

Appropriations Committee do the numbers. Based on his calculations of what we will save because you not only do away with judges, you do away with support staff, you do away with all the administrative services that follow that, you do away with some of the benefits, you do away with some of the capital equipment and outlays that go with that. The approximate savings is right at a million dollars over the biennium and if anyone would like to see that, I have the memorandum here from the fiscal office to do so. With that, I would urge the adoption of the amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: You've heard the closing on the first half of the Kristensen amendment. We will now proceed to vote. All those in favor of the first half of the amendment vote aye, opposed vote no. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of Senator Kristensen's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: The first half of the Kristensen amendment is adopted. The next item on the bill, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Schimek would move to amend the bill, Senator Schimek and Haberman, excuse me. (AM0827 is found on page 1197 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, Mr. President and members of the body, I'm bringing back to you an amendment that was actually first offered by Senator Haberman and then he withdrew it yesterday. It's on page 1197 of the Journal and it raises the issue of the judicial nominating commissions being open to the public and would follow the open meetings law. I didn't know where else to raise this issue this year except on this bill now. I think it is a very important issue, one in which I know a number of concerns have been expressed in the media over the past few years. There have been studies done on the fairness of the process about the gender bias of the process and I just think that it would be very appropriate for the judiciary to open up this process. After all, it is the judiciary that has to rule on a number of other governmental bodies on this issue and give direction to those bodies to follow the open meetings laws and I think it's very...I don't want to say hypocritical, I don't want to use that strong a word, but I think it puts them in a very