

trials. The Supreme Court rules prohibited their presence. It was held that an artist's rendition of persons or events by drawings and sketches was acceptable and on some occasions this practice was pursued. The Supreme Court finally yielded to the pressure and changed the rule to permit cameras, but accorded the chief judge and trial judges latitude to prescribe the type of cameras and areas for the photographers to be placed. The main concern we had in this circuit was the effect on jurors and witnesses the presence of cameras, including television equipment, would have.

There were some mixed feelings about the change but the judges were in agreement that if the media would cooperate, we would work to provide areas and procedures which would not be disruptive. We found that most of the equipment operated with little sound and without abnormal lighting. Assigned to areas somewhat removed from jurors and witnesses served to reduce adverse effects. It was not long before cameras became routine in cases of special public interest and were no real problem. The media has been very cooperative on the whole.

ATTORNEY ADVERTISING

Another change which did not directly affect or involve the courts but did have an indirect influence has been the removal of the ban against attorney advertising. Such prohibition had been in effect a long time and among many was

regarded as a non-debatable necessity. However, a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States held that constitutional freedom of speech and other First Amendment rights rendered such prohibition invalid, provided there was no deception or fraud practiced. What the eventual impact will be is not certain, but I can perceive no real deterioration of professionalism in the legal profession.

OTHER CHANGES

The installation of a law college at Florida State University in the early Sixties has had the effect of contributing substantially to the number of lawyers who have located in Tallahassee. In truth, expansion of law colleges at other universities has contributed to this expansion of lawyers throughout the state.

The District Courts of Appeal have constantly expanded. Especially is this true of our First DCA. Starting in 1957 with only three judges, but men of outstanding talent as lawyers and scholars, namely: Honorables John T. Wigginton, Donald K. Carroll and Wallace Sturgis, it now has twelve judges. Part of this expansion has been due to placing in that court jurisdiction of appeals from administrative agency rulings. The Second Circuit has been perhaps the principal contributor of judges appointed or elected to that court. Besides Judge John Wigginton, there have been Judges Dewey Johnson of Quincy, and Sam Spector, Guyte P.

McCord, Jr., James Joanos, Douglas Shivers, Ford Thompson, Richard W. Ervin, Jr., and Anne Cawthon Booth, of Tallahassee.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I would like to observe that though there have been many changes wrought during by 27 1/2 years on the circuit bench, there has been with the pains of adjustment a purpose to recognize the changes and seek to make them advance the real purposes of a trial court system. These purposes have been to respect and follow the law; to make our structures instruments of fairness, but also sufficiently firm to command respect; and to conform our procedures to achieve results that tend to render our communities safe, secure and prosperous without sacrificing basic freedoms and always retaining room to fulfill wholesome dreams and goals.