



FOLLOW-UP REPORT & SUMMARY NOTES

ON LEGAL INFORMATION, LEGAL ADVICE & ACCESS TO JUSTICE

**FROM THE FIFTH ANNUAL DEAN'S FORUM MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN – COLLEGE OF LAW
MARCH 1, 2017**

**ASHLEY FALK
MICHELLE KORPAN
NOAH WERNIKOWSKI**



**UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
College of Law
LAW.USASK.CA**

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Summary of Agenda & Policy Discussion Papers Presented by Student Working Groups	4
Common Themes that Emerged from the Day's Discussion.....	5
I. Goals/Interests.....	5
II. Future Frameworks.....	6
III. Steps/Options	9
IV. Miscellaneous Comments of Participants.....	11
Appendix A: Presentation Notes.....	12
Appendix B: Discussion Groups	17
Appendix C: Questions Posed to Participants	19

Introduction

This document summarises and compiles themes from the 5th Annual Meeting of the Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution. The document outlines the day's agenda, the "Legal Information, Legal Advice and Access to Justice" project, and the content of the meeting day's discussions. Notes from the presentation given on this topic, a list of participants and small breakout groups, and the breakout group questions discussed in these groups are included in the Appendices.

Summary of Agenda & Policy Discussion Papers Presented by Student Working Groups

The 5th Annual Meeting of the Dean's Forum on Access to Justice and Dispute Resolution was held on March 1, 2017 (the "Dean's Forum"). This year's meeting focused on two topics: "Legal Information, Legal Advice and Access to Justice" and "Creating Connections Between Delivery of Justice and Health Services." This document summarises the morning session of the meeting, which focused on the former topic.

The policy paper on the "Legal Information, Legal Advice and Access to Justice" topic sought to understand how legal service providers and the legal community in Saskatchewan:

- 1) Conceptualise the distinction between legal information and legal advice (the "Distinction"),
- 2) Are affected by it, and
- 3) Are concerned about and/or interested in potential changes to it.

The paper's content was informed primarily by personal interviews, and therefore was largely qualitative in focus. It sought to understand the experiences and opinions of those affected by the Distinction, which is essential for developing policy in the area.

The Dean's Forum meeting began with a welcome and introductions to the Dean's Forum topics and participants led by **College of Law at the University of Saskatchewan Dean Martin Phillipson**. Law students **Ashley Falk, Michelle Korpan, and Noah Wernikowski** then presented their policy discussion paper to provide participants with context for the discussions that followed. In the next part of the meeting, participants met with their assigned small groups to discuss the "Legal Information, Legal Advice and Access to Justice" topic in more depth. The discussion questions encouraged each group to consider

- 1) The interests, concerns, and objectives underlying the Distinction,
- 2) Alternative frameworks to the Distinction, and

3) Practical steps forward.

The questions posed can be found in Appendix C. Each group was assigned a particular context in which to ground their discussions. These contexts and the participants assigned to each are listed in Appendix B. Following these discussions, participants reconvened to report back about the themes from the small group sessions and work toward building consensus around next steps. This large group session was facilitated by **University of Saskatchewan College of Law Professors Michaela Keet and Dr. Beth Bilson (currently on secondment as University Secretary)**.

Common Themes that Emerged from the Day's Discussion

As mentioned above, the day's discussion focused on exploring 1) the interests, concerns, and objectives underlying the Distinction; 2) alternative frameworks, other than the Distinction, that can be used to address these concerns; and 3) practical steps forward. Themes that surfaced in the day's discussion are for the purpose of this report organised according to the following headings:

- I. Goals/Interests,
- II. Future Frameworks,
- III. Steps/Options, and
- IV. Miscellaneous Comments of Participants.

Themes under the "Goals/Interests" heading outline the objectives underlying the current Distinction. Themes under the "Future Frameworks" heading outline principles and other considerations that should guide the development of frameworks other than the Distinction that can be used to protect the objectives of the Distinction. The "Steps/Options" heading outlines potential routes forward, either related to the Distinction or to access to justice more generally. Finally, the "Miscellaneous Comments of Participants" heading includes information that arose during the forum that is important but does not neatly fit under any of the preceding headings. It is important to note that the headings overlap and the distinctions they offer are therefore somewhat artificial. For example, themes under the "Future Frameworks" or "Miscellaneous Comments of Participants" headings also closely relate to routes forward.

I. Goals/Interests

a) For the public

There was consensus that the key underlying objective of the Distinction is to protect the public from poor quality legal services, whether given altruistically or exploitatively. The Distinction and the legislative prohibition on unauthorised legal

practice help ensure education standards, oversight, and other mechanisms that promote accountability, which are means to this end. This objective is balanced with an interest in promoting the public's access to legal services, part of which entails not unnecessarily restricting the type of legal service that can be provided by non-lawyers.

Many participants mentioned the need to balance these competing objectives and agreed that the current situation lacks appropriate balance in some contexts. Participants agreed the public's interests should be prioritised in developing new frameworks and next steps. Participants also mentioned that the balancing needs to be informed by realistic concerns about the public harm that would actually arise from poor legal services, rather than unsubstantiated but often-repeated fears.

b) For service providers

Participants identified the needs of legal service providers as an additional interest underlying the Distinction. Service providers need to feel sufficiently comfortable and competent to provide legal services, and thereby meet the objectives of accessibility and protection of the public identified above. One goal of the Distinction, and any new frameworks targeting the same objectives, is therefore to provide certainty to service providers around their appropriate scope of practice—that is, what types of legal assistance they can provide given their expertise and professional role. Participants also discussed the need for oversight, adequate training, and provision of supports for legal service providers in order to ensure accountability.

II. Future Frameworks

a) New Frameworks Must be Evidence-Based

A number of participants noted that new frameworks must be informed by data and evidence. Participants talked about how non-lawyers in numerous contexts currently provide legal advice and other legal services, but there is little data detailing what these services look like, how well they are working, where regulatory barriers should be removed, and where more support is needed. Such service delivery needs to be studied. The information gathered should inform and direct new frameworks. Participants also noted that new frameworks should follow, rather than disrupt, the services that are currently provided and working well. This mindset is in fact reflected in the Law Society of Saskatchewan's current approach of not enforcing unauthorised practice laws when legal services are being provided by competent non-lawyers without issue. Beneficial service delivery models and frameworks should be identified and potentially serve as models for future innovations.

b) New Frameworks Need To Ensure Some Services Are Only Delivered By Lawyers

Participants discussed the need for some legal services to remain within the domain of only lawyers. The precise content of these services was not expressly identified, but participants did propose that they include services that are very complex and require a high degree of expertise that only a lawyer can provide. This “kernel” of lawyer-only legal services was also described as being context-specific and without a definitive boundary.

Participants identified a territory around this “kernel” wherein non-lawyers should provide legal assistance as to fill gaps in the public’s access to legal services and supports. The expanding role of non-lawyers however would require non-legal service providers to receive adequate training to be properly prepared to provide such services. Many people agreed that the scope of lawyer-only services could be significantly reduced, thereby increasing services provided by non-lawyers. Innovation in this area should focus on getting people to better advice and legal services, not necessarily on getting people to lawyers.

c) New Frameworks Should Consider Harm Minimisation

Participants suggested an alternative framework could centre on the principle of harm minimisation. The idea, borrowed from the medical context, suggests new frameworks should first and foremost focus on preventing harm. Measures should be adopted if they ultimately result in harm reduction; other concerns are secondary. For example, some legal non-profit representatives thought that providing some advice, even if imperfect and only a small amount, is better than providing none in that it is likely to prevent the greater harm of a person receiving no support.

d) New Frameworks Should Consider Impartiality as a Guiding Principle in Certain Contexts

A concern identified with applying new frameworks to contexts like courthouses was that services in this setting must align with the principle of judicial impartiality. The concern is that increasing the scope of legal services available in this setting might give rise to the appearance of advocacy. As one participant noted, legal advice is almost by definition advocacy. A new framework could be guided less by the degree of services provided, and more by what kinds of services can be provided that maintain the appearance of impartiality. This principle must inform service delivery in the court context, which was one context discussed during the Dean’s Forum. The authors of this document suggest these concerns may also be relevant to

other government settings and administrative tribunals that are similarly concerned with either impartiality or appearances of conflicts of interest.

e) New Frameworks Should Focus on Providing Pro-active Planning and Guidance, Rather than Policing

Participants also suggested that a new framework should focus on being proactive instead of reactive. Currently, the Distinction is thought to be maintained primarily through the Law Society's "policing" of the unauthorised practice of law or otherwise disciplining those who go "too far" in providing legal services. Alternatively, frameworks could focus on proactively guiding people on the degree of assistance they should provide, and supporting them in providing such assistance. Limiting the policing function of the framework to only protecting the small "kernel" of lawyer-only services discussed above, and focusing on those providing services for financial gain, would avoid a chilling effect on altruistic service providers (for example, the non-profit sector) and would thus encourage the provision of helpful services.

f) Possible New Framework: Commitment to Professional Collaborations and Multidisciplinary Insights

Another principle identified was that the development of alternate frameworks should be based on collaboration that includes stakeholders from more than just the traditional legal profession. The evidence-based data collected, as discussed below, could improve knowledge of which professions are affected by the current Distinction, the ways they are affected, and the types of training and collaborative discussion necessary for understanding how to deal with requests for legal assistance and when to refer to other professionals. A proactive multidisciplinary approach will require all of those involved to consider how they will deal with the questions they are asked, the objectives of service they want to provide, how to maintain the quality of the services they are providing, and how to maintain other professional responsibilities.

g) Possible New Framework: Let Other Professions Regulate Themselves

Participants noted that accountants and many other professionals are regulated and insured by their own professional regulatory bodies. The provision of services that could be considered "legal" by these professionals should be the concern of their respective professional bodies, rather than the Law Society's.

III. Steps/Options

a) Information Gathering

As discussed above, it is apparent that legal advice is being provided despite the current prohibition against unauthorised legal service provision in the legislation. Future frameworks should be guided by evidence-based data. Therefore, a first step to moving forward is to begin gathering information on the types of services currently being offered and the areas where the regulation should be expanded and additional support provided. One recommendation was that an outcomes-based questionnaire be created for organisations to determine how they are approaching the legal questions they receive and how they maintain the quality of their service providers. The CREATE Justice Centre at the University of Saskatchewan's College of Law was identified as a neutral party that may be well-positioned to take the lead on collecting this data.

b) Collaborative Planning and Oversight Through a Community Board of Stakeholders

Some participants discussed creating a board comprised of various professionals and organisations that regularly encounter requests for legal assistance. Collaboration through this board could provide guidance to people regularly fielding such requests, as well as help provide quality control and ensure compliance with relevant legislation and guidelines. A central board would also help members of these professions and organisations know when and where to refer clients to other professionals, and would help with coordinating relevant professional training, education, and protocols.

c) Expand Existing Educational Resources

Participants also identified the expansion of existing educational resources for near to law professionals and others who provide legal assistance as a step moving forward. Participants discussed identifying what the Law Society and other organisations have on file in terms of continuing professional development resources and making these resources available in other contexts. Additional educational and training materials may need to be developed for specific contexts that supplement and build on these existing resources. Participants also identified a need to provide education about referral resources—this was much desired in the library context—and about the scope of services available in various settings, both for the public and for those service providers.

This type of education was noted as being particularly useful in the administrative tribunal context to ensure members of the public know which tribunal to turn to

and how to navigate its processes, and that tribunal staff can maximise the assistance they provide. Such is useful in this context given the high degree of expertise tribunal staff have regarding their context and the fact that administrative law processes often have few lawyers involved.

d) *The Legal Profession Act*

The current prohibitions against unauthorised practice in *The Legal Profession Act* (the “Act”) are very broad and are not enforced by the Law Society in many contexts. The Law Society has been considering ways the legislation can change that could alter the scope of services provided by non-lawyers. Potential legislative amendments discussed by participants included the prospect of creating exemptions to the Act’s unauthorised practice rules. These exemptions could apply to, for example: people already regulated by their own professional regulatory body (health care providers, accountants, psychologists, and others); government employees, including court and administrative tribunal employees; and law advocates. In the case of the former, these professionals would likely have access to insurance to protect the public and themselves. Participants noted that other jurisdictions could provide guidance on this point.

Other potential legislative amendments discussed in some small groups included: providing the Law Society with more discretion regarding who they prosecute; creating a miscellaneous clause that allows people to give advice within their scope of expertise; and including more guidelines in the Act regarding the scope of lawyer-only services.

e) Consider Additional Delivery Models

Some participants felt that existing resources were not well known and that gaps existed in terms of informing the public of these types of services. Looking at ways to increase knowledge of these services could help increase the public’s ability to access supportive resources. For example, the United Kingdom’s model of a Citizens Advice Bureau provides the public with numerous resources all in one location. By clicking on various links on their webpage, members of the public are taken to advice specific to their precise legal question and are further informed of additional resources that may assist with their issue. It was suggested that Saskatchewan 211 could be a model for this type of a service, but is not currently equipped to assist in this way with legal services. Lay advocates from various professions and organisations could similarly assist the public by providing informational resources and connecting the public with available legal service providers.

IV. Miscellaneous Comments of Participants

A number of interesting comments were made in the discussions that do not easily fit in the themes identified above. We summarise them here to improve the comprehensiveness of this document and for the reference of future researchers and policy-makers. These points include:

- Representatives from public libraries who participated in the meeting indicated they felt the current Distinction correctly defined the scope of services they provide. They spoke of desiring more referral resources, but do not wish to provide more legal services to the public themselves.
- Encouraging and empowering lay person navigators (such as social workers) to assist people in administrative law processes and other legal processes was identified as an important step moving forward.
- Speaking about developing new services and frameworks in particular contexts, participants emphasised the importance of focusing on those who use the service, how they are finding it, and how they are using it to determine paths forward.
- Limited resources were a concern and a barrier to innovation in nearly every conversation. Many steps forward cannot be undertaken without increased resource investment.
- There is mistrust of or resistance to using lawyers in some contexts, which makes alternative legal service providers an important resource for people.
- The Law Society could create policy documents that provide clarity around context-specific best practices to avoid breaching unauthorised practice laws and guidance around its approach to prosecuting under the legislation. This would give legal service providers more certainty in terms of the extent to which they can help the public.
- One point of collaboration to define and potentially expand the scope of legal services provided in the administrative tribunal context is through the Saskatchewan Administrative Tribunals Association, potentially in partnership with other parties like the Ministry of Justice, the Law Society, and the Canadian Bar Association, and with input from non-profit legal organisations like Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan and Community Legal Assistance Services for Saskatoon Inner City (CLASSIC). Such a partnership could facilitate the provision of education for tribunal staff regarding the services they can and should offer the public, and the development of projects to increase the accessibility of tribunals in the province.
- Some participants spoke of the need to identify and provide support to laypersons that help people navigate legal processes.
- One participant suggested the scope of permissible legal services, and the way service providers are dealt with through regulatory frameworks, may need to differ between the public and private sector, and may need to consider the relevance of profit-motive in service provision.

Appendix A: Presentation Notes

Introduction

Access to Justice is a concept everyone in the room is familiar with – it’s as common to policy discussions as the problems it describes are to the justice system. Our topic focuses on increasing access to legal services, which is important for increasing access to justice. And one limitation to the public’s access to legal services is the barrier between “legal information and legal advice.”

So, what is the distinction between legal information and legal advice? On a basic and generalised level, the Distinction is seen in this way: Everyone is permitted to professionally give legal information, but only lawyers can provide legal services that would be considered advice, and only in the context of a lawyer-client relationship.

This boundary is often traced to the rules of *The Legal Profession Act* that prohibit the unauthorised practice of law, and which will be discussed in more detail later. It’s also generally seen as a means to protect the public from unregulated, unqualified, and uninsured legal services.

Generally, the Distinction is used as a tool to mark the boundary between “what lawyers do” and “what everyone else can do.” For example:

- **For some front-line employees in courthouses, administrative tribunals, libraries and non-profits**, the Distinction informs the extent of assistance they provide to the public;
- **For lawyers**, it informs the extent of assistance they can provide without forming a lawyer-client relationship or incurring potential liability and obligations;
- **For non-legal professionals -- like family mediators working closely with lawyers --** it marks the boundary between the services they provide and the services lawyers provide;
- **Perhaps most importantly, for the public**, the Distinction informs the limits of available legal assistance. Those unable to retain a lawyer often rely on alternative legal service providers, most of whom do not give assistance that can be characterised as legal advice.

The Project

After some background research, we moved on to identifying and interviewing various stakeholders. We aimed to interview a diverse group of people with a focus on those involved in frontline service delivery, and were reasonably successful in doing so given time constraints. A list of our consultees and some of the gaps in terms of whom we spoke with are included in our Report.

Our goal was to understand how legal service providers and the legal community 1) conceptualise the Distinction, 2) are affected by it, and 3) are concerned about changes to it. The interview findings make up most of our Report's content. Our study is therefore primarily qualitative in focus - It is about understanding the experiences and opinions of those affected by the Distinction, which is essential for developing policy in the area.

Research Findings: Themes

A number of interesting themes emerged from our consultations. We'll highlight some of these briefly and you can take a look at our report for more detail.

- 1) Some interviewees defined the services they are and are not allowed to provide in terms of the Distinction between legal advice and information, while others saw things in terms of only "what they do" versus "what lawyers do," which often related to their degree of expertise and their own professional role.
- 2) Of those who used the legal advice/information framework, only some were clear on the Distinction between the two. And those who had a clear definition for their own purposes thought their definition probably wasn't shared by others. In fact, many who were clear provided different definitions from each other. For example, for some, going through a person's file and helping with filling out, proofreading, and improving court forms is only giving "information." But for others, even reading a specific section in legislation in response to a question could be considered "giving advice." There is clearly a lot of ambiguity here.
- 3) Interviewees were unclear on the source of the Distinction. When asked about this, many simply reiterated their understanding of the Distinction and the reasons for why it exists (for example, ensuring legal advice is only given by people adequately qualified). Many of our lawyer consultees referenced *The Legal Professions Act*, though sometimes only vaguely, as the source of the Distinction.
 - Although the words "legal advice" and "legal information" are not used in *The Legal Professions Act*, its prohibition on "advising, doing or performing any work or service for fee... in matters pertaining to the law of Saskatchewan" is often thought to prohibit the provision of legal advice, but not information. This could potentially apply to anyone receiving a either a fee or a salary.
- 4) More than just the distinction between legal advice and information, there are both internal and external limitations that affect the level of assistance people provide. At the beginning of this project, we assumed that the operative limit on assistance was the distinction - the fact that for many people it wasn't was one of our most interesting and important findings.

- Some internal limitations include:
 - Personal comfort level with legal topics, and
 - Concerns about providing insufficient or inaccurate information.
 - External limitations include:
 - Time and capacity constraints, and
 - Liability concerns.
- 5) A few other specific themes – such as some service providers being cautiously optimistic about expanding the services in their context – are also included our report, but we won’t go through them right now.

Proposals

While the main purpose of this project was to explore how the Distinction operates, some directions forward surfaced organically in the interviews. To reflect this, our report includes a brief proposal section. These proposals first emerged as themes from our earliest consultations that were later repeated and reinforced.

- 1) The main proposal that came out of our consultations, and which we invite you to consider, is to explore alternative frameworks to the “legal information and advice” distinction. The legal information and advice distinction is a tool used for a number of purposes. By limiting the offering of legal ADVICE to only certain regulated legal service providers, we are ensuring:
- That people provide adequate assistance that corresponds with their level of expertise;
 - That the public has recourse when they rely on others for assistance; and
 - That liability for giving legal assistance is limited.

It is important to understand that the distinction is not an end in itself but rather is a tool. It is helpful in that it is relatively simple and protects a number of important interests. But we also need to understand the limitations of this tool:

- In some contexts, limiting the scope of non-lawyer services to providing “information” is not necessary to protect the concerns that underlie the Distinction.
- In some contexts, the Distinction is not “minimally impairing” and can be harmful to the public in that it unnecessarily restricts the services available.
 - For example, in the Office of Residential Tenancies context (the ORT), the “legal information versus legal advice” framework is not explicitly used to define the scope of assistance the staff provides. This is, rather, based on their level of expertise and the degree to which they are “certain” about the information they provide. ORT staff provide extensive assistance, which would likely be deemed

legal advice and therefore not permitted under most understandings of the legal advice/information distinction. They will tell a person which legal routes are available, which form to use and how to fill it out, what kind of evidence is useful, and will even assist with other things like negotiating a conflict resolution. The ORT staff will not provide information about things that are uncertain—for example, the likely outcome of a hearing or the specific amount a person should claim for. The ORT’s model is beneficial and should not be discouraged. If the ORT was not allowed to provide these services that look like “advice,” it would be to the detriment of the public

We therefore invite you today to focus on the concerns and interests that underlie the Distinction, and move to address these directly, rather than considering only where the boundary between advice and information should fall. The ORT context can help us think of ways to address underlying concerns about providing legal assistance outside the “information and advice” Distinction.

- 2) While the proposal related to a new framework was our most significant, we identified a number of other proposals too. For example, directly related to the distinction between legal information and legal advice, our report suggested:
 - Amending *The Legal Professions Act* to clarify and increase the scope of services non-lawyers can provide;
 - Adopting measures to encourage lawyers to give advice outside traditional lawyer-client relationships; and
 - Addressing the current ambiguity of the Distinction by creating context-specific guidelines for distinguishing between what is legal advice and what is legal information.
- 3) Our consultations specifically focused on the distinction between legal information & advice. The proposals we’ve mentioned relate to thinking differently about and making changes to this Distinction. But some consultations shifted to focusing more on access to justice and barriers to providing legal services in general. We learned that many service providers grapple with discrete barriers to providing meaningful legal assistance.

These barriers should be addressed alongside some of these more fundamental changes. Current limitations include a lack of referral resources in some legal contexts, lack of time resources, and lack of qualified non-lawyer service providers. Proposals that would address some of these limitations and increase access to justice include:

- expanding the role of near-to-law professionals,
- dedicating staff members in major courthouses to provide public legal assistance, and

- exploring ways to encourage the expansion of existing beneficial programming (such as Legal Aid, the Public Legal Education Association, CLASSIC, the Family Law Information Centre, Pro Bono Law Saskatchewan, and Pro Bono Students Canada).

Conclusions & Questions

No questions asked.

Appendix B: Discussion Groups

Group 1: Context – A Courthouse

Facilitator: Heather Heavin, Associate Dean Research & Graduate Studies, College of Law

Recorder: Evan Hutchison, Law Student

Participants: Chief Judge Plemel, Provincial Court

Bev McDonald, Local Registrar, Regina Local Registrar's Office

Gerald Tegart, QC, Chair, Access to Legal Services Committee, Law Society

Miles Waghray, Lawyer

Kim Newsham, Crown Counsel, Innovation and Strategic Initiatives, Ministry of Justice

Group 2: Context – A Non-Legal Non-Profit Organisation

Facilitator: Glen Luther, QC, Professor, College of Law

Recorder: Noah Wernikowski, Law Student

Participants: Dr. Lorne Butler, Acting Executive Director, Int'l Centre for N Gov & Dev/Senior Strategist, VP Research Office, U of S

Sarah Buhler, Associate Professor, College of Law

Erin Kleisinger, QC, President, Law Society

Group 3: Context – A Tribunal

Facilitator: Barbra Bailey, Policy Counsel, Law Society

Recorder: Michelle Korpan, Law Student

Participants: Stacy Muller, Assistant Director, Dispute Resolution Office

Amanda Dodge, Lawyer & Coordinator, Systemic Initiatives Program, CLASSIC

Leah Howie, Director, Law Reform Commission

Neil Robertson, QC, President, Saskatchewan Chapter, Canadian Bar Association

Group 4: Context - A Law Firm/Legal Coach/Near-to-Law Professional

Facilitator: Michaela Keet, Professor

Recorder: Ashley Falk, Law Student

Participants: Lana Wickstrom, Separation Specialist

Tim Brown, Executive Director, Law Society

Janelle Anderson, Crown Counsel, Innovation Division, Ministry

Martin Phillipson, Dean, College of Law

Group 5: Context - A Legal Non-Profit Organisation

Facilitator: Kara-Dawn Jordan, Executive Director, Pro Bono Law Sask

Recorder: Aly Sparks, Law Student

Participants: Meredith Maloof, Native Law Centre, College of Law

Joel Janow, Executive Director, Public Legal Education Assoc.

Justice Barrington-Foote, Court of Queen's Bench

Chantelle Johnson, Executive Director, CLASSIC

Doug Surtees, Associate Dean Academic, College of Law

Group 6: Context - A Library

Facilitator: Charmaine Panko

Recorder: Kellie Wuttunee, Law Student

Participants: Dr. Beth Bilson, QC, Lead, Saskatchewan Access to Legal Information Project

Christine Varnam, Legal Librarian, Saskatoon Public Library

Jocelyn Wedel, Legal Librarian, Saskatoon Public Library

Nicole Saurer, MLA Regina Douglas Park, Critic for Justice

Evert van Olst, QC, Legal Counsel, Saskatoon Reg. Health Auth.

Appendix C: Questions Posed to Participants

These questions were posed to participants in the small group breakout sessions of the Dean's Forum:

1. What underlying concerns are addressed by the Distinction? Are there ways that these concerns be addressed more directly?
2. What principles ought to guide the creation of an alternate framework for addressing the concerns that underlie the Distinction? What about in the specific context your group has been given? What might this framework look like?
3. What else is necessary to ensure that such a framework "makes a difference on the ground?" Do you envision specific steps forward to increasing the public's access to legal assistance from alternative legal service providers? If so, what are they?