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Rhode also emphasizes the need for public awareness on the positive aspects of legal representation; she cites the proliferation of frivolous litigation in the media as a deterrent to citizens who may otherwise pursue legal remedies.

Second, using the criminal justice system as a case study, Rhode discusses how access to justice is hindered where defendants are unable to obtain "effective assistance of counsel." According to Rhode, many state appointment systems provide defendants with counsel with little experience in criminal proceedings, and limited resources to prepare for them.

Recognizing that pro bono work is often cited as a solution to the inaccessibility of legal services, Rhode conducted an empirical study of the factors that influence lawyers to undertake pro bono work, with emphasis on the role of law school pro bono programs. Rhode's study culminates in a list of "best practices" for employers and law schools to encourage pro bono work.

Although Rhode's analysis and empirical findings are based on the American legal system, she makes limited reference to Canadian and international legal aid experience, primarily as models to inspire reform. Many of Rhode's strategies for reform transcend the American experience, most notably in her recommendations for effective self-representation, and expanding pro bono services in the legal profession.


BY JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY

On 16 September 2005, the Faculty of Law at the University of Toronto held a conference entitled "Access to Care, Access to Justice," to discuss the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in Chaoulli v. Quebec, and its possible impact on health care policy in Canada.
Professors Flood, Roach, and Sossin have collected the papers that resulted from that conference into this ambitious volume, which aims to delve deeply into *Chaoulli*'s many facets, and to situate the decision in its many relevant contexts.

The book’s twenty-seven articles span a range of perspectives, all categorized into eight sections touching on the various legal, social, and political lives the decision is expected to take on. Peter H. Russell leads off by suggesting that while the relatively narrow judgment legally applies only in Québec, the intense political and public attention which the decision has attracted will give its public importance a life of its own beyond its strictly legal implications.

In another section contributors discuss the politics of the *Charter*, and whether the Court properly respected its institutional role in *Chaoulli*. Though attitudes towards the legitimacy of judicial review may vary, there is consensus that the substantive outcome in *Chaoulli* protects negative liberties in a way that can only help the advantaged to the detriment of the disadvantaged. Three sections canvass the Court’s handling of evidentiary issues in *Chaoulli*, the comparative evidence available on private health insurance, and the receptiveness of the Court to the idea that the *Charter* can require certain positive outcomes for those dependent on social services.

The final three sections the book incorporate the perspectives of certain health policy experts and participants in the *Chaoulli* litigation to explore the implications of allowing private health insurance, the possible governmental responses to *Chaoulli*, and the future of medicare in Canada. In a nod to the prominence of the Romanow and Kirby reports in the judgment, Roy Romanow and Stanley H. Hartt, who acted as counsel for Senator Kirby and other senators in their intervention at the Supreme Court, close the book by defending their contrasting philosophies on how best to administer universal health care in this country.