

STATE OF MINNESOTA  
IN THE SUPREME COURT

-----  
In Re Petitions of the Lawyers  
Professional Responsibility Board,  
the Board of Law Examiners, and  
the Board of Continuing Legal  
Education for Increases in the  
Attorney Registration Fee  
-----

OFFICE OF  
APPELLATE COURTS  
FILED

MAR 9 1987

WAYNE TSCHIMPERLE  
CLERK

C5-84-2139

C2-84-2163

C9-81-1206

3-19-87 Hearing

TO THE SUPREME COURT OF MINNESOTA:

The Attorney Registration Fee Committee states:

1. The Supreme Court established the Attorney Registration Fee Committee by Court Order and appointed the following persons as members of the Committee:

Sheila Fishman	Richard Malone
Jeffrey Hassan	JoAnne MaGuire
Joseph B. Johnson	Jay Mondry
Elton Kudered	Felix Phillips
Roger Magnuson	Jerry Simon

2. The Committee, as part of its duties and responsibilities, was charged with reviewing and commenting on the petition of the Lawyers Professional Responsibility Board for an increase in its allocation from the Attorney Registration Fee from \$70 to \$80;

3. As part of the Committee's review, three members visited the offices of the Lawyers Professional Responsibility Board, met with the Director, reviewed the Dreher Report, and prepared a report for consideration of the Committee, recommending that the request for a \$10 increase be granted:

4. The opinion of the members of the Committee was sought by telephone, resulting in six members agreeing with the recommendation, and four members unable to be reached.

5. The Committee, as part of its duties and responsibilities, was charged with reviewing and commenting on the petition of the Board of Law Examiners for an increase in its allocation from the Attorney Registration Fee from \$7 to \$15;

6. As part of the Committee's review, a member met with the Board of Law Examiners, considered alternative sources of funding, and prepared a report for consideration of the Committee, recommending that the request for a \$8 increase be denied;

7. The report was circulated to the members of the Board of Law Examiners, and a representative appeared at a meeting of the Committee seeking support for the petition;

8. The opinion of the members of the Committee was sought by telephone, resulting in five members agreeing with the recommendation, one member disagreeing, and four members unable to be reached.

9. The Committee, as part of its duties and responsibilities, was charged with reviewing and commenting on the petition of the Board of Continuing Legal Education for an increase in its allocation from the Attorney Registration Fee from \$5 to \$7;

10. As part of the Committee's review, two members met with the Chairman of the Board of Continuing Legal Education, considered alternative sources of funding, and prepared a report for consideration of the Committee, recommending (a) that the request for a \$2 increase be denied, and (b) that the Board seek and institute alternate funding systems that may eliminate the need for any allocation from the license fee;

11. The report was circulated to the members of the Board of Continuing Legal Education, and a representative appeared at a meeting of the Committee seeking support for the petition;

12. The Director of Minnesota Continuing Legal Education, a

provider of courses which the majority of lawyers in Minnesota attend, also appeared at a meeting of the Committee, and explained the consequences of charging fees to review courses, as that experience has been learned from other states;

13. The opinion of the members of the Committee was sought by telephone, resulting in (a) five members agreeing with the recommendation to deny the request for an increase and one member disagreeing, and (b) five members agreeing with the recommendation for alternate funding outside the attorney registration fee, and one member disagreeing. Four members could not be reached.

#### SUMMARY

The current concensus of opinion among members of the Committee is summarized as follows:

1. That the petition of the Lawyers Professional Responsibility Board be granted;
2. That the petition of the Board of Law Examiners be denied;
3. That the petition of the Board of Continuing Legal Education be denied; and
4. That the Board of Continuing Legal Education seek and institute alternate funding systems that may eliminate the need for any allocation from the Attorney Registration Fee.

Dated: March 6, 1987

Respectfully submitted,

---

M. L. Proctor, for the Committee  
Attorney No. 88523  
345 St. Peter, #800  
St. Paul, MN 55102  
(612) 297-6400