

## INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

Hi. I'm Rosanna Perretta. Today is Monday, February 26, 2001. We're in Center City Philadelphia at the law firm of Pepper Hamilton and we're here to interview William Klaus for the Oral Legal History Project at the University of Pennsylvania Law School. Mr. Klaus is a retired partner at Pepper Hamilton and a pioneer in the legal services movement. Thank you so much, Mr. Klaus, for agreeing to take part in this interview.

Rosanna: I'd like to begin with your childhood. Where and when were you born?

Mr. Klaus: I was born in the town of Lansdowne in Pennsylvania in 1926.

Rosanna: Where were your parents born?

Mr. Klaus: Both born in the Philadelphia area.

Rosanna: And what did your parents do?

Mr. Klaus: My father was a real estate broker, a general contractor, ran a small insurance business. My mother was a housewife.

Rosanna: Where were you raised?

Mr. Klaus: Lansdowne, and then moved to Upper Darby. Went to Upper Darby High School and then on leaving high school in 1943 I immediately volunteered for the Army and went into the service in 1943. Stayed there until 1946. Served in the European theater of operations as a tank commander. After the war I stayed on in the Occupation Army and ended up editing a newspaper, for the Army. For my battalion. Which led me to believe that I could become a great writer. And so I left the Army with every intention of becoming a great writer and running with the Bulls in Pamplona. And intending to work my way up to that by doing feature work and writing in newspapers. So I chose Temple University, which had a great journalism school and started out on my writing career. Wrote a lot of articles for magazines, Philadelphia magazine, in its prior form and Mainline Times. I worked for them as a reporter. And I worked for them and did all of that through law school. But Temple had a very interesting program. They encouraged veterans who were coming out of the service to take advantage of I guess additional credits that would allow you to jump two years of law school, um, two years of undergraduate school and go direct to law school. So, having lost 3 years, I decided it would be a very good idea to do that. So I had no intention whatsoever of being a lawyer until, um, someone offered me this.

Rosanna: Okay.

Mr. Klaus: So I took advantage of it and went to Temple Law School.

Rosanna: Do you have any siblings?

Mr. Klaus: No.

Rosanna: Do you have any children?

Mr. Klaus: Yes. I have just one son.

Rosanna: How would you describe the neighborhood in which you grew up?

Mr. Klaus: Well, I think it was very much a suburban, middle class upbringing. All the way through high school I worked as a camp counselor, swimming instructor, and things like that. Just really a very relaxed life, until I got into the Army.

Rosanna: What were some of your hobbies and interests as a child?

K: Mostly sports. I've always read a lot.

R: Do you remember what you wanted to be when you grew up?

K: No I don't think I had any idea. I think I probably wanted to be an artist and transferred my artistic desires to the journalism aspect. I've always felt that journalism and my training as a newspaper reporter was a tremendous asset as a young lawyer. Because it teaches you how to find skeletons in closets, how to write succinctly and to the point.

R: Now what did you major in at the Carnegie Institute of Technology?

K: Hmm?

R: What did you major in at the Carnegie Institute of Technology?

K: That was part of an Army program. I enlisted at 17 and was sent to Carnegie Tech, now Carnegie Mellon. The object I think was to train officers for mostly engineering. It was an engineering course and so I took it without a lot of enthusiasm. I mean, it wasn't seemed to be directed at what I wanted to do. I thought about being an architect for a while. Too much math.

R: What led to your decision to attend Temple Law?

K: Well, I think I answered that, in that it was the offer of being able to cut two years of undergraduate school that tempted me to try the Law school.

R: Were there any faculty members in college or in law school that had a substantial impact on your life?

K: Not in law school. Not, no, not in undergraduate school either. If anything, the most important person in my early life was the counselor -camp director- when I worked as a summer counselor in a summer YMCA camp. He was a very helpful role model.

R: Do you keep in touch with any of your classmates from college or law school?

K: Not in college. In law school. Many of them are in Philadelphia. Those that are left, not many left of us. Over two-thirds of my law school class are gone.

R: Did you have any legal role models as you entered law school?

K: Did I have what?

R: Any legal role models?

K: None whatsoever.

R: And do you have a fondest memory of law school or something you liked particularly about law school?

K: No.

R: I can identify with that.

K: Although I must admit, I enjoyed, I enjoyed the work. I liked to do research and writing and I was editor of the Law Review. That took up my third year pretty much. And so I really enjoyed going to law school.

R: What did you like least about law school, if there was anything?

K: Well, Temple Law School was not at the Temple campus in the fancy building it has now. It was on the ninth floor of the Gimbel's Building in Philadelphia, which has since been torn down. And it was a, they knew they were gonna move, and it was a ratty old place to try to practice law. It required me taking subways back and forth. It was very inconvenient.

R: Did you have any course in law school that was your favorite?

K: Yes, I think I really liked the corporate, business side and the research and legal writing.

R: And were you involved in any activities or clubs?

K: Uh, at the law school. Only as Editor in Chief of the Law Review.

R: Can you describe the Temple Law student body during your time as a student?

K: Yes, there were mostly veterans and I think there were ten people that had taken advantage out of 100 in the class who had taken advantage of the program to skip undergraduate school. And it was also the first class that took the SAT, LSAT. There was an amazing correlation between those ten men. They were, uh, scored very high on the LSAT and they scored very high in the class, interestingly.

R: Do you remember anything else about the admissions process? Was there an interview?

K: No, it's been over 45 years, you know.

R: Yes. Did you work during the summer after your first and second years?

K: Uh, no. I worked with my father for the first year out of law school. Now, from then on I worked on the Law Review. In the summer it's a full-time job all summer editing a Law Review.

R: Yes. How did you select your law school courses?

K: Pretty much by, they were assigned. Didn't have any choices or options.

R: Is there any course that you regret not taking?

K: No, because I think I took every course offered.

R: Was law school what you expected it to be?

K: I guess. I'm not sure. I went with the flow but I did, I emphasize the fact that I enjoyed it.

R: In what ways, if any, were you different after graduating from law school than you had been before?

K: I think you learn a lot in law school. You learn how to think, discipline yourself, take pressure. You learn a lot about the world.

R: Who were your legal role models as you exited law school?

K: Uh, when I graduated from law school I was lucky enough to get a law clerk position with a Common Pleas court. In those days, the Common Pleas court had three judges. I think there were eight courts, with three judges on each court and each court had a law clerk. Not, not personally for each judge, but you were responsible for all three. And they were in the City Hall and it was a wonderful opportunity for me. It was really, I think, the first time a Temple man had ever been given a job like that. And I guess I met another great role model in the judge, the principal judge that I worked for. His name was Judge Oliver. And he was a gentleman and a scholar and a wonderful man, very kind to me and taught me a lot. And he also recommended me to this firm. In 1951 I went over, in the summer of 1951, and started to do research on a major, complicated case that they had here. I was really a summer student in that year and then I joined the firm in September of '52.

R: What areas of law did you work in during your years at the firm?

K: I think I probably had one of the most fascinating legal careers you can have and I don't think it could be replicated in today's world. Times have changed so very much. First of all, the clients were different. Major corporations had no inside clients, um, no inside lawyers. They were dependent on their outside law firms, so that we were thrown into contact with Sun Oil Company, Curtis Publishing Company, which is now gone, with Philadelphia National Bank, Fidelity Bank. We had a major litigation practice. And not too much departmentalization for the first few years or specialization. We were allowed to roam free and pretty much developed specialties around what the client needed. So I was assigned to work on the commercial banking work at Philadelphia National Bank, uh, Fidelity Bank, now First Union. And at Philadelphia National Bank on their international trade work. They were the only bank in town that did international trade. And uh, I learned my trade there. I learned a lot about the Uniform Commercial Code. I had to learn it. It had just been adopted. And I started to lecture on the subject. I taught at Villanova Law School for two years, on the Uniform Commercial Code. Wrote part of a book on it. Wrote a lot of law review articles and things like that and got to really know that. Became active in the American Bar Association's program to teach the Uniform Commercial Code to lawyers.

MISSING PORTION

And then I became involved with a client called NWA or AYDR, which was Philadelphia's largest, by far, advertising agency and one of the major education, uh, advertising agencies in the country. It was based in Washington Square and had offices in New York and did radio and television. And over the years I worked into becoming their lawyer and I had to learn a lot about entertainment law, writing contracts on the West coast, for music and scripts and production of television programs for use by our advertising clients. Then later on the firm started to expand into foreign countries and I was sent to ten different countries to buy agencies or start agencies, everywhere from Thailand to Paris and London and Italy, a lot of time in Italy. So I started traveling a lot. And then the work at Philadelphia National Bank started to explode and I was really their in-house lawyer on international banking matters. So suddenly I was the only person around town that knew a lot about international banking and I sort of specialized in that and traveled a lot on that. Then Fidelity started an international banking department and I was doing that, and Provident Bank started an international department and I was doing that, so I was running around town and often around the world representing various kinds of letter of credit controversies and difficulties that banks can always get into. So between NWA and the banks I was spending a lot of time out of the country. Fidelity bought a bank in Beirut before the Civil War started. I went over there to negotiate that sale. Then we turned around and went back a year later to sell half of it to the ruling family of Kuwait. So I spent a lot of time in the near East at the height of the Arab or oil cartel, I guess. So more and more of my life was drawn into international law and in the final phase of my career, I fell in with people who were doing international

acquisitions in this country. The Arabs that I met in Beirut and Kuwait started buying up real estate and making investments in companies in this country and we represented them in those transactions. I represented a firm based in London which had a large fund of money that was in use for international investment, mostly acquisitions in the United States. So the business side of my life was very exciting and unusual and I don't think replicable today. I don't think that kind of life exists. I think most of the international work is the first thing that the inside lawyer takes away from outside lawyers, because it's fun. And the advertising agencies have changed and they're all staffed up with lawyers inside. It's a different world.

R: You remained with one firm throughout your career, a phenomenon that is highly unusual today. Why did you stay...?

K: Say that again.

R: You remained with one firm throughout your career, a phenomenon that is highly unusual today. Why did you stay with Pepper Hamilton?

K: Cause I loved it. I had wonderful support, good friends. Couldn't ask for anything more.

R: So why do you think firms have such high attrition rates today?

K: Well, the world has changed from then. I think we always worked hard. I always charged 2000 hours a year, even when I was working in public matters. But, I think the pressure is on all lawyers, much worse than we had it and in different ways. Competition between law firms didn't exist. Law was a different place than it is today. When I joined this firm there was no air conditioning. We had green and white striped awnings on the top floor of the old Land Title Building and rotating, oscillating big black fans that blew all the papers off your desk with every oscillation. And no fax machines and no copy machines. We had to send out for photocopies. So it was a different life.

R: You were promoted to partner in 1960. Have the demands of partnership changed since your early years as a partner?

K: No. I think, I think a partner in a large law firm has learned his trade. Always been under pressure to get the job done and get it done right. It's a lot of responsibility. Sometimes in huge matters. This firm represented Conrail when Conrail had only one employee and ended up acquiring all of the real estate assets of the seven bankrupt railroads, including the Pennsylvania Railroad. Practically everyone in this firm was working on that around the clock for two or three years. It was a huge matter. And the responsibilities were equally huge. The pressure on partners can't be much different, except I think that there's a pace of life which is clearly much more stepped-up.

R: What changes have you noticed in legal practice over the last 30 years?

K: Well I think, I think I've said that. I mean, the advent of the fax machine alone, much less email, has stepped up the pressure to get answers for....years ago you could get a letter asking a question from a client and you could take your time answering it. Nowadays it comes over email and you're expected to email them back that day. Terrible pressures.

R: Did your clients' legal needs change over the 40 plus years that you practiced law?

K: I don't really understand that question. Say it again.

R: Did your clients' legal needs change over the 40 plus years that you practiced law?

K: Oh yes, immensely. I mean, many of them are gone. Philadelphia National Bank is now First Union, so is Fidelity Bank. NWA is gone. Sun Oil is a different kind of company. Curtis Publishing is gone. And much more on the business side of the practice, a much more entrepreneurial aspect than just sitting around waiting for a corporate client to call you and ask you to do an acquisition for them. Now you're working for people that are speculating on it, putting up their own money to make the acquisition. Lots of pressure and much harder work.

R: Do you think an attorney has a responsibility to perform pro bono work?

K: Perform what?

R: Pro bono work.

K: Yea, this firm has always supported pro bono efforts. I guess every big law firm will say that, but I really believe in it. In more, in that and other ways the firm has been very liberal and outgoing. When I joined the firm in 1952, I was, it was made known to me that I could work for the Defender Association if I wanted to or with the Legal Aid Society or Lawyers Reference Service or one of the things that then existed or to do anything else that was public. Time off to do poll watching. It was a very definite commitment to being in public service. Most of the partners, I then started to get real role models. There's nothing quite like the law firms for providing good role models. Great men here that gave their lives to a lot of institutions, things like United Way. Really worked hard, in addition to carrying a heavy workload. So it was easy for me to slide right into becoming active in bar association activities. I think I was on the committee called the Public Service Committee, which didn't do very much. It volunteered to help the Legal Aid Society, which was then the only institution in town which really provided legal services to poor people.

R: Do you think that the emphasis on billable hours at major law firms discourages attorneys who might otherwise perform pro bono services?

K: Yes. But I know that here they're very serious about it. The very fact that they have this room is an indication of that, I think. And the firm has even established an, I don't know if its annual, but an award, in my name to people that perform pro bono service, and do good work. David Franklin received it last year for his work in prison reform litigation.

R: During your career was it difficult to manage work and family obligations?

K: Of course, terrible. Especially traveling as much as I did. Cause on top of the international travel, and the other kind of traveling I was forced to do, this firm was growing and I was running the business department. We were adding offices all over the country, required recruiting, interviewing, meetings at these offices of the executive committee. And then when I got involved in the legal services movement in depth at the national level, I was spending a lot of time in Washington traveling around the country putting out the fires in legal services programs. I was away from home a lot.

R: In 1965 you authored the report Law and the War on Poverty in Philadelphia, an appraisal of existing legal services to Philadelphia's poor, which clearly found them to be inadequate. How did you initially become involved in this effort?

K: Well, now the Kennedy administration, with some help from people at the Harvard and Yale Law Schools, developed a concept of putting inside their anti-poverty action program a unit called legal services and it wasn't a corporation then, it was just a part, a division of the anti-poverty action committee work that they were setting up. It was a tremendous endeavor and it shows what government can do if it really wants to do it, cause they called in every bar association in the country and had a big meeting in Washington where they tried to sell bar associations on initiating legal services programs. So I was the chairman of that committee so I went and one of the things that they asked us to do was just learn a little bit about the problem and see if we could set

something up that they would fund. So I came back to my committee and we had been asked to do a paper on legal services in our city and who was providing it, and how adequate it was. Part of the overall anti-poverty action program which was under Sargent Shriver, created committees around each city. In other words, there would be one in North Philadelphia, South Philadelphia, West Philadelphia, Conshohocken, whatever, not Conshohocken, but in the city, and they were composed of community leaders. So that it was very easy to have access to the poor communities of Philadelphia and to be taken down to see the nitty-gritty. So it was very impressive I think, to all of us that were involved in that process of touring around the cities and seeing the urban areas, coming to the conclusion that the Legal Aid Society was well-intentioned, and it was funded by the large law firms largely, but it wasn't even scratching the surface of the need.

R: In this report, you recommended the creation of a Community Legal Services program. You called the program "a lawyers program from beginning to end, without political direction or bureaucratic interference, establishing a service which incorporates the vital traditions and the professional ethics of the bar." Do you believe that this vision for Community Legal Services became a reality?

K: Yeah, I do. I think that the principal problem with legal services has been lack of funding to do the job right. There was a time in the early days when we had over a hundred lawyers I guess in Philadelphia. Now we're down to 40 or something like that between Community Legal Services and the Philadelphia Legal Action Committee, Legal Services Committee, which is the bifurcation of that program today, which we'll talk about later, I guess, but I do think that the program number one was well supported by the bar association. The then chancellors of the Bar took a lot of flak from a lot of conservative lawyers that did not think that legal services should be federally funded. They thought it was excessively liberal, dangerously radical and maybe it was. The early days were quite radical. But I think, certainly in this city, that the concepts of professional responsibility and honesty and the practice of good law has always been a hallmark of Community Legal Services and it's thought of that way around the country by other legal services programs who look to Philadelphia for leadership.

R: After extensive cuts in federal funding in the 1990s, CLS had to close several of its neighborhood sites. In your opinion what has been the greatest impact of these closings?

K: Well I guess I don't understand that question. Say it again.

R: After extensive cuts in federal funding in the 1990s, CLS had to close several of its neighborhood sites. In your opinion what was the biggest impact of these closings?

K: Well, the neighborhood centers, there was a large one in North Philadelphia, one out in West Philadelphia on 52<sup>nd</sup> Street, one in South Philadelphia on Broad Street. Couple others. And it's hard to realize it but, then and even today, people are born, live their lives in those neighborhoods, and never come to Center City. They don't even know how to get to Center City. It wouldn't occur to them to come to Center City. And with the Anti-Poverty Action committees broadcasting the availability locally, people could walk over to the, a couple of blocks over to see a lawyer. That made all the difference in the world. And they, these lawyers became knowledgeable of local community problems with certain landlords, or health problems and difficulties with the local hospital, and they were really into it, and into the deepest part of the problems of these local people and it was a great loss to have to close those. We suffer from that today. We try to do outreach. It just doesn't have the same impact.

R: In a recent interview conducted for the 35th anniversary of CLS, you stated "Our government recognized the need for legal services for the poor and this in itself was innovative." Can you tell me what you meant by that?

K: Well, first of all, we have to solve the problem, I can't, I'm too deaf to hear you, so you'll have to.....

R: I'm sorry. Ok. In a recent interview conducted for the 35th anniversary of CLS, you stated "Our government recognized the need for legal services for the poor and this in itself was innovative." Can you tell me what you meant by that?

K: I think the legal services program is one of the greatest things any government's ever done in history, to hire committed young lawyers and turn them loose on the government right, to bring lawsuits, to require the enforcement of laws, to revise laws that are unfair, to do all of the things that Community Legal Services was intended to do, and now of course can't do because those very effective legal service, law reform activities are sort of curtailed by the new regulations. And, you can still do them, but you have to do them, and I think it was always true, law reform cases grow from real cases. They don't, they don't, they're not picked out of the air and then someone builds a case around them and finds a client. I really don't think that's happened very much. I guess all over the country there's been places where that could have happened, but mostly the problems come because lawyers see a pattern out of misuse of some law. The typical, my favorite example was, I forget the name of that case, it's like Schwab v. Lenox. The confession of judgment clause in a note signed by someone borrowing money allowed on default the creditor to file automatic judgment without having to go into court to prove his rights. And if there was a defense it'd mean you'd have to go and go to the court and ask for the judgment to be opened and the matter heard. So it was a very expensive and cumbersome thing to do. So CLS took that case to the Supreme Court and won it, and a very effective example, I think, of law reform at its best.

R: What do you envision for the future of CLS and the legal services movement?

K: I don't know. The problems of legal services are so fraught with politics and I'm sure in this present administration, the new Bush administration, that there are people who would love to just cut it out completely and they might try. The program has a tremendous grass roots support. Someone once said, attack the legal services program and you get an editorial in every newspaper in America. Cause I think mostly around the country bar associations and lawyers are very, very supportive.

R: How did some of the political and social issues facing society at the time affect your efforts to secure legal services for the poor?

K: I think, you know, the '60s and '70s were times of great ferment, and there were a lot of things going on, a lot of organizations growing up, self-help organizations, around the city and quite a bit of feeling among articulate liberals that things had to be changed, that they were wrong. Minorities of all kinds needed help, so I think that the whole civil rights movement, not only by people of color, but also by the people that supported the idea, was rampant and aided the establishment of the legal services community and abetted its activities.

R: Do you see the law as an important vehicle for social change?

K: Um, I could wish that the regulations which now restrict the activities of Community Legal Services and prevent it from receiving federal money and which restrict the services which can be rendered by Philadelphia Legal Assistance Corporation, which does receive the federal money, sharply curtails the long-range impact of the program. I think it has a very real place in our society. The adversarial system almost requires it. It's hard to believe, in today's world, how you'd ever do without it.

R: I've been told that at some point during your efforts to establish legal services for the poor your life was threatened. Would you mind telling me about that?



K: Not in any serious way. Lots of anonymous phone calls. One of the most controversial cases we ever had, right at the very beginning, one of the lawyers without consulting anyone in the program filed a suit against the police commissioner Frank Rizzo. He was a very popular, cult figure among Philadelphia's white citizens, particularly. And very unhappily, very disliked by the nonwhites. He was aggressive and a very difficult person, very military figure, militant, military figure. And he had a tough police department that were riding a roughshod, and the suit infuriated Mr. Rizzo. He attacked the program. He attacked the program nationally by going to his friends in Congress, but I think it made a major change nonetheless, even though the suit was withdrawn. It made a major change on the way that the police acted in this city and the fact that they knew they had to answer to a court. It was a major change. It confronted the board with the tremendous impact, or problem, of weighing the freedom that a lawyer should have adequately to represent his client, on the one hand, versus doing things that were so abrasive and upsetting in the community that they could destroy the program. I don't know how you fix that line. I was never able to really figure out how to do it. They're still wrestling on that issue today, and will always wrestle with it. I think generally lawyers are more careful. They don't file a suit they don't think they can win. But the freedom of the lawyer is the key to the legal services program. If they can't truly represent the client using every legal device available then they're not getting real service. It also violates the rule of professional ethics to represent your client zealously.

R: What do you consider to be your most significant contribution to the legal profession or legal community?

K: Well, the legal services program was inside the Office of Economic Opportunity and as such was subject to tremendous pressures, particularly after the Kennedy regime. Politicians didn't like it, especially if they had been sued, and it seemed best to get it out without hurting the concept of federal funding, to get it as far out and away from political pressure as possible. So I was the chairman of the American Bar Association's Committee on Legal Services and Legal Aid and Indigent Defenders and so on, and one day I was sitting with Jerry Shestak, who later on became the head of the ABA, and we said why don't we try to get this thing turned into a corporation. So we raised some money, from some foundations, got a little of ABA money and hired a staff, a couple of lawyers, a man named Chuck Edson from Washington, and we researched the issue of what kind of separate corporations were operated by the government and how they were structured and drafted a piece of legislation which the ABA then recommended to Congress and it was passed. So, it was the first time I ever saw how legislation was created. From the inside.

R: In addition to your involvement with CLS, you're involved in various capacities with a number of community and non-profit organizations. Do you enjoy this work?

K: Yeah, I never worked for any organization that I didn't feel committed to. That includes the music and educational institutions, the University Museum. I'm still active in most of the organizations and boards that I once served on.

R: Your work and your achievements have been recognized in several ways, including being named an honorary fellow at Penn Law, receiving the Arthur Von Briesen Award, and being named the first recipient of the Philadelphia Bar Association's Award for services to the bar in organizing community and legal development. Do you remember any one of these honors with particular vividness?

K: I've been very fortunate in being recognized when a lot of people who served in my opinion as much as I did have not been. I think they're all great. I think the Penn Law School thing is very important to me. I thought that was a wonderful thing that I'm still very proud of.

R: Why did you decide not to become a public interest lawyer yourself?

K: Because I was having too much fun practicing law and I thought I was much more effective as a conservative from a conservative law firm, out speaking for the program instead of just a group of recognized radicals and liberal people and coming from a large conservative law firm which supported me in many times of terrible trouble. Lots of pressure was being put on me. This so-called conservative law firm was very, very helpful to me. That answers it.

R: I know that you've also been involved in efforts to reform the state's judicial disciplinary system and to bring about a non-elective, merit selection system for choosing judges in Pennsylvania. In 1988, you along with other prominent members of the Philadelphia Bar signed a letter asking the governor to act on these issues. Can you tell me a little bit about that?

K: You know, the judges, the selection of judges in the city of Philadelphia is a highly political thing. It's a plum awarded to political stalwarts, the faithful, board leaders, and it does not necessarily go to the best judges. How to beat that and how to create the alternative, which is called merit selection, is a highly controversial issue. It goes past the political issue. There's an undercurrent of populism in this country that doesn't want to see judges appointed. They want to see them elected and so you get around the circle and back into political action. The attempt to get good judges often founders on the political issues cause the political parties don't care. I mean, they know they have the power to put people into office. This was an attempt, which caused a lot of trouble, to make judgments as to who were the good lawyers that were candidates for judge. And then to go and support them and to raise money for their campaigns. Well, it sort of really shook up the system and it was very controversial. And it didn't really work. The machine politics here are too strong. Now there's talk again, I hear, to institute merit selection. I'll see, I'll believe it when I see it.

R: What plans do you have for the future?

K: Plans for the future? Not much, really. Maybe do a little writing. I maintain a position on several corporate boards and just last month resigned as chairman of the Philadelphia Legal Services Corporation after five years. But I felt it was time for younger people to have a chance to take leadership roles. Professor Lou Rulli has taken my place. I think he'll be perfect at the job. There's always a time to leave.

R: Finally, what advice would you give to law students or attorneys who are just beginning their legal careers?

K: I don't think that's a . . . that, that question is too broad. Uh, it depends what you want in life. If you want to make a lot of money, go and be a plaintiff's lawyer and be a corporate raider. If you just really value the profession and want to practice law and make a living, I think my best answer to you is that of John Adams, made back in the 1790's or something. He said that "A lawyer without public service has the biography of a millhorse." And I think that's probably true. You can work at your desk all your life until you die there. And no one except your good clients will recognize your passing unless you've done something else. And the feeling of having contributed and using the lawyer's skills. In other words, it's not like a lawyer being on the board of the Red Cross. He might do very good work. He might do all kinds of good things. But he's not using his skills. And to work in the Legal Services movement, one really uses his own skills. And I think that's extremely important.

R: Well, thank you again, Mr. Klaus, for your time. I've enjoyed it very much.

K: It's my pleasure. Thank you for being here.