

Keynote Address*

Judy REBICK**

Thank you very much. I am happy to be here. The last time I spoke to a group of judges was in Cambridge, England, quite a long time ago at the Institute for Advanced Legal Studies, so I am very glad to have this opportunity again. What I want to talk about today is Citizen Participation in the Judicial System and I'm going to start by talking about my own experiences because I was on the Ontario Judicial Council for about 4 or 5 years and end up where I think we need to look now in terms of some trends that are happening. Je tiens aussi à dire que je suis capable de répondre aux questions en français, mais je fais ma présentation en anglais. I got appointed to the Ontario Judicial Council in, I think it was 1991. At the time I was president of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and the judges were not very happy about this appointment. I was appointed by the New Democratic Party (NDP) government. I think that could be the understatement of the year. They were so upset about it in fact that the Chief Justice at the time, Charles Dubin went to see the Premier. I do not flatter myself that he actually went to see the Premier especially to ask that I be unappointed, but I am sure it was on his list that he was discussing with the Premier and he was very upset about it and so were all the other judges because in fact I had been a pretty prominent critic of the judicial system. This was at the time when a lot of judges were making some very dumb remarks, not to put too fine on it. You might remember there was a period of two or three years, as so happened I was President of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC), when there were some foolish remarks

* Transcription from a speech presented by Judy Rebick, on October 13, 2001 in Halifax at the Annual Conference sponsored by the Canadian Institute for the Administration of Justice entitled "Citizenship and Citizen Participation in the Administration of Justice".

** Author of "Imagine Democracy", journalist and broadcaster, Toronto, Ontario.

made by judges about the women's movement I was very critical of and since I was a spokesperson of the women's movement I was upfront about that. Anyway, the Premier did not back down about this appointment and I started to sit on the Ontario Judicial Council and we had two rolls at the time. One was to discipline judges and the other was to approve appointments of judges. The first thing I want to say is that my attitude toward the judicial system changed significantly in the course of that experience. I was very cynical about the judicial system and particularly about what I considered at the time the methodology of the roll of judges, that judges were actually fair. Because of my cynicism, I did not really believe that and the experience of being on the Ontario Judicial Council changed my mind about a lot of things, and they also changed their mind about me because I realized as President of the NAC, my role was that of an advocate, I was speaking on behalf of the women's movement, the feminist movement. But on the Judicial Council I was in fact acting as a judge so to speak and judging judges, and that was a very different role, and the first thing that I think changed their minds was that at the time there was a committee appointing judges that had lay people on it and they were changing the face of the judiciary rather dramatically in Ontario, appointing a lot more women, a lot more people of colour and we had to approve these appointments. There was one appointment of a woman of colour in fact, who really was not qualified, to be a judge, she just did not have enough experience and I agreed with the others on the Ontario Judicial Council that she was not sufficiently qualified, and we sent back the appointment to the committee and they were astonished by this decision, that I would actually say that because my role as President of the NAC of course was to fight for more women of colour to be on the bench, but my role on the judicial council was different than that. It was to be to approve appointments, to make sure that there was good appointments of women and of people of colour of a more representative bench, but also to make sure that the people who were appointed could do the job. So that started to change things on the Judicial Council. But the big thing that changed things was a particular case. I cannot go into all the details of the case, but it was what the media called "the kissing judge." This was a very high-profile case and this judge was accused of sexual harassment numerous times and his lawyer argued that there was a reasonable apprehension of bias in my participation in the Judicial Council and asked that I stand down. The Judicial Council asked that I stand down, that I could not be fair in judging this case. Now this was a fairly stressful moment for me because it was also during the Charlottetown Accord. You may remember that the NAC said "no" to the

Charlottetown Accord and I was chief spokesperson, so at the same time I was leading a campaign for the no vote in Charlottetown, which, as you can imagine, was fairly stressful given that everybody else was on the “yes” side. I was faced with this decision on the Judicial Council and clearly my argument to the other members of the Judicial Council was that the reason I was on the Judicial Council was because in certain parts of the community there was a reasonable apprehension of bias in the opposite direction, that is of supporting the judge and of not understanding the concerns that the community had about what the judge was accused of doing. This was a very intense debate on the Judicial Council. It was an intense debate for two reasons: one was looking at the issue itself, but also because of the political impact because clearly if I had been asked to stand down, there would have been no reason for me to continue on the Judicial Council and I would have resigned and that would have been a big public scandal, I suppose. I tell this story because the Judicial Council had to come to grips on why they needed laypeople on the Judicial Council, because of course the judge’s view was that they could be fair in judging their peers and that is true, they could be fair, but they looked at it from a particular experience, which was a common experience. I looked at it from a very different experience, and the other layperson (there were only two of us at the time, that changed later), who was a person of colour, also looked at it from a different experience. What the Judicial Council and particularly Chief Justice Dubin learned over that time—like I said, I learned that judges really were fair, really did try to be fair, but what he learned—I do not want to speak for him, but what I think he learned and others there—was that the way they looked at things was different than the way we looked at things, and the reason why it was different was that we had different experiences. We were coming from different experiences, not only with the judicial system, but also in our lives. What we brought to the table in those discussions was a different quality of justice. We brought to the table the view of the community on these events that we were judging or these accusations that we were judging, and when it comes to the perception that the community has of justice, it is a very important issue because we know that for justice to be done, justice must be perceived that it is done and particularly in terms of judges and the fairness of judges, and so this debate was a very important debate for the Council and in the end I was allowed to stay on the case. But it was a split vote, one difference. After that, Chief Justice Dubin became an advocate for the participation of laypeople on Judicial Councils, in fact he invited me, or got me invited to speak on the Canadian Judicial Council on this topic. I did not manage to persuade

them obviously because they still have not included laypeople on the Canadian Judicial Council, which I think is an error. But this experience was a very important one because it showed the impact of laypeople on the Judicial Council. First, when the Judicial Council finally made the decision about this judge, whichever way it had gone, it had a lot more credibility in the community because I was on the Judicial Council, a lot more credibility. Secondly, I was able to bring arguments to the table that other people were not bringing to the table. In fact, this case had been put off and put off and put off and it was my argument that made them deal with it and it was making them look worse and worse certainly in the medias' eyes. But thirdly, it changed my mind about the judicial system, about judges and their role because being an advocate, being in the political sphere, you do not run into people who change their minds about things. If you can manage to get enough pressure you can force them to change their minds, but it doesn't happen very often. You know I worked in politics for many years as an advocate, working in political parties then debating on television political issues, I do not see people change their minds very often, actually be persuaded to change their minds. But on the Judicial Council I saw that. The judges would weigh the arguments and they could be persuaded to change their minds, as Chief Justice Dubin changed his mind about the role of laypeople on the Judicial Council. This was a very profound experience for me and so the impact of that, because I had a fair bit of influence in the women's movement in particular, was significant. Not only that I had changed my mind, but also the Chief Justice had changed his mind. Together we can now advocate for more citizens participation on Judicial Councils so that the disciplining of judges can be seen in the community as fair and not just judges protecting each other, which is often how it is seen. But there was another part of that experience that I also think was important and that was the role of citizens in the appointments process. I have to say it is interesting we are discussing citizen participation in the judicial system because I think the judicial system in some ways gives us a model for citizen participation in politics, which is what my book is about through the jury system. Here we give ordinary citizens and in effect a most important role in our judicial system by making life-and-death decisions or making decisions about incarcerations, innocent or guilty in our most serious court cases, and it is a role where experts are involved explaining the law, defending or prosecuting the case, but it is the citizens who make the decisions, not the experts who make the decisions. This is the argument in my book, that we need a political system where more and more experts are providing the information and the analysis that citizens need, but it should be citizens

more and more making the decisions in the political system, that is what I argue in my book, *Imagine Democracy*. But in a judicial system we already have that model through the jury system so it is interesting that there is a resistance for involving citizens at other levels of the judicial system where they can play just as important a role as they play in the jury system. It is something I don't quite understand. On the citizen participation in appointments, it is my view that the citizens, the committee that was appointed originally under the David Petersen government, I think it was a creation of Ian Scott who was Attorney General at the time to have a committee of laypeople and lawyers appointing judges and opening up the system of judicial appointments so that they actually, later under the Bob Rae government, advertised for judges and took applications from people. Up until that time it had been very much a backroom process and I think at the federal level in many ways it still is. What used to happen, the people who got appointed judges were the people who had the respect of their colleagues. Now you say, what is wrong with that, they are good lawyers, they are people with integrity. Well what is wrong with that is that it reproduces the status quo so that what happens (and this is you know demonstratable in any number of ways) is that if the legal community which is consulted by the justice minister is mainly middle-class or upper middle-class, middle-aged white males, those in general, are going to be the same kinds of people that they admire in doing legal work and this is demonstrable. I have evidence of another way, which was not mentioned in the introduction. I am the publisher now of a web magazine site called rabble.ca. Now the Internet is dominated by men, but when I was working with my editor-in-chief who happens to be a woman and we were looking for people to hire, the people we happened to come up with were mostly women. Now in this case it was a positive thing because the Internet is so male-dominated. But it was interesting to me that we were not thinking about women, we were not implementing affirmative action, it is just that the people we thought about that we thought were good, who we thought were to do the best job were people like us. This is very human there is nothing sort of evil about it. It is just very human that that is generally how we work. So in the old system which still exists in some of the provinces and the federal level, if it is the legal community (we are talking now almost ten years ago), the legal system that is deciding, then it is a kind of an old boys network that gets promoted as judges. Then Ian Scott changed this and then the NDP changed this to open it up even further to advertising and to changing, in fact to changing their requirements from judges, so that community participation, for example, became a qualification, became a good thing.

If you worked in a legal clinic, or you worked in communities that had frequent contact with the law, the impact of this was just astonishing. I wrote in my book that the most important change that the liberals and the NDP made in the province of Ontario was in this change: in the composition of the bench because we had way more women, way more people of colour and it was very dramatic and the reason for it was simply having laypeople in a committee that appointed judges or that recommended the appointment of judges. If we are going to have a justice system that has credibility in the community and that people have confidence in, it has to better reflect the community that it is serving. Now there are a lot of arguments against that. People think, "I can be fair, I can listen to the arguments" and all of that is true, like I said I was impressed by the fairness of the judges, but nevertheless we reflect our experience, we reflect what we have lived in our lives and if we are a male living a pretty comfortable life in a big city we reflect that in how we see the world. Being does determine consciousness and we see that in any number of ways. Right now you can see it in attitudes to this war. I know I am not supposed to talk about this, but I just want to use this in this one way. A friend of mine who is the Executive Director of the Matrie Foundation had a conference, it so happened the conference took place a few days after September 11 and Matrie Foundation works very hard on immigrant and visible minority issues. She had a fellow who is the head of Policy Developments for the Liberal Party who is a South Asian man give an analysis of what he thought this was all about and she said this was remarkable because the people of colour in the room all loved it and the white people in the room all hated it. We saw the same reaction in the States to the O.J. Simpson decision. If you are black or white, the attitude toward that decision was dramatically different. We see it in the gender gap in politics. Women's support for war is dramatically less than men's, but it is not just on war issues, it is on a whole series of social and economic issues: tax cuts, social service funding, a whole series of issues and where that comes from is a different lived experience. That is why it is important to have a representative judiciary. It is so that the judiciary reflects the lived experience of the community. Inevitably it will be fairer and part of the way to get that because obviously we live in a class-divided society where the legal profession, although it has improved enormously, still reflects the dominant class in society. But I know, I went to my niece's graduation last spring at University of Toronto Law School, one of the most elite law schools and I was astonished by the majority women graduating. There was a very large, very significant percentage of people of colour graduating and so I was very impressed by the dramatic

changes made in the legal profession, but nevertheless it takes awhile for that to come up to the judiciary. I would say even if we had a completely representative judiciary from a demographic point of view, we would still have issues because those of us who live a privileged life because we make a good living, in your case you have a stable job which not too many people have these days, you actually get a salary, you are guaranteed your job for life, really, more or less, well this is a very privileged position in this society to be in. Even if you are more representative of the community demographically speaking, nevertheless from the point of view of social reality and economic reality, you are not. And so to have citizens involved so that there is a constant relationship between what the judicial system is doing and what the community thinks and feels is very important so I argue that even more strongly in the political system because at least there is the jury system which ensures that in the legal system.

The second thing I want to say about it is the younger generation. It so happens that I work in the field of the Internet now and I spend a lot of time with young people and I have to say this generation under 30 which grew up with the Internet is really very different. They accept authority much less readily, they are much more interested in their own engagement and things. For example, we were putting up this web magazine and those of us who were discussing it at first were maybe over 30 and we talked about whether we wanted news, whether we wanted debates and all the young people we talked to said the same thing, which is: "If it is not interactive we are not interested. We do not want to hear what experts have to say, we want to have a say ourselves." Right across the country whoever we talked to said the same thing. So we created as part of our Internet magazine a thing called "babble". Our Internet magazine is called "rabble", and the discussion board is called "babble" and it is unbelievable. Half of the traffic on our site (we get 3.5 million hits a month) is to the discussion board and they discuss everything under the sun, mostly politics because it is a political site and the level of engagement of these—and it is mostly young people because no one else could keep up with it—is phenomenal and if they do not know something, they go off and read about it. So you know in the discussions after September 11 everyone suddenly is an expert on Islam. Well we got young people, 17-year-olds going off to the library and getting a copy of the Koran and quoting it on the site and discussing the quotes from the Koran on the site. I find this amazing, but what I noticed is that it is very much part of this generation. They want more engagement. They are not

happy to leave it to experts, they are not willing to leave it to experts and this is what our whole system our whole political system, our judicial system is based on. We elect, appoint, train experts to do things for and we keep them accountable through elections or through various means. Well I do not think it that is good enough anymore. I think we have to change that so that we are not just involved as citizens to keep our experts or our politicians or our judges accountable, but we are having more influence that in the system. I think in the political system it means making decisions. In the judicial system I think it means having more input into what happens in the judicial system. Now we have to be careful as to how that thing happens because of the fairness issue and we do not want to have votes about what happens to people who are charged with crime obviously.

I want to get onto my next point which is the issue of the groups involvement in the judicial system. Before I was talking about individuals, we were individuals in the judicial council, but we were not really representing anyone. We were chosen because we were representative, but our role was not really to represent anyone, our role was simply to bring a certain sensibility. We have a very rich experience in Canada now about the participation of groups in the judicial system and I want to particularly talk about the women's movement which is controversial, certainly outside the judicial system, but I think we can say that, because of the *Charter*, women's groups and in particular the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF), has played an enormous role in helping the Supreme Court to interpret the *Charter* in a progressive way. I can tell you I learned this when I went to Cambridge that, in fact, Canada's human rights law, Canada's equality rights law is seen as the most advanced in the world by other judges, by other lawyers in the field and that our Supreme Court has interpreted the *Charter* in very progressive ways and continues to do so and I believe the participation of LEAF in the Superior Court has made a huge difference in that and there is a backlash to that. There is a big backlash to that which argues that group interests are special interests and it is a way of diverting the justice system, it is a way of perverting the justice system, "hijacking". I read a column yesterday by Douglas Fisher, who is among those who think that the *Charter* is the source of all evil in our society and the reason they think so is because they think that feminists, "special interests groups", have hijacked the judicial system. But in fact what I think the role that LEAF played in that process has actually given the judicial system a lot more credibility in another time and I'm talking about this new

generation, which is very inter-engagement, and participation. My generation was much more into the rights of groups who had no rights, or who were oppressed in a society and so we had a society in which women were marginalized, people of colour were marginalized, aboriginal people and so on. The judicial arena of these social movements were for the representation of these groups and I think we succeeded enormously, in a legal profession this is quite dramatic, much better than in politics for example. In the courts themselves, the interpretation of the *Charter* was greatly informed by women lawyers, feminist lawyers intervening often under the umbrella of LEAF. Like I say, I believe and I think that most judges believe that this has been a very positive and salutatory effect. Where I have been involved in that process was in the justice consultations where Kim Campbell—and this is a political process but it relates to the judicial process—decided to consult with women’s groups when the Supreme Court struck down the rape law and the Justice Minister had to come up with a new rape law. It was the Seaboyer decision if you remember. She decided to consult with women’s group in this process which was not just consult in a sort of *pro forma* that politicians often consult, but in a real way and LEAF and the other women’s groups that they consulted with were actually involved in helping to draft the legislation, the new rape law legislation, and it was a very positive process not just politically—it was probably the first time that women’s groups had anything positive to say about the Mulroney government—but also in the courts because that law has stood up overtime. The same experts in the *Charter* that had assisted the Supreme Court in interpreting the *Charter* drafted it. It has stood up and it has (well it is not perfect) been a big improvement on the old law. Again there was a lot of resistance to it, but like the involvement of marginalized groups in the judicial system or in the political system is going to create resistance. There is a reason these groups are marginalized, it is because they do not have any power so therefore the people in power often object to their involvement because they see other interests that are not their interests being pushed. But that is from a judicial point of view. That is why it is a good thing because you are hearing from groups that that you do not hear from in the media very often (this has changed with the women’s movement) but at the time that you do not hear from them in the political system very often, and this is essential to be fair, to bring fairness to the system. So I think that the role groups have played—and I would not argue for a stronger role particularly for groups actually—I think that there has been the development through the *Charter* of the ideas of group intervention, of third party intervention, which has been very helpful to

the courts and I think the big thing here is to resist rolling that back. Obviously the courts should hear from all kinds of third parties, not just one kind of third party. I am just saying from my point of view I think the role that LEAF has been able to play at the court level has meant that, for women and particularly for women's groups, the workings of the court have had a lot more credibility than they would have had otherwise.

Now I want to come to the point of restorative justice because I noticed that in a lot of the panels you are looking at, this issue is going to come up. This is where community involvement is going to get trickier, which is this notion that somehow the courts should be turned over to the community. That instead of the traditional advocacy role of the courts we should have a more community-based justice system or what has been called restorative justice. In many ways I agree with this. I think that in most cases the criminal justice system is a blunt instrument, that if things can be resolved in the community, if disputes can be resolved in the community without accessing what is a very expensive, very clogged legal system, that is a good thing. But I am also troubled by it because I think we have worked very hard to develop a certain level of fairness and counter-balances in our legal system and those counter-balances are supposed to (although they do not always) assist in changing inequalities of power in the community. If I give the example of a woman who has been assaulted by her spouse, the criminal justice system is not ideal for dealing with that. In fact many women, most women will not access the criminal justice system to deal with domestic assault. But nevertheless when the criminal justice is brought into play, the power differential that exists between the women and the spouse or the person who assaulted her, changes in the court. In a restorative justice system it does not. So the idea of sentencing circles or circles to resolve domestic disputes is very problematic because the same power dynamic that creates this violent situation exists in that sentencing circle or exists in that community circle. So in women's groups—in fact I was at a conference last weekend which talked about some of these issues—women's groups who argued very hard for things like mandatory sentencing, and for the courts to take issues of violence against women seriously, which they did not do historically, and for the police to take issues of violence against women seriously, there has been big improvements on this, but there is also a downside to it and how to resolve that, how to find ways out of that, how to find ways out of the criminal court system where there can be fairness in resolving domestic violence disputes, I think we have not come to an understanding of how to do that. I know in that conference there was a lot of discussion

about it, but nothing really has emerged as a solution, as a better more viable solution than the existing solutions that we have which is through the criminal justice system. So I think that we have to be careful not to sort of just fall into trends like restorative justice system. Sounds great, it is a wonderful word if only it could work, if only it worked in every situation it would be great, much better than the punitive system that we have. But in situations, particularly in violent situations I think we have to really think twice about how it works and particularly in relation to the power dynamic in relationship.

The second thing I want to say about the criminal justice system and the civil system is the way in which victims experience the criminal justice system. Again there has been a lot of discussion about that, a lot of discussion about victim support, but again I think that we have a long way to go in terms of making the experience of a court case easier on victims than it is without taking away the rights of the accused, and much to the surprise of many people, feminists really do worry about the rights of the accused and to make sure there is a fair trial no matter what the person is accused of. Again, I think in your deliberations you can make some progress—I don't know if this is going to be addressed by any of your speakers—I think again we have to be careful about not just jumping on some bandwagons here. I think there are some very difficult issues about balancing the rights of the accused against making the court experience such that more victims, particularly here of domestic assault but also sexual assault, will be willing to come forward and use the court system. Our experiences are that the main problem is not. There is a problem in the courts, but the bigger problem is at the level of the police and that is still a problem today even though there has been a lot education. I guess on that level I do not have a lot of conclusions to bring to you, but only to say that I think we have to tread quite carefully in terms of the changes we make there.

I know that one of the preoccupations of judges is the perception in the public eye of the administration of justice. I have argued already that by including more citizens in things like judicial councils and things like appointments of judges, we improve the perception especially if we have people who have some profile in the community; we improve the perception of the judicial system. But then you have to deal with the media. I know a lot of the Chief Justices who actually said to me that “it is the role of people like you to give a better perception of the judicial system in the media.” Easier said than done, because the problem with the media in this case is that the media loves conflict. They love to report on

conflict and so when the judicial system is working well, when there is a good disposition of good cases, this is not news. But when there is a judge who makes a stupid remark then that is news or when there is a group that is furious at some decision that some judge made then that is news. I do not really know how you get around this because politicians have the same problem, advocacy groups have the same problem, I personally would like to see a different kind of media than we have, but that is not going to happen, certainly not in the near future. I think that you could have good communications people and I think certainly at the level of the Supreme Court they have been doing some very good work in explaining the judicial system, in letting judges speak more, which I think is very important, to talk about the judicial system, to talk more about the role judges play, how they see their roles, how the courts work. I think all these things are very good, but I do not think you are going to get around the problem that the media focuses on conflicts and the media loves scandal and problems and so inevitably however good your communications is, however much you try to educate, you are going to have these problems. That is why I think that the more you can involve the community in the actual process the more that these kinds of bad media coverage is countered. And I have to say also as an advocate that the bad media is not always a bad thing. It might make you uncomfortable, but it does point out where there are problems and it makes it necessary to deal with the problems. The heat makes it necessary to deal with the problems and even though we do not like it when the media goes after somebody, goes after us, nevertheless it does often play a useful role. I do not think the media is the place to solve these problems and I do not think the media is the place citizens are going to understand better the justice system either, although there is a role there.

The last thing I want to talk about is a trend I see happening now that does not have to do with the justice system *per se* but is going to have an impact on the justice system just like the fight for women's rights and gay and lesbian rights had a huge impact on the justice system: it is the move from social welfare state to social control state. Now that is a pretty dramatic way of putting it, but I see this more and more. We see the criminalization of the poor through things like safe street sex and use more of welfare fraud against poor people. We see the criminalization of decent using and we are going to see this way more now with this war on terrorism; using the heavy hand of the criminal law against protesters for example, who even five years before would not have been charged: they may have been arrested and let go. Now they are going through the court

systems and this troubles me greatly. I do not agree with this. I think it is the opposite direction we should be going in if we are talking about restorative justice and community-based justice. We are talking about getting these cases out of the court system and now instead they are coming back in the court system and part of the reason for that is that we live in a very complicated world, a very difficult world and people like simple answers to difficult questions and charging someone with a crime is a simple answer. Put him in jail is a simple answer but it is not a very good answer. In most cases it is not a very good answer. It does not solve anything. It might protect the community from someone who is a violent offender (as you know better than I do this is a tiny minority of the people who are charged), but it does not really solve social problems and if we are looking at using the judicial system a bit more to involve the community, and through restorative justice to try and see if we can resolve some social problems, I am sceptical about that. But I understand the desire because more and more of these social problems are being thrown onto the courts. Myself, I do not think the solution to that is to make the courts a social service agency. I think the solution to it is to get more value to social service agencies in our society and so I am not sure what you as judges can do about that. But I raise it because I think it is a concern for the whole community in particular because you are going to get loaded with it. It is a real concern for you, and if your organizations can speak out about this, I think that it would be very important politically to say that it does not make a lot of sense to load the social problems of society into the criminal courts or even into the civil courts, and that is not going to solve the problems. This is something that is not the topic of the conference but it is related to the topic of the conference, and I think that part of the desire for community and citizen participation in the justice system is to make the justice system more responsive to the community, to make the justice system more respectful in the community. But I suspect from the reading I have done, particularly around the restorative justice and community access to justice, that the other part of the impulse is because you are seeing more and more social problems in the court that should be solved in the community and not by the criminal law, and there I am not sure the right response is to have the courts to be more community focused. I think the right response is to get these things out of the courts and to have them solved in the community, not in the courts. I know a lot of your speakers coming from the States and I would say the United States is way past us in doing this. I mean when you know one out of four black males are in contact with the justice system in the United States, something is very wrong. They have the highest incarceration of

any society in the world, certainly any democratic society. Something is very wrong. What has happened in the United States which I see beginning to happen here is that a social welfare system was moved toward a social control system and we are seeing that beginning to happen here. It is something that I hope judges will speak out against in whatever way that they can because it will not work. It will criminalize more and more marginal people whether they be marginal because of income or because of race or because of youth and it will clog up the courts and create a much more dysfunctional court system. But my concern is much more that it creates a society with an underclass that begins to despair of any political change in the society and sees the state only as a punitive mechanism, not as a mechanism for social change, for positive progressive, social change.

On that note, thank you very much.