

that, if someone is going to divide that question, I'll wait and make my additional comments at that time. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Madam Senator Kristensen. Further discussion, Senator Morrissey.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Yes. And, again folks, I don't think we need this change. But certain people want a change, and it looks like it's going to happen, because everything they've wanted, so far, has happened, okay. So I'm just trying to make it fair. I'm trying to make it treat the citizens, and that's my intent, Senator Kristensen, treat the citizens the same as the corporation, only the least I can ask to accomplish today. Now it shouldn't be done at all in my consideration. The only place we have given direct appeal to the Supreme Court is Workers' Comp Court, and Court of Industrial Relations, the Board of Equalization, all...all referred to in the Constitution, and were all constitutionally created, and the water resources. And water resources...water is referred to...water use referred to in the Constitution. The only groups, four of them, that we've given this direct access to, direct appeal to the Supreme Court, but people want this and it's going to happen. So I say if we do it for the corporation, we do it for the people. Now maybe I'm not quite up on my law, and I am not, but as my hero, Popeye the sailor, used to say, I ain't no physicist, but I knows what matters, folks. And what matters is you treat the people at least as fairly as you treat the corporation. Popeye the sailor, that's right. And he did know what matters. So if, indeed, we decide that we need to go beyond the intent of this immediate appeal to the Supreme Court that these constitutionally created entities have and, indeed, set out one more entity that needs it, we need to do it fairly. And my understanding is that this amendment does not set a new standard for the court. The zero release objective cited it in 81-8...excuse me, 81-1580 has been there since the act was adopted in 1986. And I want to make it clear that the Legislature adopted the zero release objective and we expect the court to follow it, and we expect the department to follow it. I don't want that standard, that objective overlooked because it is in a separate section. If you're going to say it now isn't a standard, then you'll be saying something new because the zero release standard has been there since '86. I'm trying to define what the court should look at. If you vote against this amendment, sending a message to the court that the zero release objective, adopted by this body in '87, means nothing. Current