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ABSTRACT:

The purpose of this thesis is to outline the West End community's legal problems, legal needs, legal awareness and their interaction with the legal aid clinic located in the West End of Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Various theories are emphasized to furnish a fruitful comprehension of the issues under investigation. Initially, David Caplovitz's perception of the poor's circumstance is discussed to demonstrate that the less fortunate do, indeed, have legal difficulties. Subsequently, Gerald Suttles' concept of the 'provincial effect' and Herbert Gans' idea of person-oriented and object-oriented individuals are reviewed to supply an explanation of why the poor may be susceptible to exploitation. Lewis Coser's theory of conflict follows to establish that conflict does exist in our society between the poor and 'outsiders'. It is asserted that safety-valve institutions such as legal aid clinics can perhaps act as functional mediators between the disadvantaged and 'outsiders'. That is, they can channel the expression of hostile attitudes.

In light of this, sixty heads of households or their spouses were interviewed. An interview schedule was utilized consisting mainly of fixed-choice questions but, some open-ended questions were included. For the most part, the queries that were used represented indicators of variables such as recognition of legal problem (RECOLPR), not resigned to one's situation (NRETSN), awareness of legal clinic (AWDLCLC), use of clinic
(USOCLC), respect for the law (RESFRLW), awareness of legal rights (AWOLRTS), proximity to clinic, and time in area. Queries pertaining to background information such as age, sex and ethnicity were also enclosed in the interview schedule.

From an analysis of the data, it is concluded that the findings did not significantly uphold the theoretical base. However, proximity to clinic did support the supposition concerning the "isolation effect". The people most likely to use the clinic are those who live close to it. In addition, the data demonstrated that the West End legal aid clinic is assisting the disadvantaged.

Finally, recommendations regarding future research of this nature and practical methods of providing further assistance to the poor are suggested.
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THESIS

CHAPTER I.
LEGAL PREDICAMENTS OF TORONTO WEST ENDERS
AND THEIR INTERACTION WITH THE WEST END
LEGAL AID CLINIC
SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

Until quite recently, the concept of justice as a right and not a privilege had little meaning for thousands of poor persons. Society had been willing to condone a state of injustice toward a certain segment of its members.

It is pointed out by Morris Ginsberg that the nucleus of justice is the rejection of arbitrariness, especially the rejection of arbitrary power. Morris Ginsberg declares that in dealing with claims, justice consists of more than just ensuring that all involved have been considered and that none are given priority on unessential grounds. People may be treated equally yet unfairly. For instance, if all the poor were allowed to be abused by various commercial enterprises and landlords, equality of position remains but so does injustice. Therefore

equality in short, has to be considered in relation to the grounds on which the claims are made. . . Similar remarks apply to the notion of fairness for what is fair as between individuals cannot be determined without a reference to the grounds on which their claims are based.

(M. Ginsberg; 1965; p. 69, 70)

Particularly important in the endeavor against injustice is arbitrary power; the power of one individual over another whether exercised directly or indirectly. Hence justice
has been greatly concerned with controlling this type of aggression and domination. Its goal is to give protection against arbitrary power and it achieves this aim by crediting coercive power to the state. Specifically it is through criminal and civil law that arbitrary power is controlled.

In a democratic society where all men are presumed equal, there is a general consensus that everyone is entitled to a minimum standard of well-being. That is, justice is seen to be done when equals are treated equally and fairly and unequals unequally but fairly.

With the introduction of the legal aid scheme and legal aid clinics the poor are ensured the services of a lawyer or a legal representative who will act on their behalf. The services of competent members of the legal profession may be obtained to advise these impecunious clients as to their rights and how such rights may be protected.

As pointed out by Esther Brown, in the book *Lawyers and the Promotion of Justice*, the poor need attorneys for the drawing of contracts and other documents, and particularly for advising them about their legal rights and the course of action they should pursue. . . . (There are) questions to be answered in connection with insurance policies, taxes, titles to property, mortgages and debts."

(E. Brown; 1938; p. 266 and p. 274)

Indeed if the poor recognize the need for legal assistance when and if the occasion arises, it seems reasonable
to assume that they would seek the necessary aid. Unfortunately there is evidence to the contrary (which will be discussed in length as portrayed in The Poor Pay More by David Caplovitz).

Although little is known precisely of the reasons why legal advice is not sought by those manifestly in need of assistance, one explanation is ignorance of the existence of the aid and advice design. It appears that there are many people who do not realize that the legal aid scheme permits them to acquire the services of a lawyer in private practice or the assistance of a lawyer or law student in community clinics who are able to give advice.

Moreover, solicitors tend to congregate in main shopping areas and in proximity to the court houses. The fact that there is a law firm near the court will help mainly those who happen to live in the area. But the poor and uneducated who are in need of relief for their legal difficulties may not have the energy and means to find lawyers outside their area. This lack of easy access to a legal aid office may be a significant deterrent.

Another interpretation for the failure to consult a lawyer or skilled non-lawyers may be an individual's general sense of hopelessness about prospects of turning the legal system to his own advantage. In many cases, the law operates in opposition to the poor. Due to their lack of knowledge concerning contracts and agreements they find themselves being coerced by law to meet their obligations to finance companies, salesmen, etc. even though they were defrauded by such
Furthermore, a person does not have a legal problem until he perceives its existence i.e. until he characterizes the present difficulty as one in which the legal system will, or ought to be, involved. Are the poor unlikely to identify as legal in context large numbers of problems central to their lives? This issue warrants serious consideration.

It seems clear that properly conceived, a legal services program would be an influential force in our combat against poverty. The substance of the legal care would at least lessen the effects of poverty. Illegal convictions, consumer fraud, all injustices to which the poor are particularly vulnerable, could be vigilantly managed and often relieved. Certainly, such a scheme would reduce the conflict which results from the poor's interaction with loan companies, salesmen and the like.

Hence, this thesis focuses on the poor in the West End of Toronto, Ontario, Canada for the purpose of disclosing their legal predicament and commenting on their interaction with and perception of the legal aid clinic in that area.

Initially, various pertinent theories will be discussed. David Caplovitz's study regarding the exploitation of the poor will be related. He demonstrates that indigents are ignorant with respect to legal matters. Consequently, they become easy prey for the 'outsiders'. Subsequently, Gerald Suttles' theory will be related. He suggests that people in the Addams area are extremely provincial and view
their neighbourhood as a self-sufficient world. It is contended that a relationship does exist between exploitation of the poor and the 'provincial' or 'isolation effect'. That is, on the one hand, the poor are abused by 'outsiders' and therefore seek shelter within their own area in order that they can avoid interaction with 'outsiders'. On the other hand, the fact that they seek shelter may limit their knowledge of worldly affairs which makes them susceptible to abuse. In any event, an 'isolation effect' does exist in the Addams area of Chicago.

Moreover, Gans' study of Urban Villagers, conducted in the West End of Boston reinforces this theme. He suggests that the poor view 'outsiders' with suspicion. This distrust eventually produces an isolation effect. Gans' theory will be discussed in detail later in the paper.

Next, Lewis Coser's theory of conflict will be explored. It will be demonstrated that there is conflict between the poor and the 'outsiders'. The necessary factors for conflict do exist. However, the 'outsiders' maintain a superior position due to their higher socio-economic status. Consequently, they are more able to influence the implementation and administration of the law than are the poor. Hence mediators become a viable means of balancing the tables of justice.

1Herbert Gans refers to urban villagers as those situated in low-rent neighbourhoods who try to adapt their non-urban institutions and way of life to the urban environment. (Gans H.; 1967; pg. 4.)
In view of what is discussed in the "Conflict and Legal Mediator as a Safety-Valve" section, the stage is set to relate general assistance programs for the disadvantaged. Therefore, a brief discussion of the programs in the United States and Britain will follow. Then a review of the legal assistance scheme in Ontario will be made with reference to its primary purpose and procedure. Subsequently, Larry Taman's criticism of the Ontario Legal Aid Plan will be related.

Once the theory and a review of the literature have been done, a review of the methodological approach which was employed for this study will follow. There will be a brief discussion of the pilot study which was conducted initially. Indicators of the various variables will also be related to the reader.

In the "Analysis of the Data" section, the data was initially divided into two categories: the poor, and middle class. These categories were then subdivided into: 'clinic', 'non-clinic', and 'no' problems. Subsequently, the 'clinic' and the 'non-clinic' problems were subdivided again. There will be a lengthy discussion of the analytic approach in Chapter Three. The actual problems encountered by those in the sample will follow, and also various tables will be perused. Finally, the conclusions on findings from the analyses of data will be related.
SECTION II

Stance of the Poor

The stance of the poor will be perceived through the studies of D. Caplovitz, H. Gans and G. Suttles. Caplovitz provides empirical verification to the notion that the poor are exploited. Suttles advises that the poor isolate themselves, i.e., they consider their own neighbourhood to be a self-sufficient world. They distrust 'outsiders' due to their fear of being abused. This concept of distrust is given further impetus by Gans in his West End study of Boston. The poor who consider themselves person-oriented individuals, i.e. people interested in personal relationships are very suspicious of object-oriented individuals, i.e. people interested in obtaining money at any expense, in short, exploiters.

In the Poor Pay More, David Caplovitz examines the consumer practices among families from four low income housing projects in New York City. It should be noted that his book is more representative of poor families with young children than of the aged who embody a large segment of the poor. He declares that perhaps the central contribution of this book has been to show that they (the poor) too take part in the consumption society, but at a considerable cost. Whereas the poor at an earlier stage of development were viewed as exploited workers, it makes some sense today to view the poor as exploited consumers.

(D. Caplovitz; 1963; p. VXi)
Many consumers have almost no idea of the complex set of legal conditions included in the agreements they endorse. The penalties that can be brought to bear on them, such as the loss of possessions already paid for, the payment of interest on money owed, the payment of lawyer and court fees are affairs that some families are confronted with only when — for some reason or another — they miss their payment.

Moreover a missed payment is not hard to understand. According to David Caplovitz, 51% of those sampled had debts in excess of 100% while 73% either had less than $100 in savings or nothing at all. (D. Caplovitz; 1963; p. 108-110) Thus their consumer debts were not backed up by savings leaving the poor family in a very precarious position.

Perchance, one dilemma of the poor is the fact that they are caught in the strain produced by society. They want material possessions which provide both comfort and prestige, but due to their precarious financial state, they must turn to credit to fulfill their socially induced desires. However, the poor are, no doubt, the least qualified for credit. To be sure, missed payments due to the consumer's poor credit status and ignorance cause a breakdown of an unstable system of exchange. As a result, the consumer has no alternative but to leave the market. However, they exit with a much wiser and more sophisticated view of buying practices. Caplovitz cites an example in which a Puerto Rican paid $400 for a $240 refrigerator. In light of this the man stated, "I decided to leave it be, but now I look over everything very carefully.
before I buy." (D. Caplovitz; 1963; p. 168)

The incidents that are related in the Poor Pay More

make amply clear many of them (the poor). . .
are subjected to crass exploitation. Exposed
to misleading advertising and ruthless sales­
men . . . Given some protection by the law,
they are too naive, too uninformed, too
intimidated to know their rights or to exercise
them when they do.

(D. Caplovitz; 1963; p. 169)

Caplovitz suggests that the destitute have limited
education and are unfamiliar with the urban culture. As a
result, they lack the information and training to be
sophisticated consumers. They need to learn how to appraise
a salesman's advice and they need to engage in comparative
shopping. In brief, the poor are currently being exploited
and education would appear to be one method of ameliorating
their state.

The view that the poor are not familiar with the
urban culture is reinforced by Gerald Suttles in his book
The Social Order of the Slums. He states that people of the
Addams area\(^2\) regard one section of their neighbourhood as a
self-sufficient world where they can carry out most of their

\(^2\)Gerald Suttles studied the Addams area on the Near West Side
of Chicago. The future of this slum area was uncertain since
urban renewal and institutional building plans threatened to
dissolve its population. At the time of his writing, the
Addams area was the home of four different ethnic or minority
groups: the Italians, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Negroes.
practices. This notion is of particular significance because lack of awareness of a legal aid clinic may be due to the residents' insufficient mobility, or what will be termed, the "isolation effect." Suttles tells us that the atmosphere in the Addams area is 'extremely provincial' and what takes place a few blocks away may have no significant effect on the daily routine of transactions, family milieu and social affairs.

Moreover, groups within the Addams area are suspicious of one another. Each group would find it hard to conceive of another which would neglect to exploit an inter-relationship if the opportunity arose. Hence, residents of the area are sensitive to each other's relative status and to the ulterior motives individuals may have for creating egalitarian relationships.

The significant aspects of Suttles' work, for this thesis are that the poor seem to distrust others and they isolate themselves from others. These factors could have grave consequences for the destitute because the restriction that is imposed either internally by group members discomfort and suspicion of the 'outside world' or externally by the system's similar attitudes toward them limits their range of knowledge to affairs of their own area. Hence, they are isolated from people or organizations that can provide assistance.

Furthermore, H. Gans informs us that the West Enders
relied on their local Politician\(^3\) for trustworthy information. He declares that they often do not believe much of what they read in the newspapers. They consider the press to be an agency of the "outside world" that usually defends and sometimes fronts for the city government. (H. Gans; 1967; p. 172)

The concepts of equality, justice and personal probity are applied to relations with peer members as well as to relations with 'outsiders'. West Enders expect to be treated in a person-oriented manner. When they are not, they are not only disappointed but reject the others as object-oriented individuals. In light of this fact, it is easy to comprehend that the West Enders judge the law according to the extent to which it benefits or hurts them. They regard most government officials as object-oriented, motivated by greed and ambition. Such behaviour is inexcusable to the West Enders. Gans discloses that they are disappointed that government individuals do not behave like peer group members, i.e. person-oriented. The West Enders believe that the majority of government officials are out to exploit them. They, and no doubt also the poor, generally do not accept and/or do not completely comprehend the impersonalized nature of bureaucratic structures. They apparently do not take into account secondary group relationships.

\(^3\) Until 1950 Boston city councillors were elected by wards and functioned as local politicians. However, since then they no longer represent any single ward. (H. Gans; 1967; pg. 170)
For purposes of this thesis then, Gans' work is important in that it informs us that the poor distrust bureaucracies. Hence, even if they were not isolated as Suttles suggests, they may not wish to seek aid because they distrust bureaucracies.

In simplistic terms, the poor and the "outside world" support two opposing modes of behaviour. The poor are person-oriented. They desire to be liked, to be accepted by others. At the same time, they are suspicious of other people who may take advantage of them. They are fearful of being manipulated by individuals who are object-oriented. This latter type of behaviour is characteristic of "outsiders". The poor recognize these people as cold and selfish, in short, exploiters. Gans, for example, reveals that tenants in the West End regarded landlords as peer group members and expected them to react as person-oriented individuals who treated their renters impartially. Whenever a landlord raised the rent or failed to make the necessary ameliorations to the building, he was treated as an "outsider". Such behaviour suggested to the West Enders that they were being treated as tenants, and not as peer group members. It becomes evident that the poor's intimate personal demeanor is inappropriate in an impersonal world. In an "ideal type" of bureaucracy, officials should be detached and not become deeply involved in personal relationships. Yet, this informal kind of behaviour not only creates distrust in the minds of the poor, but ultimately
produces the isolation effect, i.e. the poor may seek shelter within their neighbourhood and interact with the outsiders only if a confrontation is unavoidable. Furthermore, bureaucrats and "outsiders" generally, subscribe to middle class values which are imposed on the poor instead of attempting to identify with the poor's role. This disinterest in redressing such a state can only make the social setting more prone to conflict.

Ethnocentrism is a source of, and a contributor to, the perpetuity of conflict. Members of both the poor and the outside world believe that their respective values are the best. Consequently, there exists two groups in society with conflicting values. In addition, the impersonal attributes prevailing among the "outsiders" permits them to abuse the poor. This, in turn, creates distrust and suspicion in the minds of the poor and contributes to the creation of the "isolation effect".

A stable social system is undermined when such events are allowed to prevail. To be sure, such occurrences would lead Lewis Coser to contend that conflict does exist in our society. The amount of conflict which is recognized will indubitably depend upon the social system itself.

Let us now peruse the notion of conflict more intensely.

SECTION III

"Conflict" and the Legal Mediator as a Safety-valve

Lewis Coser believes that social conflict can have a
positive consequence in relation to the maintenance of stability in society. He declares that

*Internal social conflicts which concern goals, values or interests that do not contradict the basic assumptions upon which the relationship is founded tend to be positively functional for the social structure. Such conflicts tend to make possible the readjustment of norms and power relations within groups in accordance with the felt needs of its individual members of subgroups.*

(L. Coser; 1965; p. 151)

However, he does point out that internal conflicts may be dysfunctional to the social structure if the contending groups no longer share the fundamental values upon which the social system's legitimacy is based. The amount of conflict that is tolerated in order to maintain stability in a system depends upon the social system itself.

Whether conflict will create changes within the system is dependent on the rigidity or flexibility of the system. Coser feels that closely knit systems in which there exists a high personality involvement are likely to tolerate only a small amount of conflict.

If the conflict is uncontrolled in this sort of system, it becomes dysfunctional. The basic roots of the system may be disturbed. As a result, safety-valve institutions i.e., institutions which channel the expression of hostile feelings become necessary. In a more flexible social system conflict is allowed because it is less likely to be disruptive. Groups to which individuals only participate segmentally will presumably experience fewer conflicts.
According to Coser, the activities of group members are diverse so that their total personalities are not involved in any one conflict. Thus partial participation in a multiplicity of conflicts acts as a balancing instrument within the social structure. He writes,

it may be that one reason for the relative absence of 'class struggle' in this country is the fact that the American worker, far from restricting his allegiance to class-conflict groupings and associations is a member of a number of associations and groupings which present him in diverse conflicts with different religious, ethnic, status, and political groups. Since the lines of conflict between all these groups do not converge, the cleavage along class lines does not draw the total energies and allegiance of the worker into a single area of conflict.

(L. Coser; 1965; p. 77)

Thus the poor cannot be defined as a class since they are not a "class for itself". They have not developed class-consciousness, i.e. a realization of their "common interests in the sphere of politics". (R. Dahrendorf; 1965; p. 16).

The proletariat has, in the beginning of its development, certain common interests, but it is nevertheless still an unorganized mass.

(R. Dahrendorf; 1965; p. 14)

It would appear that the poor are presently at this point in their growth. Surely they do have a common interest - the wish to be entitled to their rights without abuse from "outsiders". Only by acting out their interests and experiencing conflict can the poor eventually establish themselves as a class with the strength to force changes within the system.
Therefore, the poor do not exist as a class but, for the purposes of this thesis, it is assumed that the poor are a group. They are defined as a group because they share common characteristics such as low status, low income and they perceive their financial difficulties. Thus the poor will be regarded as a group which contains the potential for conflict with various segments of society.

Moreover, for conflict to exist there must not only be interaction between two or more persons, but also the legitimacy of the social structure must be in question. One side becomes aware that it is, indeed, being denied rights, and privileges to which it is entitled. Thus feelings of hostility which develop from this inequitable distribution of rights may eventually lead to conflict. However, it must be remembered that hostile attitudes in themselves do not necessarily mean that conflict will occur.

In summation then, conflict does exist in our society between the poor and salesmen, loan companies and the like. To be sure, the legitimacy of the social structure becomes impotent when many of its members are denied their fundamental rights to be treated fairly and to be liberated from exploitation. Also there is interaction between the poor and various consumer businesses. It is the interaction between these two interest groups which ultimately makes it possible for one side to operate illegitimately and to exploit.

Since exploitive tactics are practiced among "outsiders"
the poor becomes easy prey for such con artists who are more familiar with the system. But what can be done to ameliorate the plight of the poor and to maintain stability in society? Coser would suggest the implementation of safety-valve institutions which can act as mediators in any struggle between the poor and 'outsiders'. They can be a source of information for the poor. To be sure, tyranny, i.e. the exercise of arbitrary power is not likely to take root when men do have access to information. Thus these institutions can reach out to the destitute who because of their social, economic and educational disadvantages are unaware or unable to make use of their rights.

It is important then, that mediators such as the ward leader, the politician, the Better Business Bureau, the legal aid lawyer or the legal aid clinic's staff intervene in any struggle which may involve the poor. Their assistance acts to balance the tables of justice.

To be sure, the poor need someone or some institution that they can go to and receive aid. Unfortunately however they do not even trust their local politician fully. (H. Gans; 1967; p. 177). They regard him as potentially upwardly mobile and therefore he is object-oriented. They judge their mediators in terms of what they have done to ameliorate their (the poor's) situation. These people must produce to win the confidence of these distrusting citizens.

Certainly, the poor do have various safety-valves in order to achieve their aim of just treatment by others. Of
the various types of "safety valves", legal aid is but one scheme. However, because the concept of legal assistance is extremely important for purposes of this thesis, it is now appropriate to give an historical perspective of legal aid with the hope of furnishing the reader with knowledge of what type of legal assistance is currently available and under what circumstances it is available.

SECTION IV

Potential Remedies Regarding "Legal Plight of the Poor"

a) Various Solutions at the general level.

This section will provide one with a general understanding of the legal aid schemes existing in the United States, Britain and Ontario, Canada. It is important to note three facts: 1) The Ontario legal aid plan is based on Britain's Statutory Scheme. 2) The various legal assistance organizations which operate in the United States are not available in all cities or states. The type of scheme which is available in a particular area is intended to meet the needs of that particular locale. 3) There appears to be a socio-cultural drift toward legal aid clinics. In light of this, let us now investigate the schemes which operate in the United States, Britain and Ontario, Canada.

United States Approaches:

In the United States, organized legal aid is provided largely by a full-time paid legal staff. Funds for legal aid
especially legal aid regarding criminal matters, comes from charitable sources, including donations by lawyers.

Legal aid organizations in the U.S.A. can be placed in the following categories:

1) legal aid societies
2) law school clinics
3) Neighbourhood legal services programs
4) Public Defender system

Whereas legal aid in criminal matters is free, in civil cases it may involve a token fee ($1.00 for registration) and assisted persons are required to pay or contribute to costs if they are awarded costs in litigation. Moreover in civil cases, the federal government, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, is allocating a substantial amount of funds to assist and expand existing legal aid organizations. Provisions for legal aid have also been dependent on private contributions.

The O.E.O. has funded various neighbourhood legal services which are located in poor areas. The staff consists of fully paid lawyers who spend a considerable amount of time dealing with landlord-tenant cases. The objectives of these legal services programs are law reform, economic development of the community, community education in law and the giving of advice of a general nature.

Indubitably, the O.E.O. supports various organizations which are designed to educate the poor as to their legal
rights. It is concerned with "preventative" law. Moreover in Washington, there exists a Legal Aid Agency which represents indigents in criminal matters. Every person who is in jail awaiting trial in the District of Columbia and who has no lawyer is interviewed by a representative of the Agency. In the case of each indigent person, the Agency supplies the judge with the name of three lawyers, one from the Agency and two in private practice. The judge appoints one of the three, unless, of course, the defendant waives his right to counsel.

There also exists a Legal Aid Society. This organization gives legal assistance in civil matters only to persons unable to pay. They are funded by private contributions by the legal profession and by charitable organizations.

Legal Aid Clinics are in existence in the United States. They are, to some extent, operated by universities. They are situated in slum areas. Law students work under the supervision of lawyers (part-time).

Clinics are also established by church organizations but anyone who cannot afford a lawyer may attend the clinic.

In addition, there is a Public Defender System in the United States. The Public Defender represents individuals at trial and on appeal. If an individual appears in court without an attorney, the Chief Justice of the criminal court questions him under oath as to whether or not he can pay for counsel. If he cannot, the Public Defender is appointed to defend him.
English Schemes - Civil proceedings

Since 1949, Britain has been operating an aggressive scheme to assist the disadvantaged. Britain's National Council of Social Service created a number of 'citizen's advice bureaus' (CAB) which have been operating with public funds. The CAB purpose is to provide information concerning changes in legislation and skilled advice in many of the personal problems that arise in daily life.

Moreover, the English legal aid scheme in civil matters is based on statute: the Legal Aid and Advice Act 1949. Under this act legal advice may be given in both civil and criminal matters, but so far as proceedings are concerned it is confined to civil proceedings.

The Legal Aid and Advice Act was brought into force cryptically but was in full operation by 1961. Some of the scheme's characteristics are:

1) It is administered by the Law Society.
2) The scheme is for poor persons and persons of moderate means.
3) The scheme provides free legal aid only to individuals who cannot afford to pay. A means test is provided by the Ministry of Social Security. Also any payments are made into and out of the legal aid fund.
4) Aid under the scheme is given by barristers and solicitors in private practice.

In addition, members of the English legal profession
give legal aid and advice through area and local committees.

To obtain advice under the statutory scheme, a person first fills out an application form which is available at the Citizen Advice Bureaus, at court offices and at solicitors' offices.

An individual who comes within the means test pays a small fee to the solicitor who then completes the application form and sends it to the appropriate area committee. The solicitor retains the small fee paid by the client and he may be paid a supplement depending upon the amount of work performed. The maximum fee a solicitor can claim is £3 which includes the small remunerations by the client.

If the solicitor believes the advice concerns litigation, then he will assist the individual to complete the necessary application form and then send it to the Law Society. Moreover, with respect to civil proceedings, if an emergency develops, an individual may be granted an emergency Certificate without reference to the committee. This certificate is granted by the chairman of the area or local committee, but it must be replaced by a full certificate within three months or it is revoked.

Some advantages of being an assisted person are:
1) the person knows at the outset of the action how much it will cost him; 2) he can pay his contribution in monthly installments; and 3) if his case is taken to an appellate court, no further contribution need be made by the individual.
The system of legal aid in criminal cases is administered, not by the Law Society, but by the courts themselves. Hence, although an individual may be financially eligible, he does not have a right to legal aid.

There is no detailed means test and legal aid in criminal cases is free. However, the Widgery Committee* has recommended that assisted persons who are able to do so, should contribute towards costs.

A legal aid certificate entitles the accused to the services of a solicitor only, except in murder cases where, if the court thinks fit, counsel may be assigned.

Payment of solicitor and counsel fees is made from the legal aid fund. (The Widgery Committee has recommended that magistrates should have discretion to assign counsel as well as solicitor, not only on a charge of murder, but also in other committal proceedings where this can be justified by the prospective length and complexity of the proceedings).

Moreover, the Widgery Committee recommended that all summonses, except for trivial offences, should contain information as to how legal advice can be acquired and that persons who are arrested should be provided with a pamphlet outlining the facilities available for obtaining legal advice.

It also recommended that a prison officer should be designated in each prison to be responsible for ensuring that

---

*Widgery Committee reported on legal aid in criminal proceedings in England in 1966.
all prisoners who need legal aid fully comprehend what procedures they must follow to obtain it.

There is also another scheme in operation known as the Law Society's Voluntary Legal Advice Scheme. Under this plan, any individual can visit any solicitor whose name is on the legal aid panel and ask for advice. The solicitor may decline to give advice, but if advice is given, he must not charge the client more than £1. No means test is involved.

Furthermore, a "25 Pound Advice Scheme" has emerged in England which actually consists of three separate but complementary proposals.

The first proposal shifts the emphasis from litigation to advice, mediation and prevention. There is a socio-cultural drift away from the application certificate format and a trend toward the redistribution of members of the legal profession into areas of need.

Under the British scheme the legal aid solicitor is entitled to render advice to eligible applicants up to twenty-five pounds.

The second proposal yearns to create a meaningful connection between the legal profession and the beneficiaries of the Plan, and related agencies such as CAB.

Finally, local legal aid centres are to be created to promote a meaningful relationship between the profession and the public.
The Ontario Approach

The Ontario legal aid plan commenced in March 29, 1967, with the objective of making legal services available to all those citizens who demonstrate a need for assistance. The Plan is completely funded by the Province of Ontario and the Attorney-General is the responsible Minister. The Law Society of Upper Canada through the Legal Aid Committee, is responsible for administering the Plan.

Moreover, the Plan provides the individual with the lawyer of his choice and the legal assistance he requires. The choice of lawyer must be made from a legal aid panel list containing the names of all the lawyers that participate in the Plan. The lawyer who eventually gives assistance is paid out of the Legal Aid Fund. The Plan ensures that the citizen who is in a legal predicament will not be disadvantaged because he lacks financial resources.

It is important to note however, that in certain circumstances there may be a request for prepayment in appropriate cases from contributing clients.

In August 1970, the Legal Aid Act was amended by adding a section which allows the securing of liens from clients who own, or have any interest in, land in Ontario. These liens are applicable to clients receiving a Legal aid Certificate from August 1970, onward.

Moreover, when the Area Director finds that a contribution can be made by the applicant, then the director may require one-third of such contribution, more or less, be paid
before a civil certificate is issued.

Let us now briefly peruse the legal aid procedure. Applications for legal aid are received at the Legal Aid Office. The applicants are then referred to the office of the Department of Community and Social Service. A private interview is held with the applicant at the office. Next, the area director receives a written report which provides him with an opinion as to whether the applicant qualifies financially for Legal Aid. The area director then either grants or refuses a certificate. If the applicant is refused a certificate it is because he has sufficient funds to pay for a lawyer. If the applicant is granted a certificate, then the area director may require that all, or part, or none of the costs be repaid.

In addition, there is a committee called the Area Committee which does have responsibility under Legal Aid for certain decisions. Members of this committee contribute their time voluntarily and receive no compensation. They rule upon appeals by applicants from the area director's decision to refuse legal aid. They rule upon applications by persons who wish to appeal a decision of the court where their case has been heard and they feel that the decision was inequitable. Also they have the right and responsibility to criticize the working of the Legal Aid Plan or the manner in which the area director performs his duties.

There also exists, under the Ontario Legal Aid Plan,
a duty counsel system whose purpose is described by Ouimet:

The primary function of duty counsel is to advise the defendant with respect to his legal rights, to advise him as to the elements of the offense with which he is charged and to represent him on an application for bail or an adjournment. Duty counsel may also speak in mitigation of sentence where the accused wishes to plead guilty.

(R. Ouimet; 1969; p. 157-8)

Moreover, in 1970, the Legal Aid Committee approved the establishment of student legal aid societies at the various Ontario law schools — The University of Western Ontario, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, Queen's University and University of Windsor. A student legal aid society was established at the University of Toronto in 1969.

Each Student Legal Aid Society received referrals from the local Area Director's office. They handled a variety of cases among which were summary conviction offences under the Criminal Code and Highway Traffic Act. They also advised persons with landlord and tenant problems, debtor and creditor problems, and in Family Court matters.

(Ontario Legal Aid Plan; Annual Report; 1971; p. 12)

With respect to Ontario's legal aid system, a federal study was conducted for the National Council of Welfare by Mr. Larry Taman, Law Clerk of Mr. Justice Bora Laskin of the Supreme Court of Canada. The study rejected the scheme as expensive and passive, in comparison to the storefront lawyers' program in the United States.

The Ontario Plan was criticized for its insignificant contribution toward improvement of the welfare of the poor.
The study says the plan would be pressed to point to a list of achievements which have done anything to substantially alter the positions of the poor clients. Lack of any outreach policy, less accessibility, and little effort to educate the client community combine to create a situation in which important problems are less likely to be brought forward.

(L. Taman; 1972; p. 63)

The study disapproved of the Ontario Legal Aid System's reliance on litigation rather than preventative work. More energy and time should be spent on problems such as rented premises that do not meet local housing standards, on the problem of vague eligibility standards for public housing, and on exposure of fraudulent finance companies.

The Taman report stated that the Ontario plan was costly in so far as the judicare lawyers were remunerated nearly at a normal rate. These lawyers are paid 75% of what they would normally charge a regular client.

In conclusion, the report recommended aggressive poverty law and neighbourhood law offices. Existing evidence seemed to indicate that the United States Neighbourhood Legal Services Programme was of a greater quality than the plan operating in Ontario, and that the NLSP was operating at a much lower cost per case than the Ontario plan. (L. Taman; 1971; p. 61-63). It is unfortunate that under the Ontario Plan, no provision is made for furnishing legal assistance at police stations.

In addition, in the fall of 1971, a legal aid clinic
was established in the West End of Toronto. The West End legal aid clinic was created in an attempt to break down the image of the lawyer as someone remote from the public. It also permits immediate and improved access to legal services for people in the West End Community. The West End Legal Aid Clinic has defined geographical boundaries and it will only serve residents located within these boundaries.

The staff consists of at least two full-time lawyers and a number of law students in second and third year of study who provide minor advice and legal assistance of a summary character. The clinic is supported by government funds and other charitable contributions.

The use of the clinic is to be supplemental to the Legal Aid Plan so as to provide the Plan with the necessary depth to ensure that the community is better served.

In light of the findings of Caplovitz and the theories of Gans and Suttles, particularly with regard to the provincial atmosphere which exists in poor areas, the clinical facilities located in areas of need would appear, to a large degree, to be the appropriate remedy in ameliorating the plight of the poor.

The fact that neighbourhood legal services programs in the United States have been operating successfully and cheaply (see Taman Report); the fact that Great Britain is now moving in this direction with a consideration of the "25 Pound Advice Scheme" which includes a proposal to redistribute
members of the "Practising Bar" into geographic areas of need (Community Legal Services Report; 1972; p. 26); the fact that Ontario has already adopted this clinical approach, is some evidence that a more efficient and effective manner of ameliorating the welfare of the poor is to establish various local legal aid clinics which, in time, will adapt to the general needs of the people in that particular locale.

In summary, legal aid plans supplemented with legal aid clinics become means through which the poor can obtain their rights to just treatment by others.

SECTION V

Foundation of Study:

The injustices to which the poor are liable represent situations contrary to a democratic society. As Ginsberg points out, arbitrary power must be rejected in order for justice to prevail. The poor, because of unfair consumer practices, lose income. They lose respect for others because of unfair operation of laws. Suttles and Gans inform us that they distrust and are suspicious of 'outsiders', i.e. object-oriented individuals. Indubitably, this distrust and suspicion results to some extent because of differential enforcement of laws.

Moreover, it is Coser's introduction of safety-valve institutions that makes the legal aid clinic a viable mediator between any conflict between the poor and "outsiders". It makes sense, then, to view the legal aid clinic as a safety-
valve which has the ability of maintaining stability in society. It also makes sense to examine the relationship between the "West Enders" of Toronto and the legal aid clinic in the community.

Certainly such an investigation would furnish answers to questions such as: "Has the legal aid program precluded improper exploitation of and distress among the disadvantaged?", i.e. Are the circumstances of the poor ameliorated? But initially, the study would want to focus on whether or not the poor recognize legal problems. As pointed out earlier, a person must first realize that he has a legal problem before he will seek out legal aid. Therefore, indicators of the variable recognition of a legal problem (RECOLPR) must be constructed. We would want to know whether or not recognition of a legal problem is related to use of clinic. In addition it is contended that if an individual is aware of his legal rights (AWOLRTS), then he would attempt to redress any injustice directed toward him. Perchance, awareness of one's legal rights is related to recognition of a legal problem and is directly or indirectly related to use of clinic.

Moreover, although an individual may be aware of his legal rights and recognize a legal problem he may not seek assistance because he is resigned to his situation. That is, the individual may not believe that he can employ the available legal services to his own advantage. As a result, they may subscribe to a "what's the use" attitude. Awareness of
clinic is another variable which we would want to study. Without a doubt West Enders cannot use the clinic unless they are first aware of it. Another significant variable related to both awareness of clinic and use of clinic is proximity to clinic. As Suttles declares the poor are extremely provincial and what goes on a few blocks away may be of no interest to them. Hence, unless the legal aid clinic solicits or advertizes their services, chances are that the West Enders who do not live near the clinic will not be aware of it. To sum up then, three other important variables are: awareness of legal clinic (AWOLCLC), proximity to clinic; and use of clinic (USOCLC).

Another variable which may be relevant is respect for law (RESFRLW). If West Enders recognize a legal problem, and have a legal problem and they are aware of the legal aid clinic, but do not utilize its facilities why don't they? Could it be that they do not have respect for the law? Thus, we would want to investigate this variable.

Perchance, the variable 'time in area' may be related to awareness of legal aid clinic and also to use of clinic. It was considered too. In addition, the effects of background variables such as age, sex and ethnicity on the variable 'use of clinic' were also inspected. Let us now peruse the methods which were adopted in operationalizing these concepts.
CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH
SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes three phenomena: 1) the sampling procedure 2) the interviewing technique, and 3) the interview schedule itself. Sixty members of the "West End" area of Toronto, Ontario were sampled and the method which was utilized was the random sample technique.

The Sample

Sixty heads of households or their spouses, who lived in the "West End" area of Toronto were selected from the total list of approximately twenty-four thousand heads of households who were living in that area*. These names were obtained from a reliable city directory. Every n th name was chosen until a total of sixty names was accumulated. Since any individual in the original sample could perhaps refuse to be interviewed, a substitution rate was adopted to remedy this circumstance.

Moreover, although sixty cases represents approximately a 0.3 per cent sample which is a relatively small sample size for such a large population, this was the maximum number of individuals that were able to be interviewed given our limited resources.

Table 1A to Table 4A present the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the sample.

*Appendix A shows the boundaries of the area from which our sample was drawn.
TABLE 1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>(10-30)</th>
<th>(31-45)</th>
<th>(46 &amp; over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Ukranian</th>
<th>Other**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The "OTHER" category contained members from various ethnic groups such as Italian, French, West Indian, Portuguese and Yugoslav.

TABLE 4A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS</th>
<th>Working class</th>
<th>Middle Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to Table 1A, our sample tended to be slightly male oriented. Thirty-five (35) males and twenty-five (25) females were sampled. With respect to Table 2A, the age of those sampled tended to be skewed toward the lower or middle ages. Twenty-five (25) individuals were between the ages of eighteen and thirty. Twenty-five (25) were between the ages of thirty-one and forty-five. Ten (10) people were forty-six years of age and over. From a perusal of Table 3A,
one notices that approximately a third (1/3) of the sample consisted of people with a British background. Ten (10) Ukranians and twenty-nine (29) "other" individuals were interviewed. The "other" category consisted of people with Italian, French, West Indian, Portuguese and Yugoslav backgrounds. With respect to Table 4A, our sample was predominately working class. Forty-eight (48) individuals who were sampled were classified as working class. Twelve (12) individuals were classified as middle class.

The Interview:

The interview technique contained four basic types of questions.* The problem areas which were selected for this interview schedule were similar to those difficulties which were alluded to by Caplovitz and Gans and Suttles.

The first section presented the respondent with hypothetical situations involving legal problems. The respondents were asked to indicate whether or not he (she) recognized these problems as legal ones and whether or not he (she) was resigned to his situation. That is, would he take some kind of legal action if he were confronted with a similar legal difficulty. In the second set of questions, the respondent was asked whether he was ever confronted with an actual legal problem and if so, what he did about it. He was asked whether he was aware of any legal aid clinic and specifically whether

* A copy of the Interview Schedule is found in Appendix 8.
he had utilized the West End clinic's facilities. The third type of question pertained to the respondent's attitude toward the law. He was asked various questions regarding, inter alia, the probity of lawyers, judges and policemen. The fourth type of question pertained to the respondent's awareness of his legal rights. He was asked to state whether various statements regarding, inter alia, a policeman's power or arrest and landlord-tenant responsibilities were true or false.

Moreover, questions contained in the interview schedule were coded and most questions were fixed-choice. However, some open-ended questions were included. Subsequently the interview schedule was pretested on ten (10) people from the West End area. These people were not part of the sample upon which this thesis is based. In addition, they were selected by the researcher on the basis of what he believed would reflect the social elements of the community. The pre-test or pilot study was performed primarily to work out any difficulties in the interview schedule so that any problems which were encountered in the pilot project would not reoccur when interviewing those in the sample.

The pilot study was necessary to provide answers with respect to

1) whether or not the interview schedule was too long and
2) whether or not the people of the area understood the questions.

With regard to the former, people would indubitably be bored with a lengthy interview and as a result may fail to
co-operate. Fortunately, this was not the case. Difficulties
with the latter were detected by the responses that indicated
the question could be interpreted many ways.

Also, it was planned that an equal number of females
and males would be interviewed in the pilot study to determine

1) whether or not one sex was aware or/and utilized
the clinic more than the other;
and
2) whether or not one sex recognized legal problems
to a greater degree than the other.

If the answers favoured one sex it would be sensible
to orient the study toward that particular sex. Certainly
there is justification for this approach, since the study is
primarily concerned with discovering the legal needs of the
population of the area of study. For example, if it was
initially known that the women or wives did not need to employ
the legal tools available, i.e., they never had problems which
required a legal solution, it would be frivolous to interview
them in an attempt to determine the legal needs of the
community. Although the above situation may have sociological
implications, it would not be the purpose of this thesis to
explore them.

In any event, the pilot study demonstrated that sex
did not seem to be a significant variable. Hence, a reasonable
number of females and males were interviewed in this study.
Since twenty per cent of those interviewed in the pretest
utilized the clinic's facilities, it was expected that
approximately the same percentage in the actual sample would employ
the clinic's services.

Moreover, the pretest sample of ten was actually too small to deduce whether or not the West Enders were inclined 1) to recognize legal problems, 2) to be resigned to their situation, or 3) to be aware of the existence of the West End clinic. The majority of those in the pretest were aware of their legal rights and they possessed average respect for law. As pointed out earlier, however, the main function of the pretest was to work out any problems in the interview schedule. Some revisions were necessary.

With respect to the hypothetical section, section one, it was necessary to place the open-ended question "What would you do" after sub-question "Do you think you probably would or wouldn't do something about it?" instead of after sub-question, "If that didn't work, where else would you try to get advice or help?"

When the open-ended sub-question was placed at the end of each question, the respondents were only repeating answers from earlier sub-questions or reading off names from a source list which was given to them previously. Hence, the open-ended sub-question was placed in an earlier position so that this difficulty could be avoided. Subsequently, the problem was resolved. Other problems were less severe. "Repossessed" was changed to "anything you bought from" (see question 15). In addition, the term "installment buying" was replaced by "have you bought anything on credit and agreed to pay for it on time?" (see Section V).
Once these problems were resolved, the study was undertaken.

Data collection:

The collection of data commenced early in the summer of 1973. It was felt that initially it would be fruitful to be familiar with the West End community and to discuss my intentions with the head of the West End Legal Aid Clinic. The author wanted the Clinic to realize the implication of this study so that the clinic's staff would realize that this project was not any attempt to undermine any contributions they may have made. Certainly, the co-operation the author received has been appreciated.

The Interview Schedule:

The interview schedule itself consisted of several major factors. All questions were coded so that the data could eventually be computerized.

The information on card one dealt primarily with background information such as age, sex, ethnicity and socio-economic status. Section one dealt with indicators of variables - recognition of a legal problem (RECOLPR) and not resigned to one's situation (NRETSN). These indicators portrayed themselves in the form of hypothetical questions regarding problems people may have with household appliances under guarantee, problems with apartment fixtures which the landlord refuses to repair; employer-employee relationships; and family problems and
difficulties encountered in installment buying.

Section two pertained to Housing and problems people may have had regarding their rented homes or apartments.

Section three related to jobs held by a head of the household and his or her spouse, the marital status of the interviewee and problems relating to work e.g. difficulty of collecting pay from an employer or difficulty receiving pay due to an injury received while working at a job.

Section four and five pertained to insurance problems and installment buying respectively.

Section two to five dealt with actual problems people have had as opposed to the hypothetical problems discussed in section one.

The final section, section 6, contained four relevant variables, awareness of the legal aid clinic, use of the clinic, respect for the law, and awareness of one's legal rights.

The responses to variable - awareness of legal clinic (AWOLCLC) were demonstrated through affirmative or negative answers to questions such as:

1) Are there any places in this city where a person can get free legal services or free legal advice?
2) Have you heard of the West End Legal Aid Clinic before this interview?
3) Can you tell me where their office is located approximately?

The single indicator of use of the legal clinic (USOLCLC)
was the question: Have you ever gone to or called the West End Legal Aid Clinic for legal services or advice?

Furthermore, in determining the individual's attitudes toward the law, various questions concerning his opinion of the probity of lawyers, policemen, and judges were asked. Thus the variable - respect for the law (RESFRLW) was created. In addition, true or false responses to questions regarding:

1) Individual's rights upon arrest.
2) Parental duties in disciplining their children.
3) Racial relations.
4) Landlord-tenant responsibilities were indicators of a person's awareness of his legal rights (AWOLRTS).

SECTION II

OPERATIONALIZATION OF EACH VARIABLE:

A) RECOLPR: Recognition of Legal Problem:

Since it is contended that recognition of a legal problem may have some bearing on whether or not an individual uses a legal aid clinic, it was mandatory that indicators of this variable be constructed. Caplovitz informs us that it is appropriate to view the poor as exploited consumers. They are abused in the sense of buying goods which are inferior in quality to the ones which they intended to purchase. They are subject to swindlers who may suggest to them that they invest their limited savings in various stocks while knowing very well that the stocks are worthless, etc. Hence six
indicators of "recognition of a legal problem" were created. Each is a legal problem and it is contended that these indicators do consist of typical situations in which the poor may be involved. Various circumstances were picked as problem areas.

The six indicators are:

1) Regarding whether or not an individual recognized the purchase of a faulty refrigerator and the refusal of the store owner to take it back as a problem.
2) Regarding whether or not an individual recognized the refusal of the landlord to fix faulty plumbing as a legal problem.
3) Regarding whether or not an individual perceived the refusal of his employer to pay him "back pay" as a legal problem.
4) Regarding whether or not an individual perceived his son riding in a stolen car as a legal problem.
5) Regarding whether or not an individual perceived his underage son drinking as a legal problem.
6) Regarding whether or not an individual believed that the repossession of his car by a dealer was a legal problem.

The cutting points, i.e., the points which became the dividing lines for low, average, and high recognition of a legal problem were three and five on a scale of six. These cutting points were chosen in order to obtain the most even distribution.

Individuals who answered positively three responses or less were considered to have low recognition of a legal
problem. Those who answered four or five responses positively were thought to have average recognition of a legal problem while those who responded affirmatively to six questions were considered to have high recognition of a legal problem.

Hence the cutting points with respect to the variable RECOLPR and in terms of frequency distribution were as follows:
(see Table A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions: Re: RECOLPR</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six (6) individuals had low RECOLPR; thirty-three (33) had average RECOLPR; and twenty-one (21) had high RECOLPR.

B) NRETNN: Not Resigned to One's Situation:

It is also contended that the variable "not resigned to one situation" may have a bearing on "use of clinic". If West Enders are not resigned to their situation perchance they would use the clinic if they recognize their problem as a legal one. There is some evidence that the poor are not resigned.

As Gans suggests

Although the poorer people do not have as high expectations as the well-to-do they are no more willing to live with defective plumbing than anyone else.

(H. Gans; 1968; p. 14)

On the other hand, Caplovitz believes that the poor
are too intimidated to exercise their rights even when they do know them. Hence, it may be worthwhile to study the relationship between "not resigned to one's situation" and "use of clinic".

There were twelve indicators of the variable "not resigned to one's situation": the twelve indicators pertained to the above six hypothetical situations and to each were added the following two questions:

1) Do you think you probably would or wouldn't do something about it?
2) Would you try to get some advice or help about this or not?

The indicators of NRETSN were computerized such that a score-range from 0-12 would be produced. Zero (0) would indicate that the individual(s) would not do anything about a particular problem and twelve (12) would indicate that the individuals were completely unresigned to their situation.

The cutting points for the variable NRETSN were five and eight. These points were chosen in order to obtain the most even distribution. Hence individuals with a score of five or lower were considered to be somewhat unresigned to their situation. People with a score from six to eight inclusive were reasonably unresigned and those who had a score above eight were believed to be highly unresigned to their situation. (see Table 8)
TABLE B

NRETSN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENCY</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four individuals were somewhat unresigned to their situation, twenty-four were reasonably unresigned and thirty-two were highly unresigned to their situation.

C) AWOLCLC: Awareness of Legal Clinic:

This variable was studied to estimate the awareness people have of the West End clinic. That is, if the West Enders are not too aware of the clinic's existence, perhaps more can be done to inform them. Perhaps the clinic can increase the numbers of its advertisements.

There were three indicators of this variable:

a) Are there any places in this city where a person can get free legal services, or free legal advice? (see p. 120 of Appendix B).

b) Have you heard of the West End Legal Aid Clinic before this interview. (see p. 120 of Appendix B).

c) Can you tell me where their office is located? (see p. 120 of Appendix B).

The cutting points with respect to this variable were such that if an individual answered question (a) negatively then he was placed in the NAWOLCLC category. If he responded
positively to question (a) and negatively to question (b), then he was placed in the AWOLCLC category. If he answered question (a) and (b) affirmatively and gave at least the approximation of the legal clinic's location, he was placed in the AWOPCLC category. Therefore the cutting points were as follows: (see Table C).

**TABLE C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AWOPCLC</th>
<th>AWOLCLC</th>
<th>NAWOLCLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AWOPCLC - awareness of West End Clinic
AWOLCLC - awareness of any legal clinic
NAWOLCLC - not aware of any legal clinic

Thirty-seven individuals were aware of the West End Clinic. Twelve individuals were aware of some other legal aid clinic such as the legal clinic on St. George Street. Thus, forty-nine people who were sampled were aware of some legal assistance clinic. Eleven people were not aware of any legal aid clinic.

D) USOCLC: Use of Clinic

This study is oriented toward the West Enders interaction with the West End clinic. Some queries which we wish to answer are: "Do the West Enders use the clinic?" and "Are they satisfied with the assistance they receive?" Therefore, it is compulsory to include this dependent variable in the interview schedule.
The single indicator of variable "use of clinic" was:
Have you ever gone to the West End legal aid clinic for legal services or called for legal advice?

The frequency distribution for the variable USOCLC was the following. (see Table D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USOCLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respect for Law:
Since it is believed that "respect for law" may be related to "use of clinic", this variable was investigated. Twelve indicators of this variable were constructed. They pertained to the West Enders attitudes toward lawyers, policemen and judges. In addition, one question asked whether or not the West Enders perceived a poor man as having the same chance of succeeding in court as a rich man.

Moreover, each indicator of this variable was scaled from "strongly agree" to "agree" to "disagree" to "strongly disagree". The "strongly agree" category was given a score of (1); the "agree" category had a score of (2); the "disagree" category had a score of (3) and the "strongly disagree" category had a score of (4). Thus, the lowest score a West Ender could attain would be twelve (12), and the highest score he could attain would be forty-eight (48). The lower numbers represent
respect for law (strongly agree or agree) and the higher numbers portray lack of respect for the law (disagree or strongly disagree).

The indicators of variable "respect for the law" (RESFRLW) are amply demonstrated below along with the frequency distributions for each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Most lawyers are interested in helping people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) It is easy to find a lawyer you can trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A lawyer is always fighting for his client</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) If someone has a good lawyer he has a great advantage over others</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Most lawyers are honest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) A lawyer these days is not mixed up with crooked businessmen or crooked politicians.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Lawyers really understand ordinary people's problems</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) A lawyer will take the side of a person in trouble before he will take the side of the police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) On the whole policemen are honest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) On the whole judges are honest</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
k) It's NOT O.K. to lie in court to protect a friend who is on trial 12 41 5 2

l) In court a poor man has the same chance of winning as a rich man 4 16 27 13

Subsequently three categories were created with the following frequency distribution: (see Table E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>RESFRLW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (20-25) (high respect for law)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (26-29) (Average resp. for law)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (30-35) (Low resp. for law)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the cutting points for this variable were twenty-five and twenty-nine. Any score of twenty-five or less was considered to represent high respect for law (1), a score from twenty-six (26) to twenty-nine (29) inclusive represented average respect for law (2) and a score of over twenty-nine (29) represented low respect for law (3). Thus, nineteen West Enders had high respect for the law, twenty-four had average respect for the law and seventeen individuals had low respect for the law.

F) AWOLRTS: Awareness of Legal Rights:

It is advocated that "awareness of legal rights" may
have a bearing on whether or not an individual will utilize the West End Clinic's facilities. As pointed out previously it is contended that if an individual is aware of his legal rights, he should be able to recognize a legal problem and, if and when necessary, he should attempt to acquire legal assistance to resolve his difficulty. Consequently, ten indicators of this variable were created. The indicators pertained to 1) a police officer's power of arrest 2) parental rights and liability regarding their children 3) installment buying obligations and 4) landlord-tenant relations. Moreover, each indicator is accompanied by a score of one (1) for a correct response and a score of two (2) for an incorrect response. A correct response with respect to the first statement would be to indicate that it was false. That is, if a policeman stops you on the street (but does not arrest you) and takes you to headquarters, you do not have to answer any questions.*

The indicators of variable "awareness of legal rights" (AWOLRTS) are demonstrated below along with the frequency distributions for each indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See C. Ruby and P. Copeland; 1971; p. 15-17.
b) If a policeman arrests you and takes you to headquarters, you have a right to call a lawyer before answering any questions.  
Correct: 58  
Incorrect: 2

c) If you were on trial for a crime and couldn't pay for a lawyer, the court would have to appoint one for you.  
Correct: 57  
Incorrect: 3

d) Parents have a right to punish their children any way they want.  
Correct: 52  
Incorrect: 8

e) When husband and wife are divorced the mother always gets custody of the children.  
Correct: 53  
Incorrect: 7

f) Parents have a legal duty to provide the ordinary needs of a minor child.  
Correct: 58  
Incorrect: 2

g) Parents are liable for intentional damage their children do to the property of others.  
Correct: 53  
Incorrect: 7

h) A person who owns a restaurant or a hotel can refuse to serve someone because of his colour or race.  
Correct: 53  
Incorrect: 7

i) If you buy a television set at a department store on credit and don't pay for it, the department store has the right to come and take it back.  
Correct: 59  
Incorrect: 1

j) A landlord is legally responsible for taking care of peeling and blistering paint on walls of a residential building he is renting out.  
Correct: 58  
Incorrect: 2

Each individual who was sampled had a score ranging from ten (10) to twenty (20). In this instance the lower numbers represent high awareness of legal rights while the high numbers demonstrate low awareness of legal rights.
Since the scores ranged from ten (10) to thirteen (13), three categories were created with the following frequency distribution: (see Table F).

**TABLE F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1 (10)</th>
<th>2 (11-12)</th>
<th>3 (13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High AWOLRTS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5 (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average AWOLRTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low AWOLRTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, a recode card was employed to collapse the scores into the above three categories.

The cutting points were ten (10) which represented high awareness of legal rights, twelve (12) which demonstrated average awareness of legal rights and thirteen (13) which represented low awareness of legal rights.

G) Proximity to Clinic:

Suttles declares that an "isolation effect" does occur in poor areas. At least, he advocated that the residents of the Addams Area were extremely provincial. It is anticipated that such an effect exists in the West End area of Toronto. As a result, it is expected that people who live near the clinic are more inclined to be aware of it and use its facilities when required than are the people who live further away from it. Therefore, the variable "proximity to clinic" became an important part of this study.

The address of the sampled individual was the indicator of his or her proximity to the legal aid clinic.
With the aid of a map of the West End area of Toronto and a scale, three sections were constructed. A radius of one inch and a quarter \((1\frac{1}{4})\) from the legal aid clinic represented the area "close to the clinic". A radius of two and one half inches \((2\frac{1}{2})\) represented the section "a reasonable distance from the clinic". A radius of three and three-quarter inches \((3\ 3/4)\) represented the section "far from the clinic".

The frequency distribution for this variable was the following: (see Table G).

**TABLE G**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximity to Clinic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>close to clinic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance from clinic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far from clinic</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifteen (15) individuals lived near the clinic (that is within a half mile radius of the clinic). Twenty-four (24) individuals lived a reasonable distance from the clinic (that is within a mile radius of the clinic). Twenty-one (21) individuals were located far from the clinic due to the fact that they were within a mile and a half radius of the clinic.

H) Time in Area:

The variable "time in area" seems to be a possible significant factor. To be sure, the longer one lives in an area, the more familiar he becomes with its activities and
available facilities. Therefore, it is contended that the longer an individual lives in the West End, the more likely he is to be aware of the clinic.

The indicator for the variable "time in area" was represented by the question, "How long have you been in this West End area of Toronto?" (see p.127, Appendix B)

Scores from this variable ranged from one (1) to fifty (50). This distribution was later reduced into three groups.

The cutting points were two (2) and five (5). In other words, people who lived in this West End area for two years or less were considered to be "new to the area". People who lived from three (3) to five (5) years in the area were thought to have lived a "reasonable time in the area". Those who lived in the area for more than five years were considered to be situated in the region for a "long time".

The frequency distribution is produced in Table H.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new to area</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable time in area</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long time in area</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, seventeen (17) individuals were "new to the area", twenty-one (21) people had lived in the area for a reasonable length of time and twenty-two (22) have lived in the West End area for a "long time".
I) Sex

Since sex did not appear to be a significant variable in the pilot study it was anticipated that it would remain insignificant in the main study. However, this variable was studied anyway.

The frequency distributions regarding this variable are produced in Table I.

TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Frequency</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Frequency</td>
<td>25 (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J) Age

Originally, there were nine (9) age groupings, however, due to the limited frequencies in some of the groups, it was decided to collapse the age variable into three (3) categories. The frequency distributions are as follows (see Table J).

TABLE J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (18 - 30)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (31 - 45)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (46 and over)</td>
<td>10 (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, twenty-five (25) individuals were between the ages of eighteen (18) and thirty (30). Twenty-five were between the ages of thirty-one (31) and forty-five (45). Ten (10) people were forty-six (46 years of age or over).
K) Ethnicity

It was expected that some individuals who were recent immigrants to Toronto may not be able to speak or comprehend English. This fact not only means that they probably would be uninformed with respect to activities in the West End, but that they may be too intimidated to inquire about, or fight for, their legal rights.

It was unfortunate though, that the author could only speak English. As a result, this study had to be oriented to English speaking West Enders.

Originally eight (8) ethnic categories were established. However, due to the small frequencies with respect to most of the ethnic groups, it was decided to create only three categories. They were 1) British 2) Ukranian and 3) other.

Since the British and Ukranian groups contained the largest frequencies, it was decided that they should be left untouched and all other ethnic groups were placed in the "other" category.

The frequency distributions are found in Table K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Ukranian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29 (60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, the sample consisted of twenty-one (21) British individuals, ten (10) Ukranian people and twenty-nine (29)
"other" individuals. This latter category contained members from various ethnic groups such as Italian, French, West Indian, Portuguese and Yugoslav.
CHAPTER III: ANALYSIS OF DATA
SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

The function of this chapter is initially to provide the reader with an understanding of the analytic structure and terminology that is employed throughout the following sections.

The actual problems encountered by the sampled individuals will also be discussed and subsequently a micro-analysis of the relevant variables will be performed.

The sample was initially divided into two categories - the poor and middle class. The division was based on the author's estimation of the socio-economic status of each sampled individual. Education, occupation and income along with life style were used to determine one's socio-economic status. Primarily income was the determining factor such that an individual with an income of $7,500 and over was considered to be a member of the middle class. An individual with an income less than $7,500 was considered "poor" or "disadvantaged".

The next step was to subdivide the poor's situation into "clinic" problems, "non-clinic" problems and "no" problems.

Income along with the seriousness of the problem* were

*Through a conversation with Mr. D. Cornfield, the author was informed that the legal aid scheme is primarily designed for serious problems and that the legal aid clinic's work load is based on omission from legislation. The legal aid clinic is a supplement to the legal aid scheme.
utilized to determine whether an individual had a clinic or non-clinic problem.

If the problem was serious and the individual could have qualified or did qualify for legal aid, then he was thought to have a non-clinic problem.

Moreover, if legal aid is available, then the individual is advised to go to a legal aid lawyer (i.e. a lawyer working in harmony with the legal aid scheme) for advice.

In the event that general legal practitioners are not interested in the individual's legal problem, then he can always turn to the legal representative of the legal aid clinic for assistance.

Individuals with no problems were naturally placed in the "no" problem category.

Subsequently, the clinic problem section was subdivided into people who used the clinic and those who did not use it. These subdivisions were again split into:

1) clinic problems which were resolved, and
2) those which were not resolved.

The non-clinic problems were subdivided into

1) those difficulties that were resolved, and
2) those that were not resolved.

With regard to the middle class section, their problems
were divided into

1) the 'problem' category, and
2) the 'no' problem category

There was no need to subdivide this 'problem' category into clinic and non-clinic problems, because the middle class are not eligible for legal assistance due to opulence.

Finally, it is necessary to explain the terms 'general legal practitioner' and 'legal representative'. The former term refers to a lawyer other than one working for the legal aid clinic. He may take 'legal aid' cases through the legal aid scheme, but he is not a member of the legal aid clinic. The latter term refers to the lawyers and/or law students employed by, or working for, the legal aid clinic.

Let us now peruse some of the problems that the West Enders encountered.

**SECTION II**

**Actual Problems Encountered**

This section serves two purposes. Initially, it presents a diagram to illustrate both the number of poor West Enders who had problems and the type of problem they encountered. Some individuals had no problems, others had clinic problems, while still others had non-clinic difficulties. Subsequently, the reader is furnished with knowledge regarding the actual problems that confront the poor.

From an analysis of the data, it becomes apparent that twenty-seven disadvantaged individuals had problems which re-
quired legal assistance. One of these twenty-seven individuals refused to answer regarding the nature of his problem. However, it was believed that his difficulty was one that the West End legal aid clinic could handle. In addition, twenty-one poor individuals had no problems. Sixteen of the twenty-seven individuals had clinic problems while eleven had what was termed non-clinic problems.

Moreover, eleven of the sixteen people with clinical difficulties actually employed the clinic's facilities and all eleven individuals were satisfied with the way things finally turned out.
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Moreover, an investigation of the actual problems encountered by the eleven people who utilized the clinic's facilities and the four individuals who did not use the clinic revealed the following information.

Those who used the centre had difficulties such as

1) A father-in-law died and did not leave a will. As a result, it was necessary to have some paper work performed regarding this matter in order that the estate could be settled.

2) There existed a couple of marital problems. One individual elaborated to the point of explaining that her husband "beat her and the kid up."

3) Another marital problem dealt with visiting right regarding his child. Apparently one spouse was not allowing the other access to the child.

These marital problems were handled in a "counselling" manner such that both parties to the conflict were brought to understand their legal rights and obligations.

4) There were landlord-tenant problems. One pertained to the lack of garbage pick-up to the extent that the garbage was left in the hallways of an apartment building. A terrible odour prevailed throughout the building.

Another landlord-tenant problem dealt with the landlord refusing to abide by the contractual agreement with the tenant. In this case, the tenant made repairs to the bathroom and was not reimbursed by the landlord until a
legal representative of the clinic threatened to initiate a court action.

Also a landlord refused to pay back a portion of a tenant rent deposit.

5) An old age pensioner was receiving less money regarding pension payments than he should have received. He complained about this matter.

6) Another case dealt with an immigration matter. The details of this situation were not revealed to the author.

7) There was also a consumer problem. One individual purchased a stereo set and speakers but the speakers were of a lower quality than what the individual had bargained for. A call from the clinic redressed this situation.

Furthermore, those who had clinic problems but did not use the clinic had difficulties such as:

1) Their husbands had died and both went to lawyers who were to manage their estates. One woman complained that the lawyer even "charged for opening a letter." The other women was satisfied with the outcome.

2) An individual complained of a nuisance created by a neighbour. He handled the matter himself by admonishing the neighbour that he would call the police.

3) There existed a landlord-tenant problem in which the lady complained that "all her taps dripped." The landlord was to send a repairman to fix the trouble but no one appeared for a long time. In this instance, the woman persisted
until the "landlord got tired of hearing my voice and
sent a plumber over" to fix the taps.

4) One male refused to reveal the nature of his problem.

It is interesting to note that only one individual
of the five who had clinic problems but did not use the clinic
was pleased with her lawyer. By the way, her lawyer happened
to be her son. The others either resolved their problems
themselves or were unsatisfied with the lawyer's manner of
managing the affair.

With respect to the non-clinic problems, they were,
on the whole, of a different kind than those experienced by
the more disadvantaged individuals.

The majority of difficulties were encountered when
one bought a home. It was necessary to acquire the services
of a lawyer to draw up relevant documents such as the deed of
land and/or the mortgage instruments.

Other problems pertained to

1) The purchase of a chattel on credit which was in bad
condition. The individual bought a sewing machine which
did not operate properly. She had placed a $20.00 deposit
on the machine.

She had written letters to the Better Business Bureau
and to the head office of the sewing company. Eventually,
the machine was fixed so she paid the balance which she
owed.

2) Overpayment of an airline ticket. In this case, an air-
line agent made a mistake to the detriment of the passenger. As a result, she had to pay extra money for the airflight. The problem is currently being handled by a lawyer and she hasn't "heard from him in five months."

3) One man had a landlord-tenant problem. In fact, he was a blatant example of one who was "resigned to his situation." His problem pertained to a plugged sink. He complained to me that due to the improper drainage a revolting scent existed. Query! Why did he not complain about his problem to the landlord? His response to this question was "what's the use, he'll only kick me out."

In retrospect, what can be said regarding the legal clinic in the West End area of Toronto. Primarily, the clinic is very functional. All the individuals who went to the clinic for assistance were satisfied with the aid they received. In addition, the clinic has resolved sixty-nine percent (68.7%) of the problems which could have been handled by it.

Further, in comparing the predicament of the disadvantaged individuals with non-clinic problems and the middle-class people with legal problems, one notices that one hundred percent (100%) of the middle class problems were resolved by lawyers and satisfactorily. However, thirty-six percent (36.3%) of the disadvantaged with non-clinic problems were either unhappy with the results or have not resolved their problems to date.

In summation then, sixty-seven percent (66.7%) of the
problems encountered by the disadvantaged were resolved by a lawyer while the remainder were

1) Resolved without any "outside" assistance.
2) Still remain unresolved or
3) Were handled by a lawyer unsatisfactorily.

Examples of the above three circumstances have already been discussed but they will be mentioned again very briefly.

An example of the first situation was the woman who had "dripping taps." Her problem was resolved through constant persistence. She never gave up and eventually her problem was resolved.

An example of the second was the man with the plugged sink. His problem remains unresolved and it appears as though he is willing to live with it.

Finally, the case of overpayment of an airline ticket is an example of the third situation.

With respect to a comparison between clinic and non-clinic problems, eighty-eight (87.5%) percent of the clinical problems were resolved satisfactorily while sixty-four (63.7%) percent of the non-clinical problems were resolved to the individual's contentment.

It is interesting to note that although all the people who went to the legal aid clinic were satisfied with the outcome of their problems which had been managed by some legal representative, only one person who had a clinical problem and did not utilize the clinic's facilities actually received satisfaction via a lawyer.
The people in the latter category were more prone to handle their own problems for better or worse. This finding, although not conclusive, may suggest that the quality of assistance at the legal aid clinic is unique and responsive to the needs of the community. In other words, people not only consider the clinic to be functional but they also do not regard it as an 'outside' organization. It is one that is seen to be person-oriented - a clinic that is working for the people of the area.

Moreover, when these citizens attempt to handle their difficulties themselves, or by a general legal practitioner, their problem-solving success rate is reduced. According to Gans, this would lead the people to consider legal help via the general legal practitioner as "outside" aid. That is, the lawyer is viewed as an object-oriented person who is seeking material gain at their expense.

A more intensive investigation of the relationships between the various variables and the dependent variable, "use of clinic" is provided in the following section.

SECTION III

A Micro-analysis of the Relationships between the Relevant Variables

The function of this section is to analyze the reasons why West Enders did or did not utilize the clinic's facilities. This task is achieved by studying the associations of each relevant variable with the dependent variable, "use of clinic".
A number of tables have been included to facilitate the analysis. Each table has a basic format. It is divided into clinic and non-clinic problems with subsections of "no-problem" "use of clinic" (USOCLC) and "non-use of clinic" (NUSOCLC) which related to clinic problems and further subdivisions of "problem resolved" and "problem not resolved" which related to non-clinic problems.

It should be remembered that non-clinic problems differed from clinic problems in that with respect to the former, some individuals were too affluent to obtain assistance from the West End clinic. Also, their problems may have been of a serious nature and as a result, they would have been referred to the Legal Aid Plan or to a general legal practitioner. Subsequently, information is provided with respect to how West Enders became aware of the legal aid clinic's existence. Let us now peruse the following tables.

A) RECOLPR: (Recognition of a Legal Problem):

**TABLE 1**

Contingency Table Regarding The Relationship Between Recognition Of A Legal Problem And Use Of Clinic Controlling For The Type Of Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Prob.</td>
<td>USOCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>1( 4.8)</td>
<td>2(18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAV</td>
<td>12(57.1)</td>
<td>6(54.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHP</td>
<td>8(38.1)</td>
<td>3(27.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From an analysis of Table 1, it is apparent that the largest group of people have average recognition of legal problems. Furthermore, ninety (89.5%) percent of the disadvantaged have average and high recognition of legal problems.

With respect to clinic problems, one notices that fifty-five (54.6%) percent of those who used the clinic had average recognition of a legal problem, whereas eighty percent (80.0%) of those who did not use the clinic had average recognition of a legal problem.

However, this difference becomes minimal when one considers that another twenty-seven (27.3%) percent of those who used the clinic had high recognition of a legal problem. With respect to non-clinic problems, forty-four (44.4%) percent of the individuals who resolved their problems had average RECOLPR while fifty (50.0%) percent of the people who did not resolve their problems had average RECOLPR. Fifty-seven (57.1%) percent of those who had "no" problems had average RECOLPR.

Thus, from a perusal of Table 1, the variable "recognition of a legal problem" does not seem to be significant in any way. The vast majority of indigent people sampled have average RECOLPR at least, regardless of whether they have clinical or non-clinical problems.
B) NRETSN: (Not Resigned to One's Situation):

TABLE 2
Contingency Table Regarding The Relationship Between Not Resigned To One's Situation And Use Of Clinic Controlling For Type Of Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N R SRES</td>
<td>1 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E T NONRES</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Hi NON N RES</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the large majority of people are not "resigned to their situation." In other words, generally the people of this West End community will stand up for their rights.

With respect to clinic problems, all individuals i.e. all those who used the clinic and all those who did not use it were not resigned to their situation.

Seventy-three (72.8%) percent of the people who used the clinic were not resigned while forty (40.0%) percent of the people who did not use the clinic were not resigned to their situation.

However, when the "high non-resignation" category is perused, it is apparent that one hundred (100.0%) percent of both the people who used the clinic and those who did not were not resigned to their situation.

With respect to the non-clinic problems, seventy-eight percent (77.8%) of the people who resolved their problems were
either not resigned or highly unresigned to their situation. 

One hundred (100.0%) percent of those who did not resolve their problems were highly unresigned to their situation.

Thus the vast majority of the disadvantaged who were sampled were not resigned to their situation.

Now, let us investigate the extreme cases. That is, the individuals who were somewhat resigned to their circumstance.

One person did not have any problems so it is difficult to determine how he would react if he was in an actual legal predicament. Also the two individuals who had non-clinic problems and were resigned to their situation, had their problems resolved by lawyers. Query! Why did these resigned individuals seek aid? First, it is possible that the variable "non-resignation to one's situation" is not associated with resolution of one's problem. Second, Both problems dealt with the purchase of a home and the need for a lawyer to draw up the relevant legal documents. This type of legal situation is, perchance not one which would cause embarrassment or shame on the part of the vendor or purchaser but contentment. It is a problem with positive consequences.

In any event, the variable "non resignation to one's situation" does not appear to be significantly related to "use of clinic."
C) AWOLCLC: (Awareness of Legal Clinic):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Prob.</td>
<td>USOCCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n  (%)</td>
<td>NUSOCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAWOLCLC</td>
<td>4 (19.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOLCLC</td>
<td>3 (14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOPCLC</td>
<td>14 (66.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. resolved</td>
<td>NUSOCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n  (%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. not resolved</td>
<td>2 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n  (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (33.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (18.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (18.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One important conclusion which can be drawn from Table 3, is the fact that approximately sixty-three percent (62.5%) of the disadvantaged people sampled were aware of the legal aid clinic in the West End of Toronto.

Perchance, this suggests that the legal aid clinic could do more effective and/or more efficient advertising.

Indubitably, only the people who are aware of the clinic can use it.

It is interesting to note that only twenty (20.0%) percent of those with a clinic problem who did not use the clinic, were aware of the West End legal clinic. Possibly more individuals in the "non use of clinic" category would have employed the clinic's facilities had they been aware of it.
D) AWOLRTS: (Awareness of Legal Rights):

TABLE 4
Contingency Table Regarding The Relationship Between Awareness of Legal Rights And Use Of Clinic Controlling For Type Of Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)/n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>0 (0.0)/0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>14(66.6)/9 (81.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>7 (33.3)/2 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a perusal of Table 4, it is apparent that the majority of people had at least average awareness of their legal rights. Seventy-one (70.8%) percent of the disadvantaged had average awareness of their legal rights.

With respect to clinic problems, those who used the clinic were more aware of their legal rights (99.9%) than those who did not use the clinic (80.0%).

Although both groups were very aware of their rights there may be a slight tendency for those people who are more aware of their legal rights to utilize the clinic's facilities than those people who are slightly less aware of their rights.

With respect to the non-clinic problems, those who resolved their problems are much more aware of their legal rights (88.8%) than those who did not resolve their difficulties (50.0%).

Hence, although the evidence is not conclusive, one might say that those who are aware of their legal rights have a greater tendency to resolve their problem and/or use the clinic.
In addition, one hundred (100.0%) percent of the people with no problems had average or high awareness of their legal rights.

E) An analysis of Table 5 demonstrates that a large percentage of the sampled citizens have low respect for the law.

RESFRLW: (Respect for the law):

TABLE 5
Contingency Table Regarding The Relationship Between Respect For Law And Use Of Clinic Controlling For Type Of Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E LO</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S AV</td>
<td>5 (23.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R HI</td>
<td>6 (28.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>21 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately forty-six (45.5%) percent of those who used the clinic had low respect for the law. Generally thirty-five (35.4%) percent of the disadvantaged sampled had low respect for the law.

One hundred (100.0%) percent of those with clinic problems who did not use the clinic either had average or high respect for the law.

With regard to non-clinic problems, the majority (77.7%) of those who resolved their problems had average or high respect for the law while all of those who did not resolve their difficulties had average respect for the law.
The above facts are enlightening when one recalls Gants theory. The people who used the clinic are less likely to accept "outsiders" and in this case the legal profession generally. Although everyone who went to the clinic was satisfied with the outcome of their problems, it is possible that they still view this organization with some suspicion as they do the general legal practitioner. It is suspicion in the sense that the clinic is new to the area and one to which people may not be completely familiar. As a result, they act toward it with caution.

In addition, some general legal practitioners may not wish to handle a pauper's problem with the view that it is trivial. Such conduct may only reinforce the disadvantaged person's negative opinion of the legal profession and it may also reinforce his suspicion of any legal organization which holds itself out as a protector of people's right.*

F) Proximity to Clinic:

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingency Table Regarding The Relationship Between Proximity To Clinic And Use Of Clinic Controlling For Type Of Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinic Problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P To</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reas. Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This interpretation is based on theoretical information and the author's own perception of the people in this West End area.
The majority (72.7%) of those who used the clinic lived near the clinic.

The majority (80.0%) of those who did not use the clinic but had clinical problems lived a reasonable distance from it.

With respect to non-clinic problems, all those who resolved their problems lived a reasonable distance or far from the clinic.

Again, one cannot make any definite conclusions regarding the association between proximity to clinic and use of clinic but it would appear that those who live in proximity to the clinic are more likely to use the facilities. Whereas those who live further from the clinic are less likely to use it.

G) Time In Area:

TABLE 7
Contingency Table Regarding The Relationship Between Time In The Area And Use Of Clinic Controlling For Type Of Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time In Area</th>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Prob. USOC</td>
<td>NUSOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New In Area</td>
<td>6(28.5)</td>
<td>3(27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Time</td>
<td>8(38.1)</td>
<td>6(54.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Time</td>
<td>7(33.3)</td>
<td>2(18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21(100.0)</td>
<td>11(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only significance of Table 7, is to demonstrate that the length of time in the West End community seems to have little effect concerning one's use of the clinic.
One would think that the longer an individual lives in the area the greater chance he would have to familiarize himself with various events or happenings in the area such as the establishment of the West End legal aid clinic. However this was not the case.

Although the majority (54.6%) of those who used the clinic lived in the area for a reasonable amount of time, a large percentage (27.3%) of those in this group were new to the area.

With respect to clinic problems and those who did not use the clinic, forty (40.0%) percent of these individuals were new to the area. Would these same individuals have gone to the clinic had they been aware of it?

Perchance, periodic advertising regarding the function and location of the clinic may correct this difficulty in the event that the problem does present itself.

H) Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>Non-clinic Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Prob.</td>
<td>USOCCLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to Table 8, it appears that sex has little effect on whether or not a person would use the clinic's
facilities. Fifty-five (54.5%) percent of those who used the clinic were male while forty-six (45.5%) percent were female.

It is also important to remember that more males than females are represented in this "disadvantaged" section.

The USOCLC percentages regarding males and females corresponds to the total percentage regarding males and females. The finding is in accordance with the information derived from the pilot study. That is, it was the author's contention that sex would not have a bearing on whether or not an individual would avail himself of the client's resources.

With regard to non-clinic problems, there exists a slight tendency for males to resolve their problems to a greater extent than the females. The percentages are sixty-seven (66.6%) percent and thirty-three (33.3%) percent respectively.

I) Age:

| Table 9 |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Clinic Problem** | **Non-clinic Problem** | **No Prob.** | **USOCLC** | NUSOCLC | Prob. resolved | Prob. not resolved | N (%) |
| **Age Group** | | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | n (%) | |
| 18-30 | 9(42.8) | 3(27.3) | 2(40.0) | 3(33.3) | 2(100.0) | 19(39.5) |
| 31-45 | 10(47.6) | 6(54.6) | 1(20.0) | 5(55.5) | 0(0.0) | 22(45.8) |
| 46 & Over | 2(9.5) | 2(18.1) | 2(40.0) | 1(11.1) | 0(0.0) | 7(14.6) |
| Total | 21(100.0) | 11(100.0) | 5(100.0) | 9(100.0) | 2(100.0) | 48(100.0) |

The initial point to be remembered is that the largest category of people sampled were between thirty-one and forty-five years of age. The second point to be remembered is that
in analyzing Tables 9 and 10, a comparison will be made between the percentages of the various columns and the percentages of the "total" column.

When comparing clinic problems and non-clinic problems with the "total" percentages for each category, one notices that the percentages for those who used the clinic and were between 31-45 years of age (54.6%) and for those who resolved their problems and were between 31-45 years of age (55.5%) were greater than the total percentage (45.8%) for that age category.

With respect to clinic problems, twenty-seven percent (27.3%) of those who used the clinic were in the 18-30 age category. This percentage is lower than the total percentage (39.5%) for that age category. Moreover eighteen percent (18.1%) of those who used the clinic were in the "46 and over" age group. This percentage is a few percentage points above the total percentage (14.6%) for that age group.

Since the (N) for the latter age group is small, it is believed that the best indicator regarding use of clinic lies with the 31-45 age category.

With respect to non-clinic problems, thirty-three percent (33.3%) of those who resolved their problems were in the 18-30 category. This is below the "total percentage" (39.5%) for that particular age category. Also, eleven percent (11.1%) of those who resolved their problems were in the "46 and over" group. This fact is below the "total percentage" (14.6%) for this age group.

In summation, it appears that the 31-45 age group is more inclined to use the clinic and to resolve its problems.
than any other age group.

J) Ethnicity:

**TABLE 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinic Problem</th>
<th>No Prob. USOCLC</th>
<th>NUSOCLC</th>
<th>Prob. resolved</th>
<th>Prob. not resolved</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH</td>
<td>8 (38.1)</td>
<td>5 (45.5)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKRAINIAN</td>
<td>3 (14.2)</td>
<td>2 (18.1)</td>
<td>1 (20.0)</td>
<td>2 (22.2)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>10 (47.6)</td>
<td>4 (36.3)</td>
<td>2 (40.0)</td>
<td>5 (55.5)</td>
<td>2 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 (100.0)</td>
<td>11 (100.0)</td>
<td>5 (100.0)</td>
<td>9 (100.0)</td>
<td>2 (100.0)</td>
<td>48 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 can be summarized briefly. It appears that the people with a British background do use the clinic more than other ethnic groups.

The percentage of British who used the clinic (45.5%) is greater than the total percent (35.4%) of British comprising the "disadvantaged" section.

The same is true of the Ukranians. That is, the percentage of Ukranians who used the clinic (18.1%) is greater than the total percent (16.6%) of Ukranians comprising the "disadvantaged" section.

Moreover, with respect to those with a British background, forty percent (40.0%) of these individuals did not use the clinic. This fact also represents a greater percentage than that which exists in the "total."

Hence, it becomes evident that no definite conclusions can or will be made with respect to this variable.
One of the limitations regarding this study was the inability to speak various languages. Therefore, only English speaking individuals could be interviewed.

Finally, the subjects who were aware of the legal clinic's existence either noticed it in the Community Newspaper, in "flyers" sent in the mail, heard about it on the radio and/or on the television news, passed by it on the streetcar, "walked by it on the way to work," heard about it from a neighbour or a friend, and heard about it "from some tenant's group." In the latter case, the individual was referring to the Tenants Association which is situated in that particular community.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Theoretical Review and Summary

This study was meant to profile the West End community's legal difficulties, legal needs, legal awareness and perception of and communication with the West End Legal Aid Clinic within the community. In light of this, we attempted to determine a relevant theoretical perspective which would hopefully provide a worthwhile understanding of the phenomena under study. Consequently, David Caplovitz's conception of the poor's plight, Gerald Suttles' perception of the 'provincial effect' and Herbert Gans' notion of person-oriented and object-oriented individuals along with Lewis Coser's theory of conflict were adopted.

In brief, with these perspectives, it was hypothesized that the poor were exploited by object-oriented individuals. As a result, the destitute become extremely provincial and distrust others, i.e. outsiders. This "isolation effect" creates, in effect, a double-edge dilemma. Not only are the poor possibly isolated which means that they may not be aware of the clinic's existence but the "isolation effect" may limit their awareness of their legal rights which will perhaps affect their recognition of a legal problem. Ultimately, then, the poor may become vulnerable to the possible exploitive tactics of "outsiders". It is contended that these circumstances contribute to a system which can be redressed, to a large extent,
by establishing safety-valve institutions such as legal aid clinics. These clinics can possibly channel the expression of hostile feelings.

In order to test these several hypotheses a random sample of sixty individuals from the West End of Toronto was chosen. These individuals were subsequently interviewed. Their responses to indicators of the pertinent variables such as recognition of a legal problem (RECOLPR), not resigned to one's situation (NRETSN), awareness of legal clinic (AWOLCLC), use of clinic (USOCLC), respect for the law (RESFRLW), awareness of legal rights (AWOLRTS), proximity to clinic, time in area, and their responses to background variables such as sex, age and ethnicity were recorded. From an analysis of the data, the following conclusions were made.

Generally, the findings did not significantly support the theoretical material.

A) The majority of indigents had average or high recognition of a legal problem regardless of whether they had clinical or non-clinical problems. With regard to clinic problems, both those who used the clinic and those who did not use the clinic had average or high recognition of a legal problem. Thus, this variable did not make a significant contribution to the comprehension of the reasons why individuals use or do not use the clinic's facilities.
B) The majority of the disadvantaged who were sampled were not resigned to their situation. With respect to clinic problems both those who used the clinic and those who did not, were not resigned to their situation.

C) With regard to awareness of legal clinic, the vast majority of the poor were aware of some legal clinic. However, only a slight majority (62.5%) were aware of the West End legal aid scheme. It is interesting to note that of those who had clinical problems and knew of the clinic's existence, approximately ninety-two percent (91.6%) actually did use these legal facilities. In addition, all those who utilized the clinic's facilities were satisfied with the outcome of their predicament. It would appear then, that the staff at the West End legal aid clinic could possibly do more in the way of making its presence known to people in its area. To be sure, the clinic is serving the needs of the poor people in the West End community. The West Enders who have utilized the clinic and others who have not, feel that the clinic is "doing wonderful things for the area". In summation then, these findings do support the theory in so much as the West End legal aid clinic appears to be functional as a safety-valve institution.

D) The majority of the poor had average or high awareness of their legal rights. With respect to clinic difficulties, those who used the clinic were slightly more aware of their legal rights (99.9%), than those who did not use it (80.0%).
This fact in conjunction with the fact that those who resolved their difficulties were more aware of their rights (88.8%) than those who did not resolve their problems (50.0%), could suggest that those who are more aware of their legal rights have a greater inclination to use the clinic and resolve their problems. The evidence however, is not conclusive. The reverse could also hold true. That is, experience with the legal clinic may increase a client's awareness of his legal rights so that, in future negotiations with "outsiders", he would perhaps be more sophisticated. Consequently, the legal aid clinic may be viewed not only as a protector of legal rights but also as an educator in legal affairs.

E) Slightly more than a third of the poor (35.4%) have low respect for the law. With regard to clinic problems, only fifty-five percent (54.5%) of the indigents who used the clinic had average or high respect for the law, whereas, one hundred percent (100.0%) of those who did not use the clinic had average or high respect for the law. Although the findings were not significant, they may suggest that those with lower respect for the law have a greater inclination to utilize the legal aid centre's facilities. Upon further analysis, however, one discovers that the relationship between respect for the law and use of clinic is weak (r = -.13) and perhaps spurious.

F) Most of the individuals either lived a reasonable distance from the clinic (43.7%) or far from it (29.2%). However, the majority of those who had clinical problems lived
close to it (72.7%). Whereas, all the individuals who had clinical problems but did not use the centre's resources, lived a reasonable distance or far from it. Hence, the people most likely to use the clinic are those who live in proximity to it. This finding added some support to our theory regarding the "isolation effect". It was theorized that because the West Enders may be extremely provincial in their activities, they may only be familiar with events in their particular area. Consequently, they would be more aware of the clinic if they lived near to it than if they lived a reasonable distance or far from it.

G) Time in area did not contribute to our understanding of why people used the legal aid clinic. With respect to clinical difficulties, the data suggested that people who used the clinic were likely to have lived in the West End community for various lengths of time. Some were new to the area while others had lived in the area for as long as fifty (50) years. The largest percentage (54.6%) of individuals lived in the area for a reasonable length of time i.e. for approximately three (3) to five (5) years. Others had lived there for a long time i.e. over five (5) years. Further, those who had clinical problems but did not use the clinic were just as likely to be new to the area as they were to have lived there for some time. In summation, the length of time in area was not significantly related to use of clinic.
H) Sex had no bearing on whether or not an individual would employ the clinic's resources. This fact verified the pilot study finding which indicated that both sexes did have legal problems and that both sexes would utilize the clinic's facilities when it became necessary to do so.

I) Finally, although the evidence was not conclusive, it appeared that people in the 31-45 age category had a greater tendency to use the clinic and to resolve their problems than people in the other age categories.

J) It is difficult to say much about ethnicity because over a third of the sample was comprised of people with a British background. A number of Ukrainians were interviewed, but more ethnic respondents would have made the sample more representative of the population.

In retrospect then, the West Enders did have a variety of legal problems and many of these difficulties were, in fact, resolved by the West End legal aid clinic. To be sure, the West Enders did perceive the clinic as a meaningful channel in resolving their difficulties.

In light of the fact that many people remarked that the clinic was doing good things for the area, it may be said that they view the clinic's staff as person-oriented individuals. The clinic is seen as promoting the needs of the poor and fighting for their rights. It is developing as an integral part of the area and not just existing there as an object-oriented insti-
tution of the external world. In support of this, the clinic has established various groups which have taken upon themselves such tasks as:

1) Establishing a community credit counselling service which would ensure the enforcement of consumer protection legislation in the West End.

2) Working with the Parkdale Tenants Association in the landlord-tenant, housing and development areas, and

3) Studying the problems of the low income unorganized poor.

(F. Zemans; 1973; p. 13)

Notwithstanding the above, however, the findings have led us to doubt the literature. For the most part, the variables under study did not support the theory. None of the variables were significantly related to "use of clinic" and only "proximity to clinic" added some support to the theory. Furthermore, although it was suspected that if people were aware of their legal rights, they would use the clinic provided that they had a legal problem, the literature would have us believe that the poor are not aware of their rights. However, the evidence demonstrated the contrary. The poor were aware of their legal rights. Perhaps, in future research studies of this nature, a more sophisticated view of the poor should be adopted.
FUTURE RESEARCH

It would be judicious for anyone who desires to do research of this kind either in the West End community or in an area with similar characteristics to work with a much larger sample size. To be sure, with an increased sample size, the probability of committing a Type I and Type II error will be reduced. (J. Li; 1969; p. 59-60). Perhaps, there should be more ethnic representation and therefore serious consideration should be given to overcoming the language barriers. In addition, it is possible for a study of this nature to take a slightly different perspective. Legal representatives could be interviewed to ascertain their insights into the reason(s) why individuals use or do not use the clinic's facilities. Perchance, access to the clinic's files could be obtained with the understanding that the information is confidential and would only be used to gain further knowledge concerning the variables that affect one's use or non-use of the legal aid clinic.

PRACTICAL CONCLUSIONS

The West Enders have a good notion of what their legal rights are. However, more can be done in this area. For instance, libraries could provide books such as Law, Law, Law, by Clayton Ruby and Paul Copeland and You and the Law by the Readers' Digest. These books among others could be filed under a consumer protection and legal rights catalog section.

The government could also play a greater role in informing
the public of some exploitive tactics. It could adopt various slogans which could appear along with its television symbol (CBC) prior to commercial breaks or at other appropriate times. Such slogans could read: "You're responsible for your signature so read and be sure", or "read before you sign along that dotted line." or "legal advice doesn't have to be high priced... look for a legal aid clinic near you".

Moreover, parent-teacher meetings could have guest speakers who are knowledgeable in law. Finally, community involvement in various groups such as tenant associations or consumer rights associations could be encouraged.

In summation, this thesis attempted to examine the legal problems and legal awareness of individuals located in the West End of Toronto, Ontario, with special attention to their interaction with the West End legal aid clinic. Hopefully, this study will stimulate others to conduct research of this nature and perhaps it will assist administrators in making policy decisions in this area. To be sure, if this thesis is perceived as a fruitful exercise, then it has passed one of the most compulsory criteria of a worthwhile study.
APPENDIX A

MAP OF WEST END AREA (DEMONSTRATING INDIVIDUAL'S PROXIMITY TO THE WEST END LEGAL AID CLINIC)

West End Legal Aid Clinic
Those Who Used Clinic
Other Individuals Who Were Sampled
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Addresses of respondent

2. Neighbourhood

Hello, my name is __________. I am working on this survey for McMaster University. Its purpose is to help improve the quality of (legal) services in the community by asking about your opinion and experiences. We hope to talk to many people during this summer. Most of the people I've talked to have found these questions easy and interesting. You are under no obligation to talk with me, but I hope you will. All information will be kept in strictest confidence. Would you be willing to help us with this project?

Before we start the interview let me ask you.....

1. How many dependents do you (head of household) support?

   No. of Dependents __________

2. Attempt to contact respondent

   1st. __________
   2nd. __________
   3rd. __________
   other. __________

3. Complete interview

   1st. __________
   2nd. __________
   3rd. __________
   4th. __________
   5th. __________
   6th. __________

Card 1

92
4. Date of first interview or contact with respondent.

5. Time of first interview or contact with respondent or failure to contact
   weekday morning..................1
   weekday afternoon................2
   weekday evening...................3
   weekend morning...................4
   weekend afternoon................5
   weekend evening...................6

6. Length of interview - Less than 30 min...........1
   30 min. to 1 hr..................2
   1 to 1½ hrs......................3
   1½ to 2 hrs......................4

7. English proficiency:
   Good..................................1
   Fair...................................2
   Hardly any...........................3
   Not at all...........................4

a. Condition of furniture:
   Good..................................1
   Fair...................................2
   Poor...................................3
   Don't know...........................4

b. Did you notice a telephone?
   If so, was it black or coloured?
   Black..................................1
   Coloured...............................2
   Did not notice........................3

8. Sex of respondent
   male.................................1
   female...............................2

9. Estimated age of respondent
   18 to 25.............................1
   26 to 30.............................2
   31 to 35.............................3
   36 to 40.............................4
   41 to 45.............................5
10. Ethnicity of respondent  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Estimated socio-economic status of respondent  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Condition of dwelling -  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad repair untidy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad repair, tidy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average, untidy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average, tidy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above average for</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Location of dwelling -  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>entire dwelling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st flat</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd flat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd flat</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 floor apt.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 3rd floor apt.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basement apt.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe other

14. Record verbatim refusal if possible

---

END OF CARD 1.
HYPOTHETICAL – SECTION 1.

I'm going to begin by asking you to think about some problems that people often have. Imagine that you have these problems, and tell me what you would do...

A. Suppose that you bought a refrigerator on time, and while you are still paying for it, the refrigerator stops working. The store owner refuses to take it back or repair it even though the refrigerator is still under guarantee.

a) Is there anything wrong about this situation? yes...(ask b)...1 no...(ask b)...2

b) Do you think you probably would do something.(ask c)...1 or wouldn't do something about it? (ask b)...2

c) What would you do? (specify) (ask d)

d) Would you try to get some advice)yes...(ask e)...1 or help about this or not? no...(ask b)...2

e) Where would you try to get it/who would you ask? (see source list)......... 28

f) If that didn't work, where else would you try to get advice or help? (see source list)....... 29

B. Suppose that the plumbing in your apartment doesn't work, and the landlord absolutely refuses to make any repairs.

a) Is there anything wrong about this situation? yes...(ask b)...1 no...(ask b)...2

b) Do you think you probably would do something.(ask c)...1 or wouldn't do something about it? (ask C)...2

c) What would you do? (specify) (ask d)
d) Would you try to get some advice or help about this or not?  yes... (ask e)...1  
no... (ask C)...2

e) How would you try to get it/who would you ask? (see source list).....................  

f) If that didn't work where would you try to get advice or help? (see source list)....  

C. Suppose that your employer refuses to pay you the back pay he owes you...

a) Is there anything wrong about this situation?  yes.. (ask b)...1  
no... (ask b)...2

b) Do you think you probably would do something or wouldn't do something about it?  

(c) What would you do? (specify) (ask d)

D) Would you try to get some advice or help about this or not?  yes.. (ask d)...1  
no... (ask D)...2

e) Where would you try to get it/who would you ask? (see source list).....................  

f) If that didn't work, where else would you try to get advice or help?.....................  

D. Suppose that your teenage son has been picked up by the police while riding in a stolen car. He is being held at the police station...

a) Is there anything wrong about this situation?  yes.. (ask b)...1  
no... (ask b)...2

b) Do you think you probably would do something or wouldn't do something about it?  

(ask E)...2
c) What would you do? (specify) (ask d)

d) Would you try to get some advice or help about this or not? yes...(ask d)...1 23
   no...(ask f)...2

e) Where would you try to get it? Who would you ask? (see source list)................. 34

f) If that didn't work, where else would you try to get advice or help?......................

E. Suppose that your teenage son has been picked up by the police for drinking under age. He is being held at the police station...

a) Is there anything wrong about this situation? yes...(ask b)...1 14
   no...(ask b)...2

b) Do you think you probably would do something. (ask c)...1 24
   or wouldn't do something about it? (ask F)...2

c) What would you do? (specify) (ask d)


d) Would you try to get some advice or help about this or not? yes...(ask d)...1 25
   no...(ask f)...2

e) Where would you try to get it? Who would you ask? (see source list).................... 36

f) If that didn't work, where else would you try to get advice or help?...................... 37

F. Suppose that a car you bought was taken back by the dealer when you thought it shouldn't have been...

a) Is there anything wrong about this situation? yes...(ask b)...1 15
   no...(ask b)...2
b) Do you think you probably would do something. (ask c)...1 or wouldn't do something about it? (ask 2)...2

c) What would you do? (specify) (ask d)

d) Would you try to get some advice or help about this or not? yes...(ask d)...1 no...(ask 2)...2

e) Where would you try to get it? Who would you ask? (see source list)..............

f) If that didn't work, where else would you try to get advice or help? (see source list)...........
Section 11  Housing

2. People sometimes have problems relating to housing.
   Is this your own home..............................1
   or is it a rented home..............................2
   rented apt...........................................3

NOTE  Question No. 2 is for people who rent their homes, or apts.

A. How long have you lived here?  Less than 1 yr......1
   1 to 5 yrs............2
   6 to 10 yrs............3
   more than 10 yrs...4

B. During the last 2 years has the landlord failed to make repairs, fix plumbing, or provide heat?
   yes (ask a)...........1
   no (ask C)...........2

a) When was the most recent time this happened?
   now................1
   within last year....2
   1 - 2 years........3

b) (The most recent time this happened) did you try to do something about this or not?
   yes (ask c).........1
   no (ask d).........2

c) What did you do?  Complain to landlord...........1
   complain to landlord and fix it yourself.........2
   took legal action........3
d) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

yes (ask e)..........................1

no (ask h)............................2

e) Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record as to position or relationship to respondent.)

1.................................47

2.................................48

3.................................49

f) In general, was the help (ask for each person) gave you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st source</th>
<th>2nd source</th>
<th>3rd source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) What kind of advice did you get?

h) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

yes...............................1

no.................................2
C. During the last 2 years did the landlord notify you that you had to move out when you thought he shouldn't have?

   yes..(ask a)..........................1
   no..(ask question 3)..................2

a) When was the most recent time this happened?

   now......................................1
   within last year.......................2
   1 - 2 years............................3

b) (The most recent time this happened) did you try to do something about this or not?

   yes..(ask c)...........................1
   no...(ask d)............................2

c) What did you do? Vacate premises when notified to move.................................1

   Waited for formal legal process then vacated........................................2
   Spoke to landlord, then vacated premises voluntarily...............................3
   other....................................4

d) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

   yes..(ask e).............................1
   no...(ask h).............................2

e) Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record each source as to position or relationship to respondent). (see source list)

   1...........................................
f) In general, was the help (ask for each person) gave you


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) What kind of advice did you get?

h) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

Yes.............................................1 65

No.............................................2

END OF CARD 2.
Section III  

Jobs.

Let's move on to another subject... Sometimes people have problems relating to work.

3. Do you presently have a job? Yes..................1  10
   No.(ask b)..............2

   a) Do you work? full time.........................1  11
      part time.........................2
      seasonal.........................3
      unemployed......................4
      retired.........................5

   b) Have you had a job at any time during the past 2 years?
      Yes,(ask c)..............1  12
      No.(ask 4)..............2

   c) During the past 2 years what kind of work has the head of the household done for the longest period of time that he/she was working?

   1. major professionals - doctors and lawyers.  13
   2. lesser professionals - business managers.
   3. clerical and sales workers.
   4. skilled manual employees.
   5. semi-skilled employees (machine operators).
   6. Unskilled employees.

4. Are you Single (ask 6)..............1  14
   married (ask 5)..............2
   separated (ask 6).............3
   divorced(ask 6)..............4
   widowed,(ask 6).............5

5. Does your husband/wife presently have a job?
   Yes..(ask a)..............1  15
   No..(ask b)..............2
a) If yes: Does he/she work.  
- full time.............1  
- part time.............2  
- seasonal.............3  
- unemployed...........4  
- retired...............5

b) If NO! Has he/she had a job at any time during the past 2 years?  
- Yes...................1  
- No....................2

c) During the past 2 years, what kind of work has he/she done for the longest period of time that he/she was working.  
(see list at 3 c for code number..................)

6. During the past 2 years, have you ever had any trouble collecting pay from your employer?  
- Yes (ask a)............1  
- No. (go to 7)...........2

a) When was the most recent time this happened?  
- Now.....................1  
- within last year......2  
- 1 - 2 years..........3

b) The most recent time this happened did you try to do something about this or not?  
- Yes (ask c).............1  
- No. (ask d)............2

c) What did you do?  
- Spoke to employer...........1  
- Spoke to employer then quit..2  
- Quit without speaking to employer..................3  
- Took legal action...........4
Other (specify)..........................5

d) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

Yes (ask e)..........................1 23
No..(go to h).........................2

e) If got advice or help: Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record each source named as to position or relationship to respondent.) see source list.

1.....................................24
2.....................................25
3.....................................26

f) In general, was the help or advice (as for each source) gave you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Source</th>
<th>2nd Source</th>
<th>3rd Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) What kind of advice did you get?

..........................................................

..........................................................

..........................................................

..........................................................

h) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

Yes..........................1 30
No..............................2

7. During the past 2 years, have you ever been injured while working at your job?

Yes..(ask a)..........................1 31
No...(go to 8).......................2
a) When did this happen

Now.........................1
within last year..............2
1 - 2 years..................3

b) Did you apply for workmen's Compensation in connection with the injury/or not?

Yes.(ask c)......................1
No. (ask question 8).........2

c) When you first applied, did you receive it, were you turned down for reasons you thought were right, or were you turned down when you thought you shouldn't have been?

receive it (go to 8)...............1
turned down for right reasons (go to 8)......................2
turned down when shouldn't have been (ask d)....................3

d) If turned down when shouldn't have been: (the most recent time this happened did you try to do something about this or not?)

Yes.(ask e)......................1
No..(ask f)......................2

e) What did you do? Spoke to employer..................1
Sought legal action.............2
Other............................

.................................
.................................
.................................
.................................
.................................
.................................
.................................
.................................

....................................3

f) Did you ask someone (else) for advice or help or not?

Yes...............................1
No., (go to j).....................2
**g) Who did you ask for advice or help?** *(Record each source named as to position or relationship to respondent)*. (see source list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**h) In general, was the help or advice (ask for each source) gave you -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**i) What kind of advice did you get?**

**j) Were you satisfied with the way things turned out or not?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes...</th>
<th>No...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Section IV. Insurance.**

8. **At any time during the last 2 years, have you had an automobile insurance policy?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes.(ask A)...</th>
<th>No..(go to 9)...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. **If Yes: During the last 2 years have you made a claim for payment to your automobile insurance co.?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes.(ask a)...</th>
<th>No..(ask question 9)...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) When was the last time?  
   Now..........................1  47
   Within last yr................2
   1 - 2 years....................3

b) Did the company refuse to pay your claim when you first applied?
   Yes..(ask c)..................1  48
   No..(go to 9)...................2

IF MORE THAN ONCE, ASK FOR MOST RECENT TIME.

c) Did the company refuse to pay -
   for reasons you thought were right (ask 9)........1  49
   or did you feel they should have paid
   the claim...(ask d)..................2

d) Did you try to do something about this or not?
   Yes..(ask e).................1  50
   No..(ask f)...................2

e) What did you do?
   Spoke to claim adjuster, took no further action...1  51
   Spoke to higher authority in insurance company....2
   Sought legal action..........................3
   Other (specify)..............................4

f) Did you ask someone (else) for advice or help or not?
   Yes.(ask g)................1  52
   No..(ask j)..................2

IF GOT ADVICE OR HELP

g) Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record each source named as to position and relationship to respondent.) (see source list)

1...............................  53
h) In general, was the help or advice (ask for each source) given you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) What kind of advice did you get?

j) Were you satisfied with the way things turned out or not?

Yes.................................1

No.................................2

Section V: Installment Buying.

9. Now I would like to ask you some questions about buying things on credit. These can be any kind of things other than a house or a piece of land. Within the past 2 years have you bought anything on credit and agreed to pay for it on time, that is, to pay for it in installments?

Yes.................................1

No..(go to 13)......................2
10. Within the past 2 years have you bought something on credit but when you got it home, it was not the same thing you saw or it was in bad condition?

Yes..(ask a)....................1
No...(go to 11)....................2

a) When was the most recent time this happened?

Now.................................1
Within last year....................2
1 - 2 years.......................3

b) (The most recent time this happened) Did you try to do something about this or not?

Yes..(ask c)......................1
No...(ask d)......................2

c) What did you do? Complain to seller..................1
Complain to legal aid clinic......2
Complain to both..................3
Took other action..................

.........................................
.........................................
.........................................

.........................................

.........................................

.........................................

.........................................

.........................................

d) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

Yes..(ask e)......................1
No...(ask h)......................2

e) Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record each source named as to position and relationship to respondent.) (see source list)

1.................................
2.................................
3.................................
f) In general, was the help or advice (ask for each source) given you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) What kind of advice did you get?

h) Were you satisfied with the way things turned out or not?

Yes.........................1  72

No.........................2
11. Within the past 2 years have you thought you were renting something or using it on trial basis but you actually had signed a contract to buy it on installment?

Yes...(ask a)..................1
No...(go to 12)...............2

a) When was the last time this happened.

Now.............................1
Within last yr...............2
1 - 2 years.................3

b) Did you try to do something about it or not?

Yes.............................1
No...(ask d)...............2

c) What did you do?

Complain to person from whom you thought you were renting........................1
Refused to make credit payments.................2
Sought legal assistance.........................3
Other (specify)..................................

..............................................4
d) Did you ask anyone for advice or help or not?

Yes...(ask e).....................1
No...(ask h)..................2
e) Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record each source named as to position and relationship to respondent.) (see source list)

1.................................15
2.................................16
3.................................17
f) In general, was the advice or help (as for each source) given you —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Source</th>
<th>2nd Source</th>
<th>3rd Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

Yes .................... 1 21
No .................... 2

12. Within the past 2 years have you bought or signed up for anything on the installment plan and after making payments were told you owed more than you believed you did?

Yes..(ask a) .................. 1 22
No..(ask question 13) ...... 2

a) When was the last time this happened?

Now .................... 1 23
Within last yr ......... 2
1 - 2 years ............... 3

b) Did you try to do something about this or not?

Yes .................... 1 24
No..(ask d) .................. 2
c) What did you do?

Complain to seller.......................... 1
Refused to make payments beyond amount
you thought you owed.......................... 2
Sought legal assistance........................ 3
Other.............................................. 4

d) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

Yes...(ask e)................................. 1
No...(ask h)................................. 2

e) Who did you ask for advice or help? Record each
source named as to position and relationship to
respondent.) (see source list)

1............................................... 27
2............................................... 28
3............................................... 29

f) In general, was the advice or help (ask for each
source) given you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g) What kind of advice did you get?

................................................................
................................................................
................................................................
................................................................
h) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

Yes.............................................1 33
No.............................................2

13. Within the past 2 years have you had anything you bought taken back (repossessed) or anything you owned taken by a creditor i.e. a person you bought from for a debt?

Yes...(ask a)..............................1 34
No...(go to 14).............................2

a) When did this happen? Now..............................1 35
Within last yr.............................2
1 - 2 yrs.................................3

b) Was this done for reasons you felt were right or did you feel that this should not have been done?

Right reasons...(go to 14)..............1 36
Shouldn't have been done...........2

c) Did you try to do something about this or not?

Yes.............................................1 37
No...(go to e).............................2

d) What did you do?

Spoke to creditor.................................................1 38
Spoke to creditor and refinanced debt with him...2
Borrowed money elsewhere to pay debt and recover property.................................3
Sought legal assistance.................................4
Took other action........................................

.........................................................5
e) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

Yes..............................1 39
No...(go to i)...............2

f) IF GOT ADVICE OR HELP: Who did you ask for advice or help? (Record each resource named as to position and relationship to respondent.) (see source list).

1.........................................40
2.........................................41
3.........................................42

g) In general, was the advice or help (ask for each source) given you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st Source</th>
<th>2nd Source</th>
<th>3rd Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>some help</td>
<td>not helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) What kind of advice did you get?

i) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

Yes......................1 46
No..........................2

14. Within the past 2 years have you had your wages attached or garnished by a creditor (i.e., a person from whom you bought something) for a debt? That is, was money taken off your wages for a debt?

Yes...(ask a)...............1 47
No...(go to 15)...............2
a) When did this happen?  
- Now..........................1  
- Within last yr..................2  
- 1 - 2 yrs......................3  

b) Would you say this action was justified or do you think that it should not have been done?  
- Right reason..(go to 15)...1  
- Shouldn't have been done....2  

c) Did you try to do anything about it or not?  
- Yes.................................1  
- No..(go to e)....................2  

d) What did you do?  
- Spoke to employer..............1  
- Spoke to seller..................2  
- Spoke to seller and refinanced debt with him...........3  
- Borrowed money elsewhere to pay debt.................4  
- Sought legal action............5  
- Took other action...............6  

e) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?  
- Yes.................................1  
- No..(go to i)....................2  

f) Who did you ask? (Record each resource named as to position and relationship to respondent.)  
(see source list).  
- 1.................................53  
- 2.................................54  
- 3.................................55
g) In general, was the help or advice (ask for each source) given you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h) What kind of advice did you get?

--------------------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------------------------------

i) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out or not?

Yes.................................1  59
No.....................................2

15. Have you borrowed money within the past 2 years and agreed to pay it back in installments.

Yes..(ask 16).........................1  60
No...(ask 17).........................2

16. Were you ever told, after you had made payments, that you owed more money on any of these loans than you believed you did?

Yes..(ask a)..........................1  61
No...(go to 17)........................2

a) When did this happen? Now.........................1  62
Within last yr.......................2
1 - 2 yrs............................3

b) (The most recent time this happened) did you try to do something about this or not?

Yes.................................1  63
c) Did you ask someone for advice or help or not?

Yes........................................1 64
No...(go to g).........................2

d) Who did you ask for advice or help? (see source list).

1......................................65
2......................................66
3......................................67

e) In general, was the help or advice (ask for each source) given you -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very helpful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not helpful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) What kind of advice did you get?

..................................................
..................................................
..................................................
..................................................
..................................................


g) Were you satisfied with the way things finally turned out?

Yes........................................1 71
No........................................2

END OF CARD 4.
Section VI: Awareness of Legal Service

Now I would like to ask you some questions about services that help people.

17. Are there any places in this city where a person can get free legal services or free legal advice?

Yes..............................................1 10
No..................................................2
Don't Know.....................................3

18. Had you heard of the West End Legal Aid Clinic before this interview?

Yes..................................................1 11
No (ask 19).......................................2
Don't Know.....................................3

a) When did you first find out about Legal Assistance? (see source list)

................................................................. 12

b) If from friend, neighbour, or relative - Has your friend neighbour/relative ever been there.

Yes......................................................1 13
No......................................................2
Don't Know.........................................3

c) How long have you known about this service?

No. of months.................................

d) Can you tell me where their office is located: approx.?

Correct address..............................1 14
approx. address..............................2
wrong or don't know........................3

e) Have you advised people to go or not to go to Legal Aid Clinic?

To go - Yes......................................1 15
No...................................................2
f) If Yes - How many people?

19. Have you ever gone to the West End Legal Aid Clinic for legal services or called the clinic for legal services or advice?

Yes........................................1 16
No...(go to 20)......................2

a) How many different problems have you taken there during the past 2 years - that is since 1971?

No. of Problems.................17

b) Are they handling a problem for you now?

Yes..(go to c or d).............1 18
No..(go to d).................2

c) (If more than one problem) - When was the first time you WERE there?

No. of months.................19-20

d) When was the last time you were there?

No. of months.................21-22

e) Did a Legal Assistance lawyer or representative ever tell you he would not be able to handle your case?

Yes........................................1 23
No........................................2

IF YES: What reasons did he give you for not handling your case?

financial................................1 24
conflict of interest..............2
not legal problem...............3
other......................................

........................................
........................................
........................................
........................................
f) In general, do you think that when you have gone there they have done everything they could to help you, or do you think that they could have done more?

- did all they could ............... 1       25
- could have done more .......... 2
- don't know ................... 3

g) Do you feel that your situation was better, worse or about the same after you went there?

- better ......................... 1       26
- same .......................... 2
- worse ......................... 3
- don't know ................... 4

h) If you had another problem would you go back to the West End Legal Aid Clinic or not?

- Yes ............................. 1       27
- No .............................. 2
- Don't know ................... 3

i) In general, do you think it helps a great deal .... 1       28

- some ............................ 2
- not at all ..................... 3
- don't know ................... 4

to take a problem to the Legal Aid Clinic.

20. Now I will read some statements to you, and I would like you to tell me whether you agree strongly, agree, disagree or disagree strongly. There are no right or wrong responses. Everyone has different responses to these statements, and we just want to find out what people think.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Most lawyers are interested in helping people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>It is easy to find a lawyer you can trust.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>A lawyer is always fighting for his client</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>If someone has a good lawyer he has a great advantage over others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Most lawyers are honest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>A lawyer these days is not mixed up with crooked businessmen or crooked politicians.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Lawyers really understand ordinary people’s problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>A lawyer will take the side of a person in trouble before he will take the side of the police.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>On the whole, policemen are honest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>On the whole, judges are honest.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>It’s not O.K. to lie in court to protect a friend who is on trial.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>In the courts, a poor man has the same chance as a rich man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. During the last six months have you told anyone about free legal services?

Yes........................................1 41

No..........................................2
22. Compared with your circle of friends are you:

more likely.................................1 42
less likely.................................2

to be asked for advice about problems.

23. When was the last time you needed a lawyer? What did your problem deal with?..............................

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................
a) When was the last time you saw (i.e. went to see) a lawyer?

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................

b) IF HE/SHE NEEDED A LAWYER RECENTLY (WITHIN THE LAST YEAR) BUT HAS NOT SEEN ONE - ASK WHY have you not tried to ask a lawyer for his advice?

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................

24. If you had a marital problem such as not getting along with your husband/wife would you ask a lawyer for his advice or help?

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................

........................................................................
a) If you had problems with your landlord such that you felt he was not living up to his responsibilities (such as not fixing the plumbing or not providing or maintaining his rented grounds in a good state of repair) would you ask a lawyer for his advice or help?

b) Are there any (other) problems you have had in the past which have required the help of a lawyer or which you feel could have required the advice or help of a lawyer?

25. People have different ideas about what their legal rights are. I would like to read a list of statements to you. Please tell me whether the statement is true or false.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. If a policeman stops you on the street and takes you to headquarters, there are certain questions you must answer.</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>1 0 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If a policeman arrests you and takes you to headquarters you have a right to call a lawyer before answering any questions.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>1 0 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If you were on trial for a crime and couldn't pay for a lawyer, the court would have to appoint one for you.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>1 0 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parents have a right to punish their children any way they want.

When a husband and wife are divorced, the mother always gets custody of the children.

Parents have a legal duty to provide the ordinary needs of a minor child.

Parents are liable for intentional damage their children may do to the property of others.

A person who owns a restaurant or a hotel can refuse to serve someone because of his (colour) or race.

If you buy a television set at a dept. store on credit and don't pay for it the department store has a right to come and take it back.

A landlord is legally responsible for taking care of peeling and blistering paint on the walls of a residential building he is renting out.

Now I would like to ask you a few background questions.

26. Where were you born?

If married, where was your husband/wife born?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife or Male Head</th>
<th>Husband or Female Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other (specify) ____________________________________________

27. How long have you been in the West End area of Toronto? ____________________________________________

28. What was the last grade of school that you completed? 

IF MARRIED  What about your husband/wife? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educat. of</th>
<th>Educat. of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife or F.H.</td>
<td>Husband or M.H.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary or less ____________________________________________
Some high school ____________________________________________
Completed high school ____________________________________________ 55
Some college ____________________________________________
Completed college ____________________________________________

29. Could you look at this card and tell me which letter comes closest to your household's (Family's) Yearly Income? 56

THIS CONCLUDES THE INTERVIEW - I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU VERY MUCH...

30. Did respondent answer questions with or without the assistance of another person? 

With..............................................
Without..............................................

a) How important was the other Person's assistance? 

Very imp._________________________________________
Moderate imp.____________________________________
Little imp.______________________________________
b) How co-operative was respondent?
   - High
   - Medium
   - Low

c) How attentive was respondent to questions?
   - High
   - Medium
   - Low

d) How relaxed was respondent?
   - High
   - Medium
   - Low

e) How hospitable was respondent to interviewer?
   - High
   - Medium
   - Low

f) How frank were respondent's answers?
   - High
   - Medium
   - Low

g) How well did respondent understand the questions?
   - High
   - Medium
   - Low

h) Which questions were not comprehensible to respondent.
   Numbers
i) Which questions were offensive to respondent?

Numbers

Annual Income Card:

a. less than 1500.................................01
b. 1500-2000........................................02
c. 2000-2500........................................03
d. 2500-3000........................................04
e. 3000-3500........................................05
f. 3500-4000........................................06
g. 4000-4500........................................07
h. 4500-5000........................................08
i. 5000-5500........................................09
j. 5500-6000........................................10
k. 6000-6500........................................11
l. 6500-7000........................................12
m. 7000-7500........................................13
n. 7500-8000........................................14
o. 8000-8500........................................15
p. 8500-9000........................................16
q. 9000-9500........................................17
r. 9500-10000.................................18
s. over 10000........................................19
List of Sources.
1. lawyer.
2. friend.
3. neighbour.
4. relative (brother, sister, aunt, uncle, father, mother)
5. family doctor.
6. priest.
7. police.
8. other.
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