

A. I would suppose that I will, after I have had a chance to complete my analysis of these provisions. Particularly if I find any of them are in my mind unworkable or totally undesirable.

Q. What are your feelings at this time on the requirements of mandatory appointments of judges from lists submitted by the commission?

A. There are some parts of that I approve of. I'm not so sure I like the idea of a judge running against his record, but I haven't thoroughly thought through those things and probably will be commenting on them later on.

Q. Will you tell us a little more about that aspect of the judicial proposal?

A. Well, under the new constitution the judicial terms are ten-year terms instead of the present fifteen-year terms. And the judges would be selected from lists provided by a commission, and they would have to run for reelection every ten years. But they wouldn't run against any other candidates, they would run against their records. In other words, it would be a case of saying, yes, we want him to continue or, no, we do not.

Q. Well, what's the alternative to that?

A. To allow the judge to run against anyone who would seek to file for the office of judge; I believe the bar associations can control this very well, the people who have the confidence of the general community in legal matters, by taking active positions in the campaigns.

Q. Well, would this keep the judges out of politics?

A. There is no way to keep any official who runs for election out of politics that I can see.

Q. Isn't it less political to allow a person to run against his record rather than against anyone who wanted to oppose him?

A. I'm not sure I agree with that. I think it's quite dangerous. If you had someone who was totally undesirable to the bench running against his record, it would be very difficult to get him out. It's hard to stimulate interest in that regard.

Q. How do you feel about the bicameral Legislature?

A. I'm for the retention of the bicameral Legislature, because I think very basically it gives a second chance to look at legislation. It gives two points of view and it may be more of a cautious approach, but I think it has proven itself to be valuable. I think many bills, when