

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Elmer, you're next. Senator Lindsay, you're next.

SENATOR LINDSAY: I'd yield my time to Senator Morrissey to keep picking on me.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Morrissey.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: I guess I would just, you know, I was concerned about that, too, Senator. And Senator Landis divided the question exactly where, Mr. Clerk? The division of the question is where?

ASSISTANT CLERK: As I understand it, Senator, it's divided between lines 8 and 9, would be the equivalent of Sections 1 and 2.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Okay, and that's what I understood. So, Senator Lindsay, we're still leaving that superseedeas bond in there.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Right. I'm pointing that out, Senator, I don't have the interest in this issue that you do, but I'm trying to throw out aside, just purely from a legal standpoint, not from a policy standpoint, it's something I'm just throwing out that may want to be considered. Either way, I'll vote for the amendment. But I just pointed it out as something that may want to be considered by the body when they're voting on it.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Okay, do you think it's good precedent, since we have only four other institutions or agencies that have direct appeal to the Supreme Court, and they all are...three of them, constitutionally created and one of them, water resources, is water usage directly referred to in the Constitution. Do you think it's good policy to create another and then possibly set the precedent for future environmental concerns as for the same...

SENATOR LINDSAY: I would kind of concur with Senator Kristensen that I don't think it's bad policy. I think you're talking about a major environmental issue. We have in other areas, Department of Water Resources we have direct appeals, again, talking about major environmental issues. So, no, I don't think it's a bad precedent.