047

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

RE: THE FLORIDA BAR CASE #81,010

PETITION TO AMEND
RULE 4.84 AND RULE 4.87 TO
ADD ANTI-DISCRIMINATION TO
ANTI-BIAS RULES

RESPONSE OF JOHN R. WOOD

Respondent, JOHN R. WOOD, a member in good standing of THE FLORIDA BAR since June 1951, respectfully files his responds to the Joint Petition to Amend said Rule Sections as follows:

1. Respondent admits Paragraph 1 and 2.

2. Respondent is without knowledge of Paragraph 3.

3. Respondent is without knowledge of statements made in Paragraph 4 except First Paragraph is denied.

4. Paragraphs 5 and 6 and all the self-servicing declarations therein make no showing for judicial relief and accordingly, should not be considered by this Court.

5. Affirmative objections to said petition:

This Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction since the relief sought attempts to create a new principle of law not under any Constitutional or statutory jurisdiction but by tour de force and any judicial attempt to restrict individual liberties and freedoms of speech under the guise of moral abstractions is constitutional heresy. Article V Section 2 of the Florida Constitution grants this Court jurisdiction to"...adopt rules for

the practice and procedure in all courts..." but unless this Court assumes jurisdiction to restrict free speech, none exist unless it is found "...in the penumbras formed from emanations..." of said Article V. See Griswold v Conn. 381 US479 (1965) wherein Justice Douglas' search for jurisdiction he had to invent his power to act within those emanating penumbras - an act of judicial tyranny that has been soundly rejected by most legal scholars). If such jurisdiction is found by this Court to so restrict my constitutional rights, ipse dixit if you will, then what about my rights which must glow even brighter in those same penumbras flowing from said Article V and Article 1 Section 23 of the Florida Constitution which holds my "...right to be left alone and free from government intrusion..."

6. I find particularly objectionable that part of the proposed rule that says: "agencies and courts constituted to make such findings are uniquely equipped to adjudicate the existence of discriminary practices." This rule change is a convoluted attempt to impose upon me an unknown standard of speech which some may preconceive to be in vogue. The Board of Governors of The Florida Bar, for the most part is an intellectual enclave whose members are pursuing their liberal agenda through the courts and consequently, transforming that agenda into the force of law upon lawyers and just lawyers alone. Unless there is a compelling state need to so restrict lawyers, I should be no less free than a non-lawyer from an arbitrary restraint on free speech. (I find such a state need to audit attorney's trust account but fail to see such a need that requires my punishment when I address a mature matron as "young

lady".) The reference just made shows the absurdity of such an attempt to abridge my freedom to be left alone. Any rule that seeks to abridge my freedoms, must receive "strict scrutiny" from this Court. When I took my oath as an attorney in June 1951, I never envisioned my joining a group that lost private rights that others have under the laws of this state. I oppose the changes and demand the Petition be dismissed as lacking subject matter jurisdiction for the Court.

I certify copies sent by mail this 21st day of January, 1993 to: JOHN F. HARKNESS, JR., ALAN T. DIAMOND, PATRICIA A. SEITZ and JOHN A. BOGGS.

JOHN R. WOOD
Florida Bar No. 089503
WOOD & SEITL, P.A.
240 N. Washington Blvd.,
Suite 460
Sarasota, Fl. 34236
Telephone (813)-954-5772

W/like to participate in o.a.