WEST VIRGINIA
LAW REVIEW

PERSONAL REFLECTIONS OF A LIFE IN PUBLIC INTEREST LAW: FROM THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO APPALRED

John M. Rosenberg

Volume 96 Winter 1993-94 Number 2

PERSONAL REFLECTIONS OF A LIFE IN PUBLIC INTEREST LAW: FROM THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO APPALRED

JOHN M. ROSENBERG*

I. INTRODUCTION

It is hard for me to realize that over thirty-one years have passed since I graduated from law school at the University of North Carolina in 1962. After passing the North Carolina Bar examination, I went to work almost immediately for the Civil Rights Division of the United States Department of Justice in Washington, D.C., where I remained until the early part of the Nixon Administration in 1970. My family and I then moved to Prestonsburg, Kentucky and I went to work for the Appalachian Research and Defense Fund (Appalred).

These two .public service positions have provided me with an immensely challenging opportunity to practice law in a way that provides assistance to those who otherwise could not afford or obtain it, and hopefully helps to create a more just society for us to live in. I

* Director of Appalachian Research and Defense Fund of Ky., Inc., in Prestonsburg, KY. A.B. Duke University, 1953; LLB University of North Carolina, 1962.

John M. Rosenberg specializes in environmental law and legal rights of the elderly. He has served on the boards of numerous non-profit corporations, and he is a member of the Public Advocacy Commission for the state of Kentucky. He has been chair of the Public Interest Section of the Kentucky Bar Association, and presently chairs its Education Law Section.

am pleased to describe my experience in these two legal "careers" with the hope that it will encourage current law students to choose similar paths.

II. PUBLIC INTEREST AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

I learned to practice law in the Civil Rights Division under the tutelage of John Doar. John had joined the Division as First Assistant towards the end of the Eisenhower Administration. Robert Kennedy was so impressed with John's early work in preparing voting rights cases that he asked him to stay on as First Assistant in the Division during the Kennedy Administration. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of Civil Rights was Burke Marshall, a brilliant lawyer who was instrumental in many of the decisions made by the Kennedy Administration in the field of civil rights-from the crisis surrounding the admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi, through the prosecution of the murderers of the three Civil Rights Workers, and on to the drafting and passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.[1]

John was a plaintiff's lawyer who believed in meticulous and exhaustive preparation of a case. He knew that we would likely lose when we filed voting rights cases in the lower federal courts throughout the South. Thus, we needed to prepare an iron clad record for review in' the appellate courts, and this we did. We learned that 95 percent of winning a case was preparation and that only five percent of success came from courtroom work. We spent hundreds of hours viewing microfilm records of voter applications to document the blatant racial discrimination by southern voting registrars. These records reflected that highly literate black applicants who wrote articulate interpretations of state constitutional sections were rejected, while white applicants who could not read nor write were registered. John Doar called this detailed, time-consuming records analysis "the romance of the records." He taught us that we would win our cases on the basis of the evidence in the defendant's records and the testimony of our witnesses. This strategy of "overpreparation" paid off, as we won case after case on appeal, and as we established new remedies whereby the

---

1. 42 U.S.C. §§ 1971 to 2000h-6 (1988. Supp. II 1991 & Supp. IV 1992).

federal courts ordered black applicants to be registered if they met the standards applied to white applicants.

The lessons we learned in preparing the voting rights cases carried over to our new responsibilities under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which gave the Attorney General authority to sue to attack patterns of discrimination in employment, education, and the use of public accommodations. Again, we relied on detailed investigations of employer's and school district's records to prove their discriminatory conduct.

There was, of course, severe resistance to the implementation of these new laws by the white communities in the South, and especially by the Ku Klux Klan.[2] We found ourselves filing law suits to prevent intimidation and acts of violence and terrorism by the Klan, Perhaps our most significant criminal prosecution was against the conspirators and murderers of the three civil rights workers, James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, in Neshoba County, Mississippi, in the summer of 1964. John Doar personally presented this case at trial with the assistance of Bob Owen, my section chief, and United States Attorney Robert Hauberg.[3] I worked exhaustively with a team of attorneys in preparing this case for prosecution to the grand jury and subsequently for trial. It was of special note that the Presiding *Judge*, Harold Cox, was one of the United States District *Judges* in Mississippi whose decisions in civil rights cases we had routinely appealed. Yet, in presiding over this trial and the eventual sentencing of the guilty conspirators, he demonstrated that even for him, the murder of these innocent voter registration workers was too much.

Our successful prosecution of the Neshoba County case again demonstrated that with hard work and careful preparation, attorneys whose expertise was normally in civil litigation could make the transi-

---

2. See the opinion of Judge John Minor Wisdom in United States v. Original Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, 250 F. Supp. 330 (D. La. 1965) (3 judge court), which begins: "This is an action by the Nation against a klan . . . . We find that to attain its ends, the klan exploits the forces of hate, prejudice, and ignorance. We find that the klan relies on systematic economic coercion, varieties of intimidation, and physical violence in attempting to frustrate the national policy expressed in civil rights legislation." *Id.* at 334.

3. The defendants challenged the indictment in this case, which delayed the trial until October 1967. The indictment was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in United States v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966).

tion to criminal prosecution and obtain convictions, even under difficult circumstances. We saw this happen time and again in other prosecutions we presented involving civil rights conspiracies and police brutality by state or local officials.

In 1965, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act. This was perhaps the most significant piece of civil rights legislation ever to be passed, since it resulted in the registration of thousands of black voters throughout the South, and in turn, over the years, the election of black officials at all levels of government. Civil Rights Division attorneys accompanied federal observers to the first elections held under the Voting Rights Act, and we filed a number of law suits throughout the South to enforce the provisions of this Act, including suits in a number of southern states to eliminate poll taxes.

I was very fortunate to have been in the Division during those very historic years from 1962 to 1970. We represented this Nation in a demonstrable effort to eliminate segregation in our society. I had worked with an extraordinary group of lawyers and support staff, who worked countless hours and weeks without weekends. I had received excellent training, and I had served as a staff attorney, deputy section chief, and as a section chief of a trial section. I had learned how to prepare and present complex civil and criminal cases for trial,[4] and to be an administrator as well.

With the advent of the Nixon Administration, it appeared that civil rights would not be given the priority that the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations had given it. The new administration reversed the

4. Some of these cases are: Ross v. Eckels, 434 F.2d 1140 (5th Cir. 1970), *cert. denied*, 402 U.S. 953 (1971) (dealing with school desegregation in Houston, Texas); Gray v. Main, 309 F. Supp. 207 (M.D. Ala. 1968) (government amicus in suit by black candidate challenging election results); Brown v. South Carolina Board of Educ., 296 F. Supp. 199 (D.S.C. 1968) (3 judge court) (constitutional challenge to South Carolina School Tuition Grant Statute); United States v. Alabama, 252 F. Supp. 94 (M.D. Ala. 1966) (3 judge court) (invalidating the Alabama poll tax); United States v. Executive Committee of Dallas Co., 254 F. Supp. 537 (S.D. Ala. 1966) (suit under Voting Rights Act to require counting of ballots by black voters); United States v. Gulf States Theaters, 256 F. Supp. 549 (N.D. Miss. 1966) (3 judge court) (dealing with theater desegregation); United States v. Sampson, 256 F. Supp. 470 (N.D. Miss. 1966) (3 judge court) (suit against Greenwood, Mississippi officials to prevent interference with theater desegregation).

previous administration's position that bussing of children could be an effective remedy in school desegregation cases, a remedy I had sought in the desegregation action against the Houston School system. I felt it was time to look for a new opportunity to use the legal training I had received in. the Civil rights Division, and to use my legal skills to benefit others who might not have access to adequate legal representation. Legal services has given me that opportunity beyond any expectations I might have had.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST AND APPALRED

It was simply a coincidence that in 1970 when I left the Civil Rights Division, the Director of Legal Services in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington, D.C., was Terry Lenzner, with whom I had worked in the Civil Rights Division. At that time, Legal Services programs were funded by OEO, which had been created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Terry contacted me to see if I might be interested in working with Appalred.

Terry had been approached by the lawyers in a new public interest law firm in Charleston, West Virginia, Appalachian Research and Defense Fund (Appalred), about the possibility of funding litigation relating to coal issues in Appalachia, particularly those issues which were related to the high incidence of poverty in the region. Terry soon recognized that this relationship between the coal economy and the incidence of poverty was very direct. In West Virginia and eastern Kentucky, the economy was almost totally dependent on the coal industry. In virtually every county, the largest employer was either the coal industry or the board of education.

Coal miners had struggled in vain to obtain safety regulation of working conditions in the mines, and to obtain compensation for disabled miners from the crippling effects of black lung disease. It was only after the Farmington Mine Disaster in Virginia, in which 78 coal miners were killed, that Congress enacted the first meaningful laws

directed toward mine safety enforcement and compensation for black lung disease-the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.[5]

Similarly, the relatively new practice of coal extraction by surface mining was growing at a very fast pace and causing an untold amount of surface destruction. State statutes and regulations governing surface mining practices were lax, and in some places, almost non-existent. Mud slides and property damage impacted most on low income families whose homes were located below the strip mines. Surface mining was conducted over their objections because they did not have and could not afford legal counsel, and because state agencies and courts had been unresponsive to their objections. Surface mining practices, being relatively primitive at the time, caused erosion of the surface and tremendous pollution and siltation of streams, eventually causing flooding.

In eastern Kentucky, surface owners faced an additional obstacle, the "Broad Form Deed". Kentucky's courts had construed these mineral deeds to permit surface mining without the surface owner's consent, even though these deeds had been entered into in the late 1800s and early 1900s, at a time when surface mining methods were unknown and could not have been contemplated by the parties. The interpretation of Kentucky's highest court stood alone in the Appalachian states in this regard.[6] Furthermore, in Kentucky, the surface owner paid virtually all the taxes on the property. While the surface owner's property was taxed at fair cash value, the mineral owner was hardly taxed at all. However, most of the minerals were owned by large, powerful, out-of-state corporations.

The effect of this single industry economy, largely controlled by out-of-state interests, had become well known following the 1962 publication of Harry Caudill's book, *Night Comes to the Cumberlands.*[7] The visits of Robert Kennedy and President Johnson brought the attention of the country to central Appalachia's enormous poverty population, its poor schools, poor housing, poor health care, poor roads, and

---

5. 30 U.S.C. §§ 801-962 (1988 & Supp. II 1990).
6. Buchanan v. Watson, 290 S.W.2d 40 (Ky. 1956).
7. HARRY M. CAUDILL, NIGHT COMES TO THE CUMBERLANDS (1962).

lack of available economic opportunities. Perhaps the funding of a small public interest law firm such as the one in Charleston, West Virginia, to address these issues on behalf of low income clients would be a worthwhile investment of OEO legal services funds, thought Terry Lenzner.

In eastern Kentucky, the East Kentucky Welfare Rights Organization had recruited Howard Thorkelson, a lawyer from New York, to come to Prestonsburg in 1969 to provide legal representation to their members and other low income persons. Howard, in turn, had recruited three other attorneys, funded by small foundation grants, and the Reginald Heber Smith Fellowship program. These attorneys formed a separate entity, "Mountain People's Rights." The idea of an OEO-funded public interest firm to serve low income persons, which would address common poverty related legal issues in the region, was appealing to them. Accordingly, they decided to join with Appalred in West Virginia as a single program to become the recipient of Terry Lenzner's first OEO grant. Paul Kaufman, a prominent West Virginia attorney who had been the major force in the creation of the West Virginia firm, became the first Director.[8] Shortly thereafter, Howard Thorkelson decided to leave the area, and I was asked to come to Charleston, Prestonsburg, and Barbourville, by then the second Kentucky office, to see if I were interested in replacing Howard and to be in charge of the program in Kentucky. I accepted, and my family and I moved to Prestonsburg.[9]

We soon opened an office on the campus of the University of Kentucky in Lexington to take advantage of research assistance from law clerks at the University of Kentucky Law School, as well as to gain more immediate access to the legislative and administrative offices in the state capitol of Frankfort, only 30 miles away. The years from 1971 to 1974 were difficult years for us. Much local hostility was directed at us for legal actions we had filed on behalf of our clients

---

8. The other three West Virginia attorneys who had formed the Charleston firm were Ray Ratliff, Naomi Cohen, and Si Boettner.

9. Two attorneys that I worked with in Barboursville were Charles DiSalvo (1974-1979) and Robert Bastress (1974-1976), both of whom are currently Professors at West Virginia University College of Law.

against state and local agencies and officials. This was to be expected, since it had not been done before in these rural counties. There was also opposition from state and local bar leaders who either questioned the need for legal services at all, or who thought that our representation should be limited to routine services such as divorce. Finally, the new Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Howard Phillips, tried his best to dismantle legal services, with his initial efforts being directed at programs like ours which were filing significant poverty law cases. At one point, our legal staff in Kentucky was on half salaries to stretch our money since we were unsure of whether we would be refunded.

The story of the survival battles between Legal Services programs and OEO during that period is told elsewhere, and space does not permit its retelling here. Suffice it to say Appalred had its own significant battle. In 1973, threatened with defunding, we obtained the assistance of a *pro bono* attorney in Washington, Stephen Pollak, the former Assistant Attorney General of the Civil Rights Division, with whom I had worked. Steve, in turn, threatened OEO with a law suit if our funding were terminated. The proposed suit was settled with an agreement to continue our funding, with the proviso that the programs in Kentucky and West Virginia would be funded separately and exist independently.[10] We then separately incorporated Appalred of Kentucky, and with the help of Congress and the courts, Legal Services survived this difficult period. Ironically, one of President Nixon's last official acts in 1974 was to sign the Legal Services Corporation Act, which created anew, independent non-profit corporation, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC), to oversee and fund Legal Services programs throughout the United States.

From 1975 to 1980, the corporation obtained annual increases in funding. With these additional resources, we were able to more readily serve the day-to-day legal needs of clients in the major poverty law areas-public benefits, housing, consumer law, and family law. To accomplish this, we opened eight new offices to serve clients in our

10. Appalred's funding in West Virginia was reduced. OEO additionally funded the West Virginia judicare program, West Virginia Legal Services Plan, Inc. The plan now also has staff attorneys in their offices.

service area of thirty-seven counties. Our goal was to have an office within 45 minutes driving distance of every client. By 1980, we had 48 attorneys in our eleven offices, and a total staff of over 100. We were then faced with a new battle for survival. President Reagan targeted Legal Services programs for elimination. With the support of Congress, we weathered another storm, this one lasting twelve years. During these years, we had to contend with severe funding cuts and a Board of Directors in Washington which was, for a time, even hostile to the programs it funded. By 1993, our program in Kentucky had approximately half the staff that was in place in 1981, and salaries for staff attorneys had fallen far behind other public interest positions. Despite funding cuts, however, we made the decision not to close any of our offices, even if it meant operating with reduced staff. We felt that would be tantamount to abandoning the community.

Now, it appears that a new day has arrived. President Clinton views Legal Services as an important program for low income persons--one to be expanded. He has appointed an outstanding group of individuals to serve on the Board of the Corporation, persons with broad-based backgrounds in our work, who see its importance, and who understand how detrimental the funding cuts have been to us-a Board that will be totally supportive of our work and that will advocate for increases in our funding.

Despite this roller coaster ride of funding problems and our low salaries, we have been fortunate to attract outstanding attorneys to this program, from our immediate area and from other parts of the United States. We have won major legal victories, while at the same time serving a large number of clients with their day-to-day legal needs.

From the beginning, as might be expected, representatives of clients and client groups, such as disabled miners organizations and local welfare rights organizations, asked us to place a high priority on cases involving the coal related issues. Thus, within a year after opening our office in Lexington, we conducted an extensive review of state agency records relating to the enforcement of the strip mining laws. We found that although the law required that no additional surface mining permits should be issued to repeated violators of the law, this provision was ignored by the permitting agency. From our analysis of the

agency's records, we identified a group of companies who had been repeatedly cited for violations and had nevertheless been issued new permits to mine. We sued the agency to require that the permits of the violating companies be revoked and that the agency be required to enforce the law. The petition was ultimately dismissed on procedural grounds, but it had a substantial impact in demonstrating to coal companies that citizens were going to be looking over their shoulders in the future.

We have continued to represent low income individuals and groups in objecting to surface mining permits and insisting on proper enforcement of strip mining statutes. We have successfully prevented strip mining of a hollow where such mining would have intercepted old deep mining workings filled with water, which would have posed a substantial threat to the lives and property of persons living below them; we have obtained a damage award for clients whose home was destroyed by a slide from a strip mine; we have obtained an injunction prohibiting the continued operation of a coal tipple in a community because the company did not obtain waivers from local residents under the federal strip mining act, resulting in the dismantling of the tipple; and we have obtained a federal court order requiring state officials to ensure that coal operators have demonstrated their right to mine by appropriate documentation when applying for a surface mining permit. Finally, we' have also provided numerous comments to state and federal agencies considering regulatory changes in the strip mining laws.

At the same time, on behalf of our clients we continued to pursue legal challenges to the Kentucky Supreme Court's interpretation of the broad form deed. When it became clear that these efforts would not bear fruit, we drafted a statutory solution, which was subsequently passed by the Kentucky legislature.[11] Unfortunately, the statute was declared unconstitutional by the Kentucky Supreme Court.[12] Thereafter, a statewide citizens group, "Kentuckians for the Commonwealth," successfully promoted a campaign to put the statute into the form of an amendment to the state's constitution. In November of 1988, the Amendment was passed by vote of 82% of the electorate. That

11. KY. REV. STAT. ANN. §§ 381.930-381.945 (1984).
12. Akers v. Baldwin, 736 S.W.2d 294 (Ky. 1987).

Amendment, too, was soon the subject of a legal challenge based on federal constitutional grounds. In one of our ongoing cases, we had represented an elderly widow who had been sued by mineral owners and a coal company to prevent her from interfering with their proposed surface mining operation.-This case was pending for review in the Kentucky Supreme Court when the Amendment passed. The Court granted review and used this case to address and uphold the constitutionality of the Amendment against a challenge under the United States Constitution's Takings and Contracts Clauses.[13]

For the last 20 years, we have represented individual claimants seeking black lung benefits and have assisted the various Black Lung Associations seeking to promote reforms in black lung legislation. Presently, 96% of all black lung applications are denied. While the program provides a good avenue for compensation to doctors who examine claimants for the insurance companies and the lawyers who defend these claims, the intent of the statute-to provide benefits to disabled miners and widows-has been totally subverted. At the request of black lung groups, we drafted proposed legislation that was initially introduced in 1992 by Congressmen Perkins and Rahall and that would again provide fairness in the administration of the federal black lung claims process. New legislative proposals have been introduced in the current session of Congress, and a number of our original proposals are included. Black Lung Associations are hopeful that reform legislation will be passed in 1994.

We also found early on that the state agency overseeing deep mining did not deserve better marks than the one enforcing the surface mining law. I came to Kentucky right after the Hyden Mine Disaster in 1970 in which 38 coal miners were killed. We examined the records of this coal mine and found that the responsible regulatory agency had knowledge of violations of dust standards and the use of illegal explosives. The state agency should have shut down the mine on the basis of these regulations and should have required the mine to correct the illegal conditions. If these measures had been taken, the disaster might well have been avoided.

---

13. Ward v. Harding, 860 S.W.2d 280 (Ky. 1993), *cert. denied,* 114 S. Ct. 1218 (1994).

We initially represented the sole survivor of this explosion, but we subsequently referred him to a private attorney to pursue his remedy for damages. However, we did provide testimony and much of the information we had gathered to the congressional committee investigating this tragedy. The committee issued a report that was highly critical of the agency for failing to prevent the explosion by early enforcement action. The operator, Finley Coal Company, and the three partners in the company, Charles Finley, his father, and his brother, were subsequently indicted on sixteen counts for violating mine safety laws. The charges were dismissed when they pled nolo contendere to four counts of violating federal mine safety laws eight days before the explosion, for which they were fined $122,000.

Even today, non-union coal miners have little recourse for complaints about safety conditions in coal mines, even though the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act prohibits discrimination against coal miners who make such complaints.[14] Consequently, we found ourselves responding to requests for representation from miners who were fired after making such complaints. In a number of such cases, the miner had complained about life-threatening situations, to no avail. For example, in one case a miner had been shocked twice by a trailing electrical cable, but was ordered to continue working. In another case, a miner for good reason refused to work in an area where the roof appeared to be unstable. Subsequently, the roof fell in. We have been able to obtain reinstatement and back pay awards for the miners in many of these cases. Our efforts have also resulted in important case precedents strongly supporting the miner's right to insist on a safe work place. [15]

Recently, to address the ongoing need for representation in these cases, we established the Mine Safety Project, so an attorney could address these issues on a full-time basis. The Directing Attorney of the project, Tony Oppegard, formerly the Directing Attorney in our Hazard office, is a national expert in this area. The Project focuses not only

---

14. 30 D.S.C. §§ 801-962 (1988 & Supp. II 1990).

15. *See* Gilbert v. Federal Mine Safety & Health Review Comm'n, 866 F.2d 1433 (D.C. Cir. 1989); Simpson v. Federal Mine Safety & Health Review Commission, 842 F.2d 453 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

on litigation, but also on educating miners about their safety rights and on advocacy before administrative agencies with respect to safety regulations. Recently, Tony represented several of the widows of miners killed in the recent South Mountain Coal explosion in Virginia, in making recommendations to a Gubernatorial Task Force considering new legislative proposals to strengthen Virginia's Mine Safety Laws. He also subsequently testified before the legislative committee, along with one of the widows. We have been fortunate to fund the Mine Safety Project primarily through private foundation grants and attorney fees.

We have been active in many other poverty law related issues as well. Indeed, presently we represent about 5,000 clients a year in a variety of cases. About thirty-five percent of our work is in the area of government entitlement and disability law, and we have won significant victories in various appeals to federal district courts and the courts of appeals. Our attorneys have represented hundreds of consumers in preventing foreclosures on their homes and in preventing collection efforts based on illegal financing contracts. We entered into a consent decree in a major class action challenging discrimination in hiring against women and blacks by the Kentucky State Parks. The consent decree required affirmative action goals and has had a major positive effect in the employment and promotion of blacks and women in the park system. We have also filed successful law suits for women who claimed that they were refused positions by local officials solely because of their gender. We have represented and advocated for children with special needs in our school districts to ensure that they receive an appropriate education, and we have successfully represented parents who were threatened with the termination of their parental rights.

We have obtained verdicts against local jailers for mistreating prisoners, and we have incorporated local non-profit housing groups and helped them with legal assistance in the financing and development of low income housing. We have also directed special efforts at serving the legal needs of the elderly. Recently, we began a special outreach program which uses volunteers throughout our service area to provide counseling to the elderly on various federal and state benefit

programs. When necessary, we have also instituted legal action against nursing homes for mistreating their patients.

In February 1994, we began our first organized effort to provide legal assistance to persons who are HIV positive, by entering into a contract with an AIDS volunteer organization in Lexington. We will provide outreach and representation in five counties served by our Richmond, Kentucky, office.

IV. CONCLUSION

The variety of work I have described no doubt is typical of the work of many other legal services agencies like ours, including Appalred in West Virginia. Basically, we try to be a first class law firm for low income persons. We want them to have the same level of excellent representation that a paying client can obtain from the best law firms and thereby give them equal footing on the scales of justice.

Of course, we represent only half of the justice system. I would be remiss if I did not at least refer to the important work of public defenders in this country and to suggest that career alternative as well. Our counterparts in the criminal field work extraordinarily hard, often at compensation which is substantially less than that of the prosecutors. With limited resources, the defenders are expected to provide quality representation to clients whose very lives may be in the balance. In recent months, I have been serving on a Governor's Task Force to study our defender system in Kentucky and to make recommendations for improvement where needed. We have reviewed information, not only from Kentucky but from other states as well, and we have listened to national experts. We learned, for example, based oil a Department of Justice report for fiscal year 1990, that $74 billion or three percent of national spending was directed to the justice system. Of that amount, 42.8% was spent on police; 33.6% on corrections; 12.5% on courts; 7.4% on prosecution; and only 2.3% on public defense. These percentages paint a stark picture of the nation's priorities. Without attempting to stretch this article into my views on how our overall system of criminal justice could be improved, suffice it to say that our commitment to providing an adequate defender system should be at least equal to the funding we provide for the prosecution.

One of the great benefits of working in Legal Services or in the defender system is the opportunity to work with such an outstanding group of men and women who are themselves committed to the principles of equal justice for all citizens. In addition, there is the satisfaction we all get when we have achieved a successful resolution for our client, whether the problem is large or small, and from the positive contributions we are hopefully making to the communities in which we live.

I also need to recognize the dedicated group of private attorneys and clients who volunteer their time to serve on our Board of Directors. I have treasured my association with this outstanding group of individuals. Indeed, our past chair, Janet Stumbo, was recently elected to sit on the Supreme Court of Kentucky, the first woman to achieve this distinction. I must also recognize the growing number of private attorneys who volunteer their time representing clients to supplement our efforts. Last year, our pro bono panel handled over 300 cases in our service area.

We have just published one of our periodic summaries of Major Litigation and Activities. This one covers the period of 1990 to 1993 and is about 100 pages long. It represents the work highlighted as being significant by our attorneys and paralegals, and we are proud of it. A copy will be sent to the law school's placement office, and some additional copies are available on request.

It should be apparent that I am as enthused today about my career in legal services as I have been from the beginning. Every day presents a new challenge. I hate to think that at some point I might have to relinquish my position to give someone else a chance-but then I will probably volunteer to work as a staff attorney.