

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Well, that they can't come to a separate conclusion that they can just review the procedures.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: For error.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Error in procedure.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay. Wouldn't it be...

SENATOR MORRISSEY: In other words,...

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Wouldn't it be a whole lot simpler just to put in here that the Supreme Court will have this trial de novo on the record, so they can review the record?

SENATOR MORRISSEY: It would be a whole lot simpler, Senator, to leave it like it was. But that's not what, obviously, the body is going to do.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay. Well, I guess I'm more concerned about not...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: We've got a procedure in the Supreme Court that I don't want to get all messed up, because then you're going to have an appeal route to decide if that's what they meant or not. And, quite frankly, I don't think the court would have to follow the last sentence. I think they could do a whole lot of other things, if we'd just leave it alone. I'd be interested to hear, maybe, Senator Landis, if I could get your attention back at some time, about the...wouldn't it be a whole lot simpler just to put this trial de novo on the record and not deal with this last two sentences, in your opinion?

SENATOR LANDIS: (First part of response inaudible, microphone not turned on)...yes. My suggestion is that we divide the question, and that we handle the first part as one policy question, and the second part as another policy question.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, now that I can live with, if for nothing else, just so I don't get the procedure of the Supreme Court and create this whole new standard that I don't think would work and would sort of really muddy the waters. So, with