

SPEAKER BAACK: Have you all voted? Have you all voted? Senator Chizek. A roll call vote has been requested. Senator Bernard-Stevens, would you please record your presence. Senator Pirsch, record your presence. Senator Rogers, please record your presence. Senator Schmit, would you please record your presence. Yes. We are looking for Senator Schellpeper. Senator Chizek, we cannot locate Senator Schellpeper, can we go ahead and do the roll call? We are voting on ceasing debate, and a roll call vote has been requested. Mr. Clerk, call the roll

ASSISTANT CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See pages 2091-92 of the Legislative Journal.) The vote is 28 ayes, 9 nays on the motion to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BAACK: Debate ceases. Senator Beutler, would you like to close on your amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would simply note that with regard to the original Robak amendment, the question was called with two proponents speaking and no one speaking against it. And with regard to this amendment, the question was called with two speaking in favor and none speaking against it. Clearly, it is clear what is going on here, which is fine. That can be dealt with, but I just ask you to think about why it is going on. It is going on because if you sit there and look at the handouts that I gave you and look at the facts, you would never agree to spending \$100,000 for nothing, for nothing. We have child abuse, we have...look at the bills that we have on Select File and General File that you'd like to have an extra \$100,000 for and ask yourself why am I spending \$100,000 here when I don't have to? All you have to do is combine two judicial districts, the work load of those two districts put together will be at the very average of the judicial work loads around the state. They will not be overworked. In fact some of them will be worked the right amount for the first time in a long time, and you will have saved \$100,000 for another purpose. That's what this amendment does. It adds one judge instead of adding two new combined, and combines two new districts, so that you can spread out the work load in those two districts. What have the arguments been against my amendment? Well, first of all, they say they're going to redistrict the whole state. I can tell you, and I will tell you after this what my experience has been with judicial redistricting, because I will have time to talk,