

>> NOW WE MOVE TO THE FINAL CASE  
ON OUR DOCKET TODAY, HALIFAX  
HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER V. THE  
STATE OF FLORIDA.

>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT,  
ELLIOT SCHERKER ON BEHALF OF  
HALIFAX HOSPITAL.

THE QUESTION IS WHETHER UNDER  
THE 2003 ENABLING ACT OR UNDER  
CHAPTER 163 OF FLORIDA STATUTES  
HALIFAX IS EMPOWERED TO  
CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE A HOSPITAL  
IN THE CITY OF DELTONA.

WE SUBMIT THE ANSWER IS YES AND  
THAT THE BONDS ARE, THEREFORE,  
VALID.

ON THE ENABLING ACT, ON ITS  
FACE, DOES NOT EXPRESSLY  
REFERENCE EXTRATERRITORIAL  
OPERATIONS ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.  
BUT FOR APPROXIMATELY 60 PLUS  
YEARS BETWEEN 1925 AND 1979,  
SECTION FIVE OF THE ENABLING  
ACT-- THE ORIGINAL ENABLING  
ACT-- DID AT LEAST ARGUABLY.  
BECAUSE IT AUTHORIZED HALIFAX,  
QUOTE, TO ESTABLISH, CONSTRUCT,  
OPERATE, ETC., HOSPITALS AS,  
QUOTE, SHALL BE NECESSARY FOR  
THE USE OF THE PEOPLE OF SAID  
DISTRICT, FOR THE USE OF THE  
PEOPLE OF SAID DISTRICT.

THAT'S APPENDIX ONE ON PAGE 257.

>> LET ME ASK YOU THIS, WOULDN'T  
YOU AGREE THAT STATUTES THAT ARE  
RELATED HAVE TO BE READ TOGETHER  
IN ORDER TO UNDERSTAND THEM?

>> ABSOLUTELY, YOUR HONOR.

>> OKAY.

AND WOULDN'T YOU AGREE THAT THE  
SPECIAL LAW WE'RE TALKING ABOUT  
IS INEXTRICABLY RELATED TO  
189.0126 THAT AUTHORIZES THESE  
LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL SPECIAL  
ENTITIES?

>> WELL, IT'S ENACTED PURSUANT  
TO CHAPTER 189 WHICH REQUIRES  
SPECIAL ACTS.

>> AND THAT STATUTE SAYS THOSE  
ENTITIES GENERALLY AREN'T TO BE

CREATED WITH JURISDICTION TO  
OPERATE WITHIN A LIMITED  
GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARY.  
THAT'S WHAT THAT STATUTE SAYS,  
CORRECT?

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.

>> SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT IF YOU  
WERE GOING TO HAVE A SUBSET OF  
THAT STATUTE, A SPECIAL THAT  
CREATES ONE OF THESE ENTITIES  
AUTHORIZED BY THAT LAW AND IT  
WAS GOING TO DO SOMETHING  
DIFFERENT WHICH-- WHICH, I  
THINK YOUR CLIENT'S

INTERPRETATION IS THEY CAN  
OPERATE A McDONALD'S IN TOKYO  
AS LONG AS IT GIVES THEM MONEY  
TO OPERATE THE HOSPITAL HERE--

>> YOUR HONOR, THAT WAS CLEARLY  
IN JEST BUT, YES, THAT IS IN THE  
DEPOSITION.

>> NO, BUT IT REALLY IS THE  
THEORY.

YOU SAY THERE'S NO GEOGRAPHIC  
LIMITATION ON WHERE YOU CAN  
OPERATE AS LONG AS IT CREATES  
REVENUE THAT YOU CAN THEN USE TO  
SERVE YOUR CLIENTS.

>> THERE'S NO GEOGRAPHIC  
LIMITATION IN WHICH HALIFAX CAN  
ESTABLISH HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL  
FACILITIES FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD  
AND PUBLIC HEALTH.

THAT'S OUR POSITION.

BECAUSE HALIFAX IS EMPOWERED TO  
ESTABLISH HOSPITALS.

HALIFAX IS A HOSPITAL.

>> OKAY.

SO IT COULD ESTABLISH A HOSPITAL  
IN TOKYO.

>> YOUR HONOR, I DOUBT IT.  
THE STATUTE COVERS THE STATE OF  
FLORIDA, AND--

>> OKAY.

[INAUDIBLE]

>> I WOULDN'T SAY NO TO THAT,  
YOUR HONOR.

I WOULDN'T SAY NO.

BECAUSE WE CURRENTLY OPERATE  
JUST AS THE RECORD SHOWS, IN

ORANGE COUNTY, IN BREVARD  
COUNTY, IN FLAGLER COUNTY AND  
OUTSIDE OF OUR DISTRICT IN  
VOLUSIA COUNTY.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, THE  
EMERGENCY ROOM IS OUR FACILITY  
OPERATING NOW.

THAT'S HOW WE'VE OPERATED SINCE  
1979.

BUT ALL WE DO IS BUILD HOSPITALS  
AND PROVIDE CARE FOR PAIN  
PATIENTS AND INDIGENT PATIENTS.

THAT'S WHAT WE DO.

THAT'S WHO WE ARE.

AND THAT'S ALL WE'RE ASKING THE  
COURT TO ALLOW US TO DO UNDER A  
FAIR READING OF THE ENABLING  
ACT.

NOW, JUSTICE LAWSON, TO GET BACK  
TO YOUR QUESTION, THERE'S NO  
DISPUTE IN THIS CASE FROM ANYONE  
THAT A SPECIAL ACT SUCH AS OURS  
CAN AUTHORIZE A SPECIAL DISTRICT  
TO OPERATE EXTRATERRITORIALLY.  
YOU'VE BASICALLY GOT THREE OR  
FOUR DIFFERENT CATEGORIES OF  
SPECIAL ACTS FOR THESE HOSPITAL  
DISTRICTS.

THEY'RE ALL CITED IN OUR BRIEF.  
YOU HAVE STATUTES THAT EXPRESSLY  
SAY YOU MAY ONLY OPERATE WITHIN  
THE DISTRICT IN SO MANY WORDS.  
THERE ARE STATUTES THAT SAY YOU  
MAY OPERATE OUTSIDE THE  
DISTRICT.

AND MOST INTERESTINGLY, THERE'S  
A WHOLE SET OF THOSE ENABLING  
ACTS THAT INCLUDES THE LANGUAGE  
THAT WAS STRUCK FROM THIS  
STATUTE IN 1979 FOR THE PEOPLE  
OF SAID DISTRICT.

THOSE STILL EXIST.

SO THE ABSOLUTE PRESUMPTION HAS  
TO BE THAT WHEN THAT LANGUAGE  
WAS REMOVED FROM OUR ENABLING  
ACT, IT HAD TO MEAN SOMETHING.

>> WELL, BUT WHY IS THAT SO WHEN  
SIMILAR LANGUAGE IS LEFT IN  
THERE?

AND, BECAUSE WE HAVE THIS

LANGUAGE FOR THE USE OF THE  
PUBLIC OF THE DISTRICT.

WE HAVE THE LANGUAGE REFERRING  
TO THE FACILITIES AND SERVICES  
IN THE DISTRICT.

WE HAVE THE LANGUAGE THAT STATES  
FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE  
RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT.

IT IS A THEME IN THIS PROVISION.  
AND I UNDERSTAND YOUR ARGUMENT,  
BUT I THINK IT'S A HIGHLY  
TECHNICAL ARGUMENT THAT IS  
REALLY INCONSISTENT WITH THE  
CONTEXT.

WHEN WE LOOK AT IT IN THIS  
CONTEXT, I'M HAVING TROUBLE, I'M  
HAVING TROUBLE ACCEPTING IT.

IT REQUIRES THAT WE INTERPRET  
SOMETHING IN THE DISJUNCTIVE  
WHEN REALLY IT'S MORE NATURAL TO  
INTERPRET IT IN THE CONJUNCTIVE.  
AND, BUT WHY AM I WRONG?

BECAUSE I KNOW YOU DISAGREE WITH  
ME, SO HELP ME UNDERSTAND WHY  
THOSE THINGS-- YOU'RE FOCUSED  
ON SOMETHING THAT'S BEEN TAKEN  
OUT WHEN THERE ARE THESE THINGS  
THAT ARE STILL THERE.

>> EXACTLY.

SO WE-- THAT'S WHY WE SAY THAT  
WHEN IT WAS IN THERE, I WOULD  
AGREE WITH YOUR INTERPRETATION.  
WHEN THE FOR THE PEOPLE, USE OF  
THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT WAS  
THE FIRST SENTENCE IN SECTION  
FIVE.

I WOULD AGREE THAT IT'S VERY  
ARGUABLE THAT HALIFAX COULD NOT  
OPERATE OUTSIDE ITS DISTRICT.  
BUT WE'RE DEALING WITH WHAT  
HAPPENS WHEN THAT LANGUAGE IS  
TAKEN OUT.

SO THE FIRST SENTENCE READS THE  
DISTRICT MAY ESTABLISH,  
CONSTRUCT, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN  
SUCH HOSPITALS, MEDICAL  
FACILITIES AND OTHER HEALTH CARE  
FACILITIES-- NOT  
McDONALD'S-- AS ARE  
NECESSARY.

ONE.

TWO--

>> WHY WOULDN'T NECESSARY MEAN  
NECESSARY TO FULFILL THE STATED  
PUBLIC PURPOSE?

>> BECAUSE THAT LANGUAGE WAS  
TAKEN OUT.

>> BUT THERE STILL IS A STATED  
PUBLIC PURPOSE.

>> WHICH I'M GETTING TO, YOUR  
HONOR.

>> OKAY.

>> THE HOSPITALS, THE HOSPITALS,  
THE NECESSARY HOSPITALS, MEDICAL  
FACILITIES AND OTHER HEALTH CARE  
FACILITIES AND SERVICES SHALL BE  
ESTABLISHED, ETC., AND  
MAINTAINED BY THE DISTRICT FOR,  
ONE, THE PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC  
HEALTH, COMMA; TWO, FOR THE  
PUBLIC GOOD, COMMA; AND, THREE,  
FOR THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OF THE  
DISTRICT.

>> RIGHT.

BUT THE USE OF THE WORD AND, IT  
DOESN'T SAY OR.

>> THAT'S CORRECT.

>> AND THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OR  
THE DISTRICT.

HOW DOES THE PUBLIC OF THE  
DISTRICT, VOLUSIA, HOW DO THEY  
GO AND USE SOMETHING IN TOKYO,  
OR HOW TO THEY GO USING  
SOMETHING IN, YOU KNOW, MIAMI?

>> WE CAN STICK WITH FLORIDA, I  
CAN DEFEND THAT.

[LAUGHTER]

AND WE'RE NOT SAYING  
DISJUNCTIVE.

LET'S BE CLEAR.

AND IT IS USED AS A CONJUNCTIVE  
TO LINK THREE THINGS.

THE DOCTOR OF THE LAST  
ANTECEDENT.

WE PAY ATTENTION TO PUNCTUATION.  
IT MEANS SOMETHING WHEN IT'S PUT  
IN A STATUTE.

IT MEANS THAT USE OF THE PUBLIC  
AND THE DISTRICT ONLY MODIFIES  
THE LAST CLAUSE, FOR THE USE.

WE HAVE TO DO THREE THINGS,  
PUBLIC HEALTH, PUBLIC GOOD AND  
FOR THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OF THE  
DISTRICT.

ONCE THE FIRST SENTENCE IS  
CHANGED AND ONCE THE OXFORD  
COMMA IS INSERTED INTO THE  
SECOND SENTENCE, THAT HAS TO  
MEAN SOMETHING.

NOW, THE THIRD SENTENCE--  
JUSTICE CANADY-- SAYS  
MAINTENANCE.

MAINTENANCE, NOT CONSTRUCTION,  
NOT ESTABLISHMENT.

MAINTENANCE OF SUCH HOSPITALS,  
ETC., AND SERVICES IS HEREBY  
FOUND AND DECLARED TO BE A  
PUBLIC PURPOSE AND NECESSARY FOR  
THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE  
RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT.

WHY IS THAT LANGUAGE IN THERE?  
BECAUSE WE CAN USE OUR AD  
VALOREM TAX REVENUES FOR THAT  
PURPOSE.

WE CAN USE OUR AD VALOREM TAX  
REVENUES TO FUND REVENUE BONDS  
FOR THAT PURPOSE.

WE CANNOT USE OUR AD VALOREM  
AUTHORITY-- AND I'M GOING TO  
GET TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THAT IN  
A MINUTE-- TO MAINTAIN

FACILITIES IN OTHER DISTRICTS.  
AND AS A MATTER OF FACT, UNDER  
THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT AND  
UNDER THE BOND RESOLUTION,  
HALIFAX CANNOT USE, CANNOT USE  
THE TAX REVENUE IT GENERATES  
FROM RESIDENTS OF THE DISTRICT  
TO FUND OR TO MAINTAIN ANY OF  
THE FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT.  
SO WHEN THE LEGISLATURE SAYS  
THIS IS A PUBLIC PURPOSE, THAT  
MEANS THE AD VALOREM TAXES CAN  
BE USED.

NOW, WHEN WE GET TO--  
>> LET ME-- BACK TO THE  
QUESTION I ASKED.

WE HAVE A STATUTORY CONTEXT IN  
WHICH THE LEGISLATURE AUTHORIZES  
ITSELF TO CREATE ENTITIES THAT

OPERATE WITHIN A SPECIFIC JURISDICTION.  
YOU ARE CREATED AS AN ENTITY WITH A SPECIFIC JURISDICTION. IN THAT CONTEXT, WOULDN'T YOU NEED A POTENTIAL ACT THAT SPECIFICALLY SAID, HOWEVER, HERE WE'RE GOING TO ALLOW OPERATIONS SOMEWHERE ELSE IN ORDER TO TRUMP WHAT I THINK IS THE PRESUMPTION THAT YOU HAVE TO HAVE IF YOU READ THESE TOGETHER THAT THEY'RE GOING TO OPERATE WITHIN THE JURISDICTIONAL BOUNDARIES CREATED?

>> JUSTICE LAWSON, LET ME ANSWER THAT BY TURNING IT AROUND. THERE ARE ANY NUMBER OF SPECIALIZED--

>> I'D RATHER YOU ANSWER IT.

>>-- THAT FORBID OPERATION OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT IN SO MANY WORDS.

IF THERE WOULD BE NO NEED, IF THAT WERE THE DEFAULT RULE FOR THE LEGISLATURE TO ENACT A STATUTE THAT FORBADE OPERATIONS IN OTHER DISTRICTS, THAT WOULD BE USELESS LANGUAGE, AND WE PRESUME THE LEGISLATURE DOESN'T ENACT USELESS STATUTES. THERE IS NO DEFAULT RULE. THE QUESTION IS WHAT DOES EACH ENABLING ACT MEAN.

AND, OF COURSE, THE SPECIAL ACTS, THEN ENABLING ACTS OVERRIDE GENERAL LAW.

SO THE QUESTION IS ALWAYS AT THE BEGINNING WHAT DOES THE SPECIAL ACT MEAN.

WHEN THE LEGISLATURE WANTED TO ELIMINATE HALIFAX AS IT DID IN THE TAX-- YOU MAY ONLY EXERCISE EMINENT DOMAIN WITHIN THE DISTRICTS.

THERE'S AT LEAST ONE OTHER THAT AUTHORIZES EMINENT DOMAIN OUTSIDE ITS DISTRICT.

SO THAT'S LAWFUL UNDER AT LEAST ONE SPECIAL ACT.

SO WHEN THE LEGISLATURE WANTED US TO DO THINGS ONLY WITHIN THE DISTRICT, IT SAID WITHIN THE DISTRICT ONLY.

IT DOESN'T SAY THAT IN SECTION FIVE, AND THE ONLY LANGUAGE THAT SUGGESTED IT HAS BEEN TAKEN OUT. AND THAT'S WHY THAT'S A FAIR READING OF SECTION FIVE--

>> I THINK JUSTICE CANADY'S POINT WAS THAT THERE IS OTHER LANGUAGE THAT'S SUGGESTED. FOR USE OF THE PUBLIC IN THE DISTRICT, IN THE DISTRICT. THAT LANGUAGE IS STILL--

>> YOUR HONOR, THAT'S WHAT I WENT THROUGH.

YOU HAVE THE DISJUNCTIVE USE OF AND, BUT YOU HAVE THE DOCTRINE OF ANTECEDENT, AND THE FIRST SENTENCE HAS BEEN CHANGED.

WE ALSO HAVE TO LOOK--

>> LET ME ASK YOU THIS, IS THERE SOME DISTINCTION BETWEEN PRESERVATION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH IF, FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD AND THE USE OF THE PUBLIC? ARE THOSE DIFFERENT THINGS?

>> NO, THEY ALL RELATE TO THE SAME THING.

OF COURSE THEY DO.

BUT THE QUESTION--

>> WHAT I'M STRUGGLING WITH HERE IS THERE'S THIS VERY CLEAR REFERENCE TO THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OF THE DISTRICT.

AND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING IS UNDER THESE TERMS EARLIER IN THAT SENTENCE, BASICALLY PACKED IN THERE IS IMPLIED FOR THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT. CORRECT?

>> YES, YOUR HONOR, PUBLIC--

>> I HAVE TROUBLE-- THAT'S JUST A VERY ODD WAY FOR THE LEGISLATURE TO GO ABOUT EXPRESSING THAT.

>> I WOULD AGREE WITH YOU, YOUR HONOR, AND WOULD THAT IT WERE CLEAR, BUT WE HAVE TO ASSUME



THAT THAT AMENDMENT MEANT  
SOMETHING.  
OTHERWISE THAT AMENDMENT IN 1979  
TAKING OUT THAT LANGUAGE IN THE  
FIRST SENTENCE MEANS NOTHING,  
MEANS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING.  
AND WE CAN'T PRESUME IT MEANS  
ABSOLUTELY NOTHING UNLESS THE  
LEGISLATURE TELLS US THIS CHANGE  
DOESN'T MEAN ANYTHING.  
THIS WASN'T A RECODIFICATION,  
THIS WASN'T A CLEANUP.  
IN 1979 THE LEGISLATURE  
DELIBERATELY TOOK THIS LANGUAGE  
OUT OF OUR STATUTE AND LEFT IT  
IN OTHERS.  
AND I BELIEVE WE STAND ON VERY  
FIRM GROUND ON SAYING THAT HAS  
TO MEAN SOMETHING.  
BUT FINALLY, WE ALSO HAVE  
SECTION 15 OF THE ENABLING ACT  
WHICH REQUIRES A LIBERAL  
CONSTRUCTION.  
AND THE LAW, STATUTES WITH  
LIBERAL CONSTRUCTION IS THAT  
THAT MEANS SOMETHING, AND IT HAS  
TO BE CONSTRUED AS-- HAS TO BE  
REASONABLE CONSTRUCTION UNDER  
THE RULE OF LIBERAL  
CONSTRUCTION.  
IF THERE'S ANY DOUBT, THEN THAT  
SECTION HAS TO MEAN SOMETHING AS  
WELL.  
BUT I DON'T WANT TO LEAVE OUT  
THE INTERLOCAL ACT, BECAUSE  
THAT'S THE SECOND PIECE OF OUR  
ARGUMENT.  
AND WE HAVE SECTION 21 AS  
ENACTED IN 1989 THAT AUTHORIZES  
US TO AVAIL OURSELVES OF ANY  
POWERS UNDER ANY OTHER STATUTES.  
SECTION 163 SPECIFICALLY STATES  
THAT IT'S SUPPLEMENTAL TO ANY  
OTHER POWERS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
UNITS.  
SO WE CAN AVAIL OURSELVES OF THE  
INTERLOCAL ACT, AND WE DID, AN  
INTERLOCAL ARRANGEMENT WITH  
DELTONA.  
THERE'S NO QUESTION IT'S FOR A

PUBLIC PURPOSE, THERE'S NO QUESTION IT'S FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITIZENS OF DELTONA WHICH IS THE LARGEST CITY IN FLORIDA NOT TO HAVE ITS OWN HOSPITAL.

AND THAT'S WHY DELTONA ASKED HALIFAX TO ENTER INTO THIS INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT.

THERE'S NO LIMITATION, THERE'S NO GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION IN CHAPTER 163, NOR COULD THERE BE BECAUSE WE'RE TALKING ABOUT JURISDICTIONS, THE POWERS OF TWO DIFFERENT JURISDICTIONS.

THERE ARE FUNCTIONAL LIMITATIONS BUT, OF COURSE, THE CITY OF DELTONA COULD BUILD A HOSPITAL, WE CAN BUILD HOSPITALS.

AND SO THE POWERS ARE CO-EXTENSIVE AS FAR AS THAT GOES.

SO EVEN IF THERE'S ANY DOUBT AS TO WHETHER WE CAN OPERATE UNDER SECTION FIVE, THE LEGISLATURE GAVE US THE POWER TO INVOKE OTHER STATUTES WHICH WE DID UNDER THE INTERLOCAL.

>> AM I CORRECT THAT THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ACT DOES NOT ALLOW YOU TO DO THINGS THAT YOU'RE NOT ALREADY AUTHORIZED TO DO?

>> FUNCTIONALLY, YOUR HONOR. IT DOESN'T HAVE GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATIONS.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, THERE'S A CLAUSE IN, I BELIEVE IT'S SUBSECTION SIX, OF THE INTERLOCAL ACT THAT REFERENCES TERRITORIAL OPERATIONS THAT SAYS WHEN OFFICIALS AND GOVERNMENTS ARE OPERATING EXTRA TERRITORIALLY, THEY ALSO HAVE THE SAME PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES AS THEY WOULD IN THEIR OWN JURISDICTION.

SO IT CONTEMPLATES EXTRATERRITORIAL OPERATIONS. THE QUESTION IS FUNCTION, IS THIS SOMETHING YOU CAN DO.

>> BUT IT'S NOT YOUR POSITION  
THAT IF YOUR AUTHORIZING ACT  
SAID YOU MAY NOT OPERATE A  
HOSPITAL OUTSIDE THE BOUNDS OF  
THE DISTRICT, THAT YOU COULD  
THEN-- EVEN THOUGH YOU CAN  
OPERATE A HOSPITAL, THAT'S YOUR  
FUNCTION, FUNCTIONALLY YOU DO  
THAT-- BUT UNDER THE INTERLOCAL  
ACT, YOU COULD OPERATE A  
HOSPITAL OUTSIDE--

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.

WE WOULD AGREE THAT IF THERE  
WERE EXPRESS PROHIBITION, WHICH  
THERE IS NOT, EVEN IF THERE IS  
NOT AN EXPRESS GRANT OF  
AUTHORITY IN SECTION FIVE,  
THERE'S NOT AN EXPRESS  
PROHIBITION.

AND THE LEGISLATURE KNOWS HOW TO  
DO THAT, BECAUSE THEY'VE DONE IT  
IN ANY NUMBER OF SPECIAL ACTS.

SO IF THERE WERE EXPRESS  
PROHIBITION, I WOULD AGREE.

>> I'M STRUGGLING TO SEE WHERE  
YOU GET AUTHORITY TO DO ANYTHING  
FROM-- THAT YOU DON'T ALREADY  
HAVE IN YOUR ACT OTHER THAN TO  
JOIN WITH OTHERS TO ACCOMPLISH  
WHAT YOUR ACT AUTHORIZES FROM  
THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT ACT.  
I'M JUST, I'M STRUGGLING TO SEE  
HOW YOU CAN PULL SOME AUTHORITY  
HERE OUT OF THAT PARTICULAR HAT.

>> BECAUSE THE INTERLOCAL ACT  
EXPRESSLY CONTEMPLATES  
OPERATIONS OUTSIDE OF YOUR OWN  
JURISDICTIONS.

ONE OF THE OTHER OF THE TWO  
ENTITIES THAT ENTERS INTO AN  
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT IS  
OPERATING OUTSIDE ITS  
JURISDICTION NECESSARILY, BUT BY  
DEFINITION.

AND IT DEALT WITH A FIRE  
DISTRICT THAT ALSO HAD NO  
AUTHORITY EXCEPT LIKE TO HELP  
OUT WHEN SOMETHING BAD HAPPENS  
TO OPERATE OUTSIDE OF ITS  
DISTRICT IN ITS ENABLING ACT.

IT HAD NO AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT UNDER ITS ENABLING ACT WITH ANOTHER JURISDICTION TO PROVIDE FIRE SERVICES.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOUND THAT THERE WAS NO SUCH POWER BUT THAT THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT COULD BE INVOKED SO THAT THE FIRE DISTRICT COULD ENTER INTO A COUNTY TO PROVIDE FIRE SERVICES. IF I'M WRONG HERE, THAT'S WRONG. AND ALL THE FIRE DISTRICTS AND OTHER DISTRICTS THAT PROVIDE SERVICES OUTSIDE OF THEIR, OUTSIDE OF THEIR TERRITORIAL BOUNDARIES WOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM DOING SO.

THAT WOULD UNWIND ANY NUMBER OF INTERLOCAL AGREEMENTS AND, AS THE AMICUS BRIEF POINTS OUT, WOULD HAVE A VERY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT.

SO, YES, IF THERE WAS NO SECTION 21, FOR EXAMPLE, WHICH THE LEGISLATURE EXPRESSLY ADDED TO THE STATUTE-- IT WASN'T THERE ORIGINALLY, THEY ADDED SECTION 21-- YOU MAY AVAIL YOURSELF OF OTHER STATUTES.

THEY-- SECTION 163 SAYS THAT THIS IS SUPPLEMENTAL POWERS. NO CONFLICT WITH THE SPECIAL ACT, NO CONFLICT WITH THE ENABLING ACT.

SO ALL ELSE ASIDE, THE INTERLOCAL ACT CAN SUSTAIN AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT TO BUILD A HOSPITAL AND OPERATE A HOSPITAL IN THE CITY OF DELTONA.

I'D LIKE TO SAVE MY REMAINING TIME--

>> I, I'M SORRY, CAN I ASK ONE QUICK QUESTION?

>> YES, SIR.

>> THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CLAUSE ESTABLISHING CONSTRUCT, OPERATE AND MAINTAIN VERSUS THE NEXT CLAUSE THAT CONTAINS

MAINTENANCE OF HOSPITALS, ETC.,  
IN THE DISTRICT AND WHY?  
IT SEEMS LIKE YOU'RE, IT SEEMS  
LIKE YOU'RE PUTTING A LOT INTO  
THAT.

>> WELL, YOUR HONOR, IT DOESN'T  
SAY THAT ANYTHING EXCEPT  
MAINTENANCE WITHIN THE DISTRICT.  
NOW THERE IT'S LIMITED.  
THAT'S EXPRESSLY LIMITED.  
AND THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THAT  
SENTENCE AND THE AMENDED FIRST  
SENTENCE AND THEN WITH THE  
CAREFULLY CONSTRUCTED SECOND  
SENTENCE IS WE CANNOT USE TAX  
REVENUES TO MAINTAIN THE  
HOSPITALS EXCEPT IN THE  
DISTRICT.

WE AGREE WITH THAT.  
BUT THAT'S WHY THAT SENTENCE IS  
THERE, BECAUSE BY MAKING IT A  
PUBLIC PURPOSE, WE CAN USE OUR  
TAX REVENUES.

>> AND YOU'RE ASKING US TO INFER  
THAT THE LEGISLATURE WAS  
BASICALLY AUTHORIZING,  
ESTABLISHING, CONSTRUCTING AND  
OPERATING OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT,  
THE CLAUSE BEFORE THAT, BUT  
THEN--

>> YES, YOUR HONOR.  
BY TAKING OUT THE FOR THE USE OF  
THE PEOPLE OF THE DISTRICT IN  
THE OVERARCHING FIRST SENTENCE.  
THAT'S WHEN THE SEA CHANGE  
NECESSARILY HAD TO OCCUR,  
BECAUSE THAT LANGUAGE REMAINS IN  
SEVERAL OTHER SPECIAL ACTS.  
SOME THAT WERE MODIFIED AT THE  
SAME TIME, ALL OF WHICH WERE  
BASICALLY MODIFIED WITHIN A  
FIVE-YEAR PERIOD BECAUSE THE  
LEGISLATURE REQUIRED THE  
CODIFICATION, RECODIFICATION OF  
ALL SPECIAL ACTS DURING A PERIOD  
OF TIME IN THE '90s INTO EARLY  
2000.

SO THAT WAS DELIBERATELY LEFT IN  
OTHER STATUTE IS THE AND TAKEN  
OUT OF OUR STATUTE, AND CASE LAW

IS VERY CLEAR ON THE PRESUMPTIVE EFFECT OF THAT AMENDMENT.

SO IT'S ALL OF THOSE THINGS READ TOGETHER THAT GET US TO WHERE WE SHOULD BE, I BELIEVE.

BUT AGAIN, THEY CANNOT BE READ AS PROHIBITING US FROM ENTERING INTO AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT. THANK YOU.

>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT, MARTIN GOLDBERG ON BEHALF OF-- HALIFAX DOES NOT HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO BUILD A HOSPITAL OUTSIDE ITS DISTRICT FOR ONE SIMPLE, OVERARCHING REASON, AND THAT IS BECAUSE THE LEGISLATURE HAS NOT EXPRESSLY GRANTED THAT AUTHORITY.

AND I THINK, CHIEF JUSTICE CANADY, YOUR OBSERVATIONS ARE ON POINT IN PART BECAUSE IT HAS BEEN PART OF LAW FOR OVER A HUNDRED YEARS.

THEY HAVE NO POWERS OTHER THAN THOSE EXPRESSLY GRANTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OR AS NECESSARILY IMPLIED AS INDISPENSABLE.

AND THIS COURT HAS SAID GOING BACK TO 1919 THAT IF THERE'S ANY REASONABLE DOUBT ABOUT THE EXERCISE OF A SPECIAL DISTRICT'S AUTHORITY, THE FURTHER EXERCISE OF THAT AUTHORITY MUST BE ARRESTED.

AND, JUSTICE LAWSON, YOU'RE CORRECT BECAUSE OVER 30 YEARS CHAPTER 189, WHEN IT WAS ENACTED, DEFINED A SPECIAL DISTRICT AS A UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT CREATED FOR A SPECIAL PURPOSE WITH A LIMITED JURISDICTION GEOGRAPHICALLY.

AND FULLY AWARE OF THIS, AS HAS BEEN NOTED, THE LEGISLATURE-- WHEN IT WANTS TO AUTHORIZE EXPRESSLY A SPECIAL DISTRICT TO OPERATE EXTRATERRITORIALLY-- IT KNOWS HOW TO DO SO.

>> WHAT DO WE-- I LIKE THAT ARGUMENT.

BUT WHAT DO WE DO WITH THE  
RESPONSE FROM YOUR OPPOSING  
COUNSEL THAT THERE ARE, AND I  
THINK THEY'RE CITED IN ONE OF  
THE FOOTNOTES OF THE BRIEFS, AT  
LEAST 30 OTHER ENABLING ACTS  
THAT SPECIFICALLY HAVE  
PROVISIONS IN THEM WHICH STATE  
THEY CANNOT OR FORBID THEM TO  
ACT EXTRATERRITORIALLY?  
WHY IS OPPOSING COUNSEL NOT  
CORRECT THAT THAT LANGUAGE WOULD  
BE COMPLETELY UNNECESSARY IF  
SILENCE-- WHICH IS WHAT WE HAVE  
HERE ON THE ISSUE, AT BEST-- IF  
SILENCE AND HAVING TAKEN OUT  
THAT LANGUAGE IS NOT SUFFICIENT  
TO CONFER THE AUTHORITY?

>> OKAY.

I DO NOT AGREE THAT THERE'S  
SILENCE.

AND WHEN--

>> WELL, PUTTING THAT ASIDE, WHY  
WOULD YOU NEED THAT IN THE 30  
ENABLING ACTS THAT HAVE YOU ARE  
FORBIDDEN TO DO SOMETHING YOU  
ALREADY ARE FORBIDDEN TO DO.

>> I DON'T THINK YOU NEED IT.

>> SO IT'S UNNECESSARY.

DON'T WE HAVE EXPLICIT LAW THAT  
WE DON'T READ THINGS AS BEING UP  
NECESSARY?

>> WHAT IS NECESSARY IS FOR THE  
LEGISLATURE TO EXPRESSLY GRANT  
THE AUTHORITY TO GO OUTSIDE A  
DISTRICT.

HERE IN HALIFAX'S ENABLING ACT  
NOT ONLY DO YOU NOT FIND THAT  
EXPRESS GRANT, BUT YOU FIND AN  
EXPRESS RESTRICTION.

>> I UNDERSTAND THE, I  
UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING.

>> YES.

>> AND YOU MAY END UP BEING  
RIGHT BY WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, BUT  
I DO WANT TO DIG IN, IF IT'S TO  
POSSIBLE--

>> SURE.

>>-- TO THE OTHER POINT WHICH  
IS THAT WHY WOULD, WHY WOULD YOU

NEED THAT EXPRESS PROHIBITION IN MULTIPLE, AGAIN, DOZENS OF ENABLING ACTS WHERE THERE IS THAT PROVISION THAT WAS CITED HERE SUBSECTION SIX IN CHAPTER 189 THAT SPECIFICALLY SAYS IT CANNOT OPERATE EXTRATERRITORIAL HI?

IF WE DON'T READ THINGS AS BEING UNNECESSARY.

THE LEGISLATURE DOES THINGS ON PURPOSE.

SO IF YOU HAVE THREE BOXES, IF YOU HAVE BOX ONE THAT SAYS IT'S FORBIDDEN, YOU HAVE BOX TWO WHICH SAYS IT'S AUTHORIZED, AND THEN YOU HAVE BOX THREE WHERE-- WHAT DO I MAKE OF BOX THREE?

>> YEAH.

I GUESS THE PREDICATE IS THAT I DO NOT RECALL IN THIS RECORD OTHER ENABLING ACTS AS REPRESENTED BY MY CO-COUNSEL-- MY OPPOSING COUNSEL THAT SPECIFICALLY RESTRICT A DISTRICT FROM GOING OUTSIDE ITS BOUNDARIES.

IF THAT IS THE CASE, EVEN IF THAT IS THE CASE, AND IT MAY BE, IT WOULD BE ENTIRELY CONSISTENT, I BELIEVE, WITH OUR POSITION HERE.

THE ABSENCE OF AN EXPRESS GRANT OR IF YOU HAVE AN EXPRESS PROHIBITION, AND YOU'RE LOOKING FOR THAT ARTICLE AND THAT WOULD ASSIST ME, I THINK IT'S CONSISTENT WITH OUR POSITION.

YOU HAVE TO READ CHAPTER 189 WITH ANY ENABLING ACT OF SPECIAL LAW, AND HERE THEY LINE UP PERFECTLY.

AND I DO, CONTRARY TO MY OPPOSING COUNSEL'S ARGUMENT, WHEN IT COMES TO THE TEXT OF THE HALIFAX ENABLING ACT, WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE WORDS FOR THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OF THE DISTRICT, IN THE DISTRICT AND FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE OF THE RESIDENTS OF THE



DISTRICT, I FIND THAT THAT IS A RESTRICTION.

WE DON'T NEED IT IN THIS CASE, I BELIEVE, TO HAVE THE DECISION BELOW AFFIRMED.

AGAIN, IT COMES DOWN TO THE LACK OF AN EXPRESS GRANT.

THIS IS A POLICY ISSUE THAT THE LEGISLATURE NEEDS TO MAKE.

THIS IS A LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK THAT IS IN PLACE HERE.

AND AS SPECIAL DISTRICTS HAVE ISSUES WITH THEIR JURISDICTION, THEY NEED TO GO BACK TO THE LEGISLATURE AND ASK FOR PERMISSION AND GET AN AMENDMENT. AND THAT IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED IN THE OTHER AREAS.

I NEXT WANT TO ADDRESS MY COLLEAGUE FROM HALIFAX'S CONTENTION THAT REMOVAL OF NINE WORDS OUT OF THE FIRST SENTENCE BACK IN 1979 MAKES A DIFFERENCE.

IT DOES NOT.

THOSE VERY NINE WORDS IN THE 1979 AMENDMENT ARE FOUND IN THE NEXT SENTENCE THAT CURRENTLY REMAINS IN THE HALIFAX ENABLING ACT.

AND IF YOU LOOK BACK AT THE HISTORY--- BECAUSE I DON'T THINK YOU CAN USE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY AS HE'S TRYING TO DO TO CREATE AN AMBIGUITY IN AN ENABLING ACT. IT JUST DOESN'T EXIST.

>> WHAT ELSE WAS DONE IN THE 1979 STATUTE?

>> A NUMBER OF THINGS, ALL STYLISTIC.

AND ALTHOUGH AMENDMENTS CAN PRESUMPTIVELY BE MATERIAL, HERE THE EVIDENCE ABOUNDS IT WAS STYLISTIC.

FIRST, BETWEEN 1925 AND 1979 THERE WAS ABOUT 35 AMENDMENTS TO THE ENABLING ACT.

IN 1979 THOSE AMENDMENTS WERE SHIFTED INTO 1979 ACT.

NEXT, A NUMBER OF STYLISTIC

REVISIONS.

FOR EXAMPLE, THE WORDS EMPOWERED  
AND AUTHORIZED WAS TURNED INTO  
THIS MORE SIMPLER MAY.

THE TERM SAID DISTRICT--

>> ESSENTIALLY, IT WAS A  
CONSOLIDATION.

>> IT WAS A-- YES, AND I THINK  
THE EVIDENCE IS CLEAR THAT IT  
WAS A MODERNIZATION OF THE  
LANGUAGE IN 1979.

>> HOW MANY HOSPITALS, SPECIAL  
TAXING DISTRICTS IN FLORIDA LIKE  
THIS HAVE EXPRESS GRANT OF  
AUTHORITY TO OPERATE OUTSIDE  
THEIR DISTRICT?

>> I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY, BUT WE  
HAVE PUT IN OUR BRIEF PROBABLY  
FIVE OR SIX.

YOU HAVE NORTH BROWARD, NORTH  
BREVARD, SARASOTA THAT I  
MENTIONED AT THE OUTSET.  
THEY CAME IN AND GOT THE  
LANGUAGE BOTH WITHIN AND BEYOND  
BOUNDARIES OF THE DISTRICT.  
AND WE HAVE A NUMBER OF OTHERS.

>> DOES THAT EXPRESS GRANT OF  
AUTHORITY ALL CONTAIN THE SAME  
TYPE OF LANGUAGE?

>> IT'S ALL AN EXPRESS GRANT.  
IT DOESN'T USE THE EXACT WORDS.  
SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE IS WITHIN  
AND BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES,  
OUTSIDE OF THE BOUNDARIES.  
YOU HAVE, YOU CAN GO INTO  
SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES.  
BUT IT'S ALL AN EXPRESS,  
UNMISTAKABLE, PLAIN AND CLEAR  
GRANT OF AUTHORITY WHICH HALIFAX  
LACKS AND HAS LACKED.

YES, YOUR HONOR.

>> DO YOU FIND IT IRONIC THAT IF  
WE ACCEPT MR. SCHERKER'S  
ARGUMENT, THAT THOSE ARE  
COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT, REDUNDANT  
AND UNNECESSARY?

[LAUGHTER]

I MEAN, THAT'S TRUE, RIGHT?

I MEAN, IF A GRANT IS NOT  
REQUIRED AS THE LAW SAYS, THEN

THOSE SPECIFIC GRANTS WERE  
SURPLUS, UNNECESSARY.

>> ABSOLUTELY.

>> YEAH.

>> AS IF YOU ACCEPT HALIFAX'S  
ARGUMENT, A LOT OF OTHER LAWS IN  
THE BOOK WILL BE UNNECESSARY.  
AND I WANT TO GET TO THAT POINT  
WITH RESPECT TO THE INTERLOCAL  
COOPERATE ACT.

AND THAT IS, FIRST, THERE IS  
NOTHING IN THE TEXT OF THE ICA,  
WHICH I REFERRED TO IT, AS--  
THAT GRANTS EXTRATERRITORIAL  
AUTHORITY.

THERE JUST SIMPLY ISN'T.

MY COLLEAGUE REFERS TO IN THE  
BRIEF SECTION TWO.

THAT SIMPLY RECOGNIZES, SECTION  
TWO, THAT VARIOUS FORMS OF LOCAL  
GOVERNMENT ARE GOING TO COME  
INTO AND MAY COME INTO AN  
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT, BUT THEN  
IT SAYS IN THE TEXT TO EXERCISE  
THEIR POWERS.

AND WHATEVER POWERS THEY COME IN  
WITH IS IMPORTANT.

AND IT'S ASPIRATIONAL BECAUSE  
THEN IT SAYS TO COOPERATE AND  
TRY TO GET THE BENEFITS OF  
GEOGRAPHY, POPULATION AND OTHER  
FACTORS.

IT DOESN'T SAY YOU CAN GO OUT  
EXTRATERRITORIAL.

AND THAT HARMONIZES PERFECTLY  
WITH SECTION FOUR WHICH THIS  
COURT, FROM FORMER JUSTICE  
QUINCE, RENDERED AN OPINION  
WHICH SAYS PLAIN AND CLEAR THAT  
YOU CANNOT DO JOINTLY WHAT YOU  
CANNOT DO SEPARATELY.

WHEN YOU COME INTO AN INTERLOCAL  
AGREEMENT, YOU CAN ONLY EXERCISE  
THE POWERS THAT YOU SHARE IN  
COMMON WITH YOUR CONTRACTING  
ENTITY OR WHAT YOU CAN EXERCISE  
SEPARATELY.

AND HERE WITH RESPECT TO  
GEOGRAPHIC TERRITORY, THAT--  
HALIFAX CAME IN NOT HAVING THAT

EXPRESS GRANT.

AND I--

>> I APOLOGIZE.

TAKE THAT ONE STEP FURTHER OR  
APPLY IT TO ME IN A TYPICAL  
SITUATION.

SO TWO CITIES SIDE BY SIDE, EACH  
HAVING INDIVIDUAL LAW  
ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENTS, AND  
THEY ENTER INTO INTERLOCAL  
AGREEMENTS TO ALLOW ONE LAW  
ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENT TO MAKE  
SURE THAT IF THEY'RE FLEEING OR  
CHASING OR IF THEY SEE A CRIME  
BEING COMMITTED WHILE ON PATROL  
IN BETWEEN ONE OR THE OTHER.  
HOW WOULD WHAT YOU JUST SAID  
AFFECT AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT  
LIKE THAT?

>> SO THAT SITUATION EXACTLY  
HAPPENED.

AN INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT, OR THIS  
ACT, WAS HELD WHEN WITH IT CAME  
TO POLICE POWERS OF ADJACENT  
COMMUNITIES THAT, IF ADJACENT  
COMMITMENTS WERE NOT AUTHORIZED  
TO GO OUT EXTRATERRITORIALLY,  
THEY HAD AN ISSUE.

THEY DID NOT CONTRACT UNDER THE  
ICA TO EXTEND THEIR POLICE POWER  
INTO THE NEXT COMMUNITY.

SO THE LEGISLATURE STEPPED IN,  
AND IN 1997-- WELL AFTER THE  
1969 ICA-- THEY ADOPTED CHAPTER  
166.0495 WHICH SAYS INTERLOCAL  
AGREEMENTS TO PROVIDE LAW  
ENFORCEMENT SERVICES.

AND THAT SPECIFICALLY ALLOW  
ADJOINING COMMUNITIES TO SHARE  
WHAT HE IS SAYING, THIS  
DISTINCTION OF COMMON FUNCTION,  
TO THEN OPERATE GEOGRAPHICALLY  
IN THOSE ADJOINING COMMUNITIES.  
IT WAS ENACTED BY THE  
LEGISLATURE.

AND I'LL FURTHER SAY IN 2011 IF  
YOU LOOK AT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
OPINION THAT WE CITED, WHEN  
ANOTHER ENTITY CAME BACK AND  
SAID CAN WE TAKE LAW ENFORCEMENT

AND GO TO NON-ADJOINING  
COMMUNITIES UNDER THE ICA, THE  
ANSWER WAS, NOT.

YOU NEED TO GO BACK AND GET AN  
EXPRESS GRANT OF AUTHORITY, OR  
THE LEGISLATURE HAS TO PASS  
ANOTHER LAW.

I SEE THAT MY TIME IS UP, AND I  
WILL SIT DOWN.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

WE WOULD ASK THAT THE JUDGMENT  
DENYING THE BOND VALIDATION BE  
AFFIRMED.

>> THANK YOU.

>> MAY IT PLEASE THE COURT,  
PHILIP HAVENS, ASSISTANT STATE  
ATTORNEY.

THE STATE RESERVED FIVE MINUTES  
OF TIME AT THE CONCLUSION OF  
THIS ARGUMENT THAT I THINK MIGHT  
HAVE BEEN BETTER SPENT IF WE'D  
LEFT MR. GOLDBERG UP HERE.

A BOND VALIDATION PROCEEDING WAS  
ENGAGED IN THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT.

WE ENGAGED IN THAT PROCEEDING  
AND FOUND OUT THERE WAS A  
COMPANION THAT WAS PROCEEDING  
PARALLEL IN OUR COURTS.

WE-- I WENT TO THE ATTORNEYS  
WHO WERE INVOLVED IN THAT CASE  
AND GOT THEM INVOLVED SO ALL OF  
THE ARGUMENTS THAT YOU'RE  
HEARING TODAY WERE PRESENTED TO  
THE TRIAL COURT IN THE BOND  
VALIDATION PROCEEDING.

THAT PROCEEDING LED US TO THIS  
COURT ON DIRECT APPEAL AS  
OPPOSED TO GOING THROUGH ONE OF  
THE APPELLATE COURTS.

I THINK THE ARGUMENTS HAVE BEEN  
MADE BY BOTH SIDES VERY WELL IN  
THIS CASE.

STATE'S POSITION IS IT WAS A  
VERY SIMPLE QUESTION THAT WAS  
BEFORE THE TRIAL COURT.

IT WAS AN ISSUE OF STATUTORY  
INTERPRETATION.

THERE IS LANGUAGE SPECIFICALLY  
IN THIS STATUTE THAT'S BEEN  
DISCUSSED HERE WITH BOTH COUNSEL

THAT SPECIFICALLY SAYS THAT THE  
AUTHORITY OF THE DISTRICT IS TO  
OPERATE WITHIN THE DISTRICT.  
THE TRIAL COURT RELIED ON THAT  
LANGUAGE IN THE STATUTE IN  
REACHING ITS CONCLUSION, AND THE  
STATE'S POSITION HERE TODAY IS  
SIMPLY THAT THE STATE, TRIAL  
COURT CORRECTLY ADOPTED THE  
RULES OF STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION,  
THAT IT RELIED ON THE SPECIFIC  
LANGUAGE IN THIS STATUTE THAT  
CREATED THIS DISTRICT IN  
REACHING THE CONCLUSION, AND  
WE'RE HERE TODAY IN SUPPORT OF  
THAT DECISION BY THE COURT.  
ANY ADDITIONAL TIME THAT I HAVE  
I'LL GIVE TO MR. GOLDBERG IF HE  
CHOOSES TO COME BACK UP.

>> UNLESS THERE'S ANY OTHER  
QUESTIONS, WE WOULD SUBMIT IT ON  
OUR BRIEFS.

>> PAGE 31 OF OUR BRIEF WE LIST  
ALL OF THE, ALL OF THE  
LIMITED--

>> SO I'M LOOKING AT IT RIGHT  
NOW, I HAVE IT PULLED UP FROM  
30.

20, SORRY.

IT DOESN'T SAY FORBID IN ANY OF  
THOSE, DOES IT?

>> IT SAYS-- LET ME READ A  
COUPLE, YOUR HONOR, WITH WHAT  
TIME I HAVE.

THERE IS CREATED A PUBLIC  
NONPROFIT AUTHORITY IN BAKER  
COUNTY.

SECTION 11, THE-- TO PROVIDE  
QUALITY AND COMPREHENSIVE CARE  
FOR THE RESIDENTS OF BAKER  
COUNTY.

>> IT DOESN'T FORBID IT.

>> CORRECT, YOUR HONOR, BUT I  
WOULD READ THAT AS--

>> IT HAS THE LANGUAGE OF THE  
PUBLIC THAT WAS TAKEN OUT HERE.

>> NO, YOUR HONOR.

NOT THESE STATUTES.

THERE'S A WHOLE OTHER SET OF  
STATUTES HERE THAT KEPT THAT

LANGUAGE.

FOR THE USE OF THE PUBLIC OF  
SAID DISTRICT, WHEN IT WAS TAKEN  
OUT OF OURS.

THESE, ALL THE STATUTES LISTED  
HERE, SAY YOU MAY ONLY OPERATE  
WITHIN YOUR-- WITHIN THIS  
DISTRICT.

>> THEY DON'T FORBID, IN OTHER  
WORDS, THE LANGUAGE ISN'T WE  
FORBID YOU TO OPERATE  
EXTRATERRITORIALY, CORRECT?  
I'M LOOKING AT FOOTNOTE 20,  
PAGE--

>> I UNDERSTAND, YOUR HONOR.  
I CAN'T READ SECTION SEVEN, FOR  
EXAMPLE, OF CHAPTER 2005.315  
WHICH IS THE LAKESHORE HOSPITAL  
AUTHORITY.

THE AUTHORITIES CREATED SHALL  
HAVE THE POWER TO REPAIR, EQUIP,  
OPERATE, MAINTAIN HOSPITALS AND  
HOSPITAL FACILITIES IN COLUMBIA  
COUNTY.

I READ THAT AS FORBIDDING DOING  
IT ANYWHERE ELSE, AND THAT'S THE  
LANGUAGE OF ALMOST ALL THE  
STATUTES THAT WE CITE THERE.

AND, NO, WE DON'T AGREE THAT THE  
LANGUAGE HAS GRANTED EXPRESS  
AUTHORITY ARE MEANINGLESS.

NOT AT ALL.

THE ENABLING ACT OF EACH, FOR  
EACH SPECIAL DISTRICT CREATES  
THAT DISTRICT'S POWERS.

IT IS OUR POSITION THAT ALTHOUGH  
THE LEGISLATURE DID NOT CHOOSE  
TO USE EXPRESS LANGUAGE WHEN IT  
MODIFIED THE STATUTE IN 1979, IT  
TOOK OUT LANGUAGE THAT CLEARLY  
WAS INTENDED TO LIMIT IT AND  
CHANGED THE PUNCTUATION IN THE  
SECOND SENTENCE SO THAT THE LAST  
ANTECEDENT FOR THE USE OF THE  
PUBLIC DISTRICT, FOR THE USE OF  
THE PUBLIC OF THE DISTRICT  
DOESN'T MODIFY THE FIRST TWO  
CLAUSES.

SO WE BELIEVE WE HAVE AUTHORITY,  
AND WE CERTAINLY BELIEVE THAT

SECTION 21 OF THE ENABLING ACT  
HAS TO BE GIVEN MEANING.  
IT ALLOWS US TO ENTER INTO AN  
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT, AND IT  
DOESN'T FORBID US IN SECTION 21  
FROM ENTERING INTO AN INTERLOCAL  
AGREEMENT THAT CONTEMPLATES  
EXTRATERRITORIAL OPERATIONS.  
THANK YOU.

>> ALL RIGHT.

WE THANK YOU ALL FOR YOUR  
ARGUMENTS, AND THAT'S THE LAST  
CASE ON TODAY'S DOCKET.  
YOU MAY RETIRE.

THE COURT IS GOING TO REMAIN IN  
SESSION FOR A CEREMONIAL EVENT.

>> I'D LIKE TO NOW ASK THAT OUR  
STATE ADMINISTRATOR COME  
FORWARD.

AT THE OUTSET OF TODAY'S  
PROCEEDINGS, I INTRODUCED THE  
NEW JUSTICES.

WE HAVE A TRANSITION ON THE  
BENCH.

WE ALSO HAVE A TRANSITION IN THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF OUR COURT  
SYSTEM.

P.K. JAMISON, WHO HAS BEEN OUR  
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR NOW  
FOR NEARLY FIVE YEARS, IS GOING  
ON TO OTHER PASTURES.

NOT VERY FAR.

BUT WE WANTED TODAY TO TAKE THIS  
OPPORTUNITY TO THANK P.K. FOR  
THE WORK SHE HAS DONE FOR US AND  
FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH.

THE COURT IS DEEPLY GRATEFUL TO  
YOU, P.K., FOR YOUR DEDICATED  
SERVICE TO THE BRANCH AND FOR  
YOUR TIRELESS EFFORTS ON OUR  
BEHALF OVER THE PAST FIVE YEARS.  
WE ARE VERY SORRY THAT YOU ARE  
LEAVING US.

BUT WE ARE VERY GLAD WE WILL  
HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONTINUE  
TO WORK WITH YOU IN YOUR NEW  
RESPONSIBILITIES ON THE STAFF OF  
THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS  
COMMITTEE.

I WANT TO PERSONALLY THANK YOU



FOR THE GOOD WORK THAT WE'VE  
HAD-- GOOD WORKING RELATIONSHIP  
WE'VE HAD, AND ABOVE ALL FOR  
YOUR UNFAILING CHEERFULNESS.

ANYONE WHO KNOWS ABOUT THE WORK  
OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE  
STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR  
UNDERSTAND THAT WE HAVE TO DEAL  
WITH A LOT OF DIFFICULT  
ADMINISTRATIVE THINGS.

BUT IN THE MIDST OF-- AND  
SOMETIMES WE'RE DEALING WITH A  
LOT OF THINGS IN A SHORT PERIOD  
OF TIME.

P.K. APPROACHED EVERYTHING WITH  
A CHEERFUL, KIND SPIRIT WITHOUT  
EXCEPTION.

AND THERE WERE TIMES WHEN I WAS  
NOT SO CHEERFUL, I WILL HAVE TO  
ADMIT.

BUT P.K. WAS ALWAYS CHEERFUL,  
AND I WILL ALWAYS BE GRATEFUL TO  
HER PERSONALLY FOR THAT.

NOW, I NOW WANT TO RECOGNIZE IF  
JUSTICE LABARGA FOR REMARKS.

JUSTICE LABARGA WAS CHIEF  
JUSTICE FOR FOUR YEARS AND  
WORKED WITH P.K., AND P.K.  
TRAINED CHIEF JUSTICE LABARGA--  
[LAUGHTER]

AND SO I THINK IT'S APPROPRIATE  
THAT HE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO  
EXPRESS HIS GRATITUDE AND THE  
COURT'S GRATITUDE TO YOU AS  
WELL.

>> THANK YOU.

NOT ONLY DID SHE TRAIN ME, BUT  
SHE GOT ME OUT OF A FEW  
DITCHES--

[LAUGHTER]

P.K. AND I STARTED ABOUT THE  
SAME DAY.

I AS CHIEF AND SHE AS CHIEF  
JUSTICE.

AND I WOULD NOT HAVE DONE A  
SECOND TERM AS CHIEF JUSTICE IF  
WE DIDN'T HAVE P.K.

IF BEING CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE  
THIRD LARGEST STATE IN THE  
COUNTRY SEEMS LIKE A DAUNTING

TASK TO ANYONE, IMAGINE WHAT A TASK IT IS TO BE THE COURT ADMINISTRATOR WHO'S ACTUALLY IN THE LINE OF FIRE BETWEEN THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND EVERYONE ELSE. WE HAVE ALMOST 1,000 JUDGES IN FLORIDA, JUST A FEW SHY OF A THOUSAND JUDGES IN FLORIDA. COUNTY JUDGES, CIRCUIT JUDGES, DCA JUDGES.

WE HAVE THREE JUDICIAL CONFERENCES, ALL THREE PRETTY MUCH COMPETING WITH EACH OTHER AT TIMES, IT SEEMS.

AND WE HAVE A DIFFICULT GEOGRAPHICAL STATE.

IT'S DIFFICULT TO GET AROUND THE STATE.

AND FLYING IS NOT-- IT'S HARDLY EVER AN OPTION.

SO WE GET IN THE CARS AND WE DRIVE.

AND IT'S AMAZING TO ME HOW SOMEONE IN PINELLAS COUNTY OR NAPLES, MIAMI OR WEST PALM OR WHATEVER ELSE, ORLANDO, CAN JUST SNAP THEIR FINGERS, AND THEY CAN HAVE P.K. THERE DOING A SIX, SEVEN-HOUR DRIVE, MAKE A HALF HOUR PRESENTATION AND BE BACK IN TALLAHASSEE THAT NIGHT.

SHE DID THAT CONSTANTLY.

IF SHE GOT FREQUENT FLYER MILES FOR JUST THE DRIVING SHE DID, SHE'D FLY FREE FOREVER.

SO IT WAS JUST A DAUNTING TASK AND TO SEE HOW DIFFICULT THE JOB WAS AND JUST DEALING WITH ALL THE COMPETING THINGS THAT HAPPENED IN THIS COURT, NOT TO MENTION THAT THE LEGISLATURE ACROSS THE STREET AND SO ON. SO HER KNOWLEDGE OF THE SYSTEM, HOW THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM OPERATES, IS JUST OUTSTANDING. I LEARNED MORE FROM HER IN ONE WEEK THAN MY FOUR YEARS IN COLLEGE STUDYING AND READING ABOUT POLITICAL SCIENCE. WHEN I WALKED WITH HER ACROSS

THE STREET EITHER IN THE SENATE OR THE HOUSE, I FELT LIKE I WAS WALKING WITH A ROCK STAR.

I MEAN, ANYWHERE I WENT, THERE'S P.K., AND EVERYBODY CAME TO TALK TO HER.

WHETHER WE WENT TO COMMITTEES OR SUBCOMMITTEES, THE LEGISLATORS ALL KNEW P.K.

IT WAS JUST AN AMAZING IDEA.

AND I WOULD SAY THAT IN MY 39 YEARS OF BEING A LAWYER AND I WOULD SAY MY 23 YEARS OF BEING A JUDGE-- 13 OF WHICH WERE AT THE TRIAL COURT LEVEL AND ONE DAY AT THE DCAA AND SUPREME COURT, I'VE BEEN HERE TEN YEARS-- I HAD NEVER WORKED WITH ANYONE THAT WAS MORE PLEASANT TO WORK WITH. AND I JOKE AROUND AND I TELL PEOPLE THAT P.K. WILL COME INTO MY OFFICE TO TELL ME LIKE THE WORST POSSIBLE NEWS IN THE WORLD.

LIKE, CHIEF, YOU'RE GOING TO DIE TODAY.

[LAUGHTER]

BUT WHAT A BEAUTIFUL DAY YOU CHOSE.

[LAUGHTER]

LOOK AT THE WEATHER OUTSIDE.

HEAR THOSE BIRDS.

THE LAST THING YOU'RE GOING TO HARD.

AND SHE ALWAYS HAD THIS WAY OF MAKING THE WORST THING IN THE WORLD LOOK POSITIVE.

EVEN DYING.

SO, AND THE ONE THING THAT SHE'S DOING RIGHT NOW, BECAUSE P.K. HATES ATTENTION.

SHE'S A BACKGROUND PERSON.

SHE LIKES TO LOOK IN THE BACKGROUND AND SIT IN THE BACK AND TAKE NOTES AND WALK AWAY.

SHE'S CRAZY ABOUT STATISTICS.

YOU GIVE HER A GRAPH TO READ, AND IT'S LIKE ME READING A COMIC BOOK.

I JUST ENJOY.

AND SHE'S, SHE'S INTO MATH  
STATISTICS, ALL THESE CRAZY  
THINGS.

SHE REALLY LIKES THAT STUFF.

AND I CAN TELL YOU I'M GOING TO  
MISS HER TREMENDOUSLY.

THE CHIEF MENTIONED HER CHEERFUL  
PERSONALITY, HER ABILITY TO JUST  
WORK THROUGH DIFFICULT THINGS  
AND STILL REMAIN POSITIVE.

I'LL SAY THIS, NEVER ONCE, NEVER  
ONCE DID I HEAR HER SAY A  
NEGATIVE THING ABOUT ANYONE.  
NEVER.

AND I GOTTA TELL YOU, THERE IS A  
LOT OF PEOPLE OUT THERE THAT I  
WOULD HAVING A FEW NEGATIVE  
THINGS TO SAY ABOUT, THE WAY  
THEY BEHAVE.

NEVER, NEVER ONCE.

SHE DID HER JOB WITH HER HEAD  
DOWN, WENT BACK, I GOTTA DO  
BETTER.

SHE WOULD COME UP WITH AN  
ANSWER.

I'VE NEVER SEEN HER ANGRY.

NEVER ONCE SEEN HER ANGRY.

AND LIKE I MENTIONED EARLIER,  
PLENTY OF REASONS FOR HER TO  
HAVE BEEN ANGRY.

MOSTLY AT ME.

BUT SHE-- NEVER ONCE SAW THAT.

SO OUR LOSS IS THE LEGISLATURE'S  
GAIN, BUT I THINK P.K. IS BACK  
IN HER ELEMENT OVER THERE.

AND SO I THINK SHE'LL BE HAPPY  
AND, P.K., YOU'RE NOT GOING TO  
HAVE TO TRAVEL SO MUCH.

I DON'T THINK THEY MAKE YOU  
TRAVEL AS MUCH AS WE DID OVER  
THERE, SO HOPEFULLY YOU CAN  
ACTUALLY SEE YOUR FAMILY EVERY  
NOW AND THEN.

[LAUGHTER]

AND I THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE  
TO US.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE TO  
ME.

AND IF MY WIFE WAS HERE, SHE'D  
BE THANKING YOU FOR NOT MAKING

ME LOOK STUPID.

[LAUGHTER]

SO IN ANY EVENT, I THANK YOU,  
AND IT'S REALLY BEEN GREAT  
SEEING YOU.

AND, HOPEFULLY, WE'LL GET  
TOGETHER FOR LUNCH OR SOMETHING  
AS TIME GOES ON AND RECAP.

THANK YOU.

>> ALL RIGHT.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH, JUSTICE  
LABARGA.

WE ALSO HAVE HERE TODAY  
REPRESENTATIVES OF OUR  
CONFERENCES OF JUDGES.

AND SO I'D LIKE TO RECOGNIZE  
THEM AT THIS TIME.

FIRST, I'LL RECOGNIZE JUDGE  
ROBERTS WHO IS HERE ON BEHALF OF  
THE CONFERENCE OF DISTRICT COURT  
JUDGES.

>> THANK YOU, MR. CHIEF JUSTICE.  
I'M HERE ON BEHALF OF THE  
CONFERENCE OF DISTRICT COURT  
JUDGES.

OUR PRESIDENT, CHIEF JUDGE  
GERBER, HAD TO BE OUT OF TOWN ON  
PERSONAL BUSINESS, AND HE VERY  
MUCH REGRETS NOT BEING HERE FOR  
THIS, P.K., AND I'M VERY  
THANKFUL HE NOMINATED ME TO  
SPEAK IN HIS STEAD.

THANK YOU, CHIEF, FOR ALLOWING  
ME TO DO THAT.

I'VE KNOWN P.K. SINCE PROBABLY  
1996.

WE WORKED IN THE LEGISLATURE  
TOGETHER.

AND WHEN SHE GOT APPOINTED TO BE  
STATE COURTS ADMINISTRATOR,  
PEOPLE CALLED ME.

DO YOU KNOW P.K.?

I'M LIKE, YEAH, I KNOW P.K.

WELL, IS THIS GOING TO BE ALL  
RIGHT?

WHAT'S GOING TO HAPPEN?

I GO, WELL, LET ME TELL YOU  
ABOUT P.K.

P.K. IS ONE OF THE MOST  
INTELLIGENT PEOPLE I'VE EVER

WORKED WITH.

SHE'S, SHE'S-- PICKS EVERYTHING UP VERY QUICKLY, SHE'S ABLE TO READ VAST AMOUNTS OF INFORMATION AND ASSIMILATE IT AND COME UP WITH A PLAN.

SHE IS EXTRAORDINARILY HARD WORKING.

I'VE NEVER SEEN HER TIRED.

SHE IS PATIENT.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE, SHE'S HAD SOME OTHER JOBS THAT MADE THIS JOB SEEM LIKE A CAKE WALK.

AND I'VE ALWAYS ADMIRER HER.

I WAS HAPPY WHEN SHE CAME HERE.

IT'S BEEN A GREAT FIVE YEARS.

WE'RE GOING TO MISS HER IN THE COURT SYSTEM.

WE'RE JUST HAPPY WE STILL GET TO WORK WITH HER ACROSS THE STREET AND, P.K., I JUST WANT TO THANK YOU FOR EVERYTHING YOU'VE DONE.

THANK YOU, MR. CHIEF JUSTICE.

>> THANK YOU.

NOW I'D LIKE TO RECOGNIZE JUDGE ANGELA COWDEN ON BEHALF OF THE CONFERENCE OF CIRCUIT JUDGES.

>> I DON'T DO VERY WELL

EXTEMPORANEOUSLY SPEAKING, SO I DID MAKE SOME NOTES.

AND ON BEHALF OF THE FLORIDA CONFERENCE OF CIRCUIT JUDGES, I'M HONORED TO BE HERE TO REPRESENT OUR JUDGES IN EXPRESSING THANKS TO YOU FOR YOUR SERVICE TO OUR CONFERENCE, TO THE BRANCH AND TO ALL OF OUR JUDGES.

WE'RE PROUD FOR YOU IN YOUR NEW ADVENTURE.

WE KNOW YOU'LL SHINE.

WE'RE THRILLED THAT YOU'LL BE JUST ACROSS THE STREET, AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUING OUR STRONG RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LEGISLATURE AS YOU SERVE IN THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE.

WE APPRECIATE YOUR

PROFESSIONALISM, YOUR GUIDANCE, LEADERSHIP.

WE'RE GLAD YOU SHARED THE LAST  
NEARLY FIVE YEARS OF YOUR CAREER  
WITH US.

WE'RE SORRY YOU'RE LEAVING US  
THOUGH, SO OUR CONGRATULATIONS  
FOR YOU PERSONALLY ARE  
BITTERSWEET AS WE'RE SELFISH IN  
WISHING THAT YOU WERE NOT GOING.  
PLEASE ACCEPT OUR  
CONGRATULATIONS, OUR BEST WISHES  
AND OUR DEEPEST THANKS TO YOU  
FOR YOUR SERVICE TO OUR BRANCH,  
OUR HIGHEST HOPES FOR YOUR  
CONTINUED SERVICE TO THE GOOD  
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA.  
ALL THE BEST, P.K., GOOD LUCK,  
AND WE'RE SO PROUD AND THANK  
YOU.

>> THANK YOU.

AND FINALLY, I'D LIKE TO  
RECOGNIZE JUDGE RICHARDSON ON  
BEHALF OF THE CONFERENCE OF  
COUNTY JUDGES.

>> CHIEF JUSTICE CANADY,  
JUSTICES, I ALSO WANT TO SAY  
CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR THREE  
NEWLY-APPOINTED JUSTICES.  
IT IS A PLEASURE TO BE HERE ON  
YOUR FIRST DAY ON THE BENCH.  
SO WITH THAT, I AM HERE ON  
BEHALF OF JUDGE DAVID DENKIN, HE  
IS THE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNTY  
CONFERENCE.

EVEN UP TO THE LAST, LAST  
EVENING HE WAS TRYING SO HARD TO  
BE HERE, P.K. JAMISON, BUT HE  
COULD NOT GET COVERAGE.  
IT WAS VERY DIFFICULT FOR HIM.  
AND SO WITH THAT, I HAVE THE  
HONOR OF STEPPING IN ON BEHALF  
OF THE CONFERENCE OF COUNTY  
JUDGES.

WE, I HAVE A LETTER THAT I'D  
LIKE TO SHARE WITH YOU, AND THEN  
I'D LIKE TO SAY A FEW WORDS AS  
WELL WORKING WITH YOU FOR SO  
MANY YEARS.

DEAR P.K. JAMISON, ON BEHALF OF  
THE CONFERENCE OF COUNTY COURT  
JUDGES OF FLORIDA AND FOR ME

PERSONALLY, I WANT TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS OUR PROFOUND APPRECIATION FOR YOUR DEDICATION AND HARD WORK AS STATE COURT ADMINISTRATOR. YOU HAVE PROVIDED STRONG GUIDANCE AND VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF AND FOR THE FLORIDA JUDICIARY. PLEASE ACCEPT THESE GIFTS AS A SMALL TOKEN OF OUR APPRECIATION AND THAT OF THE COUNTY CONFERENCE FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE AND HARD WORK.

I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH YOU ACROSS THE STREET.

WE WISH YOU THE BEST AS YOU BEGIN A NEW CHAPTER.

DAVID DENKIN, PRESIDENT OF THE CONFERENCE OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES OF FLORIDA, SARASOTA COUNTY JUDGE.

I'M GOING TO PLACE HIS LETTER IN THIS FOLDER AND PRESENT IT TO YOU.

I ALSO, ON BEHALF OF THE CONFERENCE, WANT TO THANK YOU BECAUSE YOU ARE ONE OF THE HARDEST WORKING WOMEN THAT WE KNOW.

YOU HAVE ALSO ASSEMBLED A POWERHOUSE OF INDIVIDUALS IN YOUR OFFICE.

I DON'T KNOW HOW TO YOU DID IT, BUT YOUR TEAM THAT YOU PUT TOGETHER ARE SOME OF THE MOST DYNAMIC INDIVIDUALS THAT I HAVE-- THE CONFERENCE AND MYSELF PERSONALLY THROUGH THE JUDICIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND SEVERAL OTHERS-- HAVE WORKED WITH.

WE KNOW THAT WHEREVER YOU GO, YOU ARE GOING TO BE A SUCCESS.

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TREMENDOUS WORK, YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS BRANCH.

WE WISH YOU THE VERY BEST.

AND ON BEHALF OF THE CONFERENCE, WE HAVE TWO SMALL GIFTS FOR YOU



THAT YOU CAN USE WHEN YOU'RE  
ACROSS THE STREET TO REMEMBER  
YOUR FRIENDS ON THE COUNTY  
BENCH.

LET ME PRESENT--

[INAUDIBLE]

I'D LIKE TO USE THE WORD  
BITTERSWEET.

IT IS BITTERSWEET TO SAY ALL  
THIS.

BUT, AGAIN, CONTINUED SUCCESS IN  
EVERYTHING THAT YOU DO.

>> ALL RIGHT.

THANK YOU, JUDGE.

THE COURT HAS A LITTLE SOMETHING  
FOR YOU TO REMEMBER YOUR SERVICE  
HERE BY.

AND IT'S A PLAQUE PRESENTED TO  
PATRICIA "P.K." JAMISON IN  
GRATEFUL APPRECIATE FOR YOUR  
OUTSTANDING SERVICE AND  
LEADERSHIP AS STATE COURTS  
ADMINISTRATOR.

YOUR TIRELESS WORK AND ADVOCACY  
ON BEHALF OF FAIR AND STABLE  
FUNDING AND EFFECTIVE AND  
EFFICIENT OPERATIONS OF THE  
STATE COURT SYSTEM FROM JULY 1,  
2014, THROUGH FEBRUARY 8, 2019,  
HAVE HELPED BUILD TRUST AND  
CONFIDENCE AND SAFEGUARD  
ACCESSIBLE JUSTICE FOR ALL  
FLORIDIANS.

THE JUDICIAL BRANCH WILL BENEFIT  
FROM YOUR SERVICE FOR YEARS TO  
COME.

NOW, P.K., IF YOU'D COME  
FORWARD, I'D LIKE TO GIVE THIS  
TO YOU.

[APPLAUSE]

ALL RIGHT.

WELL, P.K. MADE ME PROMISE NOT  
TO MAKE HER SPEAK.

>> [INAUDIBLE]

>> OH, GOOD.

OKAY.

WELL, I'M-- PLEASE.

>> AFTER THAT, I FEEL COMPELLED  
AND I FEEL TALLER.

[LAUGHTER]

THANK YOU SO MUCH, CHIEF JUSTICE  
AND JUSTICES.

THE HONOR IS JUST AMAZING.

I HAVE TO SAY WHEN THE CHIEF  
FIRST SAID HE WANTED ME TO COME  
INTO THE COURTROOM, I HAD A LOT  
OF TREPIDATION BECAUSE I'VE SEEN  
WHAT HAPPENS TO JUDGES--

[LAUGHTER]

WHO APPEAR HERE, AND I'VE NEVER  
BEEN CALLED TO APPEAR HERE--

[LAUGHTER]

I'M VERY PLEASED NOW, AND  
RELIEVED--

[LAUGHTER]

SO, BUT THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR  
THIS HONOR, AND IT IS, HAS BEEN  
JUST A PLEASURE TO WORK HERE  
WITH YOU, ALL OF YOU.

AS YOU SAID, MY-- THE LARGEST  
PORTION OF MY TIME WAS UNDER  
CHIEF JUSTICE LABARGA.

THANK YOU, JUSTICE LABARGA, FOR  
YOUR SUPPORT, YOUR  
ENCOURAGEMENT.

IT WAS, HAS BEEN QUITE A RIDE,  
AND I CAME TO APPRECIATE,  
PARTICULARLY DURING OUR FOUR  
YEARS SINCE THAT'S THE LONGEST  
PART OF MY TENURE, MARK TWAIN'S  
WORDS OF TRUTH IS STRANGER THAN  
FICTION.

[LAUGHTER]

ON THE DAYS WHERE WE WONDERED IF  
IT WAS A FULL MOON AS WE'RE  
DEALING WITH THIS ISSUE OR THAT.  
BUT VERY REWARDING WORK.

JUSTICE LAWSON, THANK YOU.

WE TRAVELED ON THIS PART OF OUR  
JOURNEY THAT'S NOT YET COMPLETE  
ON THE SECOND CIRCUIT'S BUILDING  
ISSUE, AND I HAVE MEMORIES THAT  
I WILL KEEP TO MYSELF AND YOU DO  
TOO.

YOU WERE RIGHT THERE WITH ME --

[LAUGHTER]

AND SO WE SHARED SOME  
INTERESTING MOMENTS DURING THAT  
PAST.

JUSTICE POLSTON, IT HAS BEEN

QUITE A PLEASURE WORKING WITH  
YOU ON ALL THINGS TECHNOLOGY.  
AND YOU CERTAINLY TASKED ME WITH  
SOMETHING THAT I WAS COMFORTABLE  
TAKING ON WHEN I CAME.

WE HAVE SOME PROBLEMS WITH  
TECHNOLOGY, AND YOU NEED TO SORT  
THAT OUT.

I WORKED ON MANY IF TECHNOLOGY  
PROJECTS OVER THE YEARS, LARGE  
AND SMALL, A LOT OF REALLY BIG  
ONES.

I THOUGHT, HOW HARD CAN THIS BE?  
AND THOSE EARLY MEETINGS, I WAS  
REALLY GLAD THAT THEY WERE SKYPE  
OR PHONE--

[LAUGHTER]

THOSE EARLY TECHNOLOGY MEETINGS  
AT THE ACTC.

AND I WILL SAY THAT THOSE  
MEETINGS WERE TENSE.

MAYBE THAT'S FAIR.

MAYBE THAT'S NOT FAIR.

BECAUSE THERE WAS A LOT OF  
FRUSTRATION, AND PROBABLY THE  
FAIRER THING TO SAY WAS THEY  
WERE MORE LIKE MAYBE A JERRY  
SPRINGER EPISODE WITHOUT THE  
CURSING.

[LAUGHTER]

IT WAS INTERESTING TIMES.

SO WE HAVE COME A LONG WAY.

AND YOUR LEADERSHIP HAS MADE  
THAT SITUATION SO MUCH BETTER,

AND I FEEL GOOD ABOUT WHERE  
WE'VE COME WITH THOSE THINGS.

TO THE NEW JUSTICES, THANK YOU  
FOR BEING HERE AS PART OF THIS.  
I'M SO HONORED.

I REGRET THAT I WON'T GET TO  
WORK WITH YOU, BUT THANK YOU FOR  
BEING HERE FOR THIS TODAY.

AND, CHIEF JUSTICE, I PROMISE AS  
YOUR BUDGET COMES-- AS I'M  
WORKING ON YOUR BUDGET, I WILL  
FORGET ALL THE WEAKNESSES IN  
YOUR ARGUMENTS.

I'LL ONLY REMEMBER THE  
STRENGTHS--

[LAUGHTER]

AND THANK YOU AGAIN.

IT HAS BEEN A HIGH HONOR.

>> THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

[APPLAUSE]

P.K., WE THANK YOU, WE WILL MISS  
YOU, GOD BLESS YOU.

COURT IS NOW RECESSED.