



PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Building On Our Strengths

by Barbara Harris Chiang

Politics and elections aside, this year's presidential inauguration holds so many promises and expectations for so many, that it is difficult to



avoid well-intentioned clichés of change and new beginnings. It is equally difficult to avoid applauding as a people and as a nation.

In Barack Obama, we see ourselves, a dynamic collection of colors and cultures, faiths and philosophies, backgrounds and beliefs — the tired, poor, huddled masses yearning to breathe free — or at least get out of the office in time to pick-up the children from daycare and school. We see in him not privilege, but a regular person, a husband, a parent, with more similarities to the rest of us than differences. In his inaugural speech, President Obama reminded us that "... our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus — and non-believers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this earth; and because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation, and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass ..."

Regardless of your party affiliation, you can't help but nod to such

continued, page 7

Queen's Bench Signs Amicus Brief Opposing Proposition 8

By Suizi Lin, Co-Chair QB Amicus Committee

On November 4, 2008, a majority of California voters, 52.8 %, passed Proposition 8, an initiative that eliminates the right of same-sex couples to marry by adding language to the California State Constitution. In January of 2009, the Queen's Bench Board of Directors voted unanimously to sign onto an amicus brief opposing Proposition 8 in the matter of *Strauss et al. v. Horton, et al.*, S168047, filed in the Supreme Court of the State of California.

"Because Proposition 8 would shatter existing principles of equal

protection and fundamental rights, as well as the judicial branch's role as final arbiter of these constitutional guarantees, it constitutes a revision of the Constitution. As such, it may not be enacted by a simple majority of the voters." (Amicus Brief of Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP filed in the Supreme Court of the State of California, filed on January 16, 2009, 28:1-28:5).

Central to Queen's Bench's mission is promoting equal protection under the law. As many of you know,

continued, page 7

"Because It's Wrong"

A Look at AT&T v. Hulteen

By Mary Catherine Wiederhold, Chair QB Legislative Issues & Reproductive Rights Committee.

AT&T v. Hulteen was argued in front of the U.S. Supreme Court in December. This case has its roots in any company which had discriminatory pregnancy leave practices before 1978 and then continued its discriminatory practices after 1978 with its unlawful effects on pensions.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited private employers from "discriminat[ing] against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's . . . sex." 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1). While this provision addressed intentional disparate treatment, a companion

provision further prohibited employment practices with an unjustified disparate impact on the basis of sex. 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(2). At issue in the recently argued case, in front of the United States Supreme Court,

continued, page 2

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

Mentorship	2
Hon. Adrienne Jacobs Miller	3
Work Assumptions	4
QB New Members	5
Announcements	6
Calendar	8

Queen's Bench Mentorship Program: Sharing Your Gifts

By Alison Crane, Co-Chair QB Mentorship Committee

Recently, the National Association of Women Lawyers published its third annual National Survey on Retention and Promotion of Women in Law Firms. In evaluating the responses from many of the country's 200 largest law firms, the survey found half of law firm associates are women, a number which approximates the law school population. However, at the highest level of law firm practice, only 16% of equity partners are women. The limited number of women in equity positions can have implications for newer attorneys who have fewer successful women role models, fewer opportunities to work with senior women lawyers and fewer prospects for mentoring from women attorneys.

In 2006, Queen's Bench relaunched its Mentorship Program in an effort to fill this void. Calling on the time and talent of its esteemed membership, Queen's Bench seeks



to help women attorneys develop these valued relationships. Rather than focusing on new law school graduates, Queen's Bench has chosen to concentrate its resources on assisting women with three to nine years of experience in the legal profession – the biggest retention risk years for law firms. These attorneys have established themselves and can often use some “been there, done that” advice on career choices, client development and the quest for work-life balance.

The Program runs on a one-year cycle. The goal is for mentors and mentees to spend an hour a month together, perhaps meeting for lunch or even just a phone call to stay connected. Hopefully, mentors and mentees will develop a connection that will last well beyond the formal program.

In order for the Mentorship Program to fulfill its promise, we need mentors. Sage advice, constructive criticism, or

continued, page 7

AT&T v. Hulteen

Continued from page 1

AT&T v. Hulteen, is whether AT&T discriminated against pregnant women through its employment benefits system in violation of Title VII of the Civil Right Act.

AT&T provided pension benefits to certain employees. Noreen Hulteen and three other employees took pregnancy leaves before 1978. Before the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (“PDA”) of 1978 was enacted, AT&T classified pregnancy leaves as personal leave with a maximum of 30 days of service credit toward employee benefits. Other employees on disability or medical leave were not restricted to the 30-day limit. While out on pregnancy leave, Hulteen asked to come back to work for one day so that she could then take time off to deal with a non-pregnancy related medical condition and earn disability credit, but her request was denied. Therefore, Hulteen was only given 30 days credit for her entire pregnancy and unrelated medical leave which spanned seven months. As a result of the 30 days credit, AT&T awarded Hulteen and other respondents lower pensions when they retired in the 1990's.

After receiving a right-to-sue letter from the EEOC, Hulteen and the other respondents filed suit in federal district court. They claimed in court papers that AT&T had violated Title VII by not crediting their pre-1978 pregnancy leaves to their retirement benefits. The issue before the district court and then the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals was: did AT&T discriminate against Hulteen and the others by not adjusting their pregnancy leave as medical leave post-PDA?

AT&T argued that Hulteen and the other respondents took their leave before the enactment of the PDA. AT&T

argued that the discrimination occurred when the employer made a record of the woman's pregnancy leave, not when their pension was calculated. Therefore, to bind AT&T to the laws of the pre-PDA would give in an “impermissible retroactive effect.” However, respondents and amici curiae argued that by the early 1970's, the company should have known that its actions were discriminatory because of EEOC and court decisions, including the Supreme Court's “prohibited the type of unfavorable treatment of pregnancy leave.” Furthermore, by the time Hulteen retired, PDA had been the law for almost twenty years.

AT&T petitioned the Supreme Court to grant a writ of certiorari to consider the case. Former president Bush's solicitor general urged the court to grant the petition, the court granted cert. and the case was argued on December 10, 2008.

Writing as an amicus, the AARP argued that women's pension benefits must be “vigorously protected.” Eleven women law professors from across the United States, including the University of San Francisco School of Law and UC Hastings College of the Law, urged in their amicus brief that the relevant discriminatory act was the setting of Hulteen's pension benefit when she retired.

Legal commentators have predicted that Kennedy will be the swing vote, with the conservative wing of the Court voting for AT&T and the other wing voting for Hulteen. The outcome should be known by June.

Mary Catherine Wiederhold is the chair of the Queen's Bench Legislative issues & Reproductive Rights committee. She can be reached at mcw@mcwrealestatelaw.com.

Thanks for the Laughs and the Years — A Tribute to the Honorable Adrienne Jacobs Miller

By Kelly Robbins, QB Past President 2009

The 2009 Queen's Bench year is underway, and our new President has already convened her new board. As fun as it was, our board meeting was held without the Honorable Adrienne Jacobs Miller, as she has decided to retire from her role as the senior Past President on the board. Adrienne has been on the board for all of the years that I have served on the board (since 2002) and this article is meant to thank her and acknowledge the dedication and excellent service that Adrienne has demonstrated in her many years advancing the agenda of the Queen's Bench Bar Association.

In speaking with her briefly about her background in Queen's Bench, I learned that Adrienne first joined Queen's Bench in 1978, and that she became its president in 1987. In between 1978 and now, Adrienne has probably filled every spot within our list of officers, directors and committee co-chairs. In this brief note, I hope to relay the important role that Adrienne played for this organization.

Prior to becoming President in 1987, Adrienne worked her way up through all the positions on the board of directors, including Newsletter Editor, Treasurer, Second Vice President, and then she served as First Vice President for the Honorable Charlene Padovani Kiesselbach (nee Mitchell). When Adrienne took a minute to reminisce about her years in QB, she remembered when she worked on organizing the installation of officers for Wendy Nelder's presidency in 1982. The installation was at the Officers Club in the Presidio and I'm certain that, with Adrienne's input, it was an elegant and proper affair! Adrienne also participated in the very first Juvenile Hall Project in 1986 when the Honorable Lee Baxter initiated the project, under the presidency of Honorable Charlene Padovani Kiesselbach.

It was during Judge Kiesselbach's presidency in 1986 that Queen's Bench celebrated its 65th year with a special event. The party to commemorate its 65th anniversary depicted the history of Queen's Bench and was held at the Stanford Court Hotel. Well, when Adrienne has anything to do with an event, all who know her are sure the event goes to the top level of elegance and class, and so I have no doubt that the 65th anniversary of Queen's Bench was a fantastic affair.

Adrienne also served in very serious roles, such as appearing as a Queen's Bench delegate at the State Bar Conference of Delegates in 1985 through 1989. Also, quite naturally, Adrienne served on the Awards Committee from 1989 to 1994, with her fellow judge the Honorable Charlene Kiesselbach as her co-chair. Adrienne has staffed the Scholarship Committee since 1998 and continues to do so through the present.

Speaking for myself as I still adjust to my own recent status as Past President, I say that Adrienne has been an institution in the Queen's Bench community, and that we



are all better off because of her presence. I took the liberty of asking some of her fellow officers, directors, co-chairs and fellow Queen's Bench members to provide a comment about Adrienne, and those are included below.

As Adrienne and I were ending our conversation, she recalled how she used to bring cookies to the board meetings. Some members of the board were concerned that this was too "frilly" for women lawyers in their important role on the board of Queen's Bench. But as Adrienne laughs her contagious laugh, she says "But no one wanted to be hungry during our board meetings!" And so it became tradition that snacks were brought to board meetings. Practical, smart, funny, wise, insightful and just plain fun. That's our Adrienne, and Queen's Bench has grown and prospered with her in our midst, and Queen's Bench is much better for it!

Judge Jacobs Miller has been a wonderful friend to Queen's Bench. I especially enjoy working on the Scholarship selection committees with her, interviewing potential scholarship recipients. Her advice and mentorship have been invaluable to the Board for the last few years.

— Anee Mikacich, 2009 QB First Vice President

My memories of serving with Adrienne on the Queen's Bench Board over the years go back to when I first joined the Board. Adrienne was always so welcoming to new board members. You knew you had an instant mentor and friend. Adrienne remains an amazing ambassador to Queen's Bench.

— Eliza Rodrigues, QB Past President 2003

Adrienne has been a ray of sunshine on the board and our guidepost. The organization has definitely benefitted from her energy and wisdom

— Barbara Harris Chiang, 2009 QB President

Last year was my first year on the Queen's Bench Board and I felt privileged to serve with Adrienne. She was so supportive and inspiring throughout the year. She will certainly be missed on the board this year.

— Lisa Freitas, 2009 QB Secretary

I first met Adrienne in 1980 or 1981 when I attended a Queen's Bench Board Meeting. I had been "drafted" into QB by Ina Gjemont when she was President to be on the Scholarship Committee. It was my first Board Meeting, as I recall, and this attractive, well-dressed lady lawyer walked in with a smile and a box of See's Candy to pass around. From the beginning she presented herself as poised, elegant, cheerful and generous. Her comments were always wise and on point. I was impressed and intrigued and wanted to know her. I came to find out that, like me, she was a mom, wife and lawyer — and trying to balance all her roles. We were similarly situated. We became good friends and our families became

continued, page 7

It's Time to Re-examine Underlying Assumptions About Work

By Tammy Dawson, Co-Chair Work-Life Balance Committee

There's no denying it — 2008 was a tough year for lawyers, particularly in the Bay Area. News of layoffs and firm closures came fast and furious this past Fall, startling us out of believing that law jobs were recession-proof. Nonetheless, I can't help seeing an opportunity emerging from the crisis — the opportunity to examine our underlying assumptions about the way lawyers work to see if it makes sense. No group stands to benefit more from this examination than women.

Since the mid-1980's, law school enrollment has been comprised of between 40 and 50% women. Nevertheless, while nearly half of all law firm associates are women, only 17% of law firm partners are women.¹ At this rate, Catalyst estimates that parity between men and women won't be achieved until 2088.² Given the ample pipeline of qualified women that has existed for a generation, the question is — why? What causes women, as a group, to fail to achieve at the highest levels in their firms? Could it be the disconnect between the demands of work and the realities of women's personal lives?

Today's ideal worker is someone who will prioritize his or her job over personal considerations. This person will work late when requested (or better yet, as a matter of course), travel where and when directed, move when transferred, and will generally be available 24/7. Meeting the ideal worker norm has become even more challenging in recent years with the rise in the number of "extreme jobs, a term defined by Sylvia Ann Hewlett of the Center for Work-Life Policy and the director of the Gender and Policy Program at the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University. Extreme jobs generally have outsized demands in terms of time, energy, talent, skill and commitment.³ Today, work encroaches more and more on personal time, impinging on family, friends, health, and personal goals and interests. Approximately 70% of all lawyers — men and women, partners and associates — report struggling with similar levels and sources of conflict between work and life. The conflict, however, has a greater impact on women, who continue to shoulder the



majority of caregiving and household responsibilities.⁴ While their employers are telling them that in order to be an ideal worker they must prioritize work, they are also being told that their primary responsibility is as a caregiver — to children, elderly parents and in-laws,⁵ spouses, even schools and community organizations. This is a conflict for the overwhelming majority of women — 80% of women will become mothers in their lifetimes, and even more will have elderly parents, in-laws, or spouses who need care. As Joan Williams, Director of the

U.C. Hastings Center for WorkLife Law points out in her seminal book, *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do About It*, women fail to meet the definition of ideal workers because they do not enjoy the flow of family work that men typically enjoy. Women with caregiving responsibilities, as most women have at various points in their lives, cannot, by definition, be ideal workers. Women are caught between the proverbial rock and hard place.

Regardless of perpetually being in a no-win situation, the majority of us continue to accept the current definition of the ideal worker, believing it to be business necessity. We don't question when an employer asks us to work late, or move, or travel, or refuses requests for flexibility, or does not offer part-time options, whether *de jure* or *de facto*.⁶ We may not like it. We may feel frustrated by it. But by and large we do not question the business model, whether our employers really need to ask us to place the demands in our personal lives behind the demands of our workplace. "Of course the most valuable employee is one who is able to do what the employer asks of him or her," we say to ourselves. "If I want to get the job or the promotion or be taken seriously, I need to be willing to do whatever I'm asked. If I can't, I shouldn't be surprised when

continued, page 5

⁴ *Creating Pathways to Success*, p 8.

⁵ Hewlett, p. 32-33 (In Hewlett's Hidden Brain Drain survey, while 45% of women listed childcare concerns as triggering a decision to leave the workforce, 24% of women listed an elder-care crisis as the triggering event).

⁶ Although most firms have part-time and flexible work options on the books, using them is widely considered to be detrimental to careers. Most attorneys perceive it as being more advantageous to their careers to leave their jobs rather than use flexible work options. Combined with schedule creep and a lack of interesting assignments, flexible work options are not viewed as a viable alternative and are not often taken up, despite the fact that, in a 2000 Radcliff Public Policy Center study, about 70% of men under the age of 40 stated they would give up some of their pay for more time with their families, *Creating Pathways to Success*, p 38.

¹ Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia, "Creating Pathways to Success: Advancing and Retaining Women in Today's Law Firms," May 2006, p 4.

² Catalyst Research, *Women in Law in the U.S.*, 2008.

³ Sylvia Ann Hewlett, *Off-Ramps and On-Ramps: Keeping Talented Women on the Road to Success*, 2007, (2007) p. 60-61.

Assumptions About Work

Continued from page 4

someone else is hired or promoted or valued more than I am. And people who request 'accommodations' like flexible hours or part time options are going to necessarily place a greater burden on me, already overworked because I am doing everything that's being asked of me, so I don't want my co-workers to be able to refuse to work late, or travel, or to be granted part-time options either."

What's a woman to do?

To date, women have been leaving. According to the 2007 MIT survey of law firms, 31% of female associates have left private practice (compared to 18% of male associates).⁷ Most women aren't leaving for the workforce altogether (only 9% of women law graduates aren't working after 15 years), but rather accept jobs with other firms, non-profits, or government, thereby potentially limiting their opportunities for advancement, or they change fields.

Is this really the best use of women lawyers, almost half our legal resources? Can firms afford to spend a lot of time, effort and expense training women, just to see them leave, or worse, go to competitors?

And lately it's not just women who are leaving their firms – men are leaving too. Gen Y men in particular have aligned themselves with women on work/life balance and integration issues, perhaps because they have no expectation that their wives will either want or be able to stay home with children. In all, nearly 80% of associates leave their large law firm by their 5th year of practice, and 55% of those who remain do not expect to be working in a law firm in another 5 years.⁸ While some attrition may be desired, firms are losing many employees to unwanted attrition. At an estimated \$200,000 to \$500,000 to replace a second or third year associate, mid to large firms can wind up losing millions of dollars each year to unwanted attrition.⁹ Ouch!

If women and younger men find it difficult or impossible to meet the ideal worker definition, are there workers who can but would nonetheless choose not to? Certainly there are lawyers who desire to maintain their health, travel, run marathons, paint, participate in their churches and communities, and generally pursue outside interests. A balanced hours solution could make space for these things. But even more interestingly, there is the Boomer

⁷ MIT Workplace Center, "Women Lawyers and Obstacles to Leadership," Spring 2007.

⁸ Cited in the Project for Attorney Retention, "The Business Case for a Balanced Hours Program for Attorneys," www.pardc.org/LawFirm/Business_Case.htm.

⁹ Joan C. Williams and Cynthia Thomas Calvert, *Solving the Part-Time Puzzle: The Law Firm's Guide to Balanced Hours*, (2004) p. 18-19.

Generation that's nudging up against retirement. Could even the workaholic Boomers see the benefit of flexible work options, allowing them to ease into retirement rather than go from working 70 hours/week to none overnight? And would improvements in quality of life ultimately lead to increased productivity?

I think it's time to start questioning some of our assumptions when it comes to work:

1. Is it really true that the most valuable employees are the ones that devote themselves solely to work?

2. Is there a business case to be made for diversity? Why should firms care if women are not included in positions of power, influence and wealth?

3. Is there a way for firms to restructure employment that would include women in positions of power while maintaining and promoting profitability? Could this change in structure benefiting everyone, not just women?

4. Is there a business case to be made for flexibility programs that allow women, and men, to jump off the career ladder and utilize a lattice approach to their careers instead?

5. Are the barriers to change really insurmountable? Can law firms learn from companies who are embracing flexibility and implement similar programs?

In the coming months, I will discuss these questions in subsequent columns. In the meantime, I'd like to hear your thoughts about work/life balance and integration: how you have achieved, or sacrificed, balance; what resistance you've encountered; your own concerns about changing the law firm structure; trends you are seeing from firm management, partners, associates and clients that may impact firm work structure, etc. I invite you to post comments on the yahoo group (accessible through the QB homepage).

Queen's Bench New Members

Please welcome the following new members who joined between December 19, 2008 and January 26, 2009:

- Nicole Cabalette
Keegin Harrison Schoppert
Smith & Karner
- Michelle Fowler
Flexperience LLC
- Michelle Jew
Burnham Brown
- Nicole Radakovich



ANNOUNCEMENTS ...

Committee Co-chairs Wanted

Do you want to get involved? QB seeks motivated members to co-chair the following committees: Domestic Violence Committee Amicus Brief, and Education Committee. If you are interested, please contact Barbara Harris Chiang at bhc@dillinghammurphy.com.

Conversation With Bay Area Leaders on "Flexibility: The Future Of Work"

Wednesday, February 25, 2009, 8:00 to 11:30 a.m.
— KPMG, LLP, 55 Second St., 10th Floor

QB members are cordially invited to attend the 2009 Flexibility: The Future of Work event honoring the Bay Area Alfred P. Sloan Award winners for Business Excellence in Workplace Flexibility, presented by Flexperience and Foresight Management. Alfred P. Sloan award winners and top employers will share their stories of implementing workplace flexibility, including the challenges they faced and how their bottom lines improved. Panelists will include representatives from Sun Microsystems, KPMG, Genentech, and Woodruff-Sawyer.

Cost is \$42.50, including a 15% discount to QB members using code QB15. To register, visit www.FlexperienceConsulting.com.

Seeking Applicants!!

Senator Feinstein's Judicial Advisory Committees are currently accepting applications for the positions of federal District Court Judge for the Central District of California, U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of California, and federal District Court Judge or U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of California. Applications are available online at: <http://feinstein.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=ServicesForCalifornians.ApplicationsJud>.

Applicants should send **six (6) paper copies** of the application to:

David S. Casey, Jr., Esq.
Statewide Chair
Feinstein Judicial Advisory Process
110 Laurel Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Applications will be considered on a rolling basis but because the Committee will be working to provide candidates to the Senator as soon as possible for the current openings listed above, applicants are encouraged to submit their materials as soon as possible.

Flexperience™

Flexperience™ is a boutique firm that connects experienced marketing, human resources, finance and legal professionals with opportunities for part-time, flex-time, or project-based work with our clients. We understand the desire of many professionals to balance a rewarding professional life with an enriching personal life. We partner with our seasoned talent to make it easy to find flexible work opportunities. We are looking for talented individuals who have a wide breadth of knowledge in a variety of legal areas and diverse industries. The ideal candidate will have 4 or more years of experience in their field at a top law firm or corporation, have excellent counseling skills, be comfortable providing advice and counsel to all levels within the business, and be a team player. We are currently seeking **Transactional Attorneys** and **Litigation Attorneys**.

If you or someone you know is interested in applying, please go to our website at www.FlexperienceConsulting.com and complete the talent registration. Please note: ALL resumes must be submitted through our website so we can ensure your information is tracked in our recruiting database, which facilitates our entire recruiting process. If you have questions, please email recruiting@flexperienceconsulting.com.

QUEEN'S BENCH NEWSLETTER

Published monthly by the Queen's Bench
Bar Association of the San Francisco Bay Area,
a California nonprofit corporation

NEWSLETTER EDITOR: Lisa A. Freitas

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE:

816 E. Fourth Avenue
San Mateo, CA 94401-3317
Telephone: 415-249-9280
Facsimile: 650-344-1588

E-mail: QueensBench@astound.net
Internet: www.queensbench.org

ADMINISTRATOR: Maurine Killough

2009 OFFICERS

BARBARA L. HARRIS CHIANG President
AMEE A. MIKACICH First Vice President
SOPHIE N. FROELICH Second Vice President
LISA FREITAS Secretary
REBECCA HOOLEY Treasurer
SARAH M. KING Asst. Secretary/Treasurer
KELLY J. ROBBINS Immediate Past President

2009 DIRECTORS

VANESSA HIERBAUM
PAMELA MARKERT
ANNIE O'DONNELL
LISA KLOTCHMAN RAUCH
PATRICIA ROSENBERG
HON. ANNE BEYTIN TORINGTON

Mentorship Program

Continued from page 2

a positive push and often can have a profound impact on a young attorney. Mentors needn't have fulfilled any particular requirements other than having been in practice eight years or more and having a desire to share your wisdom with those newer to the practice. Take the opportunity to share a career that you are passionate about and give your time in ways that remind you why you love what you do.

Individuals interested in becoming mentees will find an application either inside the printed newsletter or online at: www.queensbench.org/pdf/2009Mentee_Application.pdf. The questions are designed to provide the Mentorship Committee with information about you so that you can be matched with a mentor that best matches your needs.

If you are interested in being a mentor, please contact either Alison Crane (acrane@bledsoelaw.com) or The Honorable Anne Beytin Torkington (Torkington.Anne@dol.gov) and provide us with a brief description of your practice and any other information which may be helpful in pairing you with a mentee.

Prop 8 Amicus Brief

Continued from page 1

Queen's Bench was formed in 1921 by a group of women lawyers frustrated by the resistance of male lawyers to their participation in the local bar association. Through its board of directors, committees and community efforts, Queen's Bench has worked to promote the core constitutional principles of equal protection and fundamental rights, and to oppose discrimination in all forms.

To request a copy of the amicus brief in the matter of *Strauss et al. v. Horton, et al.* or if you know of other amicus briefs that coincide with Queen's Bench's mission, please email Suizi@fjslaw.com

Adrienne Miller

Continued from page 3

friends. We did so much through QB together. We were roommates as QB Delegates to the Conference of Delegates. We worked on committees and projects toward our mutual goal of promoting the interests of women in the legal profession. Eventually, when I became President, Adrienne was my 1st VP and we planned events together. Adrienne was amazing — what energy, what attention to detail, what poise, what graciousness and what consideration. And, what humility. Everything Adrienne does is for the good of others and in furtherance of sound values and principles. QB had an amazing 65th Anniversary Gala Celebration largely due to Adrienne's work, competence, and reliability. And, with her sweetness and wonderful sense of humor, she is a joy to work with and be around. She has incredible sensitivity. She is one of my life long best friends and I love her.

—Charlene Padovani Kiesselbach, QB Past President 1986

President's Message

Continued from page 1

language. How can anyone, with any ounce of intellect, argue against that?

The inauguration of every US president is special. Under the current US Constitution, 44 seasoned politicians have taken the president's office through open, public elections; no military coups or juntas, no storming of government buildings, no one disappearing in the night. The peaceful transfer of power is always special.

January 2009, however, will forever stand above the others as a permanent milestone in US history. All of sudden, the promise of all men being created equal rings truer and the American dream feels closer to reality.

Yet, that precious Americanism comes with a price.

"For as much as government can do and must do, it is ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this nation relies," Obama said. "It is the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job which sees us through our darkest hours."

In other words, we actually ARE our brothers' and sisters' keepers. We are responsible for each other. The challenge is service — service to Queen's Bench, service to our peers, service to our chosen profession, and most importantly, service to those who would replace us.

"The Mission of Queen's Bench is to foster professional and social relationships among women lawyers and to promote equality and opportunity for all women through education, programs, and community outreach." This is our organization's official mission statement.

Are we fulfilling that mission as an organization?

The real questions are: Are we doing enough as Queen's Bench and as individual women lawyers? Is our juvenile hall program sufficient? Are we meeting our mentoring, business development and anti-domestic violence commitments? Are we helping women lawyers balance life and work? Are we meeting the needs of our members? Is there anything else we can or should do?

In this year of change and hope and fresh perspectives, I invite and encourage every Queen's Bench member to ponder those questions, and to share some answers. The coming journey might be long; it might be arduous.

The path forward might be smooth and easy, filled with excitement and fun. Yet, none of this is important.

What is important is that we, as Queen's Bench, take the journey together.

I look forward to serving Queen's Bench members on this year's journey.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

February

- 3** **Board of Directors Meeting**
6:00 p.m.
Dillingham & Murphy
225 Bush Street, 6th Floor, San Francisco
- 4** **Juvenile Hall Project**
6:30–8:30 p.m.
San Francisco Youth Guidance Center
- 18** **Juvenile Hall Project**
6:30–8:30 p.m.
- 24** **Business Development Committee**
6:15 p.m.
Nossaman LLP
50 California Street, 34th floor, San Francisco



March

- 3** **Board of Directors Meeting**
6:00 p.m.
Dillingham & Murphy
- 4** **Juvenile Hall Project**
6:30–8:30 p.m.
- 18** **Juvenile Hall Project**
6:30–8:30 p.m.
- 20** **CWL Reception**
(tentative)
- 31** **Business Development Committee**
6:15 p.m.
Nossaman LLP



www.queensbench.org

816 E. Fourth Avenue

San Mateo, CA 94401-3317

Queen's Bench Newsletter

January-February 2009