

Foster, Denise

From: John Cannel [cannel@lawrev.state.nj.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 26, 2012 11:16 AM
To: Foster, Denise
Subject: GR 31.1 (L) (12), Access to Administrative Records,

I am writing concerning the suggested new rule, GR 31.1 (L) (12), Access to Administrative Records, to concur generally with the submission of Thomas T Goldsmith, supporting increased openness in the records of the CPGB. Personal obligations make it impossible for me to submit a structured argument during the period available for public comment.

During the more than 45 years that I have worked in state government, I have worked under a wide variety of degrees of openness of public activities and records in executive, judicial and legislative agencies. For the last 25 years, I have been in the legislative branch and have become used to requirements that everything be public and open. That was a change for me as most of my prior experience was with Supreme Court Committees that worked very differently. My experience has been that openness improves the process; that it can be a burden, but that it improves the quality both of the procedures and of the results.

Where guardianships are concerned, there are added reasons for openness. A guardian has extraordinary power and extraordinary, fiduciary, duty. As a result, a guardian must be above reproach. This difference does not support restricted disclosure; it requires increased disclosure.