

Oral History Transcript
Illinois Supreme Court Historic Preservation Commission

Mary Ann McMorrow

A: I was born in Chicago 1930 and I grew up on the northwest side of Chicago and I've actually lived on the northwest side of Chicago almost continuously since I've been born.

Q: You went to school there?

A: I went to school in the northwest side of Chicago. The grade school that I attended was seven blocks away and at that time you didn't have access to meals at the school, so we walked seven blocks there each morning, seven blocks back home for lunch --

Q: My goodness.

A: -- back to school and then back again at the end of the day.

Q: Now, this was during the Depression?

A: Well, at that age, when I was going to grade school, I didn't know what the Depression was.

Q: You didn't know, huh? Do you recall the effect of the Depression on your family?

A: Only what my mother told me and some other relatives told me. At one time, my dad was a very wealthy man. He had bank stock which he had at that time, what they call double indemnity and you had -- you lost not only the value of your stock but you also had to pay back to the government, I believe, the amount that you lost. So it was a difficult time. But, again, this is what I've been told. I don't know that that's true.

Q: But you were a kid. You were -- everyone was in the same situation?

A: Yes. Yes. And I never felt deprived in any way because of the Depression. I always had a new dress when I had to have one or, you know, whatever we needed we all had. My siblings.

Q: Well, give us some insight how it was as you got older and you're in high school. Now the war is on. World War II. How did that affect you?

A: Well, as I think back on it, Joel, conversations were different. The economic situation didn't seem to affect me or my family that much but we were very much aware of the war. It was on television and in the movies and everywhere, you know, and neighbors' sons were going to duty. It was a time of trying to help in any way we could.

Q: Sure.

A: But we were somewhat limited. I was in high school. We wrote to the servicemen. I didn't go to dance with them that often but some of my friends did go to the USO spaces and dance and such, you know, and baked.

Q: Now, is this when -- now, when you're in high school, is this when you started to get involved in public speaking and debate and that sort of thing?

A: It was in high school that I started to get involved in public debate. I think that most people gravitate to similar friends. You know, we all have -- my close friends were such that we all had the same interests and we all enjoyed debating and did quite a bit of that. It was -- it was so that we would go to each others homes in the evenings, and sometimes even stay overnight arguing over what now appear like ridiculous things. We debated everything we could think of, even to the point of how do we know that there are beans in a can of beans. You know, anything and everything was subject to debate.

Q: My understanding is your mother particularly was interested in your ability as a debater and somehow inferred or suggested to you maybe you should be a lawyer.

A: She did, but, of course, she was prejudiced, you know, towards her daughter. But she did suggest that. But prior to her doing that, I hadn't thought of law school. It just wasn't something that girls considered. So it was something that stayed with me.

Q: Well, in those days girls normally didn't consider even going to college. Why'd you go to college?

A: Well, I felt I should go to college. I had -- this is in all modesty. I had the grades and the academic ability to go and my friends were going and I wanted to go to college since --

Q: Now, where'd you go to college?

A: I started out at Rosary College in River Forest and I went there for two years, after which I went to law school.

Q: And where'd you go to law school?

A: Loyola. At that time there were a lot of men returning from the service who were in the law school classes and they became my classmates and friends, really, for life. They're still my friends.

Q: Sure. Why did you study law? I know you had the interest in debate and public speaking and your family supported that idea. But what motivated you to go to law school?

A: I think that I had, again in all modesty, a keen sense of right and wrong, you know, and I perceived wrongs in certain areas and certain things that were good and right that I would have liked to have worked on and continued with. And so I thought law school was the ideal place to pursue those interests.

Q: Now, this is in the '40s into the early '50s? You say men were coming back from the war and they were going to law school. How was it being a female in Loyola Law School in those times?

A: Well, there were very few. There was one woman who was in my classes as -- when I was a freshman there and she failed. And then a woman from the night school came into the day school and so she was there during my second year of law school and she failed at the end of the second year. And so I was the only one when I graduated but I --

Q: The only woman?

A: Yes, in my graduating class. But it was a harrowing time for me. I must say I almost... I -- I think it's true that I lived in fear for those three years that I was in law school because the law school handled dismissals differently than they do now. Now I think when you get into law school you're reasonably assured of being able to stay for the three years. That was not so when I went to law school. When I started law school, there were 127, I believe, in my class and after the first year many -- I don't remember the number, though. Many though were failed. And after the second year, some more were failed. So it's not like it is now where you're reasonably assured that if you get in you won't be failed. But at that time there was no assurance whatsoever. Plus we sat in the same seats all the time and we all took the same courses. There was no electives really. And the man who happened to be seated to my immediate right was very brilliant. He came from the family, a wealthy family, that produced and distributed Jovan perfumes. I've forgot his name. But he was so smart I thought... When he asked a question, he -- I didn't understand his questions, much less know the answers, you know. So I was terribly frightened. I thought, "Am I in the wrong place?" I certainly couldn't do or ask as he

did. But after the first year he flunked and I passed. So it isn't always what you perceive it to be.

Q: Now, this was a time of the McCarthy vindictiveness and there was the outside pressures, particularly on a young law student. Did that affect you at all, the McCarthyism?

A: Well, I think it opened us up to thinking differently. I think it caused students, particularly law students, to not be so complacent about acceptance -- acceptance of everything. You know, prior to that we were a very accepting group. Didn't matter what we were told, we accepted and didn't dispute in any way. But that opened us up to thinking there are other points of view that must be considered, which was a big help to me, of course, when I became a judge.

Q: Did you have to sign a loyalty oath when you graduated?

A: I don't remember that and I don't remember the professors having to do that. Possibly we did but I don't remember that. I don't think the students had to do that, at least not at Loyola. But it is a possibility.

Q: When you were in law school, was there a particular area of law to which you gravitated, that you were interested in?

A: I think I gravitated to those areas of the law that were taught by professors that I was particularly fond of. Frank McGarr (sp?) was our teacher in Constitutional Law and he was so eloquent and so fluent. You know, words just seemed to flow out of him and I thought, "Will I ever be that way?" And I thought, "No, I won't. I can't imagine myself ever being that eloquent." But I liked -- I loved my teacher in Property Law, John Hayes, John C. Hayes.

Q: Still remember him.

A: Oh, you remember him? He became an appellate court judge briefly. His health, I think, was not good. But there were -- and ethics --

Q: So you understood Blackacre and Whiteacre and all of that?

A: Yes, yes. And John Fitzgerald, right? And the dean of the law school who embarrassed me near the beginning of my law school career, which was really the beginning of my entire career. He had given us an exam and after the exam he took the papers home and corrected them and the next day he distributed them back to the students, all except, I think, three papers. And mine was one of the three. And I thought, "Oh, what did I do?" And he held it up and I can remember this like it happened yesterday. He said, "I want you to always remember this." I wrote on that paper, "I feel that something or other is true," in response to a question. And he put a big red circle around the word feel. He said, "We don't feel in law. We believe." And, you know, ever since then I almost never use the word feel. But it was embarrassing but it was a good lesson, a great lesson. It stayed with me for many years.

Q: What was your family's reaction to your going to college and then to law school?

A: They were happy that I was interested in law. They wondered how I would fare because of the great dropout but they were happy I went to law school. My mother, I think, was a progressive lady. I remember her influence more than my dad's and she was the one who suggested I go or consider it. And...

Q: Do you have a political philosophy at the time? A particular outlook?

A: No, other than to use that education to promote right and wrong and justice in everyday life. Other than that, no. I didn't know what I was going to do.

Q: As you looked around, a young lady in law school, and looked at your colleagues and your friends, do you have a feeling about that generation? Do you feel part of it or estranged from it or above it?

A: I feel a part of it because my classmates were so warm and so welcoming to me. There was not even a hint of discrimination from them to me. They made sure that I attended every party and every time we'd go for a beer, you know, at the end of an exam they always made sure I was there. They couldn't have been better to me. You'd think I was another man or boy in the class, really, rather than a woman. They just were very welcoming.

Q: Did you feel any other discrimination, though, from faculty, from those looking in from the outside?

A: No. Well, from the outside I don't know. I wouldn't have known that, Joel. But from the faculty they -- they responded in the opposite way that you asked in your question. They, too, I think wanted to help me get through and sometimes I would think they sensed my being a bit uneasy. You know, it's just another woman in the class. They were very helpful in any way they could possibly be. They offered to answer any questions that I might have after class and such. Curiously, one of my professors in law school appeared before me when I was a judge in court and I thought, "Gee, I remember how frightened I was before you earlier in my career." He smiled and we smiled to each other. But it was interesting.

Q: I'm sure you were your usual gracious self.

A: Well, that's very generous of you, though, Joel. Thank you.

Q: Now, you received a Ford Foundation. Tell us about that. A grant.

A: Well, after I graduated, my classmates and I, of course, were all looking for jobs and I got the offer from one of the professors to work for the Ford Foundation and the subject was education, discrimination in education. And I thought that was an interesting topic. It was at the time when people became more conscious of civil rights and just rights in general and it was perfectly timed, really, to the -- to the era and I wanted to do that. And so I did. And they gave me a great deal of leeway. I could keep my own hours and do my own writing and after I finished I would submit my reports. And it was very interesting.

Q: And after that you went into private practice?

A: No, I worked for a law firm.

Q: OK.

A: Riordan and Linklater. And both Mr. Riordan and Linklater are now deceased but they, too, were very nice to me. It was a small firm but it gave me a chance to go to court and be a litigator.

[00:15]

Q: That's what you wanted to do?

A: That's what I wanted to do. Right.

Q: So you became an assistant's state's attorney?

A: Yes.

Q: In the criminal division?

A: Yes.

Q: That must have been very exciting.

A: It was, especially since I never in my wildest imagination thought I would be doing criminal work. It was just the farthest thing from my mind. But I found that I really enjoyed going to work each day and I liked --

Q: Tried felony cases? The first woman to do that?

A: I enjoyed -- yes, I did do that. I enjoyed that.

Q: Now, do you have any particular memory of some of the cases you handled at that time? Of course, I know how the assistant state's attorneys work. They just have a tub of cases every day.

A: Well, we did have that. What's more difficult for me, though, now is to recall specific cases more than 50 years later.

Q: Oh, my goodness.

A: Which is what you're asking me. I don't remember many specific cases except the last one I tried.

Q: There was at that time something called Women's Courts. What was that?

A: Women's what?

Q: Women's Courts.

A: There was one court that was entitled the Women's Court.

Q: OK. What was that?

A: It was a misdemeanor court in which if one of the defendants was arrested was a woman, that case would be sent to the Women's Court. That was similar to boy's court, where if they -- an underage boy was arrested, they would go to boy's court, gun court and gambling court, rackets court it was called. They had specialized courts. They were misdemeanor courts and they were located at 11th and State.

Q: Tell us about your marriage. Whom did you marry?

A: Oh, I married a wonderful man. It all came as a surprise because I was 32 years old and he was 42. But age difference never, ever came into our relationship in any way. I really didn't know he was ten years older in any way.

Q: He was a police officer, right?

A: Yes. He was younger than I in many of his attitudes and he had a great sense of humor, you know, and he enjoyed embarrassing me at times.

Q: Now, 1963, your daughter, Maryann, was born?

A: Yes.

Q: And that was when you left the state's attorney.

A: Yes.

Q: I don't know if there's any connection. But you went back into private practice then?

A: I did. My daughter was ill for a while after she was born and I wanted to be with her, so I thought this is the time to start a civil practice again. And I enjoyed it, Joel. I wanted to get away from the criminal practice for a while.

Q: What kind of cases did you try?

A: They really weren't big or monumental cases. There were one or two personal injury cases. But the others were domestic relations, real estate, what you would call more -- not trivial, because every case is important, but of lesser -- not importance, again, but of lesser difficulty. You know, I wanted to be with her and I could control my hours and my schedule much better by not going --

Q: It's something young women can relate to today. How was it to be a working woman in the '60s then?

A: Well, the support systems that women have now were not in existence then. And so after we married I had my husband buy me a home which was a block away from my mother's home and I always had a babysitter available. My mother wasn't working. But, you know, now there are many different places that women can --

Q: Get help.

A: -- go to work and still have flex hours or have help when taking care of a family. It wasn't available then.

Q: Now, you start to look at the world, you're a mother, you're a wife. Did your political attitude change or your social attitude or did it pretty much remain constant?

A: Well, I had never been active in politics but I enjoyed reading about it and the people involved and seeing what they did or what they didn't do. I enjoyed that kind of watching. But I wasn't a precinct captain or anything like that.

Q: Very political times, too, if you're a Democrat in Chicago.

A: Yes. It maybe would have helped but I didn't do that kind of work.

Q: Why did you decide to become a judge?

A: Well, at the urging of friends. They all thought I should become a judge, as many of those same friends urged me to run for the supreme court, which was a big scare for me, because you just don't decide you're going to run for the supreme court. You have to have a base and I didn't have that base, political base. So I decided to run for judge initially and for the supreme court at the urging of friends. Many of my friends were doing it also and I thought, "Well, if they can do it, I can try it." And I thought I would be able to dispense justice more effectively as a judge and perhaps as a lone woman practicing.

Q: Yes. And as I recall, in 1970 the new constitution at that time made judges an electable position, so there were some politics involved, were there not?

A: Well, there was. I sought the endorsement or the slating of the Democratic party when I ran. And former Mayor Byrne and the former Mayor Daley were the chairs and co-chairs of the slate making committee at that time. I didn't know how you proceed there. I didn't have anybody to nominate me or second my nomination. I didn't know that any of that was required, really, or helpful. And Mayor Byrne in particular, I am told, advocated my being slated because I -- if I can backtrack just a little bit. We were told we have -- as we waited in line to go before the slate makers, and there were long lines of people there--

Q: Was this the old Bismarck Building?

A: Yes. And we were told, I think, we had five minutes to make our presentation. And while we waited in line, a man came up to all of us in the line and said, "Well, they're running late so we want you to limit your presentation to four minutes." That's OK. I had the night before watched the clock that was in my kitchen to make sure I didn't go over the five minutes. So I decided what I could eliminate. And while we stood there he came out again and said, "They're running still later. You know, we would like you to eliminate -- " rather, not eliminate -- "but put your presentation down to three minutes." And I thought, "Well, I will do my best." And he came out again and said, "They want to have lunch. Can we do it in two minutes?" And I thought, "Well, I'll think about it." I didn't say anything because there were long lines of people also waiting to make their presentations. And I went in and I thought, "No, I'm going to use my whole five minutes," which is exactly what I did. Nobody cut me off because at that time, Joel, and

this is important, I urged the slate makers to consider slating more women because the law schools and all of the professional schools, the medical schools, the general schools and engineers and teachers, of course, were admitting and graduating more women. It was the time or the era in which women came into recognition and they slated me without the help that I had hoped for. I had gone to see someone. I'd always thought that if I were to run for public office I would see the one person that could help me. And I called him and he wasn't available until the night before we had to appear. He called me back that night and he said, "I can't help you because I've already committed to someone else. But why don't you go ahead and do it anyway." So I thought, "Sure." I already filed the papers. And that's how I started in politics and running for judge.

Q: You were elected. You became a circuit court judge and ultimately you were appointed to the appellate court.

A: Yes.

Q: How is that different from being a sitting judge in the circuit court?

A: Well, the work is significantly different. It's totally different work. You're not trying cases. You're reviewing cases. You're reviewing records to see if any error was committed in the trial court, if any evidence should have been admitted that wasn't admitted or was there evidence that was not admitted that should have been there. And, you know, all of those things are different on the appellate court than they are on the circuit court.

Q: Did you enjoy one job better than the other?

A: It's almost like comparing apples and oranges. You know, they're too different to do that. But there was a vacancy on the appellate court and one of my colleagues on the

circuit court said, "Why don't you try for that." I didn't even know about the vacancy, much less try for it. And I thought, well, why not. It was our good friend Ellen Hartman (sp?) that came to see me and advised me to try and get that opening on the appellate court. And that's how it came about, Joel, and it's different in that you have to get elected. The appointment is temporary --

Q: Right.

A: -- until the next election. But by then you have a little bit of an edge.

Q: So at that time there weren't that many women on the bench, were there?

A: Right.

Q: Or certainly in the appellate court.

A: No.

Q: No?

A: Just Helen McGillicuddy and it was Helen was leaving. I got her chambers.

Q: Oh, my gosh.

A: Um-hmm.

Q: Then you decide to become a candidate for the supreme court. Tell us when that happened and why it did. How did it work?

A: I think I alluded to this earlier. But one of the lawyers who practiced before the court when I was on the appellate court, she did almost appellate work exclusively. Came to see me and, again, urged me to run and I said, "I can't run. I have no base for that." I mean, you can't just say, "I'm going to run for the supreme court." And she said, "Well, you have a base. We'll make a base for you. And the women are a good base." At that time, she was correct. She was correct most of the time when she argued, also, I might

say. And I thought, “Well, what have I got to lose other than the work of running for the court and the expense.” But I financed all of my own campaigns at that time. So I thought, “Well, OK,” and it was at a time when, again, women were being involved in all of the professions. The law schools had great numbers of women students, and not only in law but in medicine and so forth. When I left the hospital a couple of months ago, I was amazed at the number of women doctors and I talked to them about it. There was a time when there were nothing but women doctors in my hospital room. And they agreed that this all was a phenomena of the '70s. It's been called the year of the women, although none of us thought of it as the year of the women at the time. In retrospect, it was the year of the women for getting elected and being recognized as being able to handle complex problems in medicine, as well as in law or any of the other professions.

Q: Well, any number of times you've been named the first woman to do this, the first woman to prosecute felonies as a state's attorney, the first woman this, the first woman elected to the supreme court and ultimately the first woman chief justice of the supreme court. First woman, first woman. You must have trophies all over the house. How do you react to that?

A: Well, I had never sought to be the first woman. It just happened, Joel. I didn't back off because there were no women already engaged in that type of work. I recognized and I was concerned about the fact that 51% of the population at that time was female and we had nobody at the desk when important issues which affected that 51% were being discussed. There was nobody to represent that 51% and I thought, you know, all of these decisions are being made by the men, and although many or most of them were very good, still, the woman's perspective should have been presented. Not that the law should

be different for women, because it shouldn't. It's the same. But the women's perspective in looking at facts in the law is different.

Q: Well, I suppose you've been asked this a number of times and I imagine the answer is pretty fixed. But what are the cases you remember that you worked on, that you ruled on?

A: Well...

Q: That you felt were important.

A: I thought about them this morning and the two biggest and most important ones were *Avery v. Johnson*, the one in which a national class action was being considered when a person would buy parts for his or her car. And it was a -- it was considered very important all over the United States. And I wrote that opinion. And the other that was really a big one was the tort reform case, of course. And I believe I wrote that one also.

Q: Was that *Best*?

A: I'm sorry?

Q: Was that the *Best* case?

A: Yes, yes. *Best*, right. That was a very important case because it affected so many people and it was difficult for me to write that the tort reform law that had been enacted was

[00:30]

unconstitutional. But it was true. And you had to call it as you -- I felt I should call it as I see it. As unhappy as some might be with the decision, it was, nonetheless, in my opinion the correct decision and the court agreed with that. And then I had a case, a criminal case that I was absolutely fascinated with in which the evidence -- it was a murder case. The evidence was overwhelming that the defendant was guilty. He had

shot and killed a police officer. And, again, the evidence was so clear that he was guilty. Everything pointed to that and the jurors found beyond a reasonable doubt that he was guilty. But the prosecutor asked and the judge permitted evidence of where the police officer was shot. Some of his insides came out on the uniform he was wearing. Some of his brains were on the police uniform and such and he permitted that uniform to go back to the jury room when the jurors were deliberating. I believed, and everyone on the court agreed with me, that that was too --

Q: Inflammatory?

A: It was improper, really, for those jurors to see that uniform with his brains spattered on them. So we reversed the conviction even though the evidence was irrefutable. And it was curious that when it went back and was retried, he was not given the death penalty, whereas he had with the uniform, you know, with his brain matter on it. So I remember that case so well and how even though it was so irrefutable that he was guilty, he did not get the death penalty without that flammable --

Q: Have you wrestled with the whole idea of the death penalty?

A: Yes, I have, many times, and I still do. And I have come to the conclusion that we should do away with it.

Q: You're part of a very vocal minority now that's growing in size, I think.

A: I understand. But I changed my position, Joel, when I considered that where it's established that the defendant will spend the remainder of his life in prison without the possibility of parole, that the public is no more or no less protected than it would be if he were executed. I don't think that executing a defendant now protects the public anymore

than the public is protected by being assured that he will be in prison without the possibility of parole for the rest of his life. I think we're adequately protected.

Q: Let's go to the relationship of the judiciary with the rest of society. I know you've spoken on this matter a number of times. You've been on committees and forums. What do you think about opening up the courts to cameras, in my mind, to further educate the public on what courts do.

A: Well, I struggled with that issue for a long time. And when the cameras were in the courtroom during the appellate cases, be it the supreme court or the appellate court, they were not a problem at all. And I am of the opinion that at that level -- I'm not talking about the trial court level, because there it could make a difference. But at the appellate level I saw no problem with permitting them to be in the courtroom provided, again, how it's done. So long as it's not obtrusive or would not affect anyone's testimony or anyone's argument, I thought, "Why not? Why not let the public see what's going on in the courtrooms."

Q: As a judge and now as a retired judge, I know you continued to try to implement the public's awareness of what the court does and how it does it. Tell us about that and why you think that's important.

A: I think that most of the public is unaware of what goes on in the courtrooms. Even some of the lawyers. I know when I ran for the supreme court, men who had been practicing for a long time asked questions that indicated to me, clearly, that they didn't know what the supreme court was doing, you know, or the kind of work it was doing. I think that in general most people don't know what's going on in the courtroom. They're not aware of the difference between appellate review and trial courts and the question most frequently

asked when I would give speeches or presentations when I was running for the supreme court was, “Oh, Judge, I got a ticket for turning wrong or making an improper left hand turn.” It has nothing to do with supreme court. Most of them involved, they got a ticket for something or other. It just showed there was no idea of what goes on in the court.

Q: I shouldn’t mess with those ticket things. Well, Judge, what do you think the role of a judge in society in general is, should be?

A: It should be, first and most importantly, to preserve and promote justice to make sure that everyone is given his or her rights and that those responsible for whatever wrongs may exist are corrected. That, to me, is the foremost responsibility of being a judge is. I think the judges should educate the public as much as possible and I think that judges should mingle with the lawyers who practice before the courts to understand or to better understand the problems that the lawyers have. There is so much that we can do together that you can’t do alone, including that judges cannot do alone. We need the cooperation of the lawyers. The lawyers need the cooperation of the courts. If we would just discuss some of these issues, from procedural issues all the way to substantive issues.

Q: Well, Justice McMorro, why did you decide to retire?

A: Well, it was about time. I had been a judge for more than 35 years, I believe, and I thought it was time for the court to have fresh ideas. I was on the supreme court for approximately 14 years and I thought a court should have some new thinking on the court and I’m getting old, Joel, you know. I am at the time in my life when I would like to get up when I want and go where I want and do what I want.

Q: You’re still very, very busy and very, very involved.

A: Retirement has not been “get up when you want and go where you want and do what you want.” It hasn’t been that at all. But I enjoy remaining active in the bar associations and speaking and all such things.

Q: And you’re also a member of the faculty, are you not, of Loyola or were?

A: Yes, at Loyola. I haven’t done much there except I try to accommodate the school when I can or speak or teach a class whenever I can, when they -- particularly when they ask me to do that. They provided me with an office, a secretary, computer and such.

Q: You mentioned the bar associations. What role did the bar association have in bringing more public awareness of what the courts do and how they do it?

A: I think the bar associations have a great responsibility in educating the public as to what the courts do, again, because most people don’t know. They simply don’t know.

Particularly I think in the election of judges I think that’s a difficult area that needs some correcting because there may be 50 or 54 candidates on a ballot. When I ran for the circuit court, there were 54, I believe. And the public doesn’t know one from another.

So they vote by gender, by nationality. One person told me he voted the four corners of the ballot. You know, just silly reasons and I just think that we should look at that system to make it more fair or more enlightening to the public so they know whom they’re electing because, you know, there have been a few judges that were not the best that were elected and we’re stuck with them. But the voter doesn’t know that. They can take the newspaper endorsements into the voting booth but... That’s helpful. That’s very helpful. But the bar association recommendations are helpful also. But most people don’t do that. They don’t go through that work to determine who are the best candidates. I know friends would ask me for whom they should vote and sometimes it was difficult. I

always told them to vote for certain ones who were good judges, you know. I was going to mention someone but I changed my mind.

Q: So you talk to young students, law students and so forth, and they ask this question and I'm going to ask you, too. What does the future of this profession hold?

A: The future of this profession?

Q: The profession of law.

A: Oh, I think there's a -- we must have lawyers, we must have judges, otherwise we'd have anarchy. We'd have chaos. But we have to have a place where people can go to have their rights vindicated. We have to have the public know that if you have been wronged or if you've been removed from your home unlawfully or if you've been charged unlawfully with something, there is a place where people who are knowledgeable will listen to you and correct that wrong hopefully. Otherwise what would you have? Anarchy. You'd have nothing. They have to have a place where that can be done and that is one of the big responsibilities that judges and lawyers should be ever mindful of, you know. You know, these are positions of trust. People come to you as a last resort and I don't think we should ever let them down. Ever. No matter how big or small the case is, they're important. The rights are important to the people involved.

END OF INTERVIEW