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Today is January the 17th. It’s a Wednesday morning at 10 a.m. and I’m at Judge Wolff’s home and we’re in our third session doing her oral history. And we’re going to pick up today with Judge Wolff’s job up with the Attorney General’s Office. So you had just been hired, and you told us how you were hired, so tell us about that experience.

After I saw Hart Linney, I went back to the court and Judge Nourse said what section are you going to be assigned to? I said the criminal law section. Because we were in war time, criminal appeals were way down, and I think I mentioned that before. The section exploded after the war. There was one other deputy and myself assigned to do all of the criminal briefs. Judge Nourse said, now Miss Wolff, when you go upstairs and you start writing criminal briefs, we don’t want all that boilerplate that we’ve been getting. You know, we expect a citation to be pertinent to the case. In the Attorney General’s office, I was assigned a little cubbyhole, literally. I think it had been kind of a closet. It just had room for a desk and a phone. I started writing criminal briefs and taking them to the supervising deputy. If I took it in in the morning, the brief went through without any problem. If I took it in in the afternoon, I discovered he had a lot of corrections. And the corrections turned out to be boilerplate citations. I hated having my briefs “corrected.”

Who changed your briefs? Who was doing it?
Judge Wolff: You want his name?

Ladoris Cordell: Whatever.

Judge Wolff: David Lenner was his name.

Ladoris Cordell: And he’s your boss?

Judge Wolff: Yes. He’s supervising me. I’m a deputy grade 2, the lowest deputy in the office. There was only one person in my grade, myself. I’m strictly a go-for and he’s a senior deputy. I discovered that when the briefs came in, he was dividing them – half to me and half to him. Then he would take his half and ask the district attorney who tried the case to write the first draft of the brief. But that was neither here nor there. I preferred to write the whole brief myself, and so that didn’t pose any problem. Anyway, I went in and I said, Mr. Lenner, do you have a notebook with citations? And he looked kind of embarrassed, and he said yes. And I said do you mind if I copy it? And he said no. And so I got all his citations. And that was precisely what he was using. The cases might or might not have any relevance to the subject matter. But I made sure that the case I cited as a first case was directly on point, and then if I put the others in, they went in as footnotes. So I got my briefs through without any problem, but I thought it was kind of a boring assignment.

Ladoris Cordell: So your job basically at the beginning was to do that. You’re writing briefs --

Judge Wolff: I was writing briefs, and I’m arguing the cases.

Ladoris Cordell: So tell me about that now. So you’re this new lawyer, sort of. You’d been in court quite a bit because of the Department of Employment.
Judge Wolff: That’s right. And I’ve been in Appellate and Supreme Court, and of course having worked downstairs on the fourth floor where the court was for a year – approximately a year and a half – I knew all the judges and they knew me. So I felt very comfortable both with the Appellate Court and with the Supreme Court, and I liked them. And I liked their clerks. And, you know, one thing about coming out of the court is you know your way around.

Ladoris Cordell: And your confidence level is pretty high up, right?

Judge Wolff: My confidence level was always pretty good. So, at any event, I decided most of these cases were pretty boring. A lot of them dealt with – they weren’t all boring, but a lot of them dealt with bookmaking cases and were generally routine. For the most part the District Attorney’s Office did very good work. Then I made myself available to help people. When I discovered somebody had an interesting case, I would say, would you like some help with the research. It was easy to kind of branch out. In fact I did a tax case. I wrote the brief on it and tax is definitely not my field and never was. I don’t remember the case, but I do remember the attorney finally saying, you know Miriam, you’re going to have to go and argue this case because it’s got my name on it but I really don’t understand it. And so it was really fun. I was available. I was the only “go-for” in the office, and I could pretty well work doing the things I liked.

Ladoris Cordell: How frequently were you in court would you say?

Judge Wolff: I would – well all of the briefs went to the Appellate Court, and I argued any case I briefed. Also, I took over something in bankruptcy. Southern Pacific
Ferries had gone into bankruptcy and that created a lot of bankruptcy claims in Federal Court. I was in court a lot. I can’t really give you an estimate. I’d say whenever an Appellate Court session was held, we had something on calendar, and we handled writs. I was before the Appellate Courts whenever they were in session and the Supreme Court most of the time it was in session in San Francisco.

Ladoris Cordell:  Would you describe yourself back then, you’re starting now the ’80s off. Were you arrogant, cocky? How would you describe --

Judge Wolff: No. Not really. I was always kind of surprised.

Ladoris Cordell: At what?

Judge Wolff: At being permitted to do the things I was doing.

Ladoris Cordell: And surprised because you’re young, you’re a woman, what? I mean --

Judge Wolff: I mean because I’m new. And I did not mean to give you the impression that there were not women in the office. When I went in, Bob Kenny was Attorney General. And Bob was very good to women. He liked women, he liked bright women, and he – if anything, you know, tended to favor them. He was very aware of what went on in the office. He knew all the briefs. He read everything that went across his desk. He had one of those amazing minds that remembered not only the cases that were relevant but their citations. And he would come in and say did you look at 122 California blah, blah, blah. It was a great pleasure to work for him because you had a feeling that he knew what was going on.

Ladoris Cordell: Did you develop that kind of memory for cases?
Judge Wolff: Never.

Ladoris Cordell: Well you have an extraordinary memory --

Judge Wolff: Well, I do have, but I will tell you it’s lost. Anyway, it was a very happy and productive experience. I soon worked into the work of the State Lands Commission, which I found very challenging and interesting. I still have a great production of all the statutes that are relevant on the state lands. How California got around to disposing of such things as waterfront property. From that I kind of worked into the Port work, which I found very interesting, very challenging and a lot of fun. That was because in that assignment there was a deputy who really needed help. He was overwhelmed and a very bright, nice, competent guy.

Ladoris Cordell: So tell me again the name of this section.

Judge Wolff: There was a criminal section and there was a tax section, and then basically the rest of the civil section. Oh, there was administrative law section. The Attorney General’s Department had taken over all the boards and commissions and was still in the process of taking some over. That had happened when Warren was Attorney General.

Ladoris Cordell: Are you still putting in the crazy hours, you know, going back at night, that when you were at the other job?

Judge Wolff: No, because the hours were pretty straightforward. I got there at 8:00 in the morning. One thing we did put in when I first went to the Attorney General’s Office is you worked on Saturday morning.

Ladoris Cordell: Really?
Judge Wolff: And that had been true of the Court too. We worked five and a half days a week. And then the Saturdays began to change, and you came in when it was your turn, but you did not work all day. And once in a while, if you had a brief or you wanted to research something, you might come in at night. But I by then had moved down the peninsula.

Ladoris Cordell: And then the AG’s office is in San Francisco?

Judge Wolff: The AG’s office, the principal office, was in San Francisco. The offices then were San Francisco, Sacramento which is now a big office, and the constitution says it’s supposed to be the main office of the Attorney General. But at the time that I went into the office, the Sacramento office had two people, and one of them committed suicide. So all the work, or the work basically was being handled out of San Francisco. And the Los Angeles office was a big office. And that was it. We did represent the State on all the appellate cases – we took all the cases for all the appellate courts on the criminal side. I never really functioned in the tax department. I can’t describe its activities, but I have the impression they took all the important tax cases. And you know you asked me some time ago why the Attorney General’s Office, well I was absolutely convinced that it was the best office, the best law office in the State of California. I did not consider there was any private law office in the state any better for practicing law. Young lawyers, as we all remember, have a tendency to get around and say, you know, where do you really want to go to practice. As soon as I became a lawyer, that was my first choice.
Ladoris Cordell: Interesting. So at this time were you also – your family is in Southern California --

Judge Wolff: My family, yes.

Ladoris Cordell: So were you visiting. I mean were you going there frequently or did that --

Judge Wolff: I was, but my father then had retired for health reasons and so they were more free and we were in very close touch with one another. It’s just that I came here and this is really where I wanted to settle.

Ladoris Cordell: I don’t know if you mentioned this to me, but going back when you passed the bar, where were you sworn in or how was that --

Judge Wolff: I was sworn in in Los Angeles.

Ladoris Cordell: Where was that? Was that a big event?

Judge Wolff: Yes, and there somewhere, did I give you a picture or a newspaper clipping of my swearing in?

Ladoris Cordell: No. I’ll make a note.

Judge Wolff: I saw one somewhere, because there was an article about how I was the youngest woman graduate from Stanford Law School. I don’t know whether that’s true.

Ladoris Cordell: And this was a big event at – was it a federal court, state court?

Judge Wolff: I don’t know.

Ladoris Cordell: Do you remember --

Judge Wolff: It was an auditorium of some kind.

Ladoris Cordell: And you were one of many?
Judge Wolff: Oh yes.

Ladoris Cordell: Were your parents there?

Judge Wolff: Oh yes, absolutely.

Ladoris Cordell: Your brother, this was it?

Judge Wolff: I don’t know that my brother was. He was probably in school.

Ladoris Cordell: But family was there?

Judge Wolff: And I’m sure if he wasn’t in school he was there.

Ladoris Cordell: Okay. So AG’s office, how long did you stay there and --

Judge Wolff: Well, I stayed there a long time.

Ladoris Cordell: What does that mean?

Judge Wolff: When did I leave? By the time – by the time I left the AG’s office, or you want to know how I left the AG’s office?

Ladoris Cordell: Yes, I’d like that – so you went there – I’m trying to get the dates straight. So you were there – you went in what year? Was it – I trying to remember what was said. I think you were there, was it in the late ‘40s, something like that, because you bought your first house in 1946.

Judge Wolff: Yes, I was in the AG’s office when I --

Ladoris Cordell: So you were in the AG’s office by then, so maybe the mid ‘40s you’re in the AG’s office, and you stayed there – was it ten years?

Judge Wolff: Oh no, I was there longer than that.

Ladoris Cordell: Really.

Judge Wolff: I left the AG’s office in December 1968.
There was a section of the work in the Attorney General’s office that we have not mentioned that might be of interest. Under California law, the Attorney General can issue opinions that have the effect of Appellate Court decisions, absent such a decision. When I entered the office, California operated under a statute that prohibited any County Clerk from issuing a marriage license for a miscegenous marriage. The amount of non-Caucasian blood was very small -- I think one-eighth. It covered every race -- even Hawaiian, and invalidated or prevented many marriages. Some County Clerk had asked for a ruling and one of the very first opinions I wrote was one holding that statute unconstitutional. Bob Kenny, then the Attorney General, was very pleased with the opinion. The Supreme Court came down with a similar opinion, I would guess, within a year.

Another opinion I want to mention was written by another deputy and I was one of the two approvers on it. It was written by Herb Wenig just after the passage of Title VII and it created a storm of protest, which, of course, we had anticipated. It held that women had to be afforded the right to work as Fireman. It was a great step forward and established a principle which applied to all California public agencies. We probably tackled the most difficult agency first.

Anyway, a lot of things transpired. By then I was a senior deputy, I was what they called deputy grade 4. I was the first woman to achieve that grade and the youngest deputy grade 4 that had ever been appointed. I did that through civil service exams. The Civil Service exam for deputy grade 4 was
given for a particular man, but he did not pass it. By then the Attorney
General was a man who’d been a district attorney of Los Angeles, Fred
Houser. But I passed, number one, and so they elevated me to a deputy grade
4. By then the Attorney General’s office is a big flourishing office and
occupies all the sixth floor. I actually had drawn up the papers that bought the
block. Division of Highways bought the block on Golden Gate from Polk to
Larsen, which now has a block long annex of the original State Building and
then they connected the two buildings. I actually went to court with them and
actually did the legal work of buying that entire block. I got a lot of oddball
assignments like that.

Ladoris Cordell: Do you remember any others?

Judge Wolff: Oh yes.

Ladoris Cordell: Tell me, because I’m very curious. As many as you can tell us.

Judge Wolff: Pat Brown called me in and he said --

Ladoris Cordell: Now at this time, Pat Brown was – what position was he?

Judge Wolff: Attorney General --

Ladoris Cordell: Okay. So he called you in?

Judge Wolff: -- and a very, very good one. He called me in and said they want to have
major league baseball in San Francisco, and they needed to buy the area at
Hunters Point, or they needed to develop the area at Hunters Point, and we’re
told that there are streets running through that area owned by the State of
California, and what can we do. So he said just arrange it so they can
purchase the area and put up the stadium. I figured that we ought to be able to
create a city/state group joint power, an exercise of joint power, and we did. But what I did was take the acreage, give the state the acreage around the area, and swap the streets the state owned that went through, because in the original process there had been streets running through belonging to the state. So I swapped that acreage for equal acreage around the perimeter of the area. It isn’t too hard to do things like that if you work it out. I bought the first hospital from the federal government up in Auburn. It became a state mental hospital. And I had a lot of fun doing that. It was actually a very simple exercise.

Ladoris Cordell: But you didn’t have any training to do these land deals and to come up with these _____ . So this is – you’re just creating as you go along?

Judge Wolff: Well, any lawyer has training to accomplish results like this.

Ladoris Cordell: Well, I don’t know --

Judge Wolff: It’s just a matter of figuring out if it’s something that’s valuable, if it’s fair, there is some way to do it legally. I don’t think you have to be a genius to figure that out.

Ladoris Cordell: Other minds might disagree. So what other --

Judge Wolff: I must tell you about Auburn.

Ladoris Cordell: What is Auburn?

Judge Wolff: It was the first hospital, the first of the public buildings or federal public entities that the state was getting for a dollar after the War. It seemed important for me to set up a formula. The federal government was saying you have to agree to hold us harmless for blah, blah, blah. And I’m saying, I’m so
sorry but that’s lending the faith and credit of the State of California and that’s unconstitutional. We can’t do it. If you look – and I understand that the deed that I drew up, which was a very simple document, remained the boilerplate for all, or many, of the future transactions. I was very pleased with it, because it was a very straightforward simple transfer between the federal and the state government.

Ladoris Cordell: When you worked all these deals, were you dealing with other women? Were you dealing only with men?

Judge Wolff: We’re dealing only with men.

Ladoris Cordell: So you were it? I mean, you were…and how were you received? I mean was it a problem or was it…

Judge Wolff: I have to tell you a little bit about that and at least I’d like to. And I cannot tell you how often I hear this. People say and saying it is a compliment. Oh, “Miriam’s not a woman. She’s a lawyer.”

Ladoris Cordell: Who says that? Who said that?

Judge Wolff: They are always men and I’ll tell you one incident as an example.

Ladoris Cordell: Well tell me first, what was your reaction just to that statement? “Miriam’s not a woman. She’s a lawyer.” What was your reaction? What did you feel or think? I mean, did you like it? Hate it?

Judge Wolff: I didn’t hate it and I understood it. It’s just another one of those facts.

Ladoris Cordell: But these men would say this? They still do. I mean, right in front of you.

Judge Wolff: Or they’d quote somebody else. For example, the Lilich office was a very good office.
Ladoris Cordell: What office?

Judge Wolff: Lillich in San Francisco. It handled a lot of admiralty and I worked -- I had a lot of cases with them because they represented the Pacific Coast Conference and I represented the Port. It just happened. And an attorney in Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro had lunch with Ed Ransom. Pillsbury Madison & Sutro had just hired Tony Rembe. Frank Roberts was head of the search committee when Tony was hired. They always claimed she was the first woman hired at PM&S. Actually, they had had a woman or two women during the war but they had been hired only for a limited time. One of them was Margaret Morton who became senior trial deputy in the District Attorney’s office in Santa Cara County until her untimely death of cancer. Anyway, they had -- Tony was really, officially the first woman hired and Frank told me he went to lunch with Ed Ransom and Ed said, “I don’t understand, Frank, how you can hire a woman. I would never permit a woman to be hired in our office.” And Frank said, I don’t understand your attitude. And then he said, oh women are too distracting or whatever the usual boilerplate was. And Frank said, Ed, you try a lot of cases with Miriam and Ed said, “Well, Miriam’s not a woman. She’s a lawyer.”

Ladoris Cordell: What did he mean by that?

Judge Wolff: I don’t know. So, not long after that, Ed went to the Los Angeles office and they had just hired Pam Riemer and I think they hired another woman at the same time that they hired Pat. I’m not sure. Ed came back and Ed and Frank had lunch again and Ed was so enthusiastic about Pam, and Frank said it was
so funny. It was as if he didn’t remember the previous conversation at all. I mean, he finally met a woman. He knew she was bright. It was that perception that people had and only the other day, one of the former deputy attorney generals told me a similar story concerning me and again that “Oh well, she’s not a woman. She’s not part of the female quota because she’s a lawyer.” Cyril Magnin introduced me after we were doing port development and usually I was the speaker. Very often I was introduced by Cyril and he loved telling this story. He never considered that it showed discrimination. He said, when he became president of the Board of the Port Commission he went to Pat Brown and he said, Pat, I understand we have a woman lawyer -- and Pat said, yes, you have Miriam Wolff and Pat said, but you try her for a month -- and if you don’t like having her, you come to me and I will get you another lawyer and Cyril told this story and said “at the end of the month, I went to Pat Brown and I said if you ever remove Miriam Wolff as my lawyer, I will never support you again.” Cyril’s personal matters, his personal lawyers were Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro, and they assigned him a woman lawyer. I don’t remember – I don’t know that I knew her really. She was his lawyer and he loved it.

Ladoris Cordell: So other stories – AG’s office, I mean you’re doing public speaking, you’re --

Judge Wolff: Well, that’s later. Oh I did do public speaking. I loved speaking and I loved explaining things.

Ladoris Cordell: And these are speaking to not lawyers necessarily, is that right or --
Judge Wolff: No. Most of them are – because I represented the Port. The Port was the biggest public entity business in San Francisco, and the audience was mostly steamship people, bankers, the various representatives of foreign countries. I would like to tell you the story about the Commonwealth Club.

Ladoris Cordell: Excellent. This is, you’re still at the AG’s office?

Judge Wolff: I was still at the AG’s office, but my principal assignment by then is Chief Counsel for the Port. And I’m on a lot of Port commissions and a lot of Port organizations, and it’s pretty much independent although I did take other assignments at the AG’s office. But it’s pretty much a full-time legal job. At any event, I’m giving a speech to the Commonwealth Club, and a lawyer friend of mine had a daughter who had just graduated from Palo Alto High School. He was interested in having her see a woman in the role of speaker to the Commonwealth Club. The Commonwealth Club then was all male. And he brought his daughter and the guy at the gate said, “I am very sorry. You can come in, but your 18 year old daughter cannot.” The meeting is at the Palace Hotel, you know, very public, I mean incredible. Even talking about it is incredible.

Ladoris Cordell: Wait a minute. You were speaking there?

Judge Wolff: I’m speaking, I’m the speaker.

Ladoris Cordell: Women are not allowed. They let you in.

Judge Wolff: Oh always as a speaker.

Ladoris Cordell: As a speaker, right.
Judge Wolff: I cannot tell you the number of male clubs that I went into as a speaker and almost always got stopped by some flunky somewhere saying, “Madam, you can’t go into that dining room.” And I would say, “I’m the speaker.” And they’d say, “oh.”

Ladoris Cordell: So his daughter did not get in.

Judge Wolff: And his daughter did not – he and his daughter left. Anyway, about a month later, Helen Bentley came to San Francisco, and I’m trying to think now whether Helen may have been Congresswoman from Maryland then, or she may have been head of the Federal Maritime Commission. She had been a Maritime Reporter. She was considered the premier Maritime Reporter in the United States.

Ladoris Cordell: By Reporter do you mean, are you talking about a newspaper Reporter?

Judge Wolff: A newspaper Reporter. She was very good. She later became chair of the Federal Maritime Commission. She may have been there as chair of the Federal Maritime Commission or she may have been there as a congresswoman, but she was also speaking to the Commonwealth Club. And of course it was heavily attended because she was Helen Bentley. Helen knew this story that I have just told you about my friend’s daughter. She was much more forthright than I. And so she had said when they asked her if she would come out and be speaker, she had said I want Miriam at the head table. And they acceded to that. Before she started her speech, she brought up this whole matter – women not being admitted – and exactly what she thought about that.
I was not very long after that, I’d say within a month, that the Commonwealth Club changed its policy.

Ladoris Cordell: And you think in the main because she --

Judge Wolff: Oh, absolutely.

Ladoris Cordell: Is that right?

Judge Wolff: Much as I resented the --

Ladoris Cordell: Discrimination?

Judge Wolff: Yes, the whole situation, I had never been that forthright. I belonged to a lot of organizations that I probably should have protested more violently about. At any event, then I started getting invitations, of course, to join the Commonwealth Club, which I did not do. So I must have basically resented it. I didn’t join until after I retired as a judge.

Ladoris Cordell: Is that right? So it was your own form of protest in a way.

Judge Wolff: Well, but I don’t think that’s a very good protest.

Ladoris Cordell: It’s interesting. People do things in different ways. Let me ask you, why is it if they prohibited women, why did you even agree to speak at these places?

Not just the Commonwealth Club, why --

Judge Wolff: That’s true. I was not speaking as a woman. I was speaking as a representative. I was speaking in connection with Port problems. I don’t know that there are any women allowed at Burning Tree yet, are there?

Ladoris Cordell: Yes there are now. Yes I have a neighbor who goes. Interesting.
But, you know, all the clubs were separate, including the World Trade Club. San Francisco’s a club town. Things are done at lunch and breakfast for that matter, and important things are accomplished. I had drawn the lease for the World Trade Club, and I put in a “no discrimination clause,” and it wasn’t a boilerplate lease. It was a lease I drew, and it wasn’t until a young woman lawyer came to me. And by then I was Port Director. She had graduated from Stanford. I have no recollection of her name. She had written a very complicated legal matter and was the principal draft person, and the Eastern lawyers had come out to talk about it. They had met, and her firm had to call her in because like many of these things, it bears somebody else’s name. But only the young lawyer who actually writes it can really explain it. And she said they were having this discussion -- they were going through this explanation and they said, “well let’s go to lunch together.” And they started down the street for lunch, walking down Market Street. They got as far as the front door of the World Trade Center, and they said, “oh gosh, we can’t take you. You go have lunch and join us afterwards.” And she thanked them politely and immediately came up to my office which was on the top floor. She was really upset, and I was really upset, and I said, yes, well it really is time we do something about this. So I saw a couple of members of our board, Cyril and Jim Rudden and a couple of other people and said “I think we’re going to get sued.” That was really alarming to Cyril. In the first place, he was on the President’s Commission Against Discrimination. He would be meeting with President Johnson. A suit alleging discrimination was a source
of great embarrassment and, of course, meanwhile I had a lot of friends at the World Trade Club. And there’s an article about this in the World Trade Club publication which came out about a year or so ago, about my being the first woman that had been accepted in the World Trade Club. But, and my friends in the World Trade Club were telling me, what was happening. There were one or two members of their board who were opposed to having women. Now I can’t give you a good explanation. They said women would take over the club. It would become very noisy, and, you know, then they wished to God women did take over the club because financially the could have used that kind of infusion. Although at that time it was financially very secure.

And --

Ladoris Cordell: We’re talking the ‘60s now?

Judge Wolff: Yes.

Ladoris Cordell: Okay.

Judge Wolff: I think I went with the Port --

Ladoris Cordell: You said Johnson was President, so I was just trying to --

Judge Wolff: Yes. Right.

Ladoris Cordell: So when you – I’m trying to get a --

Judge Wolff: Before we leave my 23 years in the Attorney General’s office, I want to talk about some of the cases I handled either as the sole, or principal counsel for the office. The first group are probably only of interest to other lawyers. The most important to the Port and a case of first impression in California is Board v. Dean, 118 Cal. App 2d 628, an action for mandate to validate State revenue
bonds. It held we could repay revenue bonds from existing State revenue-producing property. Had we lost that case, it would have meant that only general obligation bonds could be issued and since they require a two-thirds vote, isolated projects would probably never be approved on a statewide basis. In *U.S. v. 346 Acres*, No. Dist. Of Calif. No. 36272; *State of Cal. v. U.S.*, 395 Fed.2d 261, I handled the case to its first conclusion in the Court of Appeals. The case involved the State’s claim to damages on property under navigable waters, a matter of great importance to all Ports in the United States. In *People v. Globe & Rutgers*, 96 Cal. App. 2d 571, my friends in the insurance bar assure me that I made bad insurance law they probably still have to live with. The problem was the Port has bought insurance for over 20 years and while they thought they had a copy of the policy all those years, the insurance company pointed out the long, complicated document we were looking at was only a “binder” and the actual policy was in England and basically no one had ever seen it. I took the position, successfully, that absent proof to the contrary, we would presume the law of England was the same as the law of California, and our claim against the carrier was successful. *City of San Francisco v. Budde*, 139 Ca. App. 2d 10, determined the States’ claim to lands at a set point contrary to the claim of the City. Other cases important to establish the State’s title to lands which I also handled as sole counsel for the State were *Arques v. Sausalito*, 126 Cal. App. 2d 403; *City of San Jose v. Leslie Salt*, No. 78426. There were a great number of other cases that involve particular port problems that are of interest only to other port lawyers.
Criminal cases are much too numerous to detail, but I will mention three, just as matters of general interest. *People v. Cline*, 79 Cal. App. 2d 11, was a serial killer of women who always used the same method to select and murder his victims. He posed as a recently widowed devout Christian Scientist, would attend a church long enough to find a single woman with property and a good bank account, and without relatives around. The victim would invite this lonely man to dinner and in a very short time they became engaged, married and went on their honeymoon to a State other than her home State, and never to the same State twice. He immediately fed her arsenic in small quantities, told the hotel or motel where they were staying that his wife was ill and needed a doctor. He then described his wife’s illness to the doctor (which was an accurate description of a heart attack) and that his wife was an ardent Christian Scientist, very opposed to contacting a doctor but that he was so concerned for her welfare he was violating her orders. The doctor usually made one more visit. Within three days the victim was dead, but since the doctor had attended her and since her symptoms were consistent with a heart attack, the doctor would sign the death certificate without requiring an autopsy. Cline would immediately have her cremated and buried. He was, however, always one murder behind so he would have her buried in the name of his previous victim. While she was alive, he would have her sign blank papers and these then became wills and deeds made out in his favor and duly recorded. None of the murders occurred in California. The next to the last victim did not quite fit his pattern. She was a woman from Michigan with a
very close and loving family. Like his other victims, he murdered her within three days in exactly the same way, but he did not announce her death to her family because her previous husband left her an annuity which Cline collected for two or three years more. Meanwhile, family members became concerned. They wrote. Cline answered on her behalf using arthritis as an excuse for her not writing and his writing on her behalf. One nephew was concerned enough to come to San Francisco to try to find her. Cline later wrote him to explain they had gone on vacation. When the insurance policy ran out, Cline found another victim -- this time one without close relatives or even property -- took her to southern Oregon for her honeymoon, and within three days she was dead, cremated and buried. Prompted by the relatives of the former victim, the District Attorney’s office in San Francisco did a masterful job of uncovering the whole web, but the only crime that occurred in California was the falsification of recorded documents. In our view, Oregon could have proved the murder easily, but a jury would have to understand the whole pattern and this is an expensive operation involving witnesses from many States. Norman Elkington tried the case of falsification of public documents by proving the dates and times of seven or eight of these murders, and it then became my job to make sure the Appellate Court understood what really was involved in what appeared to be a technical case of false “recordings.” Cline died in San Quentin some years later.

Norman Elkington also tried *People v. Trujillo*, 32 Cal. 2d 105. The Trujillo gang, among other activities, stole new cars out of automobile sales
places on Van Ness and took them for “joy rides.” On this night, the victim and his wife did not stop quickly enough and bumped the rear of the stolen car. Trujillo probably had the gun, but the victim probably was killed by the hammer that “appeared” to have the letter “W” on it. Norman came to my office to tell me that he had been so involved with Trujillo that he was not sure the Court would understand how really involved the defendant Woodmansee really was. Fortunately, we were able to convince our Supreme Court to affirm the trial court’s decision.

*People v. Balanzuela and Malone* was most unusual. Malone was socially prominent. He escorted his victim, a single woman living in Burlingame, to the Palace Hotel in San Francisco. He then handed her car keys to his accomplice, Balenzuela, who was to return to Burlingame in the victim’s car, burgle her home, leave the stolen goods at some chosen point, and then return the stolen car to the hotel. What they did not count on was that the victim’s young children who were in the house called their mother at the hotel and she could not locate her car. Also, although Balanzuela entered the house, he then realized the children were then and fled. The plotters were then on the “slippery slope.”

I did go with the Port. I think the date would be ’64.

Ladoris Cordell: So when you say, go with the Port, at one point you’re the chief counsel for the Port but then you became the Director of --

Judge Wolff: I became Port Director next.

Ladoris Cordell: Right, so --
Judge Wolff: What happened was a bill was introduced into the legislature to transfer the Port from the state to the city. I thought it very possibly might go through. But most of the Port employees were quite sure that it was not going to go through. There were two groups. Reagan was Governor, and Reagan did believe that there should be smaller entities governing things. And so it fit into his philosophy of government. There were some steamship people who thought it was a good idea. But there also was a group of Fisherman’s Wharf tenants who felt that if they could get the Port transferred to the city, they could control what was going on. That is, run the Port for restaurant tenants rather than shipping interests. And the people who took their case to Reagan were not the people at the Fisherman’s Wharf. He was listening to some very important people in the steamship organizations and lawyers that represented them. And to almost everybody’s surprise, that transfer went through. So they wanted me to come down to the Port as chief counsel.

Ladoris Cordell: And who was they? This is your --

Judge Wolff: The Board.

Ladoris Cordell: The Board, okay

Judge Wolff: Lynch was Attorney General. And he said, you know Miriam, I think you’re making a mistake. But if you don’t like it, you can come back. And I thought, well there’s very seldom an opportunity like this. So I accepted.

Ladoris Cordell: Does that mean you’ve left the AG’s office?

Judge Wolff: Yes, I left the AG’s office physically and went down to the Port.

Ladoris Cordell: And you’re they’re chief counsel?
Judge Wolff: And I am chief counsel, and I have an assistant, and --

Ladoris Cordell: And where was your office then?

Judge Wolff: It was in the Ferry building.

Ladoris Cordell: And you think this was ’64?

Judge Wolff: Yes, it was ’64.

Ladoris Cordell: And is this a newly created position, never before had there been a chief
counsel for the Port?

Judge Wolff: Well, there’d been the title, but it had been under the Attorney General. The
Attorney General had taken over all commissions and that included the Port.

Ladoris Cordell: So you’re it, chief counsel to the Port, first woman?

Judge Wolff: Right. And I love this story. There was an organization called Municipal
Executive Employees. And they met a couple of times a year with the Board
of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors had a woman, Dorothy van
Bereldingen, and the group were supposedly the chief executives of San
Francisco. Well I came back to the office, I think from the Attorney General’s
Office, walked down – it was a hot day. My office was hot. They were
building the freeway, which I thought I had killed but didn’t, and it went down
the Embarcadero until it got removed. And I’m hot, I’m tired, and I went into
the office, and my secretary said there’s been a call. There’s a call for you
from somebody who’s chief executive of Weights and Measures. And to this
day, I don’t know who he was, and in fact I never knew the city had a Weights
and Measures Bureau. She either put the call through or we returned the call.
And he said, “I sent you a letter asking you to join the Chief Executives
organization, but we didn’t realize you were a woman. And we don’t have any women – and we have to withdraw that offer.” That is one of the very few times that I ever lost my temper.

Ladoris Cordell: What did you do? What did you say?

Judge Wolff: I excoriated him.

Ladoris Cordell: I mean, like give me an example. This is on the phone?

Judge Wolff: On the phone.

Ladoris Cordell: So are you calling him names?

Judge Wolff: No I didn’t call him names.

Ladoris Cordell: What did you do?

Judge Wolff: I said I couldn’t imagine an organization that was so shortsighted and so ridiculous. I don’t know. Oh, and he said, but we understand that your assistant is a man and he can join. (Laughter)

Ladoris Cordell: To which you responded?

Judge Wolff: I would relay the invitation to him.

Ladoris Cordell: Thank you for sharing.

Judge Wolff: Tony, who was my assistant, was equally outraged. Anyway, it is one of the very few times I really, I really lost my temper.

Ladoris Cordell: Well, what was it about that that caused you to lose it?

Judge Wolff: I was hot, I was tired, it was noisy.

Ladoris Cordell: Irritable – it was a bad day?
Judge Wolff: It was just – I mean, you know, it isn’t that you didn’t get just as angry, but usually good judgment prevailed and you just did not – you used some other device other than anger, other than genuine anger.

Ladoris Cordell: But not that day?

Judge Wolff: Not that day.

Ladoris Cordell: And your assistant could join?

Judge Wolff: My assistant could join.

Ladoris Cordell: Oh my goodness.


Ladoris Cordell: Uh huh. Who was that?

Judge Wolff: Agnes was Chief Deputy District Attorney, and I relayed this. And I said, --

Ladoris Cordell: Did you finish telling me who Agnes was?

Judge Wolff: Agnes became a judge shortly after that.

Ladoris Cordell: In state court? In federal?

Judge Wolff: In California, in San Francisco. Very good judge. Very good trial lawyer. The district attorney was an elected position, so she really ran the office. And I said, Agnes, I relayed the whole thing to her. And I was angry. And I said, “Have you put up with this all these years?” And she said yes. And I said – and she said, “Oh, forget it, you know, it’s not worth it – it’s just not worth getting worked up about.” I mean she was a busy woman lawyer too. We could not devote ourselves to righting that kind of wrong, but we did a lot. I want to tell you a little bit about Advocates for Women. Marilyn Patel was
not – I think she was not a judge then. I’m very proud of this – Marilyn called and asked me to have lunch with her and I did. Title VII had passed. Everybody was out of compliance. She said they were in the process of creating an organization. It had been named Advocates for Women, and what they were doing was offering Pacific Tel & Tel and PG&E, and other big corporations an organization that did a survey of these big corporations to tell them where they were out of compliance, and how many women employees they were going to need to be in compliance. We talked about it, I said I was a public employee. I did not think that I could join any organization whose principal purpose was litigation. But if we would divide the “litigation” component from the “survey” component, I would be happy to be part of the group and help set it up, etc. And that is exactly what resulted. The litigation group may have been closer than anybody realized, but it was separate. What we realized, or what I realized immediately, was that the major problem with getting women in good positions was that they could not be – number one, they could not be employed for more than eight hours. And you can’t have somebody climbing poles for PG&E and saying, whoops, my eight hours are up.

Ladoris Cordell: Why the eight hour prohibition?

Judge Wolff: It was a statute to protect women and children. You remember? And so the first thing we had to do was get that removed. The second thing we had to do was alter the Apprenticeship Council which governed how you became an electrician or plumber or any of the skilled construction jobs. It was solely
male by statute, so that had to be corrected. The waterfront always had a lot of public advocates very close to the legislature, and one was Dave Jenkins. Dave regarded himself as – and was – a liberal. So I asked Dave to meet with our group, and we drafted the legislation that he took to Sacramento. He was an important labor organizer on the waterfront, and there is nothing more important than the labor organization on the waterfront. And I will tell you a story about that, if I remember. Anyway, we carried that legislation. We corrected the eight hour day for women so women could be employed and paid overtime under contract just like anybody else. We corrected the Apprenticeship Council stuff. And it wasn’t that they were besieged by women wanting to be plumbers and electricians, but at least they had the right to become plumbers or electricians, which were the high paying jobs.

Ladoris Cordell: How large a group is the Advocates for Women?

Judge Wolff: Marilyn and I were on what was called the Advisory Board. We were probably half a dozen people.

Ladoris Cordell: So there was an Advisory Board?

Judge Wolff: Yes.

Ladoris Cordell: And then was there something --

Judge Wolff: Yes. We were designated on the printed stationery as “Advisory Board.”

Ladoris Cordell: Got it. Do you remember anyone else who was on this committee?

Judge Wolff: Looking at the stationery, I see that by 1975 the Board of Directors had five members, including Marilyn Patel and Barbara Ashley Philips. The Advisory Board had twenty-five members, some active in their corporations and unions.
The “Planning and Development Board” were seven members chaired by Caroline Charles and included Naomi Lauter, Grace Jepson, Bob Solodow, Marge Monte, Barbara Squires and myself.

Ladoris Cordell: Okay.

Judge Wolff: When the American Bar met in San Francisco, I had the pleasure of chairing the discussion group – that actually endorsed Title VII. While there was always some dissent, once the endorsement was made, the ABA was behind its passage.

Ladoris Cordell: So Advocates for Women – did this group last? Was it short lived? For years?

Judge Wolff: No. It lasted. It did – Yes, I don’t know when it went out. By the time I became a judge, there was an East Bay component and a San Francisco component. But let me tell you, when I became Port Director, we’re jumping around a lot.

Ladoris Cordell: That’s fine.

Judge Wolff: I was Chief Counsel and meanwhile the federal government was looking for women in executive positions. I had people fly out from Washington to see if I was interested in jobs, and I considered them, and they flew me back to Washington.

Ladoris Cordell: Do you recall what jobs?

Judge Wolff: The one that I do recall had to do with General Services. That one I very nearly took. And then I was getting pretty close to deciding that, you know, maybe I would go, but by then I had a house here, etc. It’s hard to make a
decision to leave California for Washington. And the jobs were interesting.

Anyway, the Federal Maritime Commission then was one of the agencies, and they offered me the job of Chief Counsel for the Federal Maritime Commission. I went and interviewed them, etc., and decided yes, I would go. And so I put this house on the market, sold my car, rented an apartment in Washington. Oh yes, packed my books and sent them back to Washington, and I had a telephone call. And the Port Board, kept asking me to please postpone going. And that was, you know, kind of easy to do – to postpone it. I had gotten to the point where I felt I could not postpone it any longer. They had a farewell dinner for me, and everybody said goodbye. When I got home and I had a telephone call. And all of the Commissioners that were on the Board were on the phone, and they said if we offer you the job of Port Director, would you stay – would you cancel going to Washington and stay here? And I said, well . . .

Ladoris Cordell: And you had been chief counsel for the Port, and then your plans changed. What happened?

Judge Wolff: Well, the Port has a Port Director who was a very irascible man. And in addition to being a very difficult man, I would say everyone of his top employees had at some time or another gone to the hospital. As with bad backs or ulcers or some stress difficulty.

Ladoris Cordell: Lots of stress?

Judge Wolff: Lots of stress. He governed through stress. I was probably the only person that he could not affect because I was pretty isolated by the Board itself. It
was evident that my relationship with the Board as a good one, and it was not dependent on him. What had happened is he went to a Board of Supervisors meeting in the afternoon and probably had had a couple of martinis before he got there. He actually got into fisticuffs with one of the members of the Board of Supervisors. And the Board -- the Port Board, was a very high-class board. It was a nonpaying job and I’d always kept it that way. In my opinion, you get far better people when you have nonpaying jobs.

Ladoris Cordell: And the Port Board was all male?

Judge Wolff: It was all male.

Ladoris Cordell: Okay.

Judge Wolff: It remained all male for a long time. And it always had been male. But it was also, for the most part, dedicated citizens. In any event, the Board decided, I guess, in their collective wisdom, that it wasn’t a very good idea to have that kind of a relationship with a Board of Supervisors when you were going to be needing various things. And they had persuaded me for a while not to leave California. They kept asking me if I would postpone my leaving. Well, following this problem with the Board of Supervisors, which I did not know about at the time, I got a telephone call in the evening. It was a joint call, and the members of the Board were on the telephone, and they said --

Ladoris Cordell: The one person though you mentioned was Cyril Magnin?

Judge Wolff: Cyril Magnin was the President, and he was the spokesperson.

Ladoris Cordell: Okay.

Judge Wolff: But they all identified themselves.
Ladoris Cordell: This was a conference call?

Judge Wolff: A conference call. And it included Harry Bridges and Jim Rudden, Henry Budde who published the neighborhood newspaper, in San Francisco a very important member of the Board, and Sam Husbands, a partner in what was then Dean Witter. They identified themselves on the telephone call and said would I consider remaining in San Francisco if they would offer me the job of Port Director? I said, “well, I’d have to think about it.” I meanwhile had rented a house -- an apartment -- in Washington, D.C. I had mailed back my books that I wanted to take with me. I had put this house that we’re in on the market for sale. I was all ready to go to Washington, and so I thought about it overnight.

Ladoris Cordell: Was this an offer you couldn’t refuse?

Judge Wolff: It basically was. And I thought, well this is really an incredible opportunity. They also, in the conversation, indicated that the previous -- they were not happy with the previous director, and he was out and would I do this. So I concluded by saying, well -- and I don’t’ remember whether it was in that conversation or later, but that I would first have to find out if I could be released from what I regarded as a commitment. I flew back to Washington at the Board’s expense and met with the Board of the Federal Maritime Commission, which was the job I was going to take, and told them what had transpired and asked them if they could release me. It was a very nice meeting, and they said, what to you really want to do? Do you really prefer to come to Washington or would you prefer to be Port Director? And I said,
well I really would like to stay in California. So they said, well I could be released if I could get a substitute.

Ladoris Cordell: Get a replacement?

Judge Wolff: Get a replacement. I thought about that and called the then Port Director of San Diego. I knew that he had just gone through a divorce and that he was a very good, bright guy, and they would probably be very happy with him. So I suggested that he go back and be interviewed and they did hire him.

Ladoris Cordell: So when you became the Port Director, we’re talking, well, I guess 1970, there had not been a woman Port Director in San Francisco?

Judge Wolff: There had never been a woman Port Director anywhere.

Ladoris Cordell: Anywhere?

Judge Wolff: Anywhere in the world.

Ladoris Cordell: So you were the first woman Port Director in the world?

Judge Wolff: That’s right.

Ladoris Cordell: So was there a lot of publicity about this?

Judge Wolff: Yes, there was a lot of publicity.

Ladoris Cordell: And did you like that? Was is scary?

Judge Wolff: I knew it would happen. I mean, the ports are a very cohesive group. They deal with one another all the time, that’s what shipping is. Ships go from port to port. So you know other Port Directors all over the world.

Ladoris Cordell: Did you meet any resistance either within the organization, or even without, to your being the female head of a port? Any resistance you can thank of -- any incidence?
Judge Wolff: I interrupted myself a couple of times on this story. I realized when I became Port Director that this was going to get wide play internationally, and that the first question I was going to be asked was, was I going to be offended by not being allowed in the World Trade Club, and I knew that would be the question and I thought I was pretty well prepared for it and sure enough, it was the question and it carried headlines, literally all over the world. “The Port Director of San Francisco is not permitted to be a member in the World Trade Club.”

Ladoris Cordell: So your main office was San Francisco?

Judge Wolff: Main office was San Francisco. We had a branch office in London to encourage shipments through San Francisco. We had an office in Japan. For a little while, we had an office in Belgium, but that got consolidated more or less with the London office. We were a very active port.

Ladoris Cordell: Well, never having been a Port Director, you just step into this job? There’d never been a women. How did you know what to do?

Judge Wolff: Well, I’d been chief counsel, so I’d gone to all the Board meetings. I’d counseled Port Directors. San Francisco had unique problems. We were self-supporting, by the way.

I want to explain my thoughts about the Port and perhaps a little about why I was interested in being Port Director. In New York, Boston, Los Angeles, almost any Port City in the United States, the City built the Port; but in San Francisco, the Port built the City. The Indians who controlled the area first built the area the Spanish called “Yerba Buena.” The Jesuit Fathers
placed the Mission in the area now called the Mission or the Castro. The California “Gold Rush” brought hundreds of ships through the Golden Gate and they docked in the mud flats of what is now the town center, the financial district and the heart of the City. By the time of the earthquake in 1906, all the area from Montgomery Street to deep water had been filled in on top of the sunken ships and a great waterfront and port has been created. The Port itself had been created by very forward thinking people. The Embarcadero, which served all the docks, was more than 300 feet wide. In addition to adequate space for truck traffic, it had complete rail access running from the southern boundary of the City through the Presidio, and serving each side of each dock structure. The Port ran its own switching railroad. During the years of the Second World War, the Port handled 15 million tons of palletized cargo per year. But anyone connected with Port operations realized we were now coming into an era where cargo would not be palletized but would be boxed and we were aware that those boxes would soon be truck bodies both in size and eventually in function. To accommodate this, we were starting to “marry” some of the piers; that is, fill in the area between them to make room for the “boxes.” It was imperative, however, that the main functions of the Port be moved south where there was more adequate “back-up” land for port functions. Meanwhile, much of the land to the North had to become income producing to support the expenses of the new building.

Much of what I was doing as speaker was trying to explain this “shift” to a reluctant audience. When I became Port Director, I let it be known that if
I did what had to be done, my tenure could last only five years. Looking back today on 90 years of living, I can state categorically that most people hate change, even change for the better. We had statistics, predictions, observations, studies, but there were always some in the audience that even doubted that the population of California would grow.

Ladoris Cordell: You had a budget?

Judge Wolff: We had a very good and complex budget based on different principle from the City Budgets. Our budget went through the State. But at that point, you know, we were pointing toward the transfer at which point the budget would go through the City. But our budget was based on cost savings. It’s a very good budget process.

Ladoris Cordell: But what was the main job of the Port Director, I mean, the Port you’re to do what?

Judge Wolff: The Board is to determine policy, but it is the function of the Director to see that the policy is implemented. We had many “in house” surveys and outside consultants and the Board had a clear policy, with which I was in total agreement. Ports were in transition. Containerization was clearly the future of shipping and docks and other facilities had to be modified or erected to service the new modes of shipping. The San Francisco public, which had great concern for what changes went on at the Port had to be convinced of what was necessary and feasible; and people generally resist change. I saw the role of the Port Director as the person who presented these changes and took the “heat.”
Ladoris Cordell: And then there’s the railroad?

Judge Wolff: We had a railroad. And we had the docks and the City was about to build a freeway across Port property, which was a really horrible idea. I guess it was basically by the time I became Port Director, it was in place, and I think we discussed that.

Ladoris Cordell: So a typical day, are you hands-on, doing things, or do you have somebody who’s -- I mean some organizations have the person who’s day-to-day --

Judge Wolff: You are the face, and theoretically, you’re not hands-on, but you know because you’re dealing with the Board, you frequently find yourself being a hands-on person. For example, Cyril Magnin and Jim Rudden, two of my Commissioners, would leave the Mark Hopkins Hotel every morning, walk down the hill to the Embarcadero, start down the Embarcadero to Cyril’s office which was just off Port property and beyond Market Street, King, I think, and then Cyril would call and say, we passed Pier such-and-such and the garbage has not been removed.

Ladoris Cordell: He called you?

Judge Wolff: Yes. Oh, all his calls were to me.

Ladoris Cordell: To the Director?

Judge Wolff: Would you see that the garbage is removed? Or there is a broken traffic light, or there’s a whatever. So while none of this is within the realm of the Port Director, when the Board thinks it’s in your realm, you at least --

Ladoris Cordell: Do it?
Judge Wolff: Go ahead and do it or get it done. I think I mentioned that one of the first things I did when I became Port Director was to call a Saturday meeting with all the unions in San Francisco at the Union Hall in the Castro. The hall was filled with each of the unions in San Francisco, that is representative of the unions, and there were, I think, in the entire audience, two women. They represented something like the office cleaners, or one of the basically low-paying union jobs. I was amazed. Really. I thought many of the other union jobs which were largely women, such as people working department stores, that San Francisco was highly unionized. But all of the heads of the unions were males. And because we, the Port, were one of the biggest employers in San Francisco, I had wanted to have this meeting to explain that I intended to continue to have a good relationship with the unions.

Ladoris Cordell: How did the meeting go?

Judge Wolff: It went very well, because Port directors had not held themselves out to the unions for a long time.

Ladoris Cordell: So, I mean, it sounds like you were very accessible.

Judge Wolff: I was completely accessible. I hoped I was completely accessible to my staff. I discovered that I was not as accessible as I always thought because I had a secretary that had come from the Attorney General’s office with me, who decided that she was going to see who came in and out, who was permitted in my office.

Ladoris Cordell: She was going to screen everybody?
Judge Wolff: And she did. I had not been in the position too long before I learned from the staff that they had tried to see me about something but she had said I was not available. So we devised a system. But in any event, I really wanted to have an open door policy. I was very proud of the fact that many of the steamship companies that were important to us expressed the fact that they were very pleased to have me in the job. I was very sensitive to their problems and very sensitive to their needs and saw that their problems were solved as fast as possible.

Ladoris Cordell: Was this a 9 to 5 job?

Judge Wolff: Oh, no. It lasted -- it -- well, in the first place, we were always at our desks by 8:30am. And in the Attorney General’s office we were always at our desks by 8:30am. Then in the evening, at least a couple of times during the week, there would be some kind of gathering, either welcoming a new steamship line, maybe a ship or a country that hadn’t been in the Port for a long time -- like the Chinese, who made their very first visit when the ban was lifted against Chinese shipping. Their very first visit was to San Francisco.

Ladoris Cordell: So you’re also --

Judge Wolff: Oh, yes. You went down and you greeted the ship, went aboard, said hello to the officers -- the public relations section would prepare a place that they could display in the wheelhouse saying their first visit to San Francisco was such and such a date. San Francisco is regarded by virtually every country as -- or at least it was then -- as a prime diplomatic post. Most of the consul generals are people about to retire from their consular service, and being in
San Francisco is kind of a reward, or at least it was at the time. So you had a lot of consular dealings. They would -- if they were entertaining high level visitors at the consulate, the Port Director was part of the invitation list.

Ladoris Cordell: Right. Did you enjoy this? Did you like doing all that?

Judge Wolff: I can’t say it was my favorite activity. You know a dinner might be, but I never drank, and so --

Ladoris Cordell: And why is that?

Judge Wolff: Well, you can’t drink and do business. So what I would do is go in, get a glass of ice water, have the bartender put a slice of lemon or something on top, and then I considered it was my duty to wander around the room and greet everybody.

Ladoris Cordell: I’m sure people wanted to meet you too.

Judge Wolff: Yes, and basically they knew who I was, and if they had visitors we wanted to say hello to them. To that end, I always left in the office a change of clothes so that there’d be something that looked more like something you’d wear in the evening. It was really part of the duties. And then there were a lot of speaking engagements, presenting to the citizens of San Francisco, or the need for building on the Port, the general use of the property. We wanted to put in some high-rises they didn’t want to have, and we didn’t get. And that was a large part of the duties -- the off-time duties of the Port Director.