmen v. Virginia*, 377 U.S. 1 (1964); *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415 (1963).

13. See, ABA Canons of Professional Ethics, Canons 27 & 28.

14. These basic policy choices include: (1) a combination of individual service to the poor and law reform work aimed at the general causes of poverty; (2) a policy on the handling of fee-generating cases; (3) a choice between small decentralized offices close to the client population and fewer but more fully staffed central offices; (4) a decision about the role of law schools and law students in the program; (5) a decision about the role of lawyers in community education; and (6) a decision about community and client participation in program management. See Report at 56-60.

15. *Id.* at 12-14. In particular, the Report stated that there was no evidence of undue federal influence in either the Savannah or Atlanta programs, both of which were receiving OEO funds at that time. *Id.* at 13.

16. *Id.* at 15, 61.

were also actively engaged in organizing the Saturday Lawyers Program under the auspices of the Atlanta Legal Aid Society. In this program, each volunteer attorney helps staff a legal aid office one Saturday each month, and clients acquired during the volunteer Saturday are then served by the attorney in a normal attorney-client relationship.¹⁷ Still very active today, the program has received national attention,¹⁸ and approximately 400 attorneys have participated from time to time.

As an important side-benefit, the Saturday Lawyers Program provided insights into the problems of indigent clients for those same attorneys who were attempting the organization of a statewide legal assistance program in Georgia. Through this exposure of volunteer attorneys to the legal problems of the poor,¹⁹ the proposed legal services program gained solid supporters within the organized bar. The influence and support of these many alumni significantly aided the Georgia legal services effort.

ESTABLISHING THE PROGRAM

After demonstrating the need for a legal services program, it is important to secure from the organized bar a firm commitment to provide legal services prior to presenting specific proposals for the implementation of such a program. This theoretical commitment creates an institutional basis from which disagreements over program proposals can be resolved without damaging the decision that services should be provided. In Georgia, the Report prepared for the Board of Governors of the State Bar was designed to secure a commitment authorizing the committee to solicit funds for a comprehensive statewide program. In preparation for the presentation, copies of the Report were sent to each member of the Board of

17. Once a client has visited an attorney at the legal aid office the volunteer follows through just as he would to a private client and provides service directly from his own office. After some time in the program, each volunteer will build up a substantial clientele from the program.

18. *TIME*, March 7, 1969, at 47.

19. One somewhat celebrated case involving the Saturday Lawyers deserves recounting as an illustration of the results that volunteer attorneys can accomplish in a legal services setting. An elderly illiterate woman came into contact with a Saturday Lawyer. It appeared that the woman had executed a deed to her home as security for \$700 worth of household repairs. A loan company, standing as a holder in due course, claimed that as a result of interest accrual and other charges, the debt had appreciated to \$1,900. Upon investigation, the Saturday Lawyer discovered not only that the repairs had never been performed but also that the same contractor and loan company in concert had repeatedly practiced the same scheme throughout a wide area of rural Georgia. The lawyer promptly filed an action against both the contractor and the loan company alleging fraudulent conspiracy and praying for \$25,000 in punitive damages. Eviction proceedings were quickly dropped.

Governors, the officers of the State Bar were contacted individually, and an oral presentation of the Report was thoroughly prepared. To forestall opposition that might be aroused by attempts to move forward immediately with a fully funded program, the young lawyers simply sought permission to prepare an application for funding to be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval at a later date. Despite arguments that the private bar was already fulfilling any need for legal services among the poor, a motion to grant the desired permission was supported by the progressive faction of the Board and others who had been influenced through personal contact or review of the Report. Passage of this resolution by the Board of Governors was a major step forward because it represented a firm philosophical commitment on the part of the organized bar to support the principle of statewide legal services to the poor.

GILS—THE QUEST FOR FUNDS

Experience with legal-aid programs staffed by part-time volunteer attorneys has demonstrated that only full-time, adequately compensated, legal services staff attorneys can provide the comprehensive program necessary to serve completely the legal problems of the poor.²⁰ Adequate funding, therefore, is an absolute prerequisite to the establishment and maintenance of a viable legal services program. Much of the success of the Georgia program has resulted from the ability of its leadership to tap traditional funding sources while discovering and employing novel monetary resources.

Having secured bar approval, the young lawyers immediately approached the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) for federal funding.²¹ While OEO had limited funds available for new programs, it was felt bar support would be a positive factor in convincing OEO to find funds for Georgia. Perhaps because of prior bad experience, OEO seemed to see an incompatibility between bar support and the type of law reform programs receiving OEO favor and support. At this point, the entire effort began to falter. The organizers, however, discovered that the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) had funds available to im-

20. This article does not purport to resolve the continuing controversy between proponents of fully funded legal service programs and those who advocate the provision of such services directly through the private bar by means of programs such as *Judicare*. Both approaches recognize the need for funding and the inadequacy of the pure volunteer approach.

21. The Office of Economic Opportunity was providing federal funds for legal services programs. See note 2, *supra*.

plement an HEW proposed regulation²² requiring that counsel be provided to recipients of federally-aided welfare grants at hearings on the denial or termination of welfare benefits.²³ This proposed HEW program provided for a one-to-one funding formula; a state contribution of one dollar would be required for each dollar of federal assistance.

At the same time, the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services, the State agency responsible for administering federal welfare monies, obtained an appropriation of 54,000 dollars to provide the legal services under this anticipated HEW welfare hearing counsel program. Significantly, the Department had also established a legal services section and appeared willing to cooperate fully with the state bar in developing an HEW-supported program. A strategy was devised whereby a legal services corporation would be formed with state bar approval.²⁴ This corporation would, in turn, contract with the Department to provide legal assistance to welfare recipients at welfare hearings.

A proposal was drafted calling for the establishment of a non-profit corporation, Georgia Legal Services Program, Inc., to serve as a contractor to the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services in providing the desired assistance. To avoid a repetition of the hostile reaction accorded the proposal's first presentation at the Board of Governor's August meeting,²⁵ individual members of the Board were contacted, and support was mustered prior to the rescheduled October meeting. Certain features of the proposed charter and by-laws for the program were purposely drafted to allay the fears of the organized bar and thereby gain support. For example, the proposal provided that the directors of the corporation would consist primarily of members of the Board of Governors of the State Bar and that all members of the proposed corporation's board would be attorneys. This factor distinguished the proposed program

22. Proposed 45 CFR § 205.10, 34 Fed. Reg. 1144 (1969); Proposed 45 CFR § 220.25, 34 Fed. Reg. 1356 (1969).

23. The Supreme Court's decision in *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254 (1970), holding that a hearing was required as a matter of constitutional due process before termination of welfare benefits, increased the hope that HEW would also institute the counsel provision of the proposed regulations.

24. This plan received valuable assistance from H. Sol Clark, a private attorney who for many years has been a leading proponent of volunteer legal aid efforts. For a complete history of the Georgia legal aid effort prior to 1967 see Clark, *History of Legal Aid in Georgia*, 8 GA. S.B.J. 299 (1972).

25. At the first presentation, a member of the Board launched an emotional attack on the evils of federal funding and control resulting in a request by the proponents for a postponement.

from OEO-funded law reform programs, which have had heavy client involvement in program control.²⁶ In addition, the word "indigent" was added to the title of the proposed corporation to assure certain concerned Governors that the proposed corporation would serve only those who in fact could not afford to pay legal fees. For the purposes of obtaining approval, the image projected by the program temporarily became more important than its content. Put finally to a test, the Board of Governors approved a resolution to endorse the formation of Georgia Indigents Legal Services, Inc. (GILS).

Although GILS was duly incorporated in March 1970, efforts to secure the release of the HEW matching money were unsuccessful. After a spring filled with dilatory maneuvering, HEW finally scrapped the mandatory counsel regulations in May of 1970. GILS seemed to have maneuvered itself into a cul-de-sac since the program had been tailored away from OEO client-participation concepts in order to gain bar support. Upon renewed questioning, however, the proponents of GILS discovered that HEW also had a voluntary program for the provision of legal services to the poor.²⁷ This program was a potential treasure trove, providing a three-to-one ratio of federal to state monies in contrast with the one-to-one ratio of the now defunct mandatory program. A threshold problem to the effective utilization of the voluntary program was the absence of sufficient state funds with which to match a possible federal contribution. The 54,000 dollars which the State of Georgia previously had appropriated for a mandatory program remained unspent in the State's coffers. Since these funds had been appropriated to provide legal services to welfare recipients, they seemed an obvious choice for the necessary local contribution. Several important members of the State Bar—the President, the Legal Aid Committee Chairman, and the Director of Georgia Family and Children Services—approached Governor Lester Maddox, seeking release of the appropriated but unspent state funds as a local contribution of the HEW optional program. The Governor, who was impressed with both the support of the bar and the uses to which the money would be put, released the money.²⁸ In December 1970, a year after incorporation, HEW approved and funded GILS on a three-to-one matching basis.

26. 45 CFR §§ 1061.2-1 to .2-5 (1973).

27. 45 CFR §§ 220, 222 (1973).

28. As one GILS founder recounted later, "Lester ate it up. We told him it was for the little people. We got our money." *The Atlanta Constitution*, Jan. 3, 1972, at 10-A.

GILS—THE BATTLE TO INCREASE SERVICES

Once GILS established funding and leadership,²⁹ the HEW optional program appeared an ideal starting point for the provision of legal services to all the poor of Georgia. First, the favorable three-to-one matching ratio of the HEW optional program would produce twice the funding anticipated from the mandatory program—216,000 dollars instead of 108,000 dollars. Furthermore, the optional program had far fewer strings attached. The new term “optional” meant whatever the State Bar wanted it to mean, so long as services were limited to federally supported welfare recipients. While this HEW-imposed requirement did restrict potential clientele to only a significant fraction of the state’s otherwise eligible poor, the optional program would nevertheless provide a full-service program to that eligible group. GILS moved to persuade the bar to approve this optional program and, once again, prior informal contacts with members of the Board of Governors and elected bar leadership paid off. In January 1971, the Board of Governors overwhelmingly approved expansion into a comprehensive legal services program for welfare recipients.³⁰

GLSP—A NOVEL APPROACH TO FURTHER FUNDING

As the program expanded it became apparent that, despite innovative local funding devices,³¹ there were insufficient funds to provide a program of sufficient scope to meet demonstrated need. Attention again turned to OEO monies since GILS’ demonstrated successes had overcome OEO’s initial skepticism that a legal services program that enjoyed bar support could in fact meet the “real

29. Bettye Kehrer became the first GILS director and was instrumental in the program’s successes. From the first, Bettye was dedicated to running a strong legal services program and was continually aware that bar support could assure further success.

30. Provision of services to welfare recipients helped to avoid a policy problem for legal services programs—the precise demarcation of a line between eligible and ineligible clients. Prospective clients and the organized bar were both told that eligibility determinations would be made by the Georgia Department of Family and Children Services, a state agency, and not by the program itself. Since eligibility for legal services hinged on receipt of welfare assistance—a recognized standard of poverty—bar fears that the program might serve undeserving clients were reduced.

31. In Columbus, the GILS supporters made a discovery that was to have import for the future. Before the advent of GILS, Columbus had a modest volunteer legal aid effort supported with contributions from United Way. Local bar supporters in Columbus approached the United Way leadership and persuaded them to support GILS. In the process, it was discovered that federal funding regulations would permit local charitable contributions to be used as a matching share for which federal monies could be obtained. As GILS was operating on a one-to-three local to federal money ratio, a relatively modest input of local charitable money could go a long way in improving the GILS effort.

needs" of the poor. Certain staff members of the regional OEO legal services were impressed with the uniqueness of a bar supported state-wide legal services program financed without the help of OEO. While there were no allocated funds for the Southeast, a special allocation was made. Because the organizational structure of GILS was essentially inconsistent with OEO client participation requirements, it was impossible to use GILS as a recipient of these OEO funds. Moreover, any potential changes in GILS' structure to accommodate OEO requirements might jeopardize the Bar's decision to form and support GILS. The solution seemed to be to form a new corporation, structured along OEO guidelines, to act both as a recipient of OEO monies and as a provider of legal services in needed areas. Despite the clear danger that the patent subterfuge of a second corporation would imperil bar support, the young lawyers incorporated Georgia Legal Services Program, Inc. (GLSP) on May 3, 1971. GLSP was formed without coordination with the bar leadership and the young lawyers received some criticism from bar leaders for breaking ranks. Nevertheless, they did expose the Governors to GLSP informally and won gradual acceptance of the program. Furthermore, 500,000 dollars in urgently needed additional funds were now available annually to support the Georgia effort.

In establishing the state-wide program GILS-GLSP adopted a methodology of concentrating on expansion into areas where potential local support could be found. Such local support helped the program win acceptance with the legal profession and judiciary in each community. To ensure this vital local support, GILS adopted the approach of contacting local bar members to obtain support before establishing a branch office in any new locality. In particular, efforts were directed toward incorporating already existing volunteer legal aid organizations into the GILS structure.³² The rapid and smooth implementation of the GILS program throughout Georgia provides ample justification for the time and effort expended in developing a solid base of bar support at the local level.³³ For example, a concerned state superior court judge was instrumental in implementing the program in Dalton, Georgia. In Augusta, GILS-GLSP artfully walked a tightrope between an existing OEO-funded community action program that was attempting to provide legal

32. GILS incorporated pre-existing volunteer programs in Macon, Gainesville, and Columbus. At the same time, a central administrative and professional center was established in Atlanta to support the program as a whole.

33. By the end of 1971, branch offices had been opened in Albany, Augusta, Brunswick, and Dalton. In 1972, the program added offices in Savannah and Rome.

services and an opposed local bar faction, winning the eventual support of both groups. In still other areas, GILS-GLSP was forced to develop from scratch both a local program and local support. Throughout these efforts, GILS-GLSP organizers constantly were aware of a need to adapt their approach to local concerns and personalities in order to mobilize supporters of every type.

WORK WITHIN THE ORGANIZED BAR

In addition to activities directly related to establishing and funding a program, other types of bar activities can promote a climate generally favorable to a legal services effort.

One of these subsidiary projects—a bar referral directory—was established by working through the Legal Aid Committee of the State Bar. Questionnaires were mailed to every Georgia lawyer asking an indication of willingness to accept referrals of poverty clients on a fee or nonfee basis, or both. The mailings were accompanied by an article in the *State Bar Reporter*³⁴ explaining the program and urging participation. The affirmative response from thirty percent of the bar resulted in the publication of a referral directory listing available attorneys and the areas in which they had expressed a willingness to render legal assistance. The completed directory was distributed to legal services offices, social workers, and others who come into contact on a regular basis with persons needing legal assistance. Although the exigencies of private law practice limited the usefulness of the referral directory, some clients were served and the publicity accompanying the compilation of the directory served to acquaint the private bar with the need for indigent legal services.

It is also important to recognize the need to maintain educational efforts that will give the practicing bar an appreciation of the need for legal services to the poor. Throughout the developmental stages of the Georgia statewide program the organizers worked to ensure that a steady stream of legal aid information was carried in State Bar publications.³⁵ As the GILS-GLSP program came into being, the State Bar Younger Lawyers Section sponsored seminar and panel programs to foster interest and gain support. Moreover, the June 1972, annual meeting of the State Bar featured a speech by William Klaus, then Chairman of the ABA standing committee

34. *Id.*, *The Bar Referral Directory—A Step Toward Organizing Our Commitment*, VI GEORGIA BAR REPORTER 1 (1970).

35. *Id.* See, e.g., Kehler, *Statewide Legal Services Program Launched*, VII GEORGIA BAR REPORTER, June 1971, at 3; VIII GEORGIA BAR REPORTER, Dec. 1971, at 1; VIII GEORGIA BAR REPORTER, Oct. 1971, at 12; 7 State Bar of Ga., YLS Newsletter, Apr. 1968, at 4.

on Legal Aid. Talking in terms of concrete problems rather than vague principles, he appealed to each individual attorney's instincts concerning effective professional representation of a client. If legal aid is discussed in specific terms, the listener is readily carried to the core of the problem. Continued educational efforts produce the bar support necessary to sustain the legal service programs through periods of opposition.

CONCLUSION

The experience of GILS-GLSP demonstrates that the extensive investment of time necessary to involve the organized bar in the legal services effort can make a vital contribution to the development of a stable, professional, statewide, legal services program. Bar support eases access to the political process, improves community relations, and facilitates program funding. Furthermore, bar support helps reduce the political strife that has heretofore plagued legal services programs. The rewards of such an approach can be great. Adequate funding obtained with active bar support has enabled GILS-GLSP to provide increasingly comprehensive legal services to indigent clients.³⁶ From a modest budget of 216,000 dollars in 1970-71, the funds available to GILS-GLSP grew to 1,200,000 dollars in 1973-74. State bar leaders have persuaded the Georgia State Legislature to appropriate ever increasing amounts as a local matching share for GILS-GLSP, and at this writing the projected

36. The increase in client services provided by GILS-GLSP in its first 3 years of operation is dramatically illustrated by the substantial increases in cases opened. In most instances, each case represents a client served or advised. The breakdown is by branch offices.

	1971	1972	1973
Albany	324	1,015	828
Atlanta*	784	33	0
Augusta	549	725	805
Brunswick	227	537	1,175
Columbus	1,742	3,605	3,390
Dalton	310	613	671
Gainesville	181	568	800
Macon	416	2,510	2,410
Rome	y	130	451
Savannah	z	1,749	1,220
	4,535	11,484	11,750

*—In the early stages of the program, cases were opened at the Atlanta office and then transferred out to branch offices. GILS-GLSP has never provided direct legal assistance to

budget for GILS is 1,500,000 dollars for the program in 1974-75.

Of equal importance, confidence in continued bar support has permitted the program to de-emphasize such traditional legal aid areas as domestic relations and become more effective to the indigent client community by moving heavily into fields such as housing, consumer protection, and welfare rights.³⁷ By the end of 1973, GILS-GLSP had forty-one full-time staff attorneys providing these comprehensive legal services throughout Georgia.³⁸ Because the pro-

residents of the Atlanta metropolitan area. Such services are provided by the Atlanta Legal Aid Society.

y—Office opened in 1972.

z—Office became part of GILS-GLSP organization in 1972.

On the basis of cases opened during January and February of 1974, it can be reasonably projected that GILS-GLSP will open approximately 15,000 cases in 1974.

Source: GILS-GLSP *Caseload Statistics Ledger*, on file in the offices of GILS-GLSP.

37. As GILS-GLSP has increased its delivery of legal services to indigent clients in Georgia, the program has continually placed greater emphasis upon comprehensive or law reform type activities. The following statistics demonstrate, on a percentage basis, the GILS-GLSP cases in various legal areas. In particular the statistics demonstrate a relative decrease in family law and domestic relations assistance when compared with other types of poverty problems.

BREAKDOWN OF CASES SERVED
(Percentage Basis)

	1971	1972	1973
Family Law	67.4	62.4	51.8
Consumer Protection	13.7	19.9	23.5
Housing	4.9	6.1	10.1
Welfare	6.6	5.9	11.3
Other*	7.1	5.5	3.1

*Includes juvenile matters, general legal advice and services not provided by GILS-GLSP, including criminal defense and nonlegal help. This category has declined as the program's potential clientele has become better acquainted with the scope of services available.

Source: GILS-GLSP *Caseload Statistics Ledger*, on file in the offices of GILS-GLSP.

* Includes juvenile matters, general legal advice and services not provided by GILS-GLSP, including criminal defense and nonlegal help. This category has declined as the program's potential clientele has become better acquainted with the scope of services available.

Source: GILS-GLSP *Caseload Statistics Ledger*, on file in the offices of GILS-GLSP.

38. The continued expansion of full time paid staff attorneys in each branch office is further evidence that GILS-GLSP has been able to increase its delivery of legal services to indigent clients. The following statistics show the attorneys on duty at each GILS-GLSP office.

posed Federal Legal Services Corporation Act mandates greater state bar participation in the formulation and management of legal services programs, the example of GILS-GLSP should give all legal services advocates greater confidence that bar participation can assist in building a strong legal services program. While the yellow brick road of bar support may contain some pitfalls, the potential results of comprehensive legal services to the indigent of our nation justifies the effort.

	1972	1973	1974 ^y
Albany	2	3	7
Atlanta x	8	9	9
Augusta	2	3	5
Brunswick	2	3	5
Columbus	5	5	7
Dalton	1	2	2
Gainesville	3	3	5
Macon	5	6	7
Rome	1	2	4
Savannah	5	5	7
	—	—	—
	34	41	58

Source: Gils-GLSP Office Manual, on file at the offices of GILS-GLSP.

Source: GILS-GLSP Office Manual, on file at the offices of GILS-GLSP.

x—While the Atlanta office does not provide client services directly, it has attorneys who are expert in various areas of poverty law, including consumer rights, housing welfare, and family and juvenile law, and it provides legal assistance to branch office attorneys in difficult cases, including appeals.

y—The figures for 1974 are projections based upon increased funding levels. These positions are currently budgeted, and GILS-GLSP is seeking qualified attorneys to fill them.