THE TENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

PROFESSIONALISM COMMITTEE

Presents:
"Historic Perspective:
The History of Women on the Bench and Bar"

A panel discussion

FRIDAY, MARCH 12, 2010
11:37 a.m. - 1:01 p.m.
The Oliver L. Green, Jr., Courtroom

Introduction: The Honorable Chief Judge
J. David Langford

Moderator: Howardene Garrett, Esquire
Guest Panelists: Senior Judge Susan W. Roberts
Martha Barnett, Esquire
Marie Alice Crano, Esquire
Wendy Loquasto, Esquire

Stenographically Reported by:
Trina B. Wellslager
Registered Professional Reporter
Videotaped by:
Jamie Hollingsworth

Sclafani Williams Court Reporters, Inc.
1-866-SET-DEPO P R O C E E D I N G S

CHIEF JUDGE DAVID LANGFORD: Good morning, everyone.

On behalf of the judges of the Tenth Judicial Circuit, I'd like to welcome you here today for this presentation by the History Committee, this being the Tenth Judicial Circuit History Committee and Women of the Bench and Bar, presenting an historic perspective in regard to the history of women on the Bench and Bar here in the Tenth Circuit.

We appreciate our moderator, Howardene Garrett, being here today, and our participants, Marie Alice Crano, Judge Susan Roberts, Retired, and also Wendy Loquasto will be appearing with us by videoconferencing, and $I$ believe that we have also Martha Barnett appearing by a video presentation.

And in conjunction with those video presentations that are going to be made, $I$ at this time would also like to thank, on behalf of the Tenth Judicial Circuit, Jenae Lewis, John Gaskell, Wanda Smith, and Jose Faoul, who have set up all this technology and equipment, which is far beyond my understanding, but certainly well within theirs. And we certainly appreciate the job they've done for us in setting this up and making all this possible
for each of us.
Also from the office of the State Court Administrator, Gerard Ford and Charles Hash have been instrumental in also setting up this video equipment. We do appreciate that.

And without further ado, I'm going to turn it over to our moderator, Howardene Garrett.

MS. GARRETT: I'd also like to say welcome and good morning. We have some thanks to give out also.

First, as y'all are eating, I know you want to appreciate Jean Henning, who provided our lunch today, as a sponsor of this presentation. How about a round of applause for those of you who have your hands free?

And the food was provided by Terrie Lobb Catering, which is always wonderful.

We also have thanks to Sclafani Williams Court Reporters for reporting and transcribing this historic event for the preservation of the Tenth Judicial Circuit History website.

The history -- we want to thank the History Committee, which is chaired by our Chief Judge David Langford, for organizing this presentation. And I'd also like to offer my thanks to Fran and Judge Green, who really put this thing together, and
all the real work in putting this thing together.
When you came in, you saw some handouts. The first one is the CLE court credits official form, which gives you your instructions, including the course number that you need to log onto the Florida Bar website and get credit for this.

And also you'll find a reading list that Ms. Loquasto will refer to, some interesting reading about the history of women in the Bar.

And also, finally, and probably most importantly is a flyer for our next History Committee presentation, which is going to be on Wednesday, March 17th, with E.J. Salcines and our own Oliver Green talking about the history of the Second District Court of Appeal and the Federal Middle District in Florida. A very interesting area, and a St. Patrick's Day presentation you won't want to miss.

I was honored to be asked by Judge Green to participate in this forum. We share a family legacy in the law, and many of you know me as the daughter of a father who was an attorney, Howard Garrett, a member of the Florida Bar for more than 50 years, but many of you do not know me as the daughter of a mother who was an attorney and is an attorney.

My mother was Marie Garcia Garrett, graduated from the University of Florida Law School in 1948. When she graduated from law school, the numbers had actually dropped. The numbers had increased a little bit during World War II, when all the men were away fighting and women were holding down many positions. And after the war, the numbers in law school went way up with the soldiers, sailors, and flyers returning from World War II. And that was where she began studying the law.

She was a practicing attorney in private practice as $I$ grew up. So unlike many lawyers today, $I$ had the big advantage of seeing in front of me a wonderful example of an attorney balancing family life and the practice of law.

She made her own path. She was the daughter of a cigar maker and the first one in her family to finish high school, much less go onto college, much less become an attorney, much to the surprise and consternation of her father, who thought she should do something more womanly, like be a teacher. When I graduated from University of Florida Law School in 1978, there was no one prouder than my mother, second only to my father, but $I$ thought my mother might actually explode with sheer joy that her
daughter was graduating.
Many of you who know me, though, know that I'm also the mother of a future woman attorney. My daughter is in her third year at Stetson University College of Law in Gulfport, and she will be the third generation of native Floridian women attorneys when she graduates from Stetson in May 2010.

The practice of law that $I$ saw my mother engage in when $I$ was growing up was very different from the practice of law that I've experienced for the last 30 years. And $I$ am quite certain that the practice that my daughter engages in in the next 50 years or more will be much different than the one $I$ have seen. And so this history of women in the practice Of law is what we're talking about today. So I think we have a really interesting group of panelists to share the history of women in the legal practice in Florida and especially in Polk County.

We're going to start with a presentation by Wendy Loquasto, the founding member and senior partner of the firm of Fox and Loquasto in Tallahassee. She received her Juris Doctor degree from Stetson in 1988, magna cum laude, where she was on the Law Review for two years, and has specialized in appellate practice, where she's also a member of
the appellate practice section and in their Executive Counsel and Publications Committee, and through her bar activities became interested in the history of women in the law in Florida and was research chair of the Florida Bar's, First 150 Lawyers, Women Lawyers' Committee, and helped with also the Florida Association of Women Lawyers, their First 150 Women Lawyers' Committee. And we're, first of all, pleased to have her with us by video.

Next, we're going to see a presentation by video from Martha Barnett, who was really trying her very best to be here personally but was unable to do so at the last minute. Now, many of you know Martha Barnett as a partner of Holland \& Knight. She was -- one of her most noteworthy claims to fame is a former president of the American Bar Association and the first woman to serve as chair of the ABA House of Delegates, which she did earlier. And also many distinctions -- among the many distinctions she has as awards from the Girl Scouts Of America, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the Hillary Clinton Glass Cutter Award, and Distinguished Alumnus of the University of Florida.

Next, we're going to hear a presentation from

Marie Alice Crano. Many of you haven't had the pleasure of meeting her, as $I$ recently did in preparation for this. Ms. Crano is a 1959 graduate of Georgia Washington University in Washington, D.C., became a member of the D.C. Bar in 1960, and then travelled to Florida for what was to be a very short time to be counsel for Indian Lake Estates. She liked Florida so much she took the Florida Bar, became a member in 1961, and stayed in Florida ever since.

After six more months as corporate counsel for Indian Lake Estates, she went into private practice, first in the large and teaming metropolis of Frostproof, where she distinguished herself as city attorney, as city judge, until the constitutional revision, and then moved her practice to Lake Wales, where she owned a building on Highway 27 and practiced there until selling the building in 2001, full-time. And yet she continues to provide pro bono representation in her retirement, and I was really tickled to meet her after she was meeting with a client this week and seeing that that was a wonderful continuing service she's providing.

Her practice was business representation, including growers, and local banks. I was pleased,
though, as a criminal -- practicing criminal defense attorney, to know that she did try one case, one criminal case, a manslaughter case, before Judge Amidon, and was able to vindicate her innocent client with a verdict of not guilty. And so $I$ think we'll enjoy hearing from her on the practice of law in Polk County in the '60s.

And our last presenter will need no
introduction, but $I$ will introduce her anyway; is our own Retired Senior Circuit Judge,

Susan Wadsworth Roberts; a graduate of Florida State University College of Law, I believe the first woman to graduate from Florida State University College of Law, and distinguished herself in Polk County first as a county judge -- well, before, city judge, city prosecutor, city public defender, and then county judge and then circuit judge.

And we know well her many contributions to the Bar in Polk County, especially the area of organizing and coordinating the efforts to prevent spouse abuse and try to set up a regular and more efficient system to deal with those problems.

So I am excited, and I hope you will enjoy the presentation. And at the end of all the presentations, if there's time, $I$ will be glad to
forward questions with our participants. Ms. Loquasto is going to stay connected by video with us in case there are questions.

So let me grab the microphone so I'm sure she hears me. We will the program over now to Ms. Loquasto. Thank you very much.

MS. LOQUASTO: Thank you for that kind introduction. I appreciate it. Can $y^{\prime}$ all hear me okay?

MS. GARRETT: Yes. I'm seeing some nods.
MS. LOQUASTO: This May will mark the tenth anniversary of the First 150 Women Lawyers' project. And I know that as a chair for the committee and having presented it, $I$ am very biased about the event and the book, and so $I$ say that up front. But I think $I$ can state a fact that it created a big splash in Florida's legal community, and that splash has continued to ripple over the year for 10 years.

You know, when we presented the book and had the celebration, we had a banquet done in Miami that had over 900 people at it. Attorney General

Janet Reno spoke. This was her first trip to
Florida after the Elian Gonzalez controversy, and so there was a lot of newspaper coverage about her visit, and that was good for us. And then we had a

Supreme Court ceremonial session to honor the women lawyers.

So it was all -- it was great. And all sorts of newspaper articles, and it's been followed up over the years with young women doing history projects about these women lawyers. We distributed the books to the libraries around the State, both public libraries and law schools. I have been in contact with family and friends of these women and people interested in the history of law over these 10 years, and bar associations and organizations continue to do programs about it.

So it is -- this program here today just shows that there's yet another ripple in the project, in The First 150 project and I'm very pleased about that. I'm very happy with your interest, so pleased to be invited to speak, so thank you so much for having me.

My talk today is going to provide a little bit of history about women in the law.

And I think, you know, we have to start that with Margaret Brent, America's first woman lawyer. She came to this country in 1836 and lived in Maryland, and although I'm not quite sure what her credentials were, but she appeared in court.

And maybe that was just a matter of necessity, because the colonies and what was -- you know, how many lawyers were there? I don't know. But she acquired a lot of land and she had to manage that land, so that brought her to court. And also she was a guardian for young women in the colonies, including a young Indian woman.

Her biggest foray into the courts was, though, through her administration of the estate of Governor Leonard Calvert, who was governor there in Maryland, and she had to manage -- she had to defend lawsuits and institute lawsuits for money that had been owed to him during his life. And by her own count, she was involved in 124 court cases over an eight-year period because of that.

So she really is America's first woman lawyer. But from 1836, in her time period, up till 1869, there's really nothing. There were a few women that had represented themselves in court, but there's no history about women lawyers. And so you have to wonder what's going on there. I guess that's part of society as we lived in then.

The Civil War and the expansion to the west were really the things that opened the doors for women lawyers, and it's no surprise that many of the
early women lawyers came from our, quote, "frontier." There weren't many people there, and so that gave women an opportunity to do job that they couldn't do in northeastern society, where there were a lot of restrictions on women.

I think you have to remember that as we exist today, life was very different for women back then. When they married, they essentially became the property of their husbands. They couldn't enter into contracts. They couldn't own property in their own name. They had a legal disability, so they couldn't be lawyers.

So many of the early women lawyers that started out were either single women who didn't have this legal disability -- and they stayed single for that purpose, to be in control of their own property, to be in control of their own lives -- or there were women who were married to enlightened men, men who really saw their spouses as helpmates in their careers, who encouraged them to study the law, who let them work in their office, who -- "let them" -had them work in their office and encouraged them in their legal careers.

I think the first -- you know, America's first woman lawyer, admitted women lawyer, was
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Arabella Babb Mansfield. And she's from Iowa, our frontier, and she took advantage of the Civil War and entered Iowa Wesleyan College. You know, all the men were away, and so the college admissions were down. And if you were a paid student, you had a good chance to get in then as a woman, whereas if -- but for the Civil War, you probably wouldn't have been able to get into college as a woman. So that's what she did, and then she married a college professor who encouraged her to study the law. And in 1869, in June, she passed the Iowa State Bar Examination.

And she was fortunate, because Iowa had a law that limited admission to the Bar to men, white males. And she was fortunate that her case came before a enlightened progressive judge by the name of Springer who looked at the law and looked at other Iowa law and said, hey, there's this provision that says where it says now that includes the female, and he applied that to the admission of women in the law and said Iowa law would allow her to be admitted. And so she became America's first woman admitted to a Bar in June of 1869.

Unfortunately, she didn't practice law. She traveled a little bit with her husband and then came
back and taught law, though, at a law school. So she was able to encourage people and spread her expertise in the law through her profession as a professor.

I think maybe you -- many of you might have heard of Myra Bradwell, probably the most celebrated -- one of the most celebrated women lawyers. She took the Bar exam. She was married to a lawyer and she, during the Civil War, helped in his law office. She helped him research and write his briefs. And he eventually went on to be a Judge.

She also founded the Chicago Legal News, which is a -- was the first law journal published in the west. So she was really involved in the legal profession.

She took the Bar examination in August of 1869, two months after Mansfield had been admitted in Iowa. Unfortunately, she did not have an enlightened and progressive judge, and so Illinois denied her admission to the Bar, and she -- and she had to take her case all the way up to the Supreme Court. Illinois denied her because she was a married woman. The United States affirmed that decision, but not just because she was married, but
just because she was a woman. And that's 1872 that decision was rendered. And that decision caused all women that wanted to become lawyers to have to fight for admission in each state according to each state's laws.

And you can read plenty of history books about women lawyers and their struggles to become lawyers. There's Belva Lockwood and Lavinia Hill are two really prime examples.

In Florida, our first woman lawyer is
Louise Pinnell, interestingly, somebody who came from Missouri, an area where many of the first women lawyers were from. And she probably knew of Myra Bradwell. Her father was an attorney. Perhaps she read the newspaper and that's how she became encouraged, because Myra Bradwell published the stories of women lawyers in the Chicago Legal News.

She's not -- when we tried to compose our list of the first women lawyers, you know, there was no list. And so we had to make it up. And that led me to the minutes in the Florida Supreme Court book, because that's where all the registrations for attorneys were kept up until we had the Florida Board of Bar Examiners and the Florida Bar, which didn't come into effect until 1950 .
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So there's a whole lot of area there between Louise Pinnell in 1898, when she was admitted, and the keeping of good records through the Florida State Bar Association and the Florida Bar. We included Louise Pinnell in our book because there's this great composite that we found in the archives that has the pictures of all the lawyers that were admitted in 1899, and there's two women in that bunch. There's Louise Pinnell and Alice Johnson, who was from Live Oak, and they're our first and second lawyers in our book. They're included because they're in that picture and there is information that they were women lawyers.

Everybody else -- I think I'm running out of time, but everybody else that was in the book was picked out from the minutes in the Florida Supreme Court book, and we got information from them, from law schools, local histories, Martindale-Hubbell. We found family and friends. We talked to lawyers who knew some of these women. And in 2000, when we celebrated it, there were 14 living women out of The First 150. We also added five African-Americans to our celebration, because they were unrepresented in the first 150.

I think it's interesting to note that Edith

Osborne, when she wrote her article for The First 150, she said, "In 1966, there were only a 175 women lawyers in Florida. And in 1975, there were only 684." Today, we're well over 30,000 , and over a third of the women lawyers -- of the lawyers in the State, so we've progressed a long way, but we still have a long ways to go.

I think Martha will tell us about -- and others will tell us about the struggles that they've had in being able to be women lawyers, but I think that it's important for us to know that it's much easier for us today because of what these women lawyers did for us, because they were strong and brave women who were unafraid and were willing to take the ostracism, the bias, the prejudice that came to them as women in the law, because they had a vision that they were making our lives better. And that's what we owe to them, is the ease that we have today. And that's what we owe to the generations that come before us, something -- doing things to make their lives easier.

I'm sorry; $I$ went over a little bit,
Judge Green. I'll end now and be happy to take questions whenever you're going to do that.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: As You can see,
we're setting up now the DVD from Martha Barnett.
MS. BARNETT: Hi, I'm Martha Barnett, and I am so sorry that $I$ can't be with you in person today. Unfortunately, I've had a --

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: StOP.
MS. GARRETT: We're pausing.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Turn off your mic over there. We're going to reorient you so that you can see the rest of the presentation.

MS. GARRETT: And now, through the miracle of modern technology, Ms. Loquasto will be able to watch the video of Martha Barnett, as well.

Thank you very much.
MS. BARNETT: Hi, I'm Martha Barnett, and I am so sorry that $I$ can't be with you in person today. Unfortunately, I've had a conflict come up that requires me to be out of the state. But $I$ did want to participate in this important conference.

I especially wanted to have an opportunity to say hello to some old friends, or maybe $I$ should say long-time friend, my friend Judge Roberts and certainly Judge Green, tell you how much I miss seeing you and being with you.

I'm going to talk about three things today: One, what was the practice of law like, what was the
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legal profession like when $I$ started practicing law, what changes have $I$ seen in the last three decades, and what recommendations do $I$ have for women lawyers, particularly the next generation of women lawyers.

The year was 1970, and I remember my first day in law school. I went to the orientation program. I looked around the room and my first thought was, "Where are the women?" I had grown up in -- I had gone to college, $I$ had gone to an all-women college, and $I$ was used to having women around me all the time. And when $I$ went to the orientation, $I$ really didn't see any women. There were only a handful, maybe ten women in the class. I later learned that there were less than 30 women in the University of Florida Law School at the time. It was a surprise to me, because $I$ had never really thought about women and -- women being excluded from professional opportunities.

After $I$ graduated from law school, $I$ got a job with Holland \& Knight and moved to Polk County and started practicing law in Polk County. I met people like Susan Roberts. She was one of the first people I met, and while it's been almost 35 years and my memory probably is not as accurate as it should be,

I believe that Susan and $I$ and two other women lawyers had lunch one day. And that may have been the first meeting of the Polk County Women's Bar Association. And we talked about the very question I had talked about when $I$ was in law school, and that was, where are the women? There just weren't that many women lawyers practicing law in Polk County at the time.

Today, of course, everything has changed. Women are, as everyone knows, hovering at about 47 to 48 percent of the entering class at every law school in the country. Some schools have above 50 percent, but almost every one of them has 40 percent or more. Women -- there are women lawyers in every aspect of the profession, whether it's in private practice, government service, public service, corporate counsel, even in law school. A lot has certainly changed in the intervening 35 years.

But what was it like to practice law in 1970 and 1980? I think it was perhaps more difficult for the law firms sometimes than it was for the women who actually worked for them, because law firms weren't used to having women. Many didn't have maternity policies. Certainly none had balanced
life, balanced work policies. Few, if any, had ever thought about the needs women might have to take care of children or take care of their families; I should say the needs their lawyers would have to take care of their families or their children, because they hadn't had women. So they grappled with some new challenges as they integrated women into the institution, into their social life, and into their cultural life.

I think for women like me, our focus wasn't so much on being women but on how do we succeed in this new environment? What do we need to do? How do we learn the rules? How do we make primarily men, both lawyers as well as clients, feel comfortable with us and have confidence that we have the skills and the training to really be a good advocate for them and to adequately represent them?

That was a big challenge. There were no role models, but there were good people who were dedicated to the success of women. They were mostly men, but most of the women $I$ know today who have been successful somewhere along the line had someone who was their mentor. And it was oftentimes, at least in the ' 70 s and early ' 80 s, it was oftentimes the senior partner in a law firm, a general counsel,
some high government official, a judge, who would take you under his wing and teach you the ropes, tell you what you really had to do to be successful, not the things they taught you in law school but the things you learned by watching, observing, having the opportunity to experience new things, to have someone validate you by transferring their credibility to you, to vouch you into the club, to tell a client, "This is my lawyer. This is the best person we have. She'll do a good job for you."

Women were busy learning not just how to be lawyers, but how to be lawyers in a new environment and to succeed in that environment. The kinds of opportunities open to women were limited, I think, initially in large law firms. In the 1970s, when $I$ was hired, Holland \& Knight had never had a woman lawyer. A lot of the other law firms in Florida, typically in central Florida and north Florida, had not had women lawyers. They had women professionals, but not as lawyers.

But that was a time of great change in the
legal profession. It was a time of change precipitated in some measure, as history tells us, a lot of other Industrial Revolution changes in the workforce have come about because of war. It was
during the Vietnam war, and the country was in turmoil. It was a time when you had the women's rights movement. You had a lot of things, social and cultural and political upheaval, that seemed to create a moment for change.

And, as I said earlier, when I started law school there were very few women. Where are the women? When $I$ left just three years later, about 25 percent of the entering class of law students were women. And that change continued for -really, until today, although $I$ think it has peaked in the last couple of years.

The kinds of professional opportunities available to women today are unlimited. Then they were limited. Very few judges had clerks that were women. Very few corporations hired women as lawyers. It was very hard to get an -- have opportunities in the academy, to teach at a law school, to get a tenure-track professional position. But women did, and they became role models and they became path finders and they opened up the doors of opportunity to the next generation of women.

Today, I sometimes ask the same question I asked in 1970, and that is: Where are the women? Because even though women are hovering at 45,

50 percent of the law students, women in leadership roles of the profession, are hovering at the 15 to 25 percent.

So something has happened -- something happens between law school and professional achievement. There are lots of studies about why 20 percent of the deans of law school are women when 50 percent of the student and 50 percent of the lawyers are women; that people ask questions about why 15 percent of the general counsels of major corporations are women; why managing partners, senior partners in law firms, equity partners, hover at about 28 percent of women.

So there is a gap in achievement at the highest levels of the profession, even though entry in the profession has been opened up. And that is something that women of my generation worry about a lot, not because it limits our opportunities but because it's limiting the opportunities for the next generation of women lawyers. People look at their future career opportunities for success and then make judgments about whether they will actually choose law, medicine, engineering, academics, technology. They make judgments based on the successes they've seen the people that have gone
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before them have had.
So I think for that reason alone, it's an
important question to ask, and it's being asked, and there are a lot of answers that have been suggested. I'm not sure anybody has the real answer. But today the legal profession, in my judgment, is fully accepting of women as lawyers. The important point in our success, however, has been something people rarely talk about, and that has been the acceptance of clients of women as their lawyer.

When $I$ first started practicing law, there was actually a firm client who refused to have a woman work on his matter, absolutely refused to let me work on a case. The firm accepted that. This was a good client, clients rule, and they accepted that. Many years later, that client and I were very good friends and he had changed his mind.

Today, there's a general -- among the clients -- and when I use the word "clients," I'm talking about private clients; I'm talking about a corporate client; I'm talking about the public, if you're a judge; I'm talking about often people in governmental positions that are very important, the people you serve as a lawyer, a broad base of people as clients.

Clients don't care whether you're a male or a female. They're very sophisticated. They do want a personal relationship with you, but they want results. They want the person that represents them to be the person that can get that divorce for them, that can close that deal, that can win that lawsuit, that can make them feel like they are the most important person in your daily activities.

And they want somebody they can afford. They want somebody that returns their phone calls, but they don't necessarily want a male or a female. And that has created a huge leveling impact in the profession.

Indeed, I see today that some of the best rainmakers, the people that bring business into law firms, are women. Women are taking leadership roles at the Bar. Certainly in Florida, we're very proud that the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court is a woman. And she's the third woman that's been the Chief Justice of our Supreme Court. The United States Supreme Court at one point in the not-too-distant past, Sandra Day O'Connor was the leader of the Court and perhaps the most respected lawyer in America and maybe even the world. Today, there are two women on the United States Supreme

Court, each in their own right leaders and respected by their colleagues.

So there are many, many -- there are many, many new things today. People accept and take for granted that women are going to be lawyers.

I've talked a little bit about history. One of the keys over the years to the success of women has been the kind of opportunities they have to actually be a lawyer, the kinds of clients that they get, whether there was a fear in the early days women would be pigeonholed into doing domestic work or estates and trusts or something people thought was more appropriate for women.

That is -- nothing could be further from the truth today. Women are -- women have benefited dramatically from specialization, from the ability to become the best securities lawyer, to become the best appellate lawyer, the best divorce lawyer, the best corporate lawyer. Whatever it is, clients want the best, and specialization allows women to create an area that they can excel in, that they are the go-to person. And I think that is something that will continue, particularly as technology changes, not just everything, but especially how we practice law and how we interact with our clients. The
specialization and expertise become even more critical differentiators.

At that, $I$ would turn to today and perhaps recommendations for the future. And the first one $I$ would say is:

Don't forget you are a woman. Your women friends will be important assets to you in good days, when you celebrate, and with the hard days, when you still have challenges that you face, whether it's because of your family or your children or just your job. Don't forget you're a woman and cherish and really nuture your friendships with women.

But also, think about your day. You can't do it all. The day of a generalist is over. Think about what you like to do, what you're good at, and become a specialist. Create a reputation for yourself. Create a brand. Make sure the brand includes excellence, but create an area where you can control what you do and where you can be the person that others seek out for their advice and counsel and to represent them.

Be a part of your community. Don't just be a lawyer who provides services to someone who's going to pay you for those, although that's certainly
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important and that's really -- it is a job as well as a profession. But contribute to your community so you're known as somebody who cares about the people who live and work in your community and who will come to you to ask you for your help as a lawyer. Your community can be a small community; it can be a state community; it can be a national. But be part of your community. Be somebody in your community. And if you are, people will come to you because they want to associate with people who are somebody.

Take advantage of technology. One the biggest challenges that we see in our law firm today with many, many women -- particularly young women, but also young men, increasingly -- is how do they balance the many demands on their life? How do they balance their competing needs, the things they want to do, children, jobs? Being a lawyer is a pretty -- it's pretty intense, driven profession. And the ability to have a family, have a career, have a life, has become increasingly difficult in today's environment.

One of the things that you can do that will allow you to manage that is to take advantage of technology. It used to be important to be in an
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office at your desk every day. You can be an international lawyer in your garage today. You can represent people all over the world and never leave your home office. You don't have to be at the office every day. You can manage and control your life if you can manage and control technology.

I can't even fathom what it's going to be like five years from now, just looking at what it is today. But $I$ think just as clients have been a great leveler and have made opportunities for women real, technology is really going to be the thing that finally takes our profession and makes it gender-neutral. It will really be based on results, competence, expertise. You can still have a relationship with someone even if you do it from a computer. You can still develop that personal rapport and respect and goodwill that's so important as a lawyer even if you do it remotely.

So my recommendation to you is to be proud of being a lawyer, don't forget you're a woman, and don't forget your obligations to your profession and your community, and most of all, don't forget to have fun, because $I$ think it's the greatest profession in the world.

MS. GARRETT: That's a very tough act to
follow, and I'd like to ask Ms. Crano to share with us next.

MS. CRANO: Do You mind if $I$ sit here?
MS. GARRETT: No, not all. Please do.
MS. CRANO: I hope you'll be able to hear me.
I thought $I$ would simply reminisce about my wanting to be an attorney. I have no special pearls of wisdom to impart to you. But when $I$ was going to college in Pittsburgh, I decided I needed broadening, so $I$ enrolled in law school in Washington, D.C.

And I really liked it. There were five women in my law class at that time. But during the time that $I$ was in law school, $I$ was working, as well, and $I$ worked for a developer who was developing Indian Lake Estates, so I would make trips down to Florida occasionally. And when I graduated and I was admitted to the District of Columbia Bar in 1960, I was asked to come down to Florida to the development for about six months concerning contracts and so forth.

So I agreed, and while I was here, I decided to take the Florida Bar. And -- with all plans of going back to Washington. And I made some visits to the courthouse and liked the atmosphere. And it was
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the old courthouse, incidentally, which $I$ just loved. And the judges were very helpful. I never felt that there was any feeling that because $I$ was a women attorney that they should be treating you differently. As a matter of fact, $I$ recall Judge Love constantly calling me "Miss Marie."

And I was admitted in Florida in 1961 and decided that $I$ would stay. And eventually I opened my office in Frostproof, and of course, the judges and the attorneys would say, "Frostproof, where is that?" You know. And -- but I enjoyed the practice there. The people were wonderful. I represented a lot of the small grove owners, 100 acres, 200 acres; formed their corporations and from time to time would transfer stock. I started that with them to the children so that their estate would even out upon death, and they liked it.

I thoroughly enjoyed the clients that I had, and I must say that the majority of my clients were male, not female. And they would call me sometime during the day and say, "Ms. Crano, I've got to talk to you. I've got a problem." And I would say "okay," and usually they could come right in. And they knew what they wanted to do; they just wanted to be quite sure it was going to be legal. And so
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we had a -- we really had a great time. I enjoyed all of my clients.

And then from there, $I$ moved to Lake Wales, because $I$ needed a larger office. Incidentally, while $I$ was in Frostproof, $I$ was City Attorney for five years and City Judge for one. That was just prior to the time that the constitution changed and the county courts were then started.

I moved to Lake Wales and bought a building and, of course, my clients all came to Lake Wales. And one of them was nice enough to tell me that he would go to Tampa if $I$ moved to Tampa. So I really don't think that, even though it was in the '60s and '70s, that we had much of a problem being female.

I then, during that period of time, the last 13 years of my practice, I represented First Federal Savings and Loan as well as my regular clients. And then $I$ retired in 2001 and sold my building, and today $I$ am maintaining my license to provide some free legal work. And $I$ do that in Winter Haven, and Winter Haven is great. They have a library that I think you would thoroughly enjoy that has small conference rooms, and you can reserve those rooms free of rent and have your conferences. So $I$ meet a lot of the clients there. And then $I$ also meet with
them at St. Joseph's in Lakeland, and they let me have an office in their office building.

And the -- the legal problems that $I$ have with these people today are varied, quite varied, as a matter of fact. And the last one that $I$-- of course, $I$ have about 14 of them now that $I$ haven't completed, and one $I$ was talking with yesterday concerned expunging a record. And of course, I haven't done that, so $I$ was thinking that $I$ had now made a friend and $I$ will get some help. Teach me.

MS. GARRETT: We call that "networking."
MS. CRANO: So $I$ can't really tell you anything more about it, but $I$ must say that $I$ thoroughly enjoyed the practice of law. It was 40 years of practice, and 10 after my retirement. So $I$ would recommend it to any woman that wanted to consider it.

MS. GARRETT: Thank you very much.
MS. CRANO: My pleasure.
MS. GARRETT: Judge Roberts, would you like to use the podium?

JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes ma'am.
MS. GARRETT: Okay.
JUDGE ROBERTS: I see my résumé.
What was the practice of law like for me when $I$
came to Lakeland in 1970?
There was only one female lawyer in Lakeland at the time, and that was Mrs. Ellis. And she did research for her husband and his law partners, and I never met her.

Martha Barnett came to Lakeland to practice law at about that same time. Nearly two years later, incidentally, we were both pregnant. We wore our dark hair long, and the uniform back then for women lawyers was skirted suits with a scarf or bow at the neck of your tailored shirts, kind of like we dressed like a guy. People got me and Martha confused with each other, and that resulted in the opinion that we were very energetic, and that helped.

You may have known or met Arthenia Joyner. She appeared upon the scene not too much after Martha and I got here. Arthenia was a graduate of the last class of A\&M College of Law, and I graduated in the first class of FSU's College of Law.

Arthenia's father lived in Lakeland, so she would come to Tampa to represent her dad and his neighbors and friends. And she would come to City Court, and that's where $I$ saw the most of her.

Arthenia is now a representative in the Florida

Legislature from Hillsborough County.
At the time when $I$ came here, there were four prominent local law firms. And I can't remember the names of them, except for one, and that was the one where Judge Oliver Green practiced. It was the Oxfords, right?

RETIRED SENIOR JUDGE GREEN: (Nodding head.)
JUDGE ROBERTS: I forgot the other three names, but anyway.

Was it difficult to get a job? In a law firm, yes. Like Ms. Crano said, they didn't know what to do with you. You're a female lawyer; they probably thought that was an oxymoron. And they did not know what to do with you.

I remember the law wives telling me they'd like for me to join their group, but they didn't know what to do with me. I wasn't married to a lawyer at the time, so they -- you know, eventually, though, people figured it out.

I worked -- I did get a job on the District Court of Appeal because my father had been -- he was a Circuit Judge also -- had been in the Legislature with Judge Woodie Lyles from Hillsborough County. And Judge Lyles was, of course, on the Second District Court of Appeal, and I became his law
clerk.
People got the impression or had the impression, $I$ noticed, like Martha referred to, that they thought women lawyers were very smart and diligent. Harvey Kornstein said that women kind of paid attention to detail, and that's what people have generally thought, I think, about women lawyers the whole time I've been one.

Prior to having a job practicing law, I had been interviewed by many law firms, and each one asked me if $I$ could type and did I intend to get pregnant. You know, they didn't know what to do with us.

After the law clerk position ended, I got a job working with a sole practitioner in Lakeland. My participation in his practice was limited, and after a while, $I$ opened my own office. I then represented men and women, but the women were single, mostly. They weren't married. Very few women even thought about hiring a lawyer in the early '70s.

At that time, women could not obtain a mortgage unless their husbands or fathers signed on as guarantors. We were still considered to be chattel; but the law did change, thankfully, a couple of years after that.

I worked in the City Court, appointed by the City Commissioners, as their first public defender. They didn't know what to do with me. I got paid $\$ 35$ a case, and there were only two people that $I$ represented and they got appointed -- or I got appointed to represent.

I was then promoted to prosecutor and then became the Lakeland City Judge. I left -- I left that part-time job and my practice in my other part-time job with Polk County Legal Aid to run for a County Judge seat about eight years later. I took Judge Strickland's place. And I know you still remember Judge Tim Strickland. His name was on the door, or on the wall next to the door. And $I$ couldn't get anybody to put my name up there, so I filed a petition with Judge Dewell to change my name to conform to the name on my door. And then they put my name out.

Back then, $I$ was in the old courthouse that Marie was talking about. They didn't have women's bathrooms, so they devised this system about a light over the door, and it really didn't work.

Let's see. When I started my practice, I was not aware that there was a local fee schedule. I violated it and was chastised by a Bar member and
told not to do it again. There were no Bar
Association meetings where one could learn of such things at the time that $I$ was aware of.

Women lawyers needed a male lawyer then to vouch for us to other Bar members and to potential clients. Two helped me.

One was Parkhill Mays. It's interesting that his father and my grandfather were in the Legislature in the 1890s in Florida, and they both signed on that constitution that was passed around that time; it was before then. Anyway, Parkhill Mays told people that $I$ thought like a man. That was very helpful at the time, and it certainly made it possible for me to earn a living practicing law. Nowadays, I really think it's insulting to be told that you think like a man, but back then, it was a blessing. It was an economic blessing to me.

Bobby Stokes, or Robert Stokes, who was a Circuit Judge, became a Circuit Judge later on, helped me figure out to how to do the work I was hired to do for my first clients. Filling in deed forms was not something I learned in law school, and neither was how to act in court before a Judge. Judge Stokes was a great example for me. He practiced in City Court, where I worked as a
prosecutor, so I was in there all the time. So I had the opportunity to watch him work his magic in the courtroom, and he was really something else. His office was on the far side of the parking lot from mine, and I asked him a lot of questions. He was patient and gracious, and every now and then, he'd give me some work that I'd get paid for to do.

Bill Blakeman was my supervising attorney at Legal Aid. He hired me and helped me learn a great deal of civil law. We had a lot of interesting questions come into Legal Aid back then.

Judge Ed Threadgill, who later became a Second District Court of Appeals Judge, and I shared office space as county judges. He helped me learn how to stop being an advocate and act like a Judge. That was before judges' schools came along. There were no other women judges at the time.

Martha talked about not having a role model, and we just didn't have any role models. In the 1970s, there were only 100 lawyers in Polk County, as I recall, and we all knew each other. Can you imagine, 100 lawyers in the whole county?

Another lawyer who helped me figure out how to do things like writing appellate briefs was Bob Trohn. He was encouraging and sent me work from
time to time.
You know, you had to have men help you learn how to get your point across while you thought like a man and acted like a lady. There were no women lawyers who had any hearing room or courtroom experience at that time, except for Marie, but like, she was too far away, so you couldn't exactly walk to Frostproof and ask her a question in 10 minutes. And there was Clara Gyn, in Gainesville, too far away and dealing with a different community of lawyers and clients.

What changes with women lawyers have $I$ seen? I've had the privilege from the catbird's seat of watching women become very good trial lawyers, women like Ms. Garrett, who's moderating this panel, are very good attorneys who are not afraid to try any sort of case. That wasn't something that was encouraged when $I$ started.

My first jury trial was with Judge Langston, not that he wasn't encouraging, but it was with him, and it was a criminal case, and $I$ was lost. You know, Marion Moorman trains his people very well; but when you're one of the first ones, there ain't nobody to train you.

Civil matters were what first came to be
handled by women. I guess it was what was acceptable, though we did -- I guess you'd call it -- advance to the courtroom, when women, the women that $I$ knew, did stuff like drafting petitions, orders, they wrote orders, they wrote letters, they wrote briefs, they consulted with clients.

That's what Martha did. So our careers took different paths and I didn't see much of her, particularly after she moved to Tallahassee. But she is a great friend. I could call her at any time and talk to her about whatever and she'd tell me.

Most of the lawyers globally are women, and that's been true for a very long time. I remember hearing that right after I graduated from FSU's College of Law. And people told me that, you know, the doors were wide open; that people would -- the general public would come to realize that women were a good idea as a lawyer, and they'd just start hiring us.

And I encourage women to continue to do whatever it is you're doing, and I encourage you that things are going to continue to change. They are. And one day Martha Barnett will not be the only women to have been the president of the

American Bar Association.
Thank you for listening.
MS. GARRETT: We do have some time available, and I'd like to open up the opportunity for questions.

Any questions anybody feels appropriate for Ms. Loquasto in Tallahassee and also for our panel here?

Oh, come on, folks.
AUDIENCE: I just have a general question.
Has there been a women as a chief Judge in this circuit?

JUDGE ROBERTS: No.
AUDIENCE: There hasn't been since I've been around.

MS. GARRETT: Good question. Thank you.
Another question? Yes sir.
AUDIENCE: Does anybody remember
Andrea Bateman?
JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes.
AUDIENCE: I believe she was possibly the first female prosecutor.

JUDGE ROBERTS: I think she was.
AUDIENCE: So I think she deserves to be remembered.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Didn't she come from Washington, D.C., also?

AUDIENCE: $I$ don't recall. She was a very brave young woman; and $I$ don't think she was discriminated against, but of course there were a lot of expectations about whether she would behave like a man.

MS. GARRETT: Please speak to that.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Andrea wasn't street-smart, you
know, and that's the only thing $I$ noticed about her. She knew the law, she knew how to behave in a courtroom, but she really had a hard time communicating with some of the people that she represented.

AUDIENCE: Well, $I$ think that we were all young turkeys back then, the men, and so, you know, we expected her to act like us and fight like us, and she didn't. But she was a fantastic attorney and a wonderful person, and $I$ just think that she needs to be remembered.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes. She was a good attorney.
AUDIENCE: Last $I$ heard of her, she was in

Orlando.

MS. GARRETT: And that seems to have been a theme, the difference in expectations of what a
lawyer looks like when the lawyer is a woman and a lawyer is a man.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: I have just a few questions.

Ms. Crano, you were a municipal --
MS. CRANO: I can't hear you.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: You were a
municipal Judge?
MS. CRANO: I can't hear.
MS. GARRETT: You were a City Judge, right?
MS. CRANO: A City Judge, just for about a year.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: When was that?

What year was that?
MS. CRANO: I think that was just prior to '68.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: So you were
probably -- I'm trying to get this straight. That's what $I$ was trying to find out.

JUDGE ROBERTS: I think we were about the same time.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Municipal judges about the same time?

JUDGE ROBERTS: Uh-hum.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Okay. So you were the two first women judges and you were municipal
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judges about the same time?
JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes, about.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: But in different parts of the county?

MS. CRANO: Yes. She was the big one.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Judge Roberts, let me get this straight. You were in the first graduating class of FSU Law School; is that right?

JUDGE ROBERTS: Uh-hum.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: You were -- were you the first woman to graduate from FSU Law School? JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: And were there -in the context of FSU Law School and the graduates, where were you on whether you were the first to become a judge?

JUDGE ROBERTS: I was the first to become a Judge from FSU.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: From FSU Law School, first class, first woman graduate, first to become a judge. That's pretty amazing. (Applause.)

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: And you were also the first female County Judge here in Polk County, right?
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JUDGE ROBERTS: Yeah.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: And the first
female Circuit Judge here in Polk County, as well?
JUDGE ROBERTS: Judge Fulmer was first circuit Judge.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Judge Fulmer was the first Circuit Judge, and then it was you?

JUDGE ROBERTS: Yes.
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: That's amazing.
Thank you very much.
MS. GARRETT: Renee, you had a question?
AUDIENCE: I do. You had both talked about the reception, $I$ guess, that you got from men, not only --

MS. CRANO: I have difficulty hearing.
MS. GARRETT: I'll repeat it for you.
AUDIENCE: The question is, you talked about the reception that you got from men, not only men lawyers but just men in general, at the time that you started. What kind of a reception did you get, how were you treated by women, not only other professional women in your work, but secretaries or support staff or women in the community?

MS. GARRETT: So the question is, y'all both mentioned the reception that you got from men, both
clients, other lawyers in the community, but what was the reception that you got from women, women clients, women in the community, women employees such as secretaries, et cetera?

MS. CRANO: It was fine. I had no problem.
JUDGE ROBERTS: They just didn't know what to do with us.

MS. CRANO: They did think we were pretty smart.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Yeah, that.
AUDIENCE: Thank you.
MS. GARRETT: Yes sir.
AUDIENCE: $I$ actually have the same question, but in terms of the reaction from juries.

Did you guys feel like you were treated any differently by the juries? Did they look at you any differently or expect anything different?

JUDGE ROBERTS: No.
MS. GARRETT: The question is the jury, how the jury members treated you when you appeared in front of a jury.

MS. CRANO: I don't think there was any problem with that.

Although I must say, I'll have to tell you, once $I$ was walking out and one of the male clients
said, "I like Your suit." And I said, "I like Yours too."

And the other -- and the other attorney grabbed me, Robin Gibson, Robin Gibson said, "Marie, you don't care how you win a case, do you."

MS. GARRETT: That's very good.
Okay, yes.
MR. MASLANIK: This is a question for all the panel, and you don't have to name names or anything like that. But I've always wished that, you know, once a month you could say whatever you really thought about what a judge said to you or did to you in a particular situation, and $I$ want to ask you all if you could tell us if you ever had that one particular situation where you were treated in a prejudicial way by a judge that you wish you could have said what was really on your mind, if you could tell us about that experience.

MS. GARRETT: Okay. So Austin is asking if there was, in the interest of like an amnesty, if there was ever a moment that you could feel like -if you could say whatever you really wanted to someone, because of the way that they treated you, especially a judge, what you would say and what that might have been.

Judge Roberts says nothing.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Some of the judges were protective of their courtrooms or -- I don't know what. I think it had to do with territory, but I'm not sure. But, like, a judge is a judge is a judge, and they never forget, I've always figured. So you, like, keep your mouth shut. It's called respect.

MS. GARRETT: Did You ever have a moment,

Ms. Crano, where you felt you'd like to say
something back about the way you were treated?
MS. CRANO: Ung-ugh. This may not be exactly relevant, but $I$ think $I$ told you that once $I$ was trying to make a point that -- before Judge Wilson, and he looked down at me and he said, "I'm not impressed with the force of your argument." So that might have been something similar.

MS. GARRETT: Okay. Thank you.
Yes ma'am.

AUDIENCE: Ms. Loquasto, this is directed towards you. I have your book here.

Can you hear me okay?

MS. LOQUASTO: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

AUDIENCE: Yes, I can.
Okay. In your book, you mentioned almost all
of the 150 women lawyers had extracurricular or extra-work activities; they were members of the Red Cross, Order of the Eastern Star, different political parties.

Why do you believe that is, and do you feel it's still important for us to be members of different organizations, as well, today?

MS. LOQUASTO: I think that early women lawyers were involved in all those activities because that's where they -- they were active, determined women who wanted to make society better in some way, and they could do it through those organizations.

I also think that they learned a lot of their leadership skills by being involved in those organizations, the same way that we do today. You know, you start in your local voluntary Bar Association and you move up to leadership positions there, you know, with your women's organizations, and then you move into the total Bar Association that's men and women, and then you move into the State level.

And you learn the skills that bring you respect with your colleagues by being involved in these organizations, and that's the same thing that Martha said: Be involved in your community. Doesn't
matter whether it's the Red Cross or it's a part of the Bar Association. If you're a person that's active in those -- in those organizations, and you do well, people will come to you and you'll get the skills to be able to move up.

I think that's exactly what these early women lawyers did.

MS. GARRETT: Thank you. I think that really is true. And it's all kinds of organizations, as well. It can be religious -- could be church organizations, could be the Rotary, could be the Lions Club, it could be any kind of group that gets you in front of the public and gets you in a leadership position, leads to the recognition by the public at large.

Judge Green?
JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Ms. Loquasto, something that I found very impressive about Ms. Pinnell and Ms. Johnson is to set them in the context of the other folks with which they were practicing the Bar at the time.

Now, it's my understanding that people were admitted -- could be admitted by circuit judges around the State; that your research was focused, because you had limited resources, with the Florida

Supreme Court records and who was admitted through the Florida Supreme Court. And according to the Florida Supreme Court records, these were the first two women in the 1899 Bar composite, which, by the way, a copy is hanging in the Boswell \& Dunlap law firm.

But, anyway, could you mention just the other folks, what kind of people that they were -- that those two women were practicing with at the time in $1899 ?$

MS. LOQUASTO: Well, we really don't know much about Alice Johnson. But Louise Pinnell had a very successful career in the railroad industry. She was from Bronson, which $I$ think is not really near you, Levy County, Hernando County, in through there. Her dad was a lawyer in Missouri, and then he came down, and if you -- I learned a lot of railroad history when $I$ researched her, because her career really went with the expansion of the railroads in Florida. And her dad had represented railroad people in Missouri, and they did the same when they came to Bronson.

And she then worked in -- she went to work for a man named -- called St. Clair-Abrams in Jacksonville, who also represented railroads. And
at the time, you know, that's in the 1900s, early 1900 to 1922 or '3 that she worked for him, and then she worked for Henry Flagler with the Florida East Coast Railway until 1948 .

She did real estate law, which was a comfortable place for women lawyers. You know, I think other have alluded to that, transition work, transaction work, rather than courtroom work, where women could find better jobs, and she did real estate. And there was all sorts of -- if you understand railroad history, there was all sorts of litigation about that, about how much they could charge to carry their cargo and land acquisitions because they were building the railroads and expanding.

So they did that. I.
Really -- we don't really know much about Alice Johnson to know what she did do. But that's what most of the women lawyers did, was a lot of the transaction work, probate, wills and estates. It was a comfortable place for them to be. Or they worked as legal secretaries and as law clerks for judges.

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: Well, back in 1899, they were also practicing a lot with veterans
from the Civil War; is that correct?
MS. LOQUASTO: Well, they would have been -yeah, they would have been practicing with them, but I think -- and I guess you've asked me that question before and I'm not sure what the connection of that is, what you mean by that; that somehow the veterans of the Civil War treated them differently or better or --

JUDGE MARY CATHERINE GREEN: It's just an amazing context for everyone, that at the time, it was -- there was -- that there were many people that went into the practice of law after the war with different experiences. And it must have been a very colorful Bar at the time for these women as well as for the others.

MS. LOQUASTO: You know, as I said, the railroad, $I$ mean, the expansion to the frontier brought them down, and then a lot of women lawyers came to Florida. They moved here from other areas. And so the fact that they -- a lot of them, like Louise Pinnell came from Missouri; of course she wasn't a lawyer there, but a lot of the women lawyers moved here from other states and having gone to law schools. And we didn't have a Law School in Florida until 1900.

So, yes, you could read the law, you could be an apprentice to become a lawyer, and you could be admitted at the circuit level by just, you know, associating with a law -- a local judge, a local lawyer, and learn the law through practicing -- not practicing, but through apprentice work with them, and then you would take the Bar examination and be admitted.

Our first Law School was Stetson. Then there is UF, but they didn't admit women until 1925, and Miami is 1928. And then you don't get into FSU and FAMU, FAMU's I think '59 or '58, late 50s, and they went through the 60s, and UF, and FSU's not until, like, '69, '70, in through there.

So you had to at some point, and I'm not really sure how long that apprentice part went, but pretty far up until maybe even the Second World War, after that.

MS. GARRETT: Judge Roberts points out that it was '67, '66, when FSU Law School began.

MS. LOQUASTO: Okay, yeah.
MS. GARRETT: Okay.
Question, yes.
AUDIENCE: I just have a story to tell.
When I came in 1981, $I$ was interning at the

Public Defender's Office and I had an interview with a law firm. And it went very poorly, about what I might expect as a female attorney in Polk County, and that $I$ might be expected to make coffee and this and that; very uninspiring interview. So I came back to the office and Judge Davis, Charlie Davis, had his desk right outside mine, and he goes, "You need to talk to Judge Roberts."

So he called Judge Roberts and Judge Roberts says, "I'll meet you for lunch." I think it was the next day, and she brought Amanda Trawick with her. And so the three of us had lunch and told me to ignore everything that I'd heard; that it wasn't like that. And I'm here to say that it wasn't like that, and I've had a great experience practicing in Polk County.

But I've always appreciated that,
Judge Roberts.
MS. GARRETT: Yes sir.
AUDIENCE: I'll add to that.
In the '70s, '80s, and early '90s, when $I$ was getting into divorce work, and there was a noted predisposition for the men who were on the other side of the divorces where $I$ was representing the woman to seek out female lawyers. And the reason
for that was by having a female lawyer, it was kind of like she was vouching that they weren't as bad as they were being made out to be. So it was kind of like reverse discrimination. It really did happen a lot.

MS. GARRETT: The idea was using some aspect of your lawyer to vouch for you. I think that's a long tradition.

AUDIENCE: That's the way I took it.

MS. GARRETT: Yes ma'am.

AUDIENCE: I was really impressed with the law field and so forth. Why wasn't there a pay scale or attorneys' fees charged for them?

MS. GARRETT: The question was about as attorneys progressed, what was the pay scale like, or were you paid --

JUDGE ROBERTS: More.

MS. GARRETT: What was the pay scale like? Did it change or do you see any difference?

Ms. Crano, did you see any difference.
MS. CRANO: Pay scale.

MS. GARRETT: Yes.

MS. CRANO: What you would charge?
MS. GARRETT: Fees, yes ma'am.
MS. CRANO: What you would charge. Oh, well, I
think it was -- we started with something like \$20 an hour at that time, way back then.

JUDGE ROBERTS: Well, don't forget there was a fee schedule in place in Lakeland. I don't remember if it was the entire county, but you'd really get in trouble if you kept going under it or you went way over it. But we did make more money as time went on.

MS. GARRETT: As hopefully have we all.

Yes sir.

MR. BRANDON: I had the privilege of initiating my practice with Judge Roberts and Marie Crano and Martha Barnett, and for the life of me, it seemed to me like they all just fit in. I can't remember -- I just remember having cases with them.

But I really wanted to make reference to Attorney General Janet Reno and the reference to Attorney General. She, on her invitation to come to Miami, I happened to be on the executive committee of the Florida Bar Board of Governors, and she had been invited by the president of the Florida Bar, Edith Osmond, to come down to that first major celebration of women lawyers and their contribution to the Florida Bar.

But as a result of her decision in the Elian
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Gonzalez case, there was a major push back from Miami to disinvite her to that function. It was very emotional. The board, I know the executive committee, looked at it and evaluated it.

Edith Osmond wanted her to come. The decision was made by the board for her to come.

But the point I'd like to make: She really attended that function; that was her first return, as was pointed out, to Miami. Very emotionally charged atmosphere. Many people in Washington advised her not to come for fear of her -- concern for her life at that point in time. And she stood up and certainly attended, gave a great presentation, but $I$ think it's certainly reflective of her courage and the challenge that she was facing, and she just moved forward.

MS. GARRETT: And I think that's -- Janet Reno was a woman attorney of Florida that we're very proud of, and justifiably, for that and other reasons.

I saw another hand somewhere. I think we have time for one more question?

Yes, Judge Green?

RETIRED JUDGE OLIVER GREEN: My question is
somewhat to endorse what Jack Brandon just said.

Marie Crano mentioned the attorneys from Frostproof, and this is probably an ancient but in-house belief. Of the attorneys from Frostproof, namely Marie Alice Crano and David Higginbottom, there couldn't have been more of a contrasting appearance in court, really.

And that's not intended as a negative comment against either, except that Marie from Day 1 was always composed; she never wasted your time; she was absolutely prepared. David, on the other hand, would come in with theories that never occurred to you.

Jack, am I exaggerating?
MR. BRANDON: No, that's the truth.
RETIRED JUDGE OLIVER GREEN: It was just a pleasure. It was actually fun working with Mr. Higginbottom, also, but it was better to go through one with Marie.

MS. GARRETT: Thank you very much.
Well, we appreciate your coming and we look forward to sharing with you in the next presentation on March 17th with Judge Salcines and Judge Green. Thank you.

## (Applause.)

THEREUPON, the Proceedings were concluded.
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