

and the judge looked at him. And after a pause, the man added the words, "takes me to be". So the judge, being arrogant but his conscience being struck because he knew he was a no good, rotten scoundrel told the man, put your words closer together. What Senator Kristensen and those who support this bill need to do is bring its terms closer to the truth and to do that they would have to say that it's a bill designed to reduce the work of these judges. They feel that they're elitists, they feel that they are better than other men, consequently they should receive large amounts of remuneration while doing less work than should be expected of somebody in that position. The judges have told us repeatedly in seeking this change that the quality of their work is poor, it is a shoddy, shabby product and the only way they can come close to offering anything that is passable is for you to substantially reduce the amount of work that they have to do. Now, by reducing the amount of work, it does not make each case that they handle a better work product, it makes their overall...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...work product better because they have fewer cases to mess up. So they just don't do as much messing up over all but each individual case still is badly handled. They should stop and consider some time what is being said about them when they offer this kind of material. I hope that what enough of us will do is to vote no so that this amendment, the portion that allows the judges to manipulate numbers so as to add additional judges, will be defeated.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Hall, I'm kind of surprised at you. You got up and you said, it's been voted in by the people, they want this court and, as chairman of the Revenue Committee, I think you should know so you can go back to your people and tell them that in five years the court system is going to cost us \$32 million a year, \$32 million a year with the addition of the appellate court. Now let's see what's happening in Iowa. Intermediate court, yes; backlog, yes. The Iowa Supreme Court decides which cases it will consider after examining those up for appellate review. This is to say that cases where a constitutional question is at issue may be of interest to the Supreme Court and will, therefore, skip the intermediate court and go directly to the