

>> OKAY.

THIS CASE IS THE IN REFERENCE TO AMENDMENTS TO THE FLORIDA RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION.

WHENEVER YOU'RE READY.

>> GOOD MORNING, MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT.

THIS IS OUR REGULAR CYCLE AMENDMENT PROPOSAL.

IT'S, IT CONTAIN AS LOT OF THINGS THAT ARE JUST NOTICED OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS WHERE THE RULES DON'T EXACTLY MATCH UP TO THE PRACTICE THAT EXISTS.

AND WE ARE ASKING TO CHANGE THE RULES TO CONFORM TO THE PRACTICE THAT NOT ONLY EXIST BUT SEEMS TO BE WORKING OKAY.

FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAVE A, WE HAVE, ONE OF THE RULES NOW SAYS, IF YOU WANT TO ADVANCE A RULES PROPOSAL, HAVE IT CONSIDERED BY ONE OF THE RULES COMMITTEES YOU NEED TO SEND IT TO THE CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT, WHO WOULD REFER IT OUT TO ONE OF THE COMMITTEES.

IN PRACTICE OF COURSE, IF YOU SEND SOMETHING TO THE CHAIR OF ONE OF COMMITTEES, GETS PUT ON THE COMMITTEE'S AGENDA, IT GETS ADDRESSED BY THE COMMITTEE WITHOUT GOING THROUGH THE CLERK. I IMAGINE THE CLERK WOULD BE WILLING TO PASS TO TOUCH ON EVERY SINGLE ONE OF THESE THINGS WHICH THE RULE SEEMS TO REQUIRE AND I DON'T THINK ANYBODY OBJECTED TO HAVING THE RULES COMMITTEES RECEIVE, THEN PROCESS, THE RULE PROPOSALS. THAT IS ONE OF THE CHANGES.

>> THIS IS LIKE THIS ISSUE OF, THERE IS SOME CONCERN THAT THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE WANTS TO BECOME THE SUPERPOWER ON THE RULES.

COULD YOU TELL ME, WHAT IS THE CURRENT NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS ON

THE RULES OF JUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION AND WHAT ARE
THEIR, HOW MANY JUDGES, LAWYERS,
ETCETERA?

WHAT IS, DO YOU KNOW?

>> I CAN'T GIVE YOU AN EXACT
NUMBER BUT FILLS A ROOM WITH
PEOPLE AND LESS THAN HALF JUDGES
I CAN TELL YOU THAT BECAUSE--

>> IS IT INTENDED TO BE, WHEN
THESE RULES COME UP, THEY'RE
REALLY, THERE ARE RULES ON
SPECIFIC AREAS, THEY'RE REALLY
SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTISE RULES.

SO I NEVER SAW THE RULES OF
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION
COMMITTEE AS REALLY HAVING THE
STAFF, THE EXPERTISE, TO BE ABLE
TO SAY OH, THIS RULE, THE FAMILY
LAW RULES COMMITTEE IS PROPOSING
CONFLICTS WITH THIS RULE OF, YOU
KNOW, THIS OTHER CIVIL RULE.

AND, IS THAT, ARE YOU INTENDING
TO TAKE THAT ON AS YOUR
RESPONSIBILITY, THAT YOU'RE
GOING TO MAKE SURE ALL THE RULES
THAT ARE IN THE THICK BOOK, ALL,
NONE OF THEM ARE IN CONFLICT?

>> THAT WOULD BE A PRETTY BIG
THING TO TAKE ON.

>> RIGHT, RIGHT.

>> AND SOMEBODY HAS TO, AT LEAST
TAKE ON THAT AT SOME LEVEL.

WE DON'T PROPOSE TO DO IT AS A
COMMITTEE COLLECTIVELY.

WHAT WE HAVE IS A LIAISON
SUBCOMMITTEE, AND MEMBERS OF THE
LIAISON SUBCOMMITTEE ARE
APPOINTED BY INDIVIDUAL RULES
COMMITTEES THEMSELVES.

THEY'RE THE ONES WHO SELECT
THOSE PEOPLE, NOT PRESIDENT OF
THE BAR, NOT CHAIR OF RJA
COMMITTEE.

ANY OF THESE KINDS OF PROPOSALS
THAT WOULD WORK UNDER THIS
PROCESS, WOULD GO THROUGH THAT
COMMITTEE FIRST, WHICH WOULD
HAVE AT LEAST ONE PERSON
REPRESENTATIVE OF SUBSTANTIVE

RULES COMMITTEE IN ORDER TO--
>> IT IS FALLIBLE, IT SEEMS TO ME.

AS MUCH AS THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE WANTS TO DO ITS JOB, WE'RE STILL TALKING ABOUT VOLUNTEERS AND YOU KNOW, I KNOW THAT OUR STAFF WORKS VERY HARD WHEN THEY SAY WHY DID THIS RULE GET SUBMITTED THIS WAY.

IS THERE A STAFF MEMBER AT THE FLORIDA BAR OR DO YOU NOT KNOW?

>> OH, I DO KNOW.

SORE TO--

>> HAS THE EXPERT TEASE TO REALLY LOOK AT ALL THE RULES, BE THE RULE GURU, MAYBE SURE THIS RULE BEING PROPOSED DOESN'T CONFLICT WITH ANOTHER RULE?

>> THE JOB WE TALKED ABOUT WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE IF WE DIDN'T HAVE QUALITY OF PEOPLE WE DO ON THE BAR STAFF.

CHRIS GODWIN IS OUR PRIMARY CAN'T AND HAS OTHER MEMBERS ON STAFF COLLECTIVELY PUT TOGETHER WE HOPE, EVERYTHING THAT NEEDS TO BE DONE BUT--

>> YOU DON'T SEE THEM AS BEING, GIVING YOU MORE-- I THINK THEIR CONCERN WAS, IT IS GIVING RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE SORT OF VETO POWER, SUPERPOWER, THAT IT WILL DELAY AN ALREADY-DELAYED PROCESS. COULD YOU ADDRESS THAT?

>> SURE, YEAH.

IF THE COURT THINKS THAT LANGUAGE WOULD GIVE THE RJA COMMITTEE VETO POWER, THE COURT SHOULD DISAPPROVE THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE JUST DOESN'T SAY THAT ANYWHERE IN THERE.

IT IS READ INFERENTIALLY. AND IF, ALL OF THE ARGUMENTS THAT I HEARD SO FAR, I WANT TO LET OTHER FOLKS SPEAK TO WHAT ARGUMENTS ARE, ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE ANSWER

THAT.

THOSE ARGUMENTS SEEM TO ME NOT FULLY APPRECIATE WE ALL WORK IN SERVICE OF THE SUPREME COURT. ALL WE CAN DO IS MAKE PROPOSALS. WE DON'T HAVE ANY POWER TO DO ANYTHING OR CERTAINLY VETO ANYTHING.

IF OUR COMMENT WAS WORTH CONSIDERING THE COURT WOULD CONSIDER IT APPROPRIATELY. IF NOT, THEN DISREGARD IT.

>> THE PROBLEM IS, THE COURT, WE GET RULES PROPOSALS.

IF WE THINK THERE IS AN AREA OF CONCERN WE'LL REFER IT.

OTHERWISE WE HEAR THIS WEEK USED TO BE, 20 YEARS AGO, LIKE EVERY RULE WOULD COME UP AND WE WOULD HAVE TO FIGURE OUT, IS THERE, IS THIS GOING TO COMPLICATE THINGS OR SIMPLIFY.

WE DON'T HAVE EXPERTISE IN THESE PARTICULAR AREAS.

SO WE DO HAVE TO RELY ON THE RULES COMMITTEE.

THE COURT CAN RAISE THESE CONCERNS BUT WE'RE REALLY RELY-- RELYING ON SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTISE.

WILL THIS RULE SOLVE A PROBLEM OR CREATE ANOTHER PROBLEM, RIGHT.

>> OF COURSE.

WE'RE PROPOSING TO DO IS INCREASE LINES OF COMMUNICATION SO THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE IS IN THE POSITION TO LOOK AT THESE OTHER RULES PROPOSALS.

SEE WHETHER IT IMPACTS OTHER COMMITTEES RULE SETS.

>> LET ME ASK YOU, RIGHT NOW IT GOES, A RULE IS PROPOSED.

BEFORE THE PETITION IS FILED, DOES THE COMMITTEE SEND IT TO YOU?

AT THE COMMITTEE?

IN OTHER WORDS, BEFORE A PETITION'S FILED, RULES OF

JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION IS NOTIFIED?

>> NOWADAYS, THAT DOES HAPPEN IN PRACTICE.

I DON'T KNOW IT IS REQUIRED BY THE RULE BUT WE DO GET IT.

>> THAT IS WHEN INPUT SHOULD BE GIVEN, RIGHT?

>> THAT IS WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING.

>> IT ONLY NEEDS TO GO TO THIS, IF IT IS GOING TO LIAISON TO THE COMMITTEE IS ON THE COMMITTEE, WHO YOU IS THAT HELPING THE PROCESS?

YOU SAID IT WOULD GO TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE.

EVERYTHING COMES TO THE COMMITTEE GETS REFERRED TO A SUBCOMMITTEE.

THIS SUBCOMMITTEE IS MADE UP OF MEMBERS DESIGNATED BY THE OTHER COMMITTEES.

>> WHAT SEEMS TO ME, PRESENTLY WHAT HAPPENS THE PROPOSED RULES ARE SENT TO YOUR COMMITTEE, THE RULES OF JUDICIAL

ADMINISTRATION, AND YOU'RE SUPPOSED TO, YOUR COMMITTEE IS SUPPOSED TO LOOK AT THEM AND POSSIBLY SEND THEM TO ANY OTHER COMMITTEE THEY MIGHT AFFECT.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM WITH THAT KIND OF PROCEDURE?

WHY DO WE NEED YOUR COMMITTEE TO NOW LOOK AT THEM AND POSSIBLY MAKE PROPOSALS ALSO?

OR ADVOCATE FOR CHANGES OUTSIDE OF THE COMMENT PROCESS THAT ANYBODY CAN GO THROUGH?

>> THE OPERATING ASSUMPTION, I REALLY WAS THINKING ABOUT IT LAST NIGHT, I CAN'T REALLY PINPOINT THE SOURCE OF THE OPERATING ASSUMPTION.

BUT THE OPERATING ASSUMPTION THAT WAS PRESENTED YEARS AGO WHEN I FIRST STARTED WITH THIS COMMITTEE WAS THE COURT WAS INTERESTED IN SEEING A MORE ROBUST COORDINATION PROCESS

HAPPENING BEFORE THESE RULES GOT UP TO THIS POINT WHERE PEOPLE WOULD ARGUE ABOUT THEM, ANY POTENTIAL CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE RULES AND THINGS LIKE THAT. ONE THING I WANT TO MENTION THOUGH, WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT IS REALLY ONLY CONSIDERING WHETHER A RULE IS SOMETHING A GENERAL COMMON APPLICATION RULE, VERSUS A QUESTION WHETHER, WE'RE NOT TRYING TO EXERCISE INDIVIDUAL-- I'M SORRY?

>> ISN'T THE COORDINATION THE PART WHERE YOU WOULD, YOUR COMMITTEE WOULD, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE FAMILY LAW COMMITTEE PROPOSED THINGS AND YOU SEE THAT THEY MIGHT ALSO AFFECT JUVENILE, YOU WOULD SEND THOSE TO THE JUVENILES RULES COMMITTEE. THAT IS WHERE THE COORDINATION WOULD THEN START.

THE JUVENILES RULES COMMITTEE WOULD OBVIOUSLY GET WITH THE FAMILY LAW COMMITTEE, THEN THEY SEE HOW THAT PROPOSED RULE WOULD AFFECT BOTH OF THEM.

I CAN UNDERSTAND THAT KIND OF PROCESS BUT THE NEXT STEP WITH YOUR COMMITTEE ALSO DOING SOME KIND OF A LOOK AT IT TO SUBSTANTIVELY IS THE PART THAT I'M NOT REALLY SURE ABOUT.

SO WHY WOULD YOUR COMMITTEE EVEN WANT TO TAKE ON THAT KIND OF OBLIGATION?

>> THAT'S SUCH A GOOD QUESTION THAT I DON'T HAVE AN ANSWER FOR. IT IS AS JUSTICE PARIENTE POINTED OUT, IT IS TAKING ON A REALLY BIG JOB IN A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE NOT FUNDED RIGHT? OUR WORK IS DONE BY VOLUNTEERS WHO CONTRIBUTE THEIR VERY VALUABLE TIME.

WHEN THINGS ARE DONE BY COMMITTEE, IT IS A FALLIBLE PROCESS.

>> DID YOU HAVE A QUESTION?

>> ONE OF THE JUSTIFICATIONS FROM YOUR COMMITTEE WAS THAT THIS WOULD SPEED UP OR BRING FORWARD THE TIME WHICH THIS COORDINATION WOULD HAPPEN BUT UNDER THE CURRENT RULE EACH COMMITTEE IS TO PROVIDE A COPY OF ANY PROPOSED RULE CHANGE WITHIN 30 DAYS AFTER THEY VOTE TO RECOMMEND IT.

THAT IS THE SAME PROVISION IN THE REVISED RULE.

I'M STRUGGLING TO UNDERSTAND WHY THE REVISIONS WOULD, WOULD BRING FORWARD OR MAKE HAPPEN FASTER THE COORDINATION THAT YOU ALREADY DO?

>> I DON'T THINK IT WOULD.

>> OKAY.

>> I THINK WHAT THE BENEFIT OF THIS IS, IT WOULD GET US, VARIOUS COMMITTEES TALK TO EACH OTHER AND SOME THINGS THAT OTHERWISE MIGHT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED AS CONTROVERSIES TO THE COURT WOULDN'T BE BECAUSE WE WOULD BE ABLE TO WORK THEM OUT AND REACH A SATISFACTORY SOLUTION BEFORE IT REACH THIS IS LEVEL.

>> I MEAN, SO REALLY ALL THIS PROPOSAL DOES IS GIVE YOU, YOUR COMMITTEE, AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE ITS OWN HEARING AND SLOW THE PROCESS DOWN IF IT WANTS TO IN ORDER TO PROVIDE A SPECIAL COMMENT?

>> THAT'S FAIR TO SAY. THE ONLY THING I WOULD--

>> I GUESS WHY COULDN'T, SO I MEAN IT REALLY DOESN'T AFFECT OR CHANGE THE COORDINATION PROCESS AT ALL.

IT WOULD CONTINUE TO HAPPEN THE WAY IT HAPPENS.

>> BASICALLY THAT IS CORRECT. IF THE RJA COMMITTEE THOUGHT IT NECESSARY TO MAKE COMMENT ABOUT APPLICABILITY OF THAT RULE OR OTHER RULES, THE OTHER RULES

COMMITTEE WOULD HAVE TO INCLUDE THE RJA'S COMMENT.

OF COURSE, AS YOU SAID, YOUR LIAISON COMMITTEE HAS SOMEONE ON IT FROM EVERY COMMITTEE, AND IT WAS JUST A REGULAR PRACTICE THAT WHEN SOMETHING CAME UP IN OUR COMMITTEE, THE LIAISON WOULD SAY, WELL, I THINK THAT HAS GENERAL APPLICABILITY.

LET ME TALK TO THE RJA COMMITTEE, LET'S COME BACK TO THIS.

THAT SEEMED TO BE HAPPENING. HAS THAT STOPPED?

>> NO, I THINK IT DOES HAPPEN. AND I THINK IN THE MAJORITY OF CASES NOW WHEN IT HAPPENS, THE LIAISON COMMITTEE IS THE LAST STEP.

THEY SAY, NO, THIS ISN'T SOMETHING RJA NEEDS TO LOOK AT, AND THE REST OF THE COMMITTEE DOESN'T SEE ANYTHING FURTHER.

>> OKAY.

>> YOU'RE DEEP INTO YOUR REBUTTAL TIME.

YOU'RE WELCOME TO USE IT IF YOU WANT TO.

>> I'LL SIT DOWN NOW.

[LAUGHTER]

>> GOOD MORNING, MR. CHIEF JUSTICE.

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, I'M CAROLINE BLACK SIKORKSE, AND I AM APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE FAMILY RULES COMMITTEE AND THE JUVENILE COURT RULES COMMITTEE, AND I'M ALSO A LIAISON TO THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE.

DUE TO A FLIGHT CANCELLATION CAUSED BY BAD WEATHER, MR. JON SCUDERI WILL NOT BE ABLE TO BE HERE TODAY, AND HIS TWO MINUTES WILL BE CEDED TO MR. HALL. THE SEVEN RULES COMMITTEES THAT PREPARED COMMENTS TO THE PROPOSED RULE OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION 2.140 JOINED

TOGETHER IN CONCERN REGARDING THE ADDITION OF THE NEW LANGUAGE TO 2.140A6 BECAUSE THERE'S NO REAL NECESSITY FOR THE LANGUAGE IN LIGHT OF THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGES IN A5 AND A4 BECAUSE THERE IS THE POTENTIAL FOR DELAY IN AN ALREADY-CUMBERSOME PROCESS AND BECAUSE THE NEW LANGUAGE DOES CREATE AN ADDITIONAL LEVEL OF AUTHORITY FOR THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE IN AN AREA IN WHICH THEY A MAY NOT HAVE THE BACKGROUND AND EXPERTISE NECESSARY--

>> SO WHAT SPECIFICALLY IS THAT SECTION YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT?

>> A6.

>> AND WHAT DOES A6 PROVIDE?

>> A6 PROVIDES THAT THE 30 DAYS' FORMAL RESPONSE, THAT THE RJAC WILL BE ALLOWED TO POST A FORMAL RESPONSE 30 DAYS AFTER THE NEXT REGULARLY-SCHEDULED MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE.

SO WHAT'S IMPORTANT IN LEARNING HOW THAT CREATES A DELAY IS TO UNDERSTAND THE CYCLE.

AND THE CYCLE OF THE RULE, THE REGULAR CYCLE IT'S THREE YEARS.

SO IF THE FAMILY LAW RULES COMMITTEE, FOR EXAMPLE, WANTS TO PROPOSE A RULE, THEY REALLY NEED TO HAVE THEIR ACT TOGETHER AND ALL PUT-- ALL THE COMMITTEES HAVE ALL THEIR INPUT BY JANUARY PRECEDING THE DEADLINE FOR THE RULE TO BE FINALIZED.

SO IN THE JANUARY MEETING OF THE FLORIDA BAR, THE RULES COMMITTEE FINALLY APPROVES ITS RULE, AND THEN THEY SEND IT TO THE RJAC RULE-- THE COMMITTEE.

AND AT THAT POINT IN TIME, THEIR NEXT REGULARLY-SCHEDULED MEETING IS JUNE.

SO IF YOU HAVE BEEN WORKING FOR TWO FULL YEARS ON A PARTICULAR RULE AND IN JANUARY YOU APPROVE

IT AND THEN YOU SEND IT TO
RJA-- AND, BY THE WAY, RJA'S
BEEN NOTIFIED ALL ALONG IN THAT
TWO-AND-A-HALF YEAR PROCESS.
AND THEIR NEW RULE PROPOSAL SAYS
WE ALL MUST, ALL RULES
COMMITTEES MUST EXCHANGE AGENDAS
AND MINUTES.

SO THEY'VE BEEN ADVISED, AND
THEY'VE PROVIDED INPUT.
AND SO NOW HERE WE ARE IN
JANUARY, AND WE'VE APPROVED OUR
FINAL RULE AND WE WANT TO SUBMIT
IT.

WELL, THEY NOW GET UNTIL JUNE,
THEIR NEXT REGULARLY-SCHEDULED
MEETING, TO PROVIDE THEIR FORMAL
RESPONSE WHICH, IF WE HAVE ALL
THESE PUBLICATIONS REQUIREMENTS
AND ALL THESE REPORTING
REQUIREMENTS, NOW WE'RE INTO THE
NEXT CYCLE FOR THAT RULE TO BE
IMPLEMENTED AND PUT BEFORE THIS
COURT FOR CONSIDERATION.

SO THERE IS A POTENTIAL FOR
DELAY.

AND BY THE WAY, THERE ARE 45
MEMBERS OF THE RJAC.

AND AS A LIAISON, WE ABSOLUTELY
DO INVOLVE THE RJAC IN EVERY
DISCUSSION THAT WE THINK HAS
SOME PERTINENCE OR RELEVANCE TO
OUR PARTICULAR RULES COMMITTEES.

>> WOULDN'T A BETTER PROCESS
SIMPLY BE THAT OUR, THE RULES OF
JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION WOULD
HAVE THE RIGHT TO COMMENT JUST
LIKE ANY OTHER COMMITTEE, PERSON
OR ANYTHING ELSE, THEY HAVE THE
RIGHT TO COMMENT ON WHATEVER
YOU'RE PROPOSE-- THEY GET THEM
AND THEY DO SEND THEM OFF TO
SOME OTHER COMMITTEE IF THEY
THINK IT MIGHT AFFECT THAT
COMMITTEE.

BUT AT THE SAME TIME, YOU
PUBLISH THEM, AND THEY GET TO
COMMENT JUST LIKE ANYONE ELSE
WOULD GET TO COMMENT.

>> THAT'S RIGHT.

IF YOU TOOK OUT THAT REQUIREMENT THAT THEY'VE ADDED, THE 30-DAY FORMAL RESPONSE, THEY STILL HAVE THE ABILITY TO COMMENT JUST LIKE EVERYBODY ELSE.

AND IT'S REQUIRED BY THE RULES THAT ARE CURRENTLY WRITTEN. THERE'S NO NEED FOR AN AMENDMENT TO ADD THIS REQUIREMENT, ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT OF A 30-DAY FORMAL RESPONSE.

SO THE POTENTIAL FOR DELAY REGARDING THE CYCLE ALSO HAS AN IMPACT FOR OUT-OF-CYCLE REPORTS.

>> EXCUSE ME.

YOUR TIME IS-- YOU'RE WAY OVER YOUR TIME.

>> OH, THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

>> THE RED LIGHT MEANS YOU'RE OVER.

>> IT WENT OVER.

THANK YOU.

>> MORNING.

MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, MY NAME IS JOEL SILVERSHEIN.

I AM THE CHAIR OF THE CRIMINAL LAW SECTION OF THE FLORIDA BAR. THE CRIMINAL LAW SECTION IS COMPRISED OF OVER 2400 LAWYERS WHO CONCENTRATE IN THE AREA OF CRIMINAL LAW INCLUDING LAW PROFESSORS, PROSECUTORS, PUBLIC DEFENDERS, ATTORNEYS GENERAL AND JUDGES.

ALL THE PRACTICE IN BOTH THE STATE AND FEDERAL SYSTEM.

OUR 31-MEMBER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL IS MADE UP OF MANY EXPERIENCED PEOPLE, MANY WHO HAVE SERVED--

>> ARE YOU FOR OR AGAINST-- WE KNOW WHO YOU ARE.

[LAUGHTER]

ARE YOU FOR OR AGAINST THIS?

>> WE ARE AGAINST THIS ADOPTION OF THE RULE.

AND I WILL SAY THAT WE HAVE HAD OUR MEMBERS OF OUR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL HAVE SERVED ON APPELLATE--

>> WHEN I, I THINK IF ANYONE WAS

HEARING IN THAT WASN'T INSIDE
BASEBALL, THEY'D BE WONDERING
HOW THE RULES PROCESS WHICH IS
SUPPOSED TO HELP LAWYERS AND
LITIGANTS CAN BE SO CUMBERSOME
AND CAUSE SUCH CONSTERNATION
AMONG THE VARIOUS COMMITTEES.
AND I THINK THAT THE GOOD PART
IS THIS, IS THAT IF THERE'S
COMMUNICATION, WE TALKED ABOUT
HOW THERE'S NOW
VIDEOCONFERENCING AND E-MAILS.
I DON'T GET WHY IF THERE'S A
RULE THAT'S BEING PROPOSED OF
CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, YOU KNOW, AN
E-MAIL DOESN'T GO TO WHOEVER THE
LIAISON OR THE RULE OF JUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION, HERE'S WHAT
WE'RE CONSIDERING, DO YOU HAVE
ANY INPUT.

WHY DO THEY HAVE TO WAIT SIX--
I MEAN, THIS IS SORT OF FOR ALL
OF YOU.

WHY IS IT SO, LIKE, WE'VE GOT TO
WAIT FOR SIX MONTHS TO DISCUSS
AN ISSUE THAT MAY BE VERY SIMPLE
TO RESOLVE?

>> AND I AGREE.

AS FAR AS RULES COMMITTEE, AND
I'VE SERVED 27 YEARS ON RULES
COMMITTEES.

I'VE CHAIRED ON TWO SEPARATE
OCCASIONS.

I CAN TELL YOU THAT THE
THREE-YEAR PERIOD GOES BY VERY,
VERY QUICKLY, AND IT'S VERY--
IF YOU'RE LUCKY.

BECAUSE RULES DON'T HAVE TO COME
FROM WITHIN THE COMMITTEE, THEY
CAN COME FROM ANY SOURCE.

THEY, THAT THE SAUSAGE-MAKING
PROCESS-- YOU'RE LUCKY IF YOU
GET A YEAR TO A YEAR AND A HALF
TO GET A RULE OUT OF COMMITTEE
AS WELL.

>> DO YOU THINK THESE COMMITTEES
ARE TOO BIG?

>> NO.

>> TOO MANY PEOPLE?

>> NO.

>> IS THAT THE CAUSE OF THE PROBLEM?

>> WE HAVE A BIG STATE. HOW LAW IS PRACTICED IN NORTH FLORIDA IS DIFFERENT-- I COME FROM A COUNTY CIRCUIT JUST LIKE YOU DID, JUSTICE LABARGA. BUT HOW LAW'S PRACTICED IN BROWARD AND PALM BEACH AND DADE COUNTY IS DIFFERENT THAN WHAT MIGHT BE PRACTICED IN THE THIRD CIRCUIT WHERE YOU HAVE SEVEN COUNTIES AND AN AREA LARGER THAN THE STATE OF DELAWARE. AND THAT'S-- YOU HAVE TO TAKE EVERYTHING INTO CONSIDERATION. YOU HAVE TO TAKE IDEAS FROM MANY DIFFERENT CONSIDERATIONS. ON OUR SECTION WE HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE PROFESSORS, PEOPLE WHO ARE--

>> I DON'T THINK OUR CHIEF IS SUGGESTING THAT THE NUMBER ISSUE SHOULD BE USED TO DISCRIMINATE AGAINST SOME PART OF THE STATE. I THINK WHAT HE'S SAYING IS, AND I THINK IT'S SOMETHING THAT THE COURT HAS EXPERIENCED OVER THE YEARS, IS THAT THE COMMITTEE OPERATION BECOMES UNWIELDY. I MEAN, YOU COULD HAVE-- YOU SAY YOU HAVE 45 MEMBERS. THAT'S A PRETTY LARGE GROUP. I MEAN, YOU KNOW, MAKE A ZEBRA LOOK LIKE A THOROUGHBRED OR SOMETHING WITH A COMMITTEE LIKE THAT.

>> RIGHT.

>> THAT'S-- HIS QUESTION IS GOING TO MAKING THESE THINGS WORK, I THINK, IS WHAT-- HE WASN'T TRYING TO DISCRIMINATE. WHAT I'M SAYING, SO WHY, WHY IS A 45-MEMBER COMMITTEE A GOOD, WORKABLE NUMBER, AND WHY SHOULD WE NOT CONSIDER 15, 20?

>> YEAH.

>> BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO HAVE PEOPLE'S IDEAS COME IN, AND YOU HAVE TO UNDERSTAND OTHER

PEOPLE'S ABILITIES AND HOW THE PRACTICE IS RUN IN DIFFERENT PLACES.

TALKING ABOUT THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION--

>> THE SUPREME COURT IS IN CHARGE PRETTY MUCH OF THE BAR, AND THERE'S SEVEN OF US. AND THERE'S ONE OF US FROM EACH DCA DISTRICT REPRESENTING A PART OF THE STATE.

>> CORRECT.

>> AND YET WE DO THE ENTIRE STATE.

WHY DO YOU NEED 45 PEOPLE TO DO THAT?

I MEAN, YOU KNOW?

>> WELL, THAT'S-- THAT'LL BE UP TO THE COURT IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE BAR PRESIDENT--

>> WELL, I'M ASKING YOU. IS THAT CAUSING THE PROBLEM, SCHEDULING THESE THINGS FOR 45 PEOPLE?

>> WELL, WE DO VERY WELL WITH 30 PEOPLE ON OUR EXECUTIVE COUNCIL. IT DEPENDS ON THE RULES.

SOME RULE SETS ARE BIGGER AND MORE, HAVE MORE APPLICATION--

>> BUT WE KNOW, THOUGH, LIKE CRIMINAL, YOU KNOW, THERE HAS TO BE HALF PROSECUTORS, HALF DEFENSE LAWYERS.

OR CIVIL-- BUT THIS IS FOR ANOTHER DAY.

I THINK THAT WE ARE SEEING WITH THIS IN THIS MODERN AGE WITH 100,000 LAWYERS THAT MAYBE THE RULES PROCESS FROM START TO FINISH NEEDS TO BE REVAMPED.

AND THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE STILL SERVES A VERY VALUABLE PURPOSE, SO WE WANT TO MAKE SURE THEY'RE NOT THE, YOU KNOW, THEY'RE TRYING TO DO SOMETHING THAT WOULD HELP TO MAKE SURE THAT EVERYTHING'S COORDINATED.

WE'LL JUST HAVE TO DO IT IN THE SAME WAY THAT WON'T DELAY.

>> RIGHT.

AND THAT IS OUR COMMENT IN
ADOPTING THE APPELLATE RULES.
WE'RE CONCERNED THAT THE
ADOPTION OF THIS RULE WOULD
UNDULY DELAY AN ALREADY VERY
TIGHT PROCESS.

AND WE WOULD ASK THAT THE COURT
NOT ADOPT 2.140A6 AS PROPOSED BY
THE RULES OF JUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION.

>> THANK YOU.

>> THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, MY
NAME IS TOM HALL.

I'M AN ATTORNEY HERE IN
TALLAHASSEE, BUT I'M HERE TODAY
IN MY ROLE AS VICE CHAIR OF THE
APPELLATE RULES COMMITTEE.

I'M ALSO SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF
CRIMINAL--

>> LET ME ASK YOU IN YOUR ROLE
AS THE FORMER CLERK OF THE
COURT.

>> OKAY.

>> JUDGE STEVENS STARTED OUT BY
SAYING SOMEHOW THE CLERK GETS
THIS, AND THE CLERK HAS TO
DECIDE WHO IT GETS SENT TO.
WAS THAT PROCESS-- DID YOU FIND
THAT TO BE EITHER REALLY NOT
SOMETHING THAT WAS IN YOUR
DOMAIN, OR MAYBE THE SUPREME
COURT CLERK DOESN'T NEED TO BE
INVOLVED IN WHO GETS SENT?
BECAUSE THAT, TO ME, THE
MECHANICS OF GETTING IT
SOMEPLACE SEEMS TO BE ONE OF THE
ISSUES THAT IS BEING BROUGHT UP.

>> IT WAS A PRETTY PERFUNCTORY
THING IN THE CLERK'S OFFICE AT
THE TIME.

ANYTIME WE GOT A LETTER FROM ANY
ATTORNEY, WE HAD A STANDARD
LETTER THAT SAID PURSUANT TO
RULE 2.135 WE GOT THIS LETTER,
WE'RE REFERRING IT TO YOUR
COMMITTEE.

>> SO THAT WOULD JUST BE FOR
THIRD-PARTY REFERRALS, SO TO

SPEAK.

>> PEOPLE WHO DON'T KNOW TO TAKE IT TO THE RULES COMMITTEE, YES. I THINK IN PRACTICE MOST RULES COMMITTEES-- LIKE APPELLATE, I KNOW-- ANYTIME A LAWYER WRITES A THING AND SAYS I'VE GOT A PROBLEM, WE TAKE IT UP.

THE ONLY PROBLEM I PARTICULARLY SEE WITH NOT HAVING IT GO THROUGH THE CLERK-- ALTHOUGH I DON'T OBJECT TO THAT PARTICULAR CHANGE-- IS WHEN IT CAME TO THE COURT THROUGH THAT REFERRAL, YOU GET A LETTER BACK SAYING WE DECIDED NOT TO DO ANYTHING.

SO YOU KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO IT.

>> THAT'S A DIFFERENT ISSUE.

>> RIGHT.

>> THAT'S NOT THE-- SO WHAT ABOUT, THE CLERK DIDN'T DO ANYTHING WITH THE RULES OF JUDICIAL, THEY WEREN'T THE ONES TO SAY THIS SHOULD BE COORDINATED?

>> NO.

>> OKAY.

>> THE CLERK'S OFFICE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT. OVERALL, WE MADE THREE POINTS IN OUR THING, AND I WANT TO GO OVER THOSE AGAIN, BUT I THINK THE COURT REALLY HAS SORT OF HIT ON THIS ALREADY.

WE THINK THIS IS A SOLUTION IN SEARCH OF A PROBLEM.

WE THINK THAT WHAT'S HAPPENING NOW ON THAT COMMITTEE IS ACTUALLY WORKING.

IN ANSWER TO JUSTICE LAWSON'S QUESTION, AT ONE POINT THE LIAISON COMMITTEE SORT OF FELL INTO DISUSE.

AND SO THAT WAS ACTUALLY NOT BEING DONE.

AND I THINK THIS WHOLE RULE SPRUNG UP DURING THAT TIME.

WHAT HAPPENS NOW, AND I'M ON THIS LIAISON COMMITTEE BECAUSE I'M ALSO A MEMBER OF THE RULES

OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION
COMMITTEE, AND I'M NOT A
LIAISON.

I'M NOT APPELLATES REP, BUT THEY
HAVE THOSE REPS AND OTHER
PEOPLE, AND I'M ON THAT.

AND WE GET THOSE ALL THE TIME
WHERE THEY PASS THAT WE LOOK AT
IT.

WE SAY, HEY, YOU KNOW, YOU'VE
GOT A CIVIL RULE HERE YOU'RE
GOING TO ADOPT OR--
PARTICULARLY GOES THE OTHER WAY.
WE'VE GOT A PROBATE RULE WE'RE
GOING TO ADOPT, AND IT LOOKS
LIKE THIS MIGHT CONFLICT WITH
CIVIL.

AND WE SEND IT TO THOSE TWO
COMMITTEES, AND THEY WORK IT
OUT, AND WE FIND OUT WHAT
HAPPENS TO IT.

>> NOW, DO YOU HAVE TO DO
THAT-- YOU DO THAT ONCE EVERY
SIX MONTHS?

>> NO.

YOU DO IT EVERY TIME YOU GET IT,
BECAUSE THE INDIVIDUAL LIAISONS
REPORT SORT OF--

>> YOU DO IT INFORMALLY--

>> YOU DO IT INFORMALLY,
ABSOLUTELY.

>> YOU ACTUALLY USE E-MAIL--

>> RIGHT.

>>-- AND MAYBE SOMETIMES PICK
UP THE PHONE?

>> RIGHT.

ABSOLUTELY, THAT'S WHAT HAPPENS.
AND YOU ASKED THE QUESTION,
JUSTICE PARIENTE, ABOUT HOW MANY
PEOPLE THERE ARE.

THERE ARE 45 PEOPLE ON THE
COMMITTEE WITH ASSISTANCE OF BAR
STAFF.

I WENT THROUGH IT.

OUT OF THOSE 45, 23 PRACTICE
CIVIL LAW.

THERE'S ONE TRAFFIC PERSON, ONE
PROBATE, ONE SMALL CLAIMS.

AND I THINK IF THERE'S A PROBLEM
IN TERMS OF THAT, THE VETTING OF

THOSE RULES IF THIS COMMITTEE GETS THIS GENERAL, COMMON APPLICATION THING THAT THEY HAVE, IT'S NOT BALANCED. IT DOESN'T HAVE THE REPRESENTATION YOU NEED--

>> WELL, MAYBE THAT'S WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE.

>> WELL, THAT'S ONE OF OUR ALTERNATIVE SUGGESTIONS IN OUR THING, IS THAT THE STRUCTURE OF THE COMMITTEE NEEDS TO CHANGE. BUT I THINK THE CASE YOU HAD BEFORE IS A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF WHAT THE COMMITTEES FEAR. RJA DECIDED THERE NEEDED TO BE ONE RULE FOR HOW ATTORNEYS GET IN AND OUT OF CASES. AND THEY TOOK IT UP TO BE A RULE THAT WOULD APPLY ACROSS THE BOARD.

AND AS I THINK WE JUST SAW IN THE ARGUMENT THERE, IT DOESN'T REALLY WORK.

AND SO THERE WAS A LOT OF THINGS THAT WENT BACK AND FORTH ABOUT DON'T MAKE THIS APPLY TO OUR COMMITTEE, YOU KNOW? THEY WENT BACK AND FORTH FOR A WHOLE TIME.

I THINK THAT A LOT OF THOSE RULES WOULD BE-- AND THAT PARTICULAR RULE, I THINK, WOULD BE MUCH BETTER SERVED, AS JUSTICE POLSTON, SAID BY HAVING INDIVIDUAL RULES ABOUT HOW YOU DO THAT.

NOW-- AND THAT'S A PROBLEM YOU HAVE RIGHT NOW.

WHEN YOU PRACTICE LAWS IN THIS STATE, YOU'VE GOT A PROBATE CASE YOU'RE GOING TO GET INTO, YOU'VE GOT TO NOT ONLY KNOW THE PROBATE RULES, YOU'VE GOT TO KNOW THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION.

TWO SETS OF RULES.

AND IT'S TOUGH TO KEEP TRACK--

>> WELL, THE RULES, THE IDEA WAS YOU LOOK TO ONE PLACE.

YOU HAVE THE FLORIDA BAR RULES,
RIGHT?

IT'S NOT WHETHER YOU'RE A CIVIL
OR CRIMINAL ATTORNEY--

>> RIGHT.

>> YOU KNOW WHAT YOUR RULES ARE.
SO THE RULES OF JUDICIAL
ADMINISTRATION, I THOUGHT, HERE
ARE RULES OF GENERAL
APPLICABILITY.

AND IF IT'S-- AND I STILL, I
DON'T WANT MS. BORMAN TO FEEL
LIKE ALL OF HER EFFORTS WERE IN
VAIN.

I THINK THE ATTEMPT, BECAUSE OF
E-FILING, TO BE UNIFORM WAS A
VALIANT ATTEMPT.

I MEAN, WE DON'T WANT TO JUST--

>> THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT
UNIFORMITY, UNIFORMITY HELPS
WHEN YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT DOING
THINGS ELECTRONICALLY.

BECAUSE IF YOU'RE GOING TO GO
THROUGH COMPUTERS, THEY'VE GOT
TO BE PROGRAMMED, AND THE MORE
UNIFORM THEY ARE, THE LESS
PROGRAMMING THAT HAS TO TAKE
PLACE.

BUT THE RULES COMMITTEE
REALLY-- WHAT WE FEAR IS NOT SO
MUCH THIS REVIEW, BUT I THINK WE
FEAR MORE THIS RULE THAT WOULD
APPLY ACROSS THE BOARD.

>> I GUESS WHAT I ALWAYS THINK
THOUGH-- SO YOU WOULD SAY LEAVE
IT THE WAY IT IS.

>> I WOULD ABSOLUTELY SAY THAT.

>> OKAY.

THE MYOPIA THAT COMES FROM A
SPECIFIC PRACTICE AREA.

YOU KNOW, I WAS GLAD TO SEE
SOMEBODY REPRESENTING BOTH
FAMILY AND JUVENILE.

AND I WROTE A NOTE BECAUSE IN
PLACES WE'RE TRYING TO LOOK AT
THE WHOLE CHILD, RIGHT, AND THIS
THESE BE UNIFIED.

>> RIGHT.

>> WE HAVE JUVENILE, OF COURSE,
DELINQUENCY BEING VERY DIFFERENT

THAN JUVENILE DEPENDENCY, THEY JUST BOTH HAPPEN TO HAVE THE WORD "JUVENILE" IN THEM.

>> RIGHT.

>> BUT THE PRACTICES ARE VERY DIFFERENT AND THE CONSIDERATIONS.

SO WE'VE GOT TO LOOK AT THIS IN A MORE GLOBAL SENSE.

>> I THINK YOU DO HAVE TO LOOK AT IT IN A MORE GLOBAL SENSE, AND I THINK WHAT I'M SAYING RIGHT NOW IS I THINK THAT IS ACTUALLY HAPPENING.

I KNOW I'M ON APPELLATE.

WE INTERACT WITH THE OTHER RULES COMMITTEES ALL THE TIME BECAUSE WE RECOGNIZE THAT WHAT HAPPENS IN THOSE RULES COMMITTEES AFFECTS APPELLATE.

SO WE HAVE INTERACTION ALL THE TIME WITH THOSE OTHER RULES COMMITTEES.

AND ALMOST ALWAYS WE WORK IT OUT.

THEY MAKE A TWEAK TO THEIR RULE OR WE MAKE A TWEAK OUR RULE.

THAT'S WHAT'S HAPPENING.

BUT I WOULD LIKE TO GIVE ONE EXAMPLE, AND I DON'T THINK THIS CHANGE RESULTS IN VETO POWER FOR THE RJC EXCEPT IN ONE POSSIBLE CIRCUMSTANCE.

EVERYTHING THEY DO HAS TO GO THROUGH THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.

AND WE'VE HAD THIS HAPPEN ALREADY.

SINCE THIS RULE EVEN-- BEFORE IT WAS EVEN ADOPTED, EVEN WHILE IT WAS UNDER CONSIDERATION.

IF YOU GO TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND YOU OBJECT TO THEIR RULE THAT THEY PROPOSE AND YOU LOSE-- LET'S SAY APPELLATE PROPOSES A RULE AND RJA SAYS, NO, THIS IS MORE OF A COMMON APPLICATION, OR WE SHOULD ALL BE THE SAME HERE.

IF YOU GO TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND APPELLATE LOSES

THERE, WE DON'T HAVE ANY RIGHT TO APPEAL THAT.
AS A PRACTICAL MATTER, WHAT APPELLATE THINKS OUGHT TO BE THE RULE CAN NEVER GET HERE.
AND WE'VE HAD THAT HAPPEN ON THE SERVICE RULE.
WE THOUGHT WE SHOULD GET FIVE EXTRA DAYS OF SERVICE, BECAUSE WRITING A BRIEF IS LIKE A LIFETIME.
YOU NEED THOSE FIVE DAYS.
THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS SAYS WE THINK YOU SHOULD WORK THIS OUT, GO BACK, AND WE SOLVED THE PROBLEM ANOTHER WAY BY AMENDING SOME OTHER APPELLATE RULES.
>> WELL, THAT'S ANOTHER ISSUE, THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.
AND USUALLY WHEN A RULE COMES UP HERE, YOU LOOK AT THE VOTE, IT'S USUALLY UNANIMOUS.
I HATE TO SAY IT, THEY DO A LOT OF REALLY GOOD THINGS, BUT I DOUBT THEY GET IN THE WEEDS.
>> IT WAS UNANIMOUS ON THIS PROPOSED RULE.
>> UNANIMOUS--
>> BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS.
>> TO APPROVE THIS--
>> TO APPROVE THIS RULE.
>> BECAUSE-- WELL--
>> SO I HAVE LESS THAN A MINUTE LEFT.
I WOULD URGE THAT YOU NOT ADOPT THIS RULE.
BUT IF YOU'RE GOING TO ADOPT THE RULE, ADOPT THE ALTERNATIVE THAT APPELLATE PROPOSED AND, ACTUALLY, IF YOU'RE GOING TO ADOPT THE WHOLE RULE, THAT YOU REALLY LOOK AT THE STRUCTURE OF THE COMMITTEE SO THAT IT'S FAR MORE BALANCED THAN IT IS NOW.
THANK YOU.
>> THANK YOU.
REBUTTAL?
>> EXCEPT FOR THE VERY LAST THING THAT MR. HALL SAID, I DON'T DISAGREE WITH ANYTHING HE

SAID.

I WANTED TO-- I STARTED OFF BY MENTIONING HOW MOST OF THIS PROPOSAL CONSISTS OF NONCONTROVERSIAL THINGS THAT JUST ARE TRYING TO CONFORM THE RULES THE PRACTICE.

SO I HOPE WE WON'T LOSE SIGHT OF THAT IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT ONE PIECE OF IT TURNED OUT TO BE HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL.

WITH REGARD TO THE CONTROVERSIAL PART, THERE ARE SEVERAL DIFFERENT POSSIBILITIES.

ONE OF THEM IS THAT THE COURT REALLY DOES WANT AN ENHANCED OR IMPROVED COORDINATION FUNCTION TO BE CARRIED OUT BY SOMEBODY, AND THE RULES OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE DOES SORT OF LOOK LIKE IT WOULD BE THE RIGHT BODY TO DO THAT BECAUSE THAT'S SORT OF WHAT THEIR RESPONSIBILITY IS, THEY'RE CHARGED WITH.

BUT IF THE COURT DOESN'T NEED THE CHANGE IN THE LEVEL OF COORDINATION THAT HAPPENS BEFORE MATTERS REACH YOU, THEN BY ALL MEANS, THERE WOULDN'T BE ANY NEED FOR THE CONTROVERSIAL PART THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED BY THE COMMITTEE THAT'S BEFORE YOU TODAY.

AND I THINK IT WOULD BE FAIR TO ASK ME WHY AS CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE LAST YEAR HAVEN'T I DONE MORE TO INCREASE THE ROLE OF THE COORDINATION FUNCTION THAN WE ALREADY HAVE. AND THAT WOULD HAVE GIVEN ME A CHANCE TO PROUDLY SAY WE'VE TRIED TO DO EXACTLY THAT AND TRIED TO GET THE LIAISON COMMITTEE TO MORE OFTEN MEET AND CARRY OUT ITS FUNCTION.

SO IF THE COURT DOESN'T WANT TO ADOPT THE COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL TODAY, WE WOULD BE VERY GRATEFUL FOR SOME SORT OF DIRECTION ABOUT

WHAT KIND OF, WHAT KIND OF--
GOING FORWARD, WHAT KIND OF
COORDINATION ROLE, IF ANY,
THE-- WELL, WHAT KIND OF
INCREASED COORDINATION ROLE, IF
ANY, THAT THE RJA COMMITTEE
SHOULD CARRY OUT.

NOW, I'LL BE CANDID THAT THIS--
BECAUSE OF THE WAY THESE RULES
WERE PROPOSED AND FORMULATED,
YOU'RE REALLY SEEING A RULES
PROPOSAL THAT WAS FORMULATED
BASICALLY THREE ADMINISTRATIONS
AGO IN TERMS OF OUR ONE-YEAR
CHAIR CYCLE.

SO IF YOU LOOK AT IT NOW AND IN
LIGHT OF ALL OF THE
TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES WE'RE
THINKING ABOUT, THIS PROPOSAL
DOES SHOOT BEHIND THE DUCK A
LITTLE BIT.

THERE ARE MORE MODERN APPROACHES
THAT WE COULD USE, BECAUSE
REALLY THE ISSUE IS
COMMUNICATION.

WE REALLY NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT
ALL THE COMMITTEES KNOW WHAT ALL
THE OTHER COMMITTEES ARE DOING,
AND THAT WOULD MINIMIZE THE
DEGREE OF PEOPLE FINDING OUT AT
THE LAST MINUTE ABOUT SOMETHING
THAT THEY CONSIDER TO BE
PROBLEMATIC.

SO TECHNOLOGICAL SOLUTION REALLY
IS PROBABLY-- THIS AS PROPOSED
WOULD SUPPORT THE KIND OF IDEA
THAT I'M TALKING ABOUT,
BASICALLY USING THE INTERNET TO
POST FOR ALL OF THE COMMITTEES
BE REQUIRED TO POST WHAT THEY'RE
DOING SO ALL THE OTHER ONES CAN
SEE WHAT'S GOING ON.

IN ANY CASE, UNLESS THERE IS ANY
OTHER QUESTIONS--

>> THANK YOU FOR YOUR ARGUMENTS.

>> THANK YOU.

>> COURT'S IN RECESS FOR TEN
MINUTES.

>> ALL RISE.

