

December, 1990 thus also cutting the cost for this bill, which is not a great amount at any rate. But I would urge the adoption of the committee amendment and will speak to the body on the bill at a later time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Further discussion? Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I hate it when he does that. He gives that knowing look, the Chair does. But, as he indicated by his look to me, the bill I'm opposed to. The amendment is all right. The current status of the bill would cause it to die in 1991. They're going to cut that back a year, to 1990. So, although the amendment does not make a clean thing out of an unclean thing, it makes it less dirty. The bill is not wise from a policy standpoint. And I'll go into more details about that when we get to the bill. But I think, at this opportunity, I want to get a few comments into the record. The court system in this state, and the Bar Association, are shot through with the, oh boy, buddy network. There are no female district judges. There aren't going to be any anytime soon. There will never be a female member of the State Supreme Court. There has never been a high ranking official of the Bar Association who is a female. So when you talk about this being a bill to help those old retired judges at the district and Supreme Court level, you've got a bunch of crusty, old men who probably were not that capable as lawyers, not that competent as judges, and thank goodness, for all the litigants who would have to come before them, they've been retired, and this bill is going to call them out of retirement, Senator Kristensen, and reinflct them on the public. To the Supreme Court's credit, and probably they anticipated my reaction, when this group of superannuated former judges (laughter) get through trying to stumble and fumble their way through a case and arrive at a decision, that decision is not final, they make a written recommendation or hire somebody to make it for them to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court can accept their recommendation, or not accept it. So, instead of cutting out the work of the Supreme Court, it adds another layer of bureaucracy and gives some employment to these retired judges, who are probably in their wives' way at home. They always talk about the founding fathers. What about the wives of those founding fathers who had to tolerate them? So these judges are in everybody's way. They make a decision, the loser does not like it, so the loser petitions the Supreme Court for a