

Berlin Listening Session  
New Hampshire Community Technical College, Berlin  
October 26, 2005

Kathy Eneguess: Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you all to the eighth of our eleven public listening sessions of the New Hampshire Citizens Commission on State Courts. My name is Kathy Eneguess and I am Co-chair of this commission with Will Abbott. I am President of this fine institution that we sit within this evening in Berlin and Will Abbott is the Executive Director of the Mount Washington Observatory. Today's sessions will have two parts, one at three o'clock this afternoon and one at six pm this evening. First of all, a little bit about who we are. We are a member commission, we have one hundred members who were appointed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in April of 2005 to independently assess the foundation and structure of the delivery of justice by the state court system from the perspective of the 1.2 million citizens of the state and to make recommendations for improvements. Today's session is dedicated to just that purpose. Thomas Jefferson once wrote that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. The commission sees its role as providing part of this eternal vigilance to assure that the courts of this state are doing what they intended to do under the New Hampshire Constitution and that in doing so are meeting the expectations of the people whose liberty the Constitution protects. If public trust and confidence in the judiciary cannot be sustained, our liberty itself can be placed in jeopardy. The commission is interested in your thoughts today about how the courts work. We are interested in learning what you think the key issues facing the New Hampshire courts and their work to provide jurisprudence. We are interested in your ideas you might have for improving the New Hampshire judiciary and its delivery of justice. Your input can be provided in three different forms. By oral comment today or at one of our other listening sessions. Those other listening sessions, correct me if I'm wrong, Julie, they are in Salem, Tamworth and Keene. If you wish the dates, we can get you those dates. I believe Tamworth is this Thursday and we'll be at the CAP, I believe it is at the CAP building right on Route 16. Thank you. Tri-County CAP building. We then have November eighth in Keene at the Cheshire County Superior Court and November fourteenth at Salem High School. You also can submit written comments to the commission by snail mail at Post Office Box 419 in Concord. Zip code 03302. You can also submit written comments electronically through our web site at [www.nhcritcourts.org](http://www.nhcritcourts.org) or by sending us an email at [public01@nhcritcourts.org](mailto:public01@nhcritcourts.org). All of your comments made today or by email, snail mail or otherwise will be entered into the public record. They also will be distributed to all of our commission members. We have been conducting a public opinion survey throughout the summer. Those results will be announced shortly and we do have a press conference scheduled for the eighth of November. Public input will continue to be gathered, at this point we have gathered input from throughout the state and will continue to do so throughout the fall. We will deliberate this winter and issue a final report in April or May of next year. The commission has met three times as a full commission and our next meeting is scheduled for November fourteenth in Concord. Meetings are open to the public, but as you might imagine because we have a hundred members, public participation in the meetings is limited to those members and observation by the public is encouraged. I will serve as moderator this afternoon and this evening. My role is to

assure that each person attending gets their opportunity to speak, make comments, but I will not be having a discussion with you. We will ask that you use your time as productively as possible and make sure that your comments are limited to making suggestions or helping us understand your experience. I would suggest that you avoid temptation to retry a case that you have been involved in because frankly we can't do anything about that. We can't reverse any court order but rather what we can do is to learn from your experience so we suggest that you take the experience from your case and use it to suggest improvements on how the courts function, or if in your view how they do not function. In order to make as much time possible, I will be asking that you fill out a card so that we will have an opportunity to have your name and your address and phone number if in fact we have further questions. At this point I will officially open the hearing, the listening session at three eighteen (3:18) and ask if there is anyone here that wishes to share some of their knowledge with us this evening? (pause) Sir, would you like to do that?

Foris Dupont: I would very much.

KE: Ok.

FD: I'm taking (inaudible).

KE: You're welcome to take as much time as you would like.

FD: Now the only thing was...let's see, the prosecutor is going to wind up two times and...the Mayor of Berlin is once, the Mayor is next, that's all-

KE: All right.

FD: That's ok?

KE: That'll be fine.

FD: I don't want you to stop me because sometimes the comprehension of what I've already said will be greatly in jeopardy.

KE: Yup.

FD: And I, I can't tell you how hard I worked to make sure cause, well actually I might as well tell you since you're the administrator here anyway, correct Mrs-

KE: That is true. Yes.

FD: Well, this will be (inaudible) with being published for sure already.

KE: Ok.

FD: In the Berlin Daily Sun so that it's structurally the way they have it to publish. I don't mean other people's letters, they don't mind me going as far as I did with regard to it's only statistics. No matter what it leans to, nobody can get out of statistics, you see, but they do have statistics right from here that would definitely be published in the paper. I already know it.

KE: Ok.

FD: So, ok.

KE: Thank you.

FD: You're welcome.

KE: Before I forget, I'd like to introduce our other commission member who's joined us this afternoon. Would you like to...?

Larry Gilpin: Larry Gilpin from Amherst.

KE: Thank you, Larry. Thank you, sir.  
(inaudible)

KE: Would you like to go ahead up and you're welcome to speak right into the microphone. And how do you pronounce your first name? Forist?

Foris Dupont: Foris.

KE: Foris. And Foris Dupont. Why don't you go right up and-

FD: Oh, over here.

KE: Yes and that microphone will record you and then we'll make sure we get everything down. Thank you for joining us this afternoon.

FD: Thank you. Though the way off the standard, people with children need our court did not and to this day hasn't helped in the way that would give people assurance that they in referring to consequences when necessary were effective. Those are the ones that my work needs to reach, the borderline people. If you believe the cause of my work makes a difference, then it's up to you to try to reach those people who need to clutch the facts in dealing with the subject, not only in my community but in the whole state. The following is an example of back in the past in that the defendant in my first letter was scheduled that same week for a list of up to six crimes to appear before the court and with the tag ring leader of the group with a possible five thousand dollar, the bail was only set for that fine, and two to five years jail time. He got six hundred dollars and two months. To have the court as a vital part and depended on by parents of maintaining law and order. It's done with the example of a sentence for a well-known misdemeanor causes young people to fear the circumstances associated with serving said sentence. In times past the court treated this matter as indifferent to it. When I asked Mayor of Berlin Monday night this the courts are supposed to be more than an attitude check to align young people's lives temporarily. Has the court done something to make the difference it's supposed to or do you wish it had done more? He said some results were evident but as evidence of some deep rooted the problem was of repetitive crimes by the same ones just that the same names aren't listed these days as it came with the new prosecutor. It seemed to play less of a difference than to solve as he as the Mayor of the people of Berlin as it is under his supervision as what could be a solution if the larger part of the population could have depended on a steep sentence for an easy one to commit, causing young people to think twice from the fear. But introducing the new prosecutor.....it did something, but an even more resolute statement he made was quotation could be stiffer.

KE: Thank you very much.

FD: You're welcome.

KE: Anyone else like to join us this evening with any comment? (pause)

FD: One thing about it is I would be glad to in that I furnish this first letter.

KE: Ok.

FD: Because we were in a lot of trouble when this particular thing arrived but of course, you know, I think that the commission will say there's no case like that but here it is.

KE: Well-

FD: I kid you not, they will definitely think there is if they read this letter. So, do you want it?

KE: Yup.

FD: This is the copy of the letter referred to as the first letter.

KE: Ok.

FD: Ok, then I, as you asked me for some simple changes word for word except for I got just a little snag but actually there wasn't any snag.

KE: Ok.

FD: Really, you know what I meant-

KE: I did.

FD: - by the new prosecutor. This is exactly what the speech was literally written, ok.

KE: Very good. Thank you very much.

FD: Making a copy of it is going to be tough.

KE: Well, that's, we will certainly make sure that this happens.

FD: Ok.

KE: We appreciate your taking time.

FD: Ok.

KE: Thank you. Since there is no one else at this point in time, we will be here until five pm and then we will reopen at six o'clock until eight pm if anyone is going to join us for further comment. Thank you. I will close this part of the listening session, it is twenty eight after three.

KE: It is ten minutes of four and I will reopen the hearing. Phil Waystack, would you like to offer some pearls of wisdom this evening?

Phil Waystack: Sure I would.

KE: Thank you.

PW: I sure would. I've been a practicing lawyer for thirty one years. I live in Colebrook, New Hampshire. I am a proud resident of Coos County and have been that entire time. I am a trial lawyer, we have a small firm in Colebrook. One of my partners is a criminal lawyer. He's also a part time judge of the probate court, Coos County Probate Court. His name is (name omitted).

KE: Excuse me.

PW: Oh, sorry.

KE: (laughs) Thank you.

PW: Just by way of information. I have another partner by the name of (name omitted), he, too is a trial lawyer, he's just finishing up a jury trial in Coos County Superior Court. I understand the purpose of this commission is to look at the way justice is delivered and maybe to think, to give some thought about other ways that it can be done better.

KE: That is correct.

PW: And so I'll just share some of my experiences with you and I will try to outline the different viewpoints or perspectives that I have on it. Let me begin with what we call family law, which really includes divorce, custody, visitation and all the related issues that go with that. For many years I did divorce work and at that time it was all in the Superior court and eight out of every ten cases had lawyers. I stopped doing it about nine years ago and in that time, that nine or ten year period, the situation has reversed dramatically. Now eight out of ten cases have no lawyers. And I think a big part of the reason that is so is because some people in the justice system have realized that there needs to be a better way to deliver services to people. And I encourage that greatly. It always was distressing to me that people who are in, and this is Coos County, it is the most rural county of the state, it is one of the poorest counties in the state and people, I've found over the years can ill afford to pay for attorneys particularly when they're faced with something as critically important as the break-up of a marriage, issues about visitation or custody of their children. And it was always troubling to me. The family court, the institution of the family court itself gives people without lawyers an

opportunity to do their own thing without a lawyer and really gets the issues resolved in a much quicker time. And the interesting to me is from what I can see and I don't make a formal study of it but I've been involved in the community for many years, I think probably the justice they get without lawyers is just as good if in fact not better than that with they got with lawyers. Why do I mean that? And this is really my message today. I think one of the key elements for people involving the justice system is this, there's two things that I think they really need and don't sometimes get because of the way the system works. The first is they need a feeling that they've been heard. When people have civil disputes, whether it's, I mentioned family law, but the same goes for what we would call a small claim. The same goes for a dispute with your neighbor. People get themselves in disputes that they're unable to resolve for whatever reason and there's lots of reasons and they're overlapping. There's emotional issues, there's financial issues, there may be substance abuse issues, alcohol, drugs, maybe a combination of both. But the trouble is it puts them at an impasse. So traditionally they go hire a lawyer and try and resolve it. But as I already explained, many times they can't afford that lawyer but the key is whether they have a lawyer or not, in order to resolve their dispute, they need to get something off their chest. They need to be heard and so if they get that hearing even if they don't get the result they're looking for, they feel as though someone's listening and it gives them an opportunity to go forward and resolve their, their difficulties. So the first issue that I think needs to be really be addressed is people without lawyers having an opportunity to be heard and there's several different ways that happens and I'm going to come back to that in a second. But the second issue is and I believe this, probably the older I get the more I realize how important this is, in addition to being heard, they also need to be heard promptly. If you have a dispute which is overwhelming which to many people it is, you know, they can't sleep, they can't eat, they can't do their job because of this issue. If you have to wait a year or eighteen months to get a hearing, that's way too long. If you got a chance to get before someone and I'll come back to that in a minute within weeks or months after this issue arises, there's a much better chance for a good outcome. The longer the period between the time of the dispute, be it family law, be it a small claims, a dispute with your neighbor, the longer the time goes between when the dispute arises, and you have a chance to resolve it, the less chance it's going to get resolved good and the more chance for I would call collateral damage. Other things happen. So, if I were designing the system and I'm not designing the system, if I were to give my comments that would be helpful it would be we need to provide people an opportunity to be heard and to be heard promptly. And if those two things can happen as a result of this commission, I think the citizens of New Hampshire will be well served. Now, as you look around the state, we have various facilities and you know that cause apparently you folks have gone around the state. This is, it's a tough place up here for people. First of all, is the part time judge issue which is a huge issue but that's for a later date and I'm not sure that's your purview but I'll mention that.

KE: Everything is our purview.

PW: Ok. The part time judge issue, here's the problem. We have a bunch of part time judges in the district court in Coos County. There really aren't any courts busy enough to have a single full time judge so what happens, you go to Colebrook on Thursday and you get judge x. I got it. You go to Lancaster on Tuesday you got judge y, there used to be two separate courts here, one in Gorham, seven miles up the road one in Berlin. As a

result of the family court, I think those two courts are getting combined now. But what would make sense and what we had heard, we talked about years ago, is why not have one full time judge who goes to each location? Then that judge is a judge every single day and if a critical, while he is sitting in Berlin, or she is sitting in Berlin, if a critical issues comes up out of Lancaster, it can be dealt with instead of waiting for a week or two weeks for the Lancaster judge to get there. So that's another issue. Let me come back to my first point, which is an opportunity to be heard. I, I'm a trial lawyer, I try cases. I mostly do personal injury work for people who have been injured. A lot of my work is in the Federal District Court in Concord. The rest of my work is pretty much in Superior Courts throughout the state. One of the things that's happened in that civil system in the last four or five years, oh six or seven years is the institution of alternative dispute resolution which now uses the acronym ADR. Alternative dispute resolution amounts to three different things, classically three things. One is called a summary jury trial, it's essentially two lawyers get up and do their closing arguments. The second is a thing called neutral evaluation where an experienced person often times an attorney, could be a judge could be a lay person, listens to both sides and tries to evaluate the case. The third and by far the most important is something, a process called mediation. Mediation is a process where both parties have a chance to state their case briefly to a trained mediator. Then after they both state their, and this is the part of getting it off their chest, you got to say what you, the reason you're mad at her, you get to say it, you get the reason to say why you're mad at her. You get it off your chest now the mediator separates you and does shuttle diplomacy back and forth. Mediation as a way of resolving disputes is extremely effective. I don't know the statistics in state court, you probably have them. I can tell you what they are in federal court. Former Chief Judge Paul Barbadaro cited these statistics all the time. Ninety eight, of the cases of lawsuits, civil lawsuits that are filed in the federal district court, ninety eight percent of those cases settle in mediation. The federal system enforces mediation. If you're going to file a federal lawsuit, you go through the process but at the end of that process you have to go to mediation, oftentimes in the federal court. And there's a little, there's a little pressure on you about that. My concern for my clients is that they have that opportunity to be heard. Sometimes it's a trial but if they get what they want in mediation, they're happy. They don't have the uncertainty of a trial, you know, trials are tough, you win or you lose and there's no second chance. So the mediation, now, the reason I'm talking, it works in state court, too in almost as well. I think that the federal court is probably a little stricter guidelines on mediation so it may be more successful. In Superior Court, we have rules as you know. Rule 170 is a provision for alternative dispute resolution and a number of lawyers, my partner's one of them, have been trained to do that. It's, the federal court is a little higher pressure so I think it works a little better but still, people will say that the mediation process resolves most of the cases in Superior Court as well. So, just to extrapolate that to people without lawyers, why can't that same process work like in the district courts? So now there's a big change underway with the sort of the family court becoming involved and big changes and no one's sure what's going to happen. But the thing that I really like about it is it's people friendly. They don't have to go to get lawyers that they can ill afford over issues that they really don't need lawyers. The advent, the advent of case managers for family law for family court is a way where people who may not have had a lot of formal education and that's a fact of life up here, there aren't a lot of highly

educated people. Even to fill out simple forms, they need help. And if there's a case manager or someone to assist them in doing that it gives them their chance. Then if they're given the option of, you have two, you have an option here, you can either go to trial in a month in front of judge a, b or c or you can go to mediation in two weeks. My guess is most of the people opt for mediation and I know the mediation in Superior Court for marital cases is also highly successful, so it would seem to me if we're going to make the courts user friendly for ordinary people without lawyers who don't have huge, huge problems, we ought to get them into court quicker, give them an option for mediation or some form of alternative dispute resolution because that really to me, it meets the biggest need they have which is the feeling that they've been heard. Because once they get to state their case or their issues, even if it isn't a perfect solution, it's off their chest. What happens is they keep it inside them for months and sometimes years and it just creates other problems that go from there. So there's my overall sense on local courts being more user friendly. The other thing I will say to you is this. The level of resources available to deal with other issues. Let me talk about juveniles for a moment if I can. The level of resources available for juveniles varies dramatically from where you are in the state. For instance, I'm involved with the judicial selection commission, we help to screen judges. We were talking to the judges about the Keene District Court, the Keene District Court has what they call a boutique court within the district court and it's called a mental health court, so anyone who comes to the district court with some type of a criminal charge where there's an overlay or an underlay of mental health issues, they get the option of going to the mental health court and really what that and what I understand it is, is and I'm not an expert in this, it's a diversionary court. So, if what's causing the person to act up let's say is a mental health issue that isn't being dealt with, get them to the mental health court, get them some services, get them some treatment and you may deal with the problem that's causing the criminal behavior. To me it's the same thing for juveniles, again, north country hard for resources here, hard to get resources. If there were more treatment options available for juveniles who find themselves before the court system I think it would be a reasonably good chance of changing behavior and I mean I've in thirty one years I've done everything, I've been a general practitioner, I've done criminal law, divorce, I've done virtually everything. Criminals who begin as young people, or young people who exhibit criminal behavior, one or two things happens. It either continues or it stops. If it continues for whatever reason, I'll come back to that in a sec, youthful criminals become adult criminals and then the theory of recidivism they just continue creating crimes, more of a burden to society and it continues. To be reactive to that, ok we caught you for assault or something like that, to be reactive to that really doesn't address the issues that are causing it in my view. There is a new theory that I've heard from people who know far more about it than I do called restorative justice and the theory of restorative justice in the criminal, in the criminal field is this, that if a crime is committed, let's say a burglary against you for instance, it isn't just you who suffers, its society who suffers. It's your neighborhood that previously thought we were safe, there wasn't a problem. If your house is burglarized, so couldn't yours, so couldn't your neighbor on the other side da da da da. So if the person who's responsible for that is dealt with, maybe part of the answer to preventing that kind of behavior in the future is a restorative answer which deals not only with the punishment issue or the retribution issue, but also the hurt to society, meaning maybe that this individual does some

community service in the neighborhood so that people can get the feeling that this won't continue and continue and continue. Years ago we used to call it court diversion, so if a juvenile comes in and he's a first timer or she's a first timer and it isn't a real serious crime, try to divert them. The problem with that theory is if there are no programs to divert them to or if there is a paucity or very few services available that addresses their need, then the diversion isn't going to work. But to me the proactive theory is this, rather than just reacting to someone who's committed a criminal act at a young age, if you can try to find out why that is happening. It may be a school issue, it may be a parent with a substance abuse issue, it could be a sexual abuse issue. But you're never going to find that out in the context of a juvenile hearing most of the time. The issue is dealt with and it moves on. But if there was a better opportunity early on to try and get to the root of what's causing it and to deal with it on a proactive basis, maybe that young person who had a lot of anger because he watched his father beat his mother day after day after day and it's a cycle he can't get out of, maybe in the dealing with that child's anger, you find out about this situation and you create a model that requires the parents to get service as well as the child. If you can take the source of that child's anger away you may be able to turn that child around and then if you turn the child around who was in a bad situation involving violence and substance abuse, break that cycle then maybe that child doesn't become a recidivist and maybe the young criminal doesn't become an adult criminal that becomes a burden to society for years and years and years and thousands of dollars. So, it would seem to me if there are more opportunities for resources that address the route of what's causing the young person to act out and...I'm no expert in this field, I gotta say that again, it seems to me that many times it's a cry for attention because of the situation that young person is in and unless you address what's causing the situation that they are in, you are really not going to address that child's problems, young person's problems. Again, when you have mental health courts, juvenile courts, that is aware of that and has resources to deal with that, you're more likely to become effective. So there's the juvenile issue. I wish that we did have more services but it's hard and what you often see here is this, we have a, as you know the public defender program and they run from court to court to court again if there was one full time judge who was in a certain court every day, that attorney and the juveniles and everybody else would be at one place at a time and more services would be available. I think in the long run, lawyers are too expensive for most people, to be frank with you. And you know that, I don't have to tell you that and even up here in the north country where our hourly rates are probably half or a third of what's being charged in Concord or Manchester, the level of income here is probably percentage wise lower than what the level income is in the more popular city areas of the state. I think people need to have a chance to be heard in a prompt fashion without having to have lawyers if they really don't need them and if we could address those issues, I think the judicial system would work much better for people. It's really happened in Superior Court with family law cases, again, ten years ago eight to ten people with family law issues had lawyers, now it's just the reverse of that. And the family court model is helping to bring that about. If the same theories that have caused, that have allowed eight out of ten people formerly being represented by lawyers to represent themselves, if the same things that allowed that to happen take place, what I would say is the entry level which is the district court system, then how can it be anything but a benefit to people? So, there's my general sense of the way some of the things work up here and why it's so

difficult. And you know, going back to 1975 when I started doing criminal law, you know because it's a small area you're more familiar with people, no names, but you'd see the same people all the time and because you're aware of the family situations, the same situation continued so the same reaction was going to occur and ultimately the kid who at fourteen who's burglarizing, at twenty three he's doing more serious crimes. The home situation is still the same and society suffers as a result of it. So, so I think those are the critical issues that need to be dealt with in the north country. The difficulty is the resource part is so much smaller here than that what I think needs to happen in order for a workable system to occur is that there needs to be a creative way of looking at providing those resources so that people have their opportunity to be heard, have their option for a prompt hearing and have their issues addressed. And if that happens, we all benefit by that. So, that's my quick sense on the justice system.

KE: Good. Thank you very much.

PW: Do you have any questions at all that I can answer?

KE: Well, we're a listening session, so-

PW: So, you're not questioning?

KE: Correct.

PW: Ok. Is there anything else I need to say or should say here? The biggest difference in the north country and other parts of the state you're going to see is I think the issue of part time courts which really makes it difficult for people and for that matter, for the part time judges and lawyers. I mean one day you're in front of a judge of this lawyer who's wearing a black robe, so he's a judge that day and you respect that. The next day you're fighting in another court where this individual is an attorney. It does, it creates, it's difficult. And I don't, it seems to me there is a way to address that in a way that allows everybody to move on but if there was one example I'd use it would be there ought to be a full time district court judge for this county because rather than have five judges who work, you know, a day or two days a week on a regular basis just doesn't make any sense. I think I've said it all.

KE: Thank you.

PW: You're very welcome.

KE: Have a good meeting.

PW: We're going to try, we're going to try.

END OF AFTERNOON SESSION.

#### EVENING SESSION TO FOLLOW:

KE: I will now open the six pm session of the Citizens Commission on the Courts. It is six fourteen (6:14) and tonight we have Barbara Tetreault with us and she is going to offer some comment.

Barbara Tetreault: Thank you. Barbara Tetreault with the Berlin Daily Sun, also a member of the Northern New Hampshire Press Association. I just have a couple comments. Can you pick me up? On, e I think that the computerization that they've done with the Supreme Court has been a really great help to reporters in rural areas, a list serv that they do, putting the slip opinions online and now you can pick up and go online and hear actual oral arguments testifying. That's been a great, great improvement for press who live in rural areas of the states like us who have maybe one or two cases a year that we'd like to follow pertaining to the Supreme Court or getting, you know, calling them

and trying to keep track of cases is just difficult so that I think has been a great improvement. Now I know that doing that at the Superior Court is probably a whole different ballgame. What I might suggest would be really helpful for Superior Courts if they could somehow put online their daily dockets, their daily schedules so you could say a week at a time go and see or two days in advance what the case is that they're hearing. I suspect that putting decisions on, eventually it would be nice to see everything online but I think if they could at least start with that that would be easy and reasonable. I have to say, you know, having someone who deals a lot with the local Superior Court in Coos, that I find their office to be very efficient, the clerks are very helpful, very patient. I'm always asking them can I see one more file and they inevitably with good, good humor go and satisfy me. I think it's a good court system, good experiences with probate. I only deal once in a while with Berlin District Court, but the clerks there have been very, very helpful. The other issue that I wanted to address is filing fees. I believe Superior Court now charges a hundred and twenty five, a hundred and fifty dollars if you want to file a complaint on a right to know violation. Or if you want to file to open up a search warrant or an arrest affidavit. I just think that it does not serve the meaning of those statutes to charge a fee. If a member of the public or a member of the press feels that there's been a violation of a right to know law or a meeting, shouldn't have to pay to see that democracy is served, is followed. It should be free. I mean I know that, you know, the right to know statute is set up if to give lee-ways so that people can represent themselves, although you're already at a disadvantage if you're a citizen or a reporter going up against a community that has legal representation. But the courts take some lee-way, but it would be nice if you didn't have to go and then pay just to file that fee as long as you have good faith belief that there's been a violation of a right to know law. I know a hundred and twenty five dollars, a hundred and fifty dollars doesn't sound like much perhaps, but if you're a newspaper or a citizen, that's a considerable sum of money. So I just think that filing fees and those situations ought to be waived. They didn't use to exist, I think they put them in a couple of years ago. So, those are my thoughts and thank you for the opportunity.

KE: Thank you. Anyone else wish to testify this evening? (pause) Thank you, I will recess until anyone else joins us or it turns eight o'clock and we all turn to pumpkins. Thank you.

END OF BERLIN LISTENING SESSION