ABA Day draws more than 350 lawyers to Capitol Hill to lobby on important issues

More than 350 lawyers from across the country convened on Capitol Hill April 14-16 for ABA Day in Washington, an annual opportunity coordinated by the ABA Governmental Affairs Office for bar leaders to meet with their members of Congress.

This year, participants focused attention on the following two core issues during their more than 400 visits to congressional offices:

**LSC Funding.** The need for legal services for the poor in the United States has never been greater, and LSC funded programs help the most vulnerable in society, including veterans returning from war and domestic violence victims. Members of Congress were asked to increase LSC funding from the current level of $375 million to $452 million, the amount requested by the Obama administration.

**Over-incarceration: Juvenile Justice and Sentencing Reform.** It is crucial to reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act with provisions to end jailing of youth for non-criminal status offenses, implement steps to reduce racial disparities, and strengthen access to counsel. In addition, Congress should pass strong sentencing reform measures, including the Smarter Sentencing Act, to reduce mandatory minimums for non-violent drug offenses and to permit judges to sentence below mandatory minimums in qualified cases.

“Your advocacy in support of these causes is vital to their legislative success,” ABA President William C. Hubbard said in welcoming the participants, adding that the personal meetings with their congressional delegations help the ABA forge lasting relationships that can be called upon when other important issues arise.

ABA Day also featured the Justice Awards, which recognized senators and representatives who have supported issues of critical importance to the association, and the Grassroots Advocacy Awards, presented to individual lawyers for their efforts to improve the American justice system.

Senators receiving the 2015 Justice Awards, which were announced April 14 at the National Archives, were: Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), for her role in sponsoring and enacting the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), leadership in addressing sex trafficking, support for legislation to reduce gun violence, and her cosponsorship and support for the Paycheck Fairness Act and the Employment Non-Discrimination Act; and Sen. Angus S. King Jr. (I-Maine), for his leadership in enacting legislation authorizing credit unions to insure Interest on Lawyer Trust Accounts (IOLTA) at the same level of coverage that banks provide, and opposition to mandatory accrual accounting legislation.
### LEGISLATIVE BOXSCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGISLATIVE ISSUE</th>
<th>HOUSE</th>
<th>SENATE</th>
<th>FINAL</th>
<th>ABA POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Justice</strong></td>
<td>Judiciary subcommittee held a hearing on civil asset forfeiture on 2/11/15.</td>
<td>Judiciary Committee held a hearing on civil asset forfeiture on 4/15/15.</td>
<td>Supports federal sentencing reform to address explosive growth in prison population and costs. Supports certain civil asset forfeiture reforms. Supports JJDPA reauthorization. Supports funding for federal and state indigent defense programs. See front page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Courts</strong></td>
<td>Appropriations subcommittee held a hearing on judicial funding on 3/25/15.</td>
<td>Appropriations subcommittee held a hearing on judicial funding on 3/24/15.</td>
<td>President signed P.L. 113-235 (H.R. 83) on 12/16/14.</td>
<td>Supports adequate judicial resources and opposes efforts to infringe on separation of powers or undermine the judiciary. See page 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABA urges DHS not to place families in detention

ABA President William C. Hubbard urged the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) last month to abandon current policies that he said have resulted in unprecedented levels of immigration detention, including a return to the “failed practice of family detention.”

Hubbard, in a March 26 letter to DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson, pointed out that the ABA for more than two decades has opposed the use of detention except in extraordinary circumstances and that current DHS detention policies fail to meet the ABA’s Civil Immigration Standards. The DHS policies instead, he said, presume detention as the default position for many migrants, particularly Central American women and children seeking asylum.

Hubbard said that since June 2014 DHS has expanded the capacity for detention of families by approximately 1,000 detention spaces and has concrete plans to create an additional 2,500 beds in the coming months. He explained that the department, which reached a decision in 2009 to eliminate the detention of families, has chosen to emphasize detention in addressing the humanitarian challenges presented last summer when larger numbers of women and children arrived at the U.S. border seeking protection.

By placing Central American women and children into expedited removal proceedings, DHS requires detention until they pass a credible fear interview allowing them to pursue an asylum claim. In addition, DHS initially insisted, based on a deterrence rationale, on the continued detention of families even after a favorable credible fear interview.

“Such detention violates basic principles requiring that any deprivation of liberty be justified based on individual circumstances and instead serves an impermissible punitive function that should be reserved for those convicted of crimes,” Hubbard wrote. He also stressed that detention causes severe harm to asylum-seeking children and families because of their unique developmental vulnerabilities and the likelihood that they have already suffered serious trauma.

DHS recently began to allow for release of some families after a favorable credible fear interview upon payment of high bond amounts that do not appear to reflect any individualized assessment, Hubbard said.

He emphasized that the widespread use of detention also significantly impedes access to legal representation, which enhances due process protections, increases rates of appearances before immigration courts, and improves the efficiency of the immigration court process.

Family detention facilities are located in remote areas that are far from major urban centers where legal services organizations and pro bono attorneys can be found. This makes it challenging for families to obtain representation and places a serious burden on the resources of pro bono legal service providers, he explained.

Hubbard also emphasized that detention is not necessary to accomplish the primary goal of ensuring court appearances because children and families released to family members in the United States are likely to appear in court, particularly when they are represented by counsel.

“There is no question that the rapid increase in families and unaccompanied children entering our country over the past year has presented challenges,” Hubbard wrote. “However, in the rush to address those challenges, the United States cannot abandon the principles of liberty, fairness and due process that make this country a beacon for those suffering persecution around the world,” he said.

Holder vacates 2008 Silva-Trevino opinion

ABA called opinion “ill-advised and pernicious”

U.S. Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. issued an order April 10 vacating the 2008 Justice Department opinion in Matter of Silva-Trevino, which was issued by then Attorney General Michael Mukasey and permitted an immigration judge, when ruling on the immigration consequences of criminal convictions, to consider evidence outside the formal record of a noncitizen’s conviction to determine if the conviction involved moral turpitude.

The ABA has been urging the attorney general for several years to withdraw the 2008 opinion, maintaining that it had “upended a century of precedent applying categorical analysis of convictions in immigration cases, including convictions for ‘crimes involving moral turpitude.’ ” The categorical approach requires immigration adjudicators to rely solely on the legal interpretation of the criminal statute and what was determined in the criminal court proceeding, thereby avoiding any relitigation of the underlying conduct.
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Justice Samuel A. Alito (center) hosted the April 15 reception at the U.S. Supreme Court.

Justice Award recipient Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) (center) with Richard Kyle, president, Minnesota State Bar Association (MSBA); Trudy Halla, ABA House of Delegates; Michael Unger, MSBA president-elect; and Susan Holden, ABA House of Delegates.

ABA Day Planning Committee Chair Robert M. Carlson, Grassroots Award recipient Patricia Apy and ABA President William C. Hubbard

Rick DeBruhl, chief communications officer, State Bar of Arizona; Patricia Lee Refo, chair, ABA House of Delegates; and Hon. Margarita Bernal, State Bar of Arizona; with Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.)

Angela Hinton, State Bar of Georgia; Rep. Barry Loudermilk (R-Ga.); and ABA President-elect Nominee Linda A. Klein

House Appropriations Committee Chairman Hal Rogers (R-Ky.) greets Grassroots Award recipient John Rosenberg as ABA Past President Wm. T. (Bill) Robinson III, looks on.

Sen. Charles E. Grassley (R-Iowa) (second from left) meets with (from left): David Brown, ABA House of Delegates; Harry Shipley, Iowa State Bar Association (ISBA); Alan Olson, ABA House of Delegates; Dwight Dinkla, ISBA executive director; ISBA President Joe Feller; and ABA President William C. Hubbard.
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“Allowing immigration adjudicators to determine the nature of a conviction by investigating facts that were never a necessary part of the criminal proceedings forces noncitizens to re-litigate their criminal cases, which raises serious issues of procedural due process and fairness,” then ABA President James R. Silkenat wrote in a March 11, 2014, letter to Holder. Silkenat called the Mukasey opinion “ill-reasoned and pernicious.”

In February 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit became the fifth federal court of appeals to reject the 2008 opinion and conclude that the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) “unambiguously forbids fact-finding beyond the record of conviction to determine if an immigrant is removable based upon a conviction for a crime involving moral turpitude.” The Fifth Circuit ruling, issued in Silva-Trevino v. Holder, remanded the case to the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) for further proceedings. In addition, recent Supreme Court decisions in Moncrieffe v. Holder, 113 S. Ct. 1678 (2013), and Descamps v. United States, 133 S. Ct. 2276 (2013) reaffirmed the categorical approach in criminal and immigration law.

“In view of the decisions of five courts of appeals rejecting the framework set out in Attorney General Mukasey’s opinion – which has created disagreement among the circuits and disuniformity in the Board’s application of immigration law – as well as intervening Supreme Court decisions that cast doubt on the continued validity of the opinion, I conclude that it is appropriate to vacate the November 7, 2008 opinion in its entirety,” Holder stated in his order.

Holder said that a “complete vacatur will enable the Board to develop a uniform standard for the proper construction and application of INA Section 212(a)(2) and similar provisions in light of all relevant precedents and arguments.”

He said the Board now may address the following issues:

• how adjudicators are to determine whether a particular criminal offense is a crime involving moral turpitude under the INA;
• when, and to what extent, adjudicators may use a modified categorical approach and consider a record of conviction in determining whether an alien has been convicted of... a crime involving moral turpitude” in applying INA Section 212(a) and similar provisions; and
• whether an alien who seeks a favorable exercise of discretion under the INA after having engaged in criminal acts constituting the sexual abuse of a minor should be required to make a heightened evidentiary showing of hardship or other factors that would warrant a favorable exercise of discretion.

Judicial Vacancies/Confirmations—114th Congress* (as of 4/21/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Vacancies</th>
<th>Pending Nominations</th>
<th>Confirmations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Supreme Court (9 judgeships)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Courts of Appeals (179 judgeships)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US District Courts (678 judgeships)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court of International Trade (9 judgeships)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes territorial judgeships
ADOPITION AND FOSTER CARE REPORTING SYSTEM: The ABA expressed support this month for adding education-related data information to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS), which includes case-level information from state and tribal agencies under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act on all children in foster care and those who have been adopted with Title IV-E agency involvement. A notice of proposed rulemaking published Feb. 9 would update AFCARS requirements to include changes made by enactment of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 and the Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act of 2014. In comments submitted April 10 to the Administration for Children and Families in the Department of Health and Human Services, the ABA said that “maintaining key educational data is essential to monitoring states’ compliance with the education requirements of the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act and – even more important – to ensure that the educational needs of children in foster care are being met.” The addition of education-related data to AFCARS “marks tremendous progress, and it will surely lead to improved data that can be used to inform and improve states’ practices and policies and enable them to measure and track the educational progress of children in care,” the ABA comments stated. The comments also pointed out that several of the data elements are already being collected in many jurisdictions and should not create an unnecessary burden for child welfare professionals. The ABA recommended several changes in the proposal dealing with school enrollment, educational level, and educational stability, and special education.

TEXAS DEATH PENALTY: ABA President William C. Hubbard expressed the ABA’s support last month for bills pending in the Texas Senate and House of Representatives that seek to ensure that attorneys who represent condemned inmates receive notice when an execution date has been sought or has been set for their clients. In a March 30 letter to the leaders of the Texas Senate Committee on Criminal Justice and the Texas House Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence, Hubbard explained that while the ABA takes no position on capital punishment generally, the association has taken the position that governments should take great care to ensure that death penalty cases are administered fairly and impartially in accordance with due process, and minimize the risk that innocent persons may be executed. In addition, he said the ABA has “extensive policies and best practice standards regarding the operation of U.S. courts and criminal cases that support the notion that meaningful and timely notice of motions and decisions of the court helps ensure basic fairness and allows defense lawyers to meet their obligations to their clients.” The bills, Senate Bill 1071 and House Bill 2110, would align Texas law with ABA best practices and require all Texas courts and prosecutors to follow consistent notice practices when seeking an execution date, Hubbard said. “To the extent that capital defense counsel in Texas are not consistently receiving immediate notice of execution dates as they are set, or there is any confusion about who or what entity is specifically under a duty to notify the representatives of the condemned, this legislation provides an easy correction and helpful clarification regarding what should happen at this final stage of a capital case in Texas,” he wrote. The Senate committee unanimously approved Senate Bill 1071 on April 7; the House committee held hearings on the House bill April 15.

NURSING HOME CARE: P.L. 114-10 (H.R. 2), the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act signed April 16 by President Obama, contains “standard of care” provisions that the ABA maintains would make it more difficult to establish a case of negligence in a lawsuit by arguing that there was a violation of federal requirements, including those under the Nursing Home Reform Act of 1987 (NHRA). In a March 25 letter to House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) urging that the provisions be removed during House consideration of the legislation, ABA Government Affairs Director Thomas M. Susman explained that the NHRA and its regulations recognize a minimum level of care that each resident should receive for a nursing home to participate in the Medicare and Medicaid programs and for each resident to attain or maintain the highest level of well-being. “The safety of more than one million nursing home residents relies on the act’s critical minimum requirements for nursing homes,” Susman wrote. He added that governmental studies have repeatedly shown that state inspection agencies fail to cite or penalize facilities for harming residents even when they find serious injuries, and many violations are never discovered by state regulatory authorities. “Often the courts are the only recourse for consumers trying to hold nursing homes responsible for their actions,” Susman wrote, “Less accountability inevitably leads to poorer quality care and greater abuse and neglect.”
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Obama authorizes sanctions to address cyber threats

President Obama declared the threat of malicious cyber-enabled activities a national emergency April 1 and issued an executive order authorizing sanctions on individuals or entities that are responsible for, are compliant in, or engage in such activities originating or directed from abroad.

Calling cyber threats one of the most serious economic and national security challenges the United States faces, Obama authorized the secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the attorney general and the secretary of State, to impose sanctions on those whose actions are likely to result in or have contributed to a significant threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economic health or financial stability of the United States. The executive order also authorizes sanctions to be imposed on individuals who knowingly receive or use trade secrets stolen through cyber-enabled activities that pose a threat to U.S. national security and economic competitiveness.

ABA President William C. Hubbard commended the president for his executive order, saying it provides a new tool for both the private sector and the government in the fight against malicious cyber activity and cyber theft.

The president’s action is in line with ABA policy adopted in 2013 that calls for appropriate sanctions for unauthorized, illegal intrusions into computer networks utilized by lawyers.

“Information security represents an increasingly important issue for the legal profession,” Hubbard said. He explained that sophisticated hacking activities on private computer systems and networks, including those used by lawyers and law firms, have increased dramatically over the last decade and expose clients, their lawyers and society to significant economic losses and undermine the legal profession by threatening client confidentiality and the attorney-client privilege.

The April 1 executive order follows President Obama’s pledge in January to push for comprehensive cybersecurity legislation. At that time he submitted a legislative proposal to Congress aimed at enhancing collaboration and information sharing by the private sector by encouraging the private sector to share appropriate cyber threat information with the Department of Homeland Security National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center (NCCIC).

The center would share the information with relevant federal agencies Information Sharing and Analysis Organizations developed and operated by the private sector. Private sector companies that participate would gain partial liability protections from lawsuits resulting from security breaches. The president also included provisions to modernize law enforcement authorities to address cybercrimes and would streamline procedures for reporting security breaches to consumers.

Although Congress was unable to agree on comprehensive legislation during the last Congress, several bills were enacted, including new laws creating the NCCIC and supporting steps for the private sector to develop voluntary best practices for reducing cybersecurity risks to the nation’s infrastructure.
ABA urges increased appropriation for LSC in fiscal 2016

The ABA recently asked Congress to provide $452 million for the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) in fiscal year 2016—a $77 million increase also requested by the Obama administration to counter the growing need for civil legal assistance for low-income Americans.

“Robust funding for LSC is desperately needed because other funding sources have diminished due to the country’s economic downturn, and pro bono efforts, while critical, are insufficient to completely replace federal legal aid funding,” ABA President William C. Hubbard said in statements submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies.

Hubbard thanked the subcommittee members for their leadership in achieving increases in LSC funding over the past two years, but he explained that LSC budget levels are still lower than they were in 2010 and an estimated 50 percent of all eligible people seeking legal aid services are turned away due to lack of resources.

“When people are unable to resolve their civil legal matters, they are more likely to require other forms of publicly funded assistance,” Hubbard said. “Therefore, funding LSC is a necessary investment that provides long-term benefits for Americans.”

LSC, the largest provider of civil legal assistance to low-income Americans, funds legal aid programs through grants in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. LSC grantees assist a variety of clients, including veterans returning from war, domestic violence victims, seniors, those with disabilities, low-income military families, those struggling with housing matters such as foreclosures and evictions, people coping with the after-effects of natural disasters, and families dealing with child custody issues.

Hubbard explained that more than a third of all cases closed by LSC grantees deal with some type of family law matter and that 26 percent of the LSC grantees’ total caseload are housing issues.

He also pointed out that military veterans and their families encounter numerous civil legal issues as they transition to civilian life and often need assistance recovering benefits from the Veterans Benefits Administration for service-related injuries. In addition, natural disasters that have occurred with surprising frequency in recent years have thrown thousands into poverty and created legal problems of unprecedented scope. He also explained that LSC grantees are sometimes the only source of legal aid for low-income citizens in rural areas.

Hubbard concluded his statement by citing the ABA’s long history of support for providing legal services to the poor, starting with the establishment of the Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants in 1920. Following a call in 1964 from then ABA President Lewis F. Powell Jr. for expansion of the nation’s legal services to the poor, the efforts of the ABA and many others led to the creation of LSC in 1974.

Federal judiciary requests $7 billion in discretionary funding

Representatives of the federal judiciary asked Senate and House appropriators last month to provide $7 billion in discretionary funding for fiscal year 2016—a 3.9 percent increase over current funding.

Judge Julia Gibbons, chair of the U.S. Judicial Conference’s Budget Committee, testified before the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Financial Services and General Government that the amount “achieves our goal of holding down cost growth across the judiciary where possible, while also investing in several important new information technology and program initiatives that will improve judiciary operations.”

The request also would increase the hourly rate by $6 to $134 for attorneys representing clients in noncapital cases under the Criminal Justice Act.

Appearing with James C. Duff, director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Gibbons emphasized ways the judiciary has contained costs in recent years through space reduction and formal arrangements by courts to share administrative services. Duff’s statement urged the members of the subcommittees to include the necessary one-year extension for nine temporary federal judgeships that will expire beginning in April 2016.

The ABA supports the judiciary’s proposed level of funding and continues to urge Congress, when making budgetary decisions, to take into consideration the judiciary’s essential role as a coequal branch of government.
Senate confirms Loretta Lynch as attorney general

Approval comes after months of delay

Loretta E. Lynch became the first African–American woman confirmed to be U.S. attorney general April 23 after the Senate voted 56-43 in favor of her nomination.

Ten Republicans joined 44 Democrats and two Independents to support the nomination, which was delayed as the Senate struggled to reach agreement on provisions in a human trafficking bill. That bill, S. 178, passed by a unanimous 99-0 vote on April 22 following a compromise.

The confirmation vote came more than five months after President Obama nominated Lynch, who has served as U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York since 2010 and also held that post from June 1999 to May 2001 after joining the office in 1990. She was a partner at the law firm of Hogan & Hartson between her two U.S. attorney appointments. She is a graduate of Harvard Law School.

Despite Lynch’s credentials and experience, some Republicans opposed her nomination because of her support for the president’s immigration policies, which would grant, through a series of executive actions, protection from deportation to up to five million undocumented immigrants. The 10 Republicans voting for confirmation were: Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (Ky.) and Sens. Kelly Ayotte (N.H.), Thad Cochran (Miss.), Susan Collins (Maine), Jeff Flake (Ariz.), Lindsey Graham (S.C.), Orrin G. Hatch (Utah), Ron Johnson (Wis.), Mark Kirk (Ill.) and Rob Portman (Ohio).

“Today, the Senate finally confirmed Loretta Lynch to be America’s next attorney general – and America will be better off for it,” the president said after the vote, emphasizing that her confirmation “ensures that we are better positioned to keep our communities safe, keep our nation secure, and ensure that every American experiences justice under the law.”

“As head of the Justice Department, she will oversee a vast portfolio of cases, including counterterrorism and voting rights; public corruption and white-collar crime; judicial recommendations and policy reviews – all of which matter to the lives of every American, and shape the story of our country. She will bring to bear her experience as a tough, independent, and well-respected prosecutor on key, bipartisan priorities like criminal justice reform. And she will build on our progress in combatting newer threats like cybercrime,” he said.

Attorney General Eric H. Holder Jr. said he is pleased that the Senate has recognized Lynch’s clear qualifications and said he is “confident that Loretta will be an outstanding attorney general, a dedicated guardian of the Constitution, and a devoted champion of all those whom the law protects and empowers.”

Follow the Governmental Affairs Office on Twitter!

You can follow us at @ABAGrassroots for updates on GAO activities and the scoop on what is happening inside the Beltway.
ABA reiterates support for cash accounting for law firms

ABA President William C. Hubbard reiterated the ABA’s opposition this month to any tax reform proposals in Congress that would require law firms and other personal service businesses with annual gross receipts over $10 million to switch from the cash method of accounting to the accrual method.

In April correspondence to the leaders of the Senate Finance Committee in response to the committee’s request for stakeholder input on improving the tax code, and in similar correspondence to the House Ways and Means Committee, Hubbard said the mandatory accrual proposal “would create unnecessary new complexity in the tax law and cause substantial hardship” for many lawyers, law firms and other personal service businesses.

Under current law, businesses are generally permitted to use the simple and straightforward cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting – in which income is not recognized until cash other than payment is actually received – if their average annual gross receipts for a three-year period are $5 million or less. In addition, all individuals, partnerships, S corporations, law firms and other personal service businesses are permitted to use the cash method irrespective of their annual revenue unless they have inventory. Most other businesses must use the accrual method, in which income is recognized when the right to receive it arises, not when it is actually received.

During the 113
th Congress, the mandatory accrual accounting provisions were included in legislation introduced in the House and in a draft Senate Finance Committee proposal. The ABA worked with a broad and diverse coalition of associations, law firms, other organizations, and over two dozen state and local bars to oppose the provisions. In addition, 46 senators and 233 representatives signed letters to the Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committees expressing support for cash accounting and concerns over the mandatory accrual accounting proposals.

Hubbard emphasized that the proposals, in addition to creating complexity and increasing compliance costs, would:

• impose new financial burdens on many law firms and personal service businesses by requiring them to pay taxes on income they have not yet received and may never receive;

• cause the legal professional to suffer particular financial hardships, as many lawyers and law firms are not paid by their clients until long after the work is performed; and

• impede economic growth by discouraging law firms and other professional service providers from expanding or merging with other providers because it could trigger costly accrual accounting requirements.

The committees will be weighing the comments and recommendations they receive from organizations and the public as they develop tax reform legislation for consideration during the 114
th Congress. ■
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practice reform. He also thanked the ABA for its assistance in the judicial nomination and confirmation process and for collaboration with the administration to address the veterans claims backlog and to provide pro bono assistance as part of the Clemency Project 2014.

Calling this year’s event a great success, ABA Day Planning Committee Chair Robert M. Carlson said, “The ABA is at its best when we bring people together to advocate on issues of fairness and equal justice under the law. The dedication and hard work of our lawyer volunteers, who take days out of their offices, and for the most part, pay their own way to Washington, to seek justice on behalf of people who might not otherwise have a voice is an inspiration to all.”