



September 13, 2017

Sent Via Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail

Clerk of Supreme Court
ATTN: Deputy Clerk – Rules
P.O. Box 1688
Madison, WI 53701-1688
clerk@wicourts.gov

Re: Rule Petition 17-04, In re Petition to Repeal and Replace SCR 10.03(5)(b) with SCR 10.03(5)(b)-(e) and to Amend SCR 10.03(6)

Dear Deputy Clerk for Rules:

I am writing in response to Rule Petition 17-04. I am writing to comment regarding the Rule Petition and to request that I be allowed to speak to the Court at the hearing to be held on October 30, 2017.

The matter of the State Bar of Wisconsin being a mandatory bar has been a topic of a great deal of debate and discussion over the years. I served on the State Bar Board of Governors when this topic was last addressed at the Board of Governors' level with a request that the State Bar itself move to become a voluntary bar. While I understand the position of those who believe a voluntary bar is appropriate, I voted to support the continuation of the mandatory bar status after a great deal of debate and personal thought. I still believe that the State Bar of Wisconsin should be a mandatory bar for various reasons that I will present to the Court.

I do not believe that Rule Petition 17-04 in any way advances the issue or in any way properly addresses the question of whether the State Bar of Wisconsin should be a mandatory bar or a voluntary bar. My reasons for that statement are the following:

- I believe that the mandatory bar status allows the State Bar of Wisconsin in conjunction with the Wisconsin Supreme Court to perform the necessary public

Clerk of Supreme Court
September 13, 2017
Page 2

service and other activities to maintain the credibility of the Court and the law in our society. In today's world, I believe that role and function is appropriate and necessary.

- I do not believe that the proposal contained in Rule Petition 17-04 will eliminate the questions that exist regarding the expenditure of mandatory dues funds and that the current procedure for a review of the lobbying expenditures and activities more clearly addresses the concerns raised by the Petitioner. It appears that the Petitioner is objecting to findings from the arbitrator under the current procedure and that the proposed procedure to address mandatory dues and voluntary dues will simply provide a more complicated process to address the concerns raised by the Petitioner.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment regarding Rule Petition 17-04. I again request to appear before the Court on October 30. Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

RUDER WARE



Dean R. Dietrich