

**IVI-IPO 2006 COOK COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT QUESTIONNAIRE – Section 1**  
**(Revised 1/5/06)**

DATE December 27, 2005 PARTY Democratic

CANDIDATE FOR The Honorable Judge Stephen A. Schiler VACANCY

NAME Judge Pamela E. Hill Veal

WEB SITE www.judgehillveal.com

CAMPAIGN ADDRESS PO Box #437100 Chicago, Illinois 60643-7110

CAMPAIGN PHONE 773-778-0889 FAX 773-233-6755

CAMPAIGN MANAGER Dr. Joan M. Hill

NUMBER OF PETITION SIGNATURES FILED approx. 14,000 by Dem. Party NUMBER REQUIRED 3500

Elective or appointive public and/or party offices previously held including dates.

Appointed to the Civil Service Board of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago from November, 1995 through December, 2004.

Other elective offices for which you have been a candidate. None

Principal business, educational, professional and civic activities of the past ten years.

Chicago State University – Assoc. Professor of Criminal Justice  
Teaching Introduction to Law, Criminal Law, Criminal Procedure, Trial Practice and Procedures and History of American Trials.  
Commenced teaching in this department in 1990 and currently on a public service leave of absence.

Private Practice – Primarily handled domestic relations cases through trial.  
Commenced my private practice in 1990.

Member – Chicago Conference of Black Lawyers (CCBL)  
Active member of CCBL since about 1990.

Chairperson – Inquiry Panel of the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission (ARDC).  
Heard various cases pertaining to attorneys and disciplinary proceedings. Initially a member and subsequently selected to chair the panel. Appointed in 1991/1992.

Chairperson – Civil Service Board of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago (MWRDGC). Heard various employment and employment-related cases pertaining to MWRDGC employees, evaluations, examinations, promotions, testing, personnel issues, etc. Initially a member and subsequently selected to chair the panel. Appointed in November of 1995.

Administrative Law Officer – Chicago Department of Administrative Hearings.  
Heard various cases pertaining to ordinance violations including, consumer, environmental, streets and sanitations, transportation, etc.

What subjects have you studied and what experience have you had which will be most helpful to you in the office you seek?

I have been a judge since December, 2004. Prior to my appointment, the quasi-judicial experience I gained at the MRWRDGC and the ARDC have helped me in my judicial position. I believe that all of my educational studies have helped me to become the judge that I am today. My psychology background, my counseling experience alone with my marketing communications skills have added to my knowledge and judicial ability.

Please detail your prior political activity, if any. Give positions held, dates, organizational memberships, role you played in political campaigns.

Periodic volunteer in the 17<sup>th</sup> ward.

As concisely as possible, state why you feel you should be endorsed over the other candidate(s). What goals for the office you seek are most important to you personally?

I was appointed by the Illinois Supreme Court to the vacancy for which I sit and for which I currently seek. I have the experience to remain in the position as well as the confidence that I will continue to administer justice in a fair, non-judgemental manner. I have integrity and will use common sense in helping litigants resolve their issues.

Please state any evaluation ratings you have ever received for any judicial office by any bar association. List the office and the date of the election for which the evaluation was made. Please use the following format:

<i>Date</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Bar Association</i>	<i>Rating</i>
04-21-03	Current	Asian American Bar Association	Recommended
03-28-03	Current	Black Women Lawyers Association	Recommended
04-01-03	Current	Chicago Council of Lawyers	Not Qualified
?	Current	Cook County Bar Association	Recommended
04-08-03	Current	Decalogue Society Of Lawyers	Recommended
04-17-03	Current	Hispanic Lawyers Association of Illinois	Recommended
03-24-03	Current	Illinois State Bar Assoc.	Recommended
03-25-03	Current	Lesbian and Gay Bar Assoc. of Illinois	Recommended
04-17-03	Current	Puerto Rican Bar Assoc.	Recommended
08-28-03 (inadvertently dated Aug. rather than April)	Current	Women's Bar Association Of Illinois	Recommended

(Note: I was interviewed prior to the appointment of my current position)

## IVI-IPO COOK COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT QUESTIONNAIRE – Section 2

In *Republican Party of Minnesota v. White*, 536 U.S. 765 (2002), the United States Supreme Court held that it violated the First Amendment to the United States Constitution for states to forbid judges and judicial candidates from “announcing” their positions on issues of interest to prospective voters. *See id.* at 788; *see also Buckley v. Illinois Judicial Inquiry Board*, 997 F.2d 224, 229 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993). It is IVI-IPO’s position that *White* created a “safe harbor” for judicial candidates to “announce” their views without running afoul of judicial canons, such as Illinois’s current Canon 67, that purport to restrict judicial candidates’ free speech rights.

Illinois’s Canon 67 A.(3)(d)(i) states that all judges and candidates shall not “make statements that commit or appear to commit the candidate with respect to cases, controversies, or issues within cases that are likely to come before the court.” IVI-IPO hereby expressly states that by answering the following questions we do not intend you to “make statements that commit or appear to commit [yourself] with respect to cases, controversies, or issues within cases that are likely to come before the court.” However, it is IVI-IPO’s position that in order for Canon 67 to survive constitutional scrutiny after *White* (at least “as applied”), it must permit judicial candidates to “announce” their positions on issues such as those the following questions present.

We have included this list of questions to assist us in determining whether to endorse your candidacy. Of course, you may answer or not answer the questions as you may choose. Although IVI-IPO strongly believes that “announcing” your answers to these questions without committing or appearing to commit yourself to ruling a certain way on them does not violate Canon 67, we recognize that the Illinois Judicial Ethics Committee has issued a different opinion. IVI-IPO disagrees with that opinion.<sup>1</sup> But if you are not comfortable answering the questions as posed, please respond as best as you can with an answer that can give us greater insight into who you are and how you feel personally about these issues. Any answer you are able to give will help us in our endorsement decision.

1. Without committing or appearing to commit yourself with respect to the issue of capital punishment that may come before you as a judge, please “announce” your position concerning the death penalty. First, irrespective of the current moratorium on carrying out the death penalty in Illinois, are you for or against the death penalty? Second, whether you are for or against the death penalty, please “announce” your reasons for being for it or against it, with particular reference to the four traditional goals of criminal punishment (deterrence, retribution, incapacitation, and rehabilitation), as well as any other reasons that you care to add.

I am personally against the death penalty. The death penalty has not been shown to deter criminal behavior. Retribution was the main reason for sentencing until the early 1920’s/1930’s when rehabilitation became the norm. Our prisons are not designed or promoted to rehabilitate an offender and assist them to become productive citizens. As for incapacitation, its objective is to recognize the potentially high-rate serious offender and differentiate him/her from a person who is less recidivist. In other words, is an offender sentenced because he/she deserved it based on the crime or is the offender sentenced in a particular manner in order to prevent any future crimes. Furthermore, this would allow for the community to allegedly protect itself from an offender if he/she attempted to matriculate within society. This form of selective incapacitation allows for an offender to be sentenced based on a wide range of variables in order to predict dangerousness. Considering all of these research-oriented factors, the death penalty would still fail to be equitably applied in this society.

---

<sup>1</sup> In particular, IVI-IPO vigorously disputes the opinion’s statement that it “defies credulity to suppose that [IVI-IPO] would have asked the Questions unless it believed the answers would have some bearing on how the candidates would rule on those legal issues.” Op. at 3. We most decidedly do not so believe. We are merely asking the questions to determine your political orientation in general, across a broad spectrum of issues, not to determine how you might rule on any given issue in any given case.

2. Without committing or appearing to commit yourself with respect to abortion issues that may come before you as a judge, please “announce” your position concerning the right of a woman to have an abortion. First, are you for it or against it? Second, whether you are for it or against it, please “announce” your reasons for being for it or against it.

I am personally pro-choice. Every woman has a right to choose what should or should not happen to her body including the decision to have a child or not to have a child. A woman should have and maintain the freedom to make decisions pertaining to any and all aspects of health care. I recall a book that indicated: “The real question is not how we can justify abortion, but how can we justify compulsory childbearing.” Currently, a woman’s right to an abortion is protected by the Constitution of the United States. This is and should be protected by the Fourteenth amendment.

3. Without committing or appearing to commit yourself with respect to the issue of mandatory minimum sentencing that may come before you as a judge, please “announce” your position concerning mandatory minimum sentencing. First, are you for it or against it? Second, whether you are for it or against it, please “announce” your reasons for being for it or against it.

I am personally against mandatory sentencing. Mandatory sentencing only views the criminal act, period. It fails to take into consideration other factors which may have lead to the behavior. The individual circumstances are ignored. In addition, it removes from the judge the ultimate decision to impose a sentence which, after taking reviewing other relevant factors, would allow for flexibility in sentencing.

4. Without committing or appearing to commit yourself with respect to the issue of treating juvenile criminal offenders as adults that may come before you as a judge, please “announce” your position concerning treating juvenile criminal offenders as adults. First, are you for it or against it? Second, whether you are for it or against it, please “announce” your reasons for being for it or against it.

I am personally against juveniles being treated like adults. By definition, juveniles are not adults. They fail to possess the necessary faculties to determine the consequence of their actions. It is my believe that this is an area where deterrence and rehabilitation treatment and techniques could be successful.

5. Without committing or appearing to commit yourself with respect to the issue of gay rights that may come before you as a judge, please “announce” your position concerning gay rights. Putting aside whether this is an issue for the legislature instead of the judiciary (since the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court seems to have done so), are you in favor of gay marriage? If not, are you in favor of civil unions instead?

I am personally for gay persons to have the same rights as any other human being. Lesbian and gay persons are human being. Therefore, one’s sexuality should not dictate whether various rights should or should not be accorded to a certain group. As for gay marriages, I am certainly in favor of two people who care and love for each other to live in a legally recognized relationship. Therefore, I am undoubtedly in favor of gay marriages. My preference is marriage because a civil union does not bestow upon the couple all of the legal and financial benefits of a marriage.

6. What do you believe are the major strengths and weaknesses of the Circuit Court? Would you change the manner in which the Circuit Court functions?

The court system is overloaded with cases. It is my opinion that a mechanism designed to identify “frivolous cases” should be re-assessed. Retiring judges could be used more efficiently as arbitrators, consultants and mediators. At this time I believe the court system is functioning at its best due to financial constraints.

7. How should the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court be chosen?

As currently in place: by one's peers.

8. How should judges be assigned to the various divisions of the Court? If you are elected, to what division would you like to be assigned and why?

Judges should be assigned to various divisions based on experience, expertise and ability. I am currently assigned to the Municipal Division and I am satisfied with my present division.

9. As a circuit court judge, how would you balance any moral or ethical/philosophical disagreements that you may have with any existing statutes or legal precedents?

It is my personal belief that my role as a judge is to fairly apply the law, its intent and/or to do what is right. Any moral or ethical/philosophical disagreements could be addressed through other avenues.

10. If a sitting judge were indicted, should the judge remain on the bench, resign or take a leave of absence? Please explain.

I personally believe that an indicted judge should take a leave of absence.