

REMARKS TO THE HAWAII ACCESS TO JUSTICE CONFERENCE
ACCESS TO JUSTICE: PURSUING A NOBLE AND NECESSARY PURPOSE
THE FIGHT FOR EQUAL JUSTICE: PROMOTING EFFECTIVE STRATEIES

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, HONOLULU, HI

FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2011

Thank you for that warm welcome. I want to begin with heartfelt thanks to Bob LeClair for inviting me to speak to you today. Please know that the 45 minutes I've been given was his idea, not mine! You should also know that Bob is a giant on the national scene and you are lucky to have him in your state working to ensure access to justice for low-income Hawaiians.

I hope you will indulge me a point of personal privilege so that I might also thank my biggest fan, my mother, Hazel Livingston. My sister, Charlotte Ned is also here. They have always been very supportive of me and they especially love to show their support when they can do it in a tropical paradise. Thank you both for being here.

To round out my many thanks for this opportunity, I want to thank each and every one of you for what you have already done to promote access to justice here in Hawaii. Your presence at this conference demonstrates a willingness to engage in conversations about change, to consider collaborations with new partners, to think big, and to imagine new possibilities. If we do this right today, we will shift some paradigms, we will push some envelopes, we will knock down some barriers, and we will open some doors. Today can be the day we re-energize old soldiers, and enlist new soldiers in the fight for access to justice.

Now, I know that there are some “NoNo’s” in the room today. Who’s NoNo you ask? Has anyone read John Kotter and Holger Rathgeber’s book, *Our Iceberg is Melting*? If so, you know what NoNo looks like and if you are involved in access to justice in this state, then you can probably also point out NoNo in this crowd. But don’t; not yet anyway. For those of you who have not read the book, *Our Iceberg is Melting* is a wonderful book about organizational change. In fact, the book’s subtitle is *Changing and Succeeding Under Any Conditions*. It’s a simple yet fantastic study of organizational culture and the need for open-mindedness, strategic thinking and creative problem solving. And that’s what we are going to be about today.

NoNo just happens to be my favorite character. I think that’s because I know so many NoNo’s. They are the folks in any and EVERY organization, or movement that’s always saying (pause) No! No, that’s not the problem or No, we don’t have a problem. No, that’s not the solution, No, he won’t do that for us. No, she doesn’t want to help us. And my personal favorite, No, that’s not the way we’ve done it in the past!!! NoNo is starting to look familiar huh??? Well, let me say that I’m glad NoNo is here because NoNo is going to help us achieve our goals. NoNo is going to help us understand the opposition and he, or she, is going to help us become better prepared to overcome the obstacles to success. NoNo is an important stakeholder and we need ALL the stakeholders at the table if we are

going to move forward toward a justice system that works for all Hawaiians: rich and poor, educated and uneducated, native and immigrant, represented by counsel and self-represented.

Now, this might be a good time for me to point out that I realize that fine line between promoting effective strategies and telling people what to do. Let me be real clear, I am not here to tell you what to do. You are the experts in this state and you are the people in this community that can make things happen. You are the witnesses to injustice and you are the people in the best position to stop injustice where it exists. You are the people who can shape what the delivery system looks like in Hawaii. And you are the people who can hold your leaders accountable for the shape it takes. So I won't tell you what to do or how to get it done. What I hope to do today is inspire you to do more of what's working, less of what's not working and to explore the things that might not work today but will be wildly successful tomorrow. There is a role for everyone here to help ensure "justice for all" in the great state of Hawaii.

So where should we start? How about at the top of justice pyramid: the judiciary. In my experience, the most effective strategies are ones that have the support of the judiciary. Please understand, judges don't always come up with the best ideas, but the best ideas tend to gain traction when judges put their

considerable judicial influence behind them. Now, I've just made Judge NoNo cringe. Judge NoNo is thinking, I just call the balls and strikes. I can't do any more than I'm already doing without running afoul of the ethics rules. I can't go talk to the legislature. I certainly can't talk to any one about money, and so on. Right about now, Judge NoNo is looking at the first concurrent workshop topic on the agenda this morning, sweating about what "judicial involvement" means. I have to say, if all you discuss in that workshop is "involvement" then you have missed an opportunity. I think it's a misnomer. I think the workshop should be entitled **judicial LEADERSHIP!** Judicial involvement ought to be a given. Seriously, what kind of justice system doesn't necessarily assume active and significant involvement by judges? Fortunately, Judge Broderick understands this, and he and the judges on his panel are going explore ways to "push the envelope" as far as possible toward a judiciary that turns the dream of equal access for all into a reality.

Your state Supreme Court has provided the kind of judicial leadership I'm talking about. Creating an Access to Justice Commission was a clear demonstration of the kind of judicial leadership that can make a difference. The Court's adoption of rules like the *Cy Pres* and Emeritus Pro Bono Rules are other shining examples of outstanding leadership. [Note Filing fees bill and any highlights in this mornings report]

The justices on your state’s high court are leading by example. Hopefully, that kind of leadership is evident throughout the courts of your state. Of course, if that were completely true, we wouldn’t need a workshop. So, if your rank and file judiciary is typical, then you have some judges who could, but don’t make access to justice a priority. Local judges, in trial courts and in appellate courts across this state have incredible opportunities to impact the justice system, not just by being wise and fair in the adjudication of disputes, but in all aspects of the justice system. I submit to you that a judge whose only focus is on the daily docket, is a judge who does not see the big picture of justice. Judges must be concerned with the rights of the people inside the courtroom and outside in the hallway. They must be concerned with the ones stuck in the clerk’s office as well as the ones stuck in the elevator. Judges must become architects of justice.

In the old days, the days before we got serious about access to justice, many judges just passively sat back and reacted to a justice system primarily designed by others. This is a paradigm that must shift. We ought not think of ourselves nor let others think or treat us like a state agency. We are the third branch of government; we are the third leg of a very sturdy three-legged stool that holds the weight of the constitution. If our leg is rotted or if it is cut down too low, it will not support the weight our heavy constitutional guarantees require. The judicial branch of

government must carry its weight and it must keep its promises to the people who's rights it protects. It's simple, without a foundation of strong judicial leadership; our justice system will continue to deteriorate to the point of irrelevance, or sheer destruction. We have already experienced a lack of confidence in our courts and we must do everything in our power to restore the public's confidence in our profession and in the justice system as a whole.

In my mind, this means that judges must rethink how they do business and how business is conducted in the courthouse. Traditionally, we have been slow to change, but we must become better at recognizing trends and keeping pace with the new realities that impact our decisions. As the paradigms in our culture shift, we must shift the paradigms in our legal system. How we meet the challenges these shifting trends present will forever impact the administration of justice in our communities. We must be forward thinking. We must be creative and we must develop innovations that can be employed to help us mete out justice in ways that are more efficient and in ways that make sense to everyone who comes to the courthouse, not just to those who are members of some elite class.

Judges must begin to see themselves as problem solvers; not just umpires. This means that courts must become problem solving courts. Drug courts, veterans' courts and mental health courts are examples of courts that are trying to solve

problems not just process people through the system. These courts are using holistic approaches to problem solving and they typically include multi-disciplinary approaches. Some of these ideas will work and some won't but we must continue to experiment.

We should also recognize that the courts may not necessarily be the best place for dispute resolution. The traditional adversarial model that is the hallmark of our court system may be the last place people need to be when they have a problem. Consider cases in which people must continue to have a relationship with one another when the case is over; like child custody matters for example.

Litigation, not separation, often makes co-parenting impossible. Before we subject kids to that reality, perhaps we should require parents to participate in a process much less adversarial than the courtroom.

Frankly, much of what happens in the courtroom could be handled in an administrative process, under the auspicious of the courts, but in much more efficient and much less expensive proceedings. Adoptions, name changes, and matters that are resolved through Collaborative Law proceedings might fall into this category. Simple probate matters, occupational driver's licenses, those ubiquitous "friendly suits" and many traffic offenses might fall into this category as well. Of course, if we all implemented "E-Ticket" systems, so that you could pay an

uncontested ticket on the spot or online the same day, we might avoid a time consuming trip to the courthouse.

I don't know about Hawaii, but in Texas any many other jurisdictions, the juvenile and child welfare systems are broken. Mostly what we do now is warehouse kids until they age out and then we wait for them to enter our adult systems. It's a heck of a pipeline. And who ever came up with the notion of "zero tolerance"? Zero tolerance TEACHES nothing except intolerance. We are wasting our resources on prison uniforms instead of teaching kids how to sew cheerleading uniforms.

Our child welfare system is, as my sister would say, "a hot mess"! We pick up kids faster and keep them in care longer than ever before. Instead of using our resources to teach people we know need parenting skills, we spend all our time and money in a never ending debate about whether a stranger must become a parent even if they don't want to! Maybe we need to reevaluate our priorities. Certainly we need to reevaluate our strategies for dealing with systems that we know are broken.

As architects of justice, judges must be about the business of redesigning these systems. We have to start experimenting with the way we design our dockets. We must explore better ways to handle business litigation and more efficient ways to deal with discovery disputes. We have to look at case management systems that will

allow us to handle an increasing volume of business. And we must be much earlier adapters and users of technology. For some of us, this will mean a significant capital investment; or maybe not. Last weekend my book club invited the author, who happens to live in California, to participate in the discussion. We couldn't afford to fly her to Texas but we could afford Skype, because it's free. It made me wonder about the possibility of holding a hearing next week in a case that requires an Arabic language interpreter. I can't find a local interpreter so I might have to use Language Line or one of the other telephone services. The quality of the interpretation is sure to be greater and the party's trust in the process is sure to be enhanced if, by using Skype, the parties and the interpreter can actually see each other. Can you see Thurgood Marshall using Skype? Times are changing and we must not only adapt to the changes, we must exploit them to the benefit of the people who need our help.

There can be no doubt that the legal system, as it has existed over the last century anyway, is changing. The old paradigm of every client walking into the courtroom with a lawyer has shifted significantly. That old "soup to nuts" representation model, the one in which a lawyer handles every aspect of every case, -- that went out the window not long after we started to see the emergence of "boutique" law firms. The explanations and reasons for these shifts and trends are

significant and worthy of study, but I submit to you that we will ultimately be judged not by why things changed but by how well we met the challenges presented by those changes.

I am hopeful that judges, here and in other jurisdictions, will rethink their roles in and out of the courtroom. I think we are long past the days of purely passive judges; especially when dealing with self-represented litigants. Judges must become more engaged all the while staying neutral, fair and impartial. This might mean something as simple as asking a question. I don't mean cross examining witnesses from the bench, but I do mean getting information that will help the judge make a decision. Judges ask lawyers questions all the time but very often they won't ask the same question of someone representing themselves. To be sure, judges must be careful of bending over the bench, but judges must also be careful of falling backward out of their seats while trying to keep their distance from self-represented litigants.

Surely our rules could be less cumbersome and our procedures could probably be simpler in many instances. We should at least consider simplifying rules and procedures and perhaps reduce the number of steps it takes to complete a process. Simple problems should have simple solutions and simple forms should elicit simple answers to simple questions. It's just that simple!

The law can be complex and I'm not saying we should dumb it down or change things so much that we put lawyers out of business. But I am saying that you shouldn't have to sell your car to pay for a simple uncontested divorce when you could probably handle that matter on your own. I'm saying that when SRL's come to the courts, which they have a legal right to do, we should at least explain to them why things are the way they are. A simple explanation can go a long way toward easing someone's frustrations.

Self-Help Centers are a wonderful way to provide assistance to SRL's. The workshop this afternoon will give you an opportunity to explore some best practices for Self-Help Centers. Some of the best SRL programs are court based. Some provide ongoing support and training for court clerks and other court staff. Some use the latest technology to automate forms and instructions, especially for use in rural communities where mere distance can mean the difference between getting justice or getting a raw deal. Some integrate law Library services and referral services in ways that provide litigants useful tools for a successful court experience.

There are a number of different models of successful self-help programs. Arizona's "Quick Court" program uses an interactive multimedia system to guide litigants through the court process with step-by-step instructions and an on screen narrator. Still other programs use instructional introductory videos to explain

exactly what will happen once the court proceeding begins. These programs can help manage the expectations of litigants and can ease some of the anxiety associated with being in unfamiliar territory like a courtroom.

There are lots of models to consider. Use what you think will work in your area. I will point out that the most successful models have a few noticeable characteristics. For example, they tend to network with one another. The program coordinators communicate with other programs and they learn from each other. They share war stories, success stories and horror stories too. They participate in national networks, they measure outcomes and they are constantly tracking trends and engaging in strategic planning. The most telling factor in the success of these models is that they all have strong support and strong leadership among the judiciary. When judges lead the way, great things follow.

Judges can encourage lawyers to partner with their clients to provide unbundled or limited scope representation so that lawyers can still earn a living doing the things that require their expertise, while allowing clients to do the things that don't require a law degree to accomplish. Judges can make this easier with rules that allow and anticipate this kind of representation arrangement. We will have to carefully consider our (lawyer/judge) ethical rules and we may even need to adopt new rules to govern things like ghostwriting and withdrawal from

representation. It will be worth the effort. This kind of an arrangement can result in significant income for lawyers as well as significant savings for clients. It's a win-win arrangement.

And I think it's time to clean up our language. Half the young lawyers in Texas can't speak legalese. I'll tell you a story about myself and a lesson I learned. One day I asked a SRL if he had any legal defenses. He looked puzzled. I routinely ask lawyers the same question and honestly, some of them look puzzled too but that's a different speech. Next, I asked him if he had any affirmative defenses. And to top it off, I next asked him if he had any kind of defenses at all. It finally hit me that he didn't understand what I meant by the word defenses. If I had just asked him what happened I would have learned that he had a ton of defenses, he just didn't know that's what they were called. It's amazing how much better my decisions are when I actually have all the facts. I've decided to give "plain language" a chance, and I'm encouraging you to do the same.

To the extent judges need to provide information, that information should be communicated as clearly as possible. That means that the courts' website should be easy to find, easy to navigate, and easy to understand. That means that brochures distributed by court personnel must also meet the same standards. A simple, one page, "frequently asked questions" sheet can convey a lot of useful information.

We must also make sure that information is accurately conveyed to people for whom English is a second or third language. Language access is a challenge that we must confront, not shy away from. The bottom line, we need to employ interpreters. We need to train interpreters and we need to make sure that they are culturally competent. We must stop allowing the children of the parties to act as interpreters. Instead, we need certified interpreters at client interviews, at depositions, at mediations and most certainly at all court proceedings.

So what can we expect from all these strategies? I think we can not only expect good results, I think success has been clearly demonstrated.. A number of jurisdictions have evaluated programs that provide assistance to self-represented litigants. They have measured outcomes in many different ways and many different delivery models were reviewed. The Spring 2011 edition of the ABA Judge's Journal features an article by John Greacen entitled "The Benefits and Costs of Programs to Assist Self-Represented Litigants". The article describes a number of efforts to evaluate various self-help programs in different jurisdictions and then goes on to describe a relatively recent study of programs in six trial courts in California's San Joaquin Valley. Here's a summary of his summary:

***workshop based self-help programs-**

--costs-13-23 cents for every dollar saved

***one-on-one programs—**

-saved at least 1 hearing per case,

-saved 5-15 minutes of hearing time for every hearing in the case

**-saved 1-1.5 hours of court staff time assisting SRL's/reviewing and
rejecting paperwork from the SRL**

***assistance at the time of a court appearance-**

-saved \$2.20 for every \$1 spent on the service (assuming only 1 hrg)

-saved \$6.90 for every \$1 spent (assuming end to multiple hrgs)

**The article concludes that economic savings to both the courts and to the
litigants are realized where these programs exists.**

**Judges can make these changes possible. I'm a general jurisdiction trial court
judge so I'm not knocking the value of precedent or the value of well settled ideas,
but let's face it, every now and then, something or somebody needs to be
overturned! I say, let's shake things up a bit and try something new and different.**

**Judges must have partners in the fight for access to justice. Lawyers are the
natural stakeholders in the fight for equal justice and we depend on the best and
brightest to lead by example. In most states, and certainly here in Hawaii, lawyers**

donate countless hours of *pro bono* service. By the way, I'm distinguishing *pro bono* legal services from public service. Both are important and I applaud everyone who participates in public service activities. However, I'm defining *pro bono* to mean providing free legal services to the poor—on purpose, and by agreement at the beginning of the representation. I don't define *pro bono* as getting stiffed on your bill. I'm also not talking about the discounted rates to your golf buddies; that might be low bono, but it's not *pro bono*. And, I'm certainly not talking about free legal advice to the symphony. I'm strictly talking about representing poor people who need legal advice. [great language in the HI judicial rules!!!]

I understand that your state is considering a rule change that would allow a \$500.00 contribution in lieu of representation. You already have mandatory reporting so maybe this is the logical next step. I don't know and I'm sure there are good arguments on both sides of this debate, but either way, encouraging every licensed attorney to live up to their professional responsibility to participate in *pro bono* activities is a rule that you can be proud of.

I also understand that you are studying a rule that would allow out-of-state lawyers to provide *pro bono* services following a major disaster. The New York Court of Appeals recently adopted a "Katrina" Rule which allows out-of-state lawyers to volunteer when the court has determined an emergency exists affecting

the justice system. With the adoption of this new rule, New York became the tenth state to do so.

Rules that would allow attorneys who take *pro bono* cases to earn credit toward their mandatory CLE requirements are becoming increasingly popular. A number of states have already implemented such a rule and those states include Colorado, Delaware, New York, Minnesota, Tennessee, Washington and Wyoming. Hawaii could be the next one. This may well turn out to be an effective strategy to increase *pro bono* participation in your state. [free CLE for taking a case *pro bono*]

[law firm credit toward billable hrs]

I'm proud of the lawyers who volunteer to take *pro bono* cases. Frankly, I think we should encourage, and guilt trip if necessary, court reporters, court clerks, interpreters, paralegals, law students, law professors, and others to volunteer their time as well.

We must encourage all of these professionals to partner with us to ensure access to justice. And we must explore new and even non-traditional partnerships in this work. Medical-legal partnerships have sprouted in many jurisdictions. I'm not sure what took us so long to realize the value of having a legal clinic co-located with a health clinic. But now that we have, let's exploit the opportunity to provide legal services when and where people need them most.

Librarians in both public libraries and law libraries have been eager to partner with the access to justice community to disseminate legal information. They understand the difference between legal information and legal advice and they have helped us understand the needs of their patrons. In many ways, librarians have become the first responders in a patrons' quest for legal help.

Some jurisdictions have found success by partnering with non-lawyer volunteers in programs like Justice Corps. Modeled after the Ameri-Corps program, the Justice Corps program utilizes college students and other young adults as aides assigned to work in the court system to help SRL litigants through the court process. They provide information, not advice, and they are well trained and supervised. They receive a stipend and valuable work experience all while providing a significant service to litigants who need assistance.

You are likely to find many of your partners among the usual suspects in the legal community. And you would be wise to mine that field for all its potential. But as you contemplate the development of a comprehensive delivery system please don't stop with the obvious stakeholders. I would also encourage you to consider extending an invitation to the general public to participate in sessions where you consider your vision. Identifying individuals or groups who represent client communities or who can offer the "public" perspective might be a challenge but

that's not a reason not to try. We can look to petit jurors and grand jurors to serve in this role. Clients of local legal services programs and members of non-profit, as well as for profit boards might offer assistance. Small business owners and people who have actually represented themselves in the past might also be willing to engage in this kind of dialogue. We can certainly learn a lot from consumers of our services and we must be willing to listen. You are likely to encounter NoNo in these discussions, but don't let that stop you.

We routinely try to partner with the Legislature when it comes to funding. By that I mean that our part of the partnership begs the other part of the partnership for millions of dollars. But we might do well to consider forming partnerships with the Legislature that center on substantive legal issues. Naturally, there will be some tension here and this can certainly be a tricky relationship to navigate. And our friend NoNo will be in the house, pun intended. But we should at least consider trying to convince our legislatures to remove politics from the law.

[note bi-partisan and non-partisan issues] Let me give you a very simple example.

In Texas, a couple must wait 72 hours after obtaining a marriage license before they can get married. However, the court can waive that requirement. The clerk's office routinely sends people to the judges, with a form in hand, to seek a waiver. By the way, the clerk also attaches the marriage license to the waiver form.

The rules of procedure, are completely silent on the criteria the judge is to use to determine whether or not to waive the requirement. So what happens? The couples take a day off work, traipse downtown in traffic, pay to park, wait, sometimes hours, to appear before a judge who asks why they need a waiver. The number one answer is “we didn’t know we had to wait 3 days and our wedding is tomorrow”.

The number one response by the judge is “here’s your waiver, congratulations and best wishes”. This is a colossal waste of everyone’s time. It’s hard to imagine that whatever public policy the Legislature had in mind is being advanced. Wasting judicial resources in this way is an administration of justice issue and it is incumbent upon the judiciary to educate state legislatures on such issues.

In all that you do to promote access to justice, you must recognize the value of collaboration. This means that those of us in the “choir” must work together to create a justice system that works. I have to say that I’ve been very proud of how well we have been able to accomplish this in Texas. The provider community works well together, the private bar works well with the providers, the IOLTA community works well with the Access to Justice community, everyone works well with the judiciary and this kind of collaboration is the key to the success we have achieved.

Now let’s talk about money! I often hear, and I’ve often said, “we need more money to provide greater access to justice”. That’s certainly true if we assume that

everything in our current budget makes sense; but what if it doesn't? I can think of at least 3 or 4 people who need to be fired and another 3 or 4 who are way past ready to be retired in my little county alone. Honestly, there is not a lot of fat in the budget for courts; but if there is—cut it! We have and we should continue to explore ways to handle our business more efficiently. We now know that we can realize savings by creating self-help programs. We are beginning to see cost savings by mandating E-Filing programs, especially in metropolitan areas. We are working hard to harness available resources, and yet, money is a resource that we still need more of. That's just a reality.

Interest rates are lower than ever before and it doesn't look like they are going to get any higher any time soon. This necessarily means that we can not depend on IOLTA revenues to the extent that we have in the past. We have to look at other sources to replace the revenues we've lost. To say that the justice system is experiencing a funding crisis is to woefully understate a significant problem.

The first thing we need to do to get over being timid about asking for money. We can make the case for the need but we actually have to make it, every chance we get. We simply have to ask. And the first group of donors we need to hit up are lawyers. If you haven't done a private bar campaign lately, then it might be time to do one. Foundations and other funders are going to want to know the extent to

which members of the bar contribute to this effort. And we must be able to say that lawyers are doing their part. It lends credibility to the cause and it demonstrates a deep commitment to justice by people who are in the business of justice.

Texas is one of about six states that requires attorneys to contribute to access to justice by paying a \$65 fee when they renew their law licenses. Half of the \$65 supports criminal indigent defense programs and the other half supports civil legal services to the poor. Minnesota just increased its attorney registration fee to \$75 and it is expected to generate \$1.8 million dollars annually. What's more, Texas lawyers voluntarily contribute well over \$700 thousand dollars by simply adding a contribution to their dues statement. By the way, that dollar amount increased significantly when the dues statement was accompanied by a very nice letter of encouragement signed by all nine members of the Texas Supreme Court.

I want to applaud you on your new Cy Pres Rule. But I also want to remind you that it's not enough to have a rule. You also need to advertise the rule, explain how the rule works and recognize the donations when they come in. Lawyers love to be recognized for big verdicts and for successful litigation so let's put their picture in the bar journal , you know, the one with them holding the big fake check with all those zeros, and let's thank them for contributing to the access to justice movement. Just to give you some incentive, let me point out that in 2009, the Texas Access to

Justice Foundation received \$230 thousand dollars from a cy pres award. And in 2010, the Foundation received \$807 thousand dollars from a single case. That's about a million dollars that we didn't have just a few short years ago.

We are not shy in Texas—we ask, we beg, and we grovel if we have to. We have been successful in generating significant revenues from our Pro Hac Vice program, and from our filing fee program. We have also generated a significant amount of revenue which flows to the Foundation from a percentage of civil penalties paid to the Attorney General's office by defendants in civil actions. In Texas, we hope to generate big dollars but we are happy and we celebrate the smaller contributions too. Our specialized license plate program, "Justice for All" generates only about \$20 thousand dollars but I can assure you that that amount makes all the difference to some of our smaller grantees. [even so, TX is not a leader in \$ spent per poor person]

I can talk about Texas because that's the state I'm most familiar with but let me assure you that these kind of successful efforts are taking place all over this country. That's the good news. The bad news is that there still remains a significant unmet need, which means that we can not rest on our laurels. We must continue to be vigilant! It's all relative, it's all regional. Do what works in your state.

As you go about this work, it might also be important to consider the wealth and depth of the key planners. I've been thinking a lot lately about succession planning. This work is too important for it to fall victim to faltering leadership. [the leadership vacuum]. I bet it's easy to identify today's access to justice champions. But who will they be tomorrow and what are we doing today to engage and prepare them?

This is important work and we need as many hands on deck as we can find. We need leaders and we need people who are willing to let others take the lead. We don't have time for turf wars. We need visionaries and we need people who know how to carry out a vision. We also need to groom tomorrow's champions because we cannot afford a leadership vacuum. Access to justice can not just be this year's pet project, it must become a part of the culture of the community. The successful access to justice initiatives that you cultivate must become institutionalized as major components of your delivery system. We, in the national community, stand ready to help!

I've always loved Martin Luther King Jr.'s encouragement for us to be drum majors for justice. Your participation today and your work tomorrow makes it clear that you are all drum majors for justice who not only hear a beat, but who can also perform a dance in a way that pays tribute to your role as choreographers.

Today, perhaps we can teach each other some new steps. Thank you.