

of marijuana cases to go to the Supreme Court, we'll change the appeal process by statute. We'll do that with an appellate court. What he is doing is going to cement in to the Constitution that every criminal case is going to go in and that then he is also confusing the point of expediting it. Now expediting is what you do when the case gets into the Supreme Court. So if we hurry all the criminal cases through, and we've got all these criminal cases, what's going to happen to the divorce cases? What is going to happen to mortgage foreclosure? What is going to happen to all those other civil cases? You can't just forget those cases. The legal system doesn't just revolve around the criminal world, it revolves around everything. It revolves around adoptions, it revolves around divorce cases, it revolves around car accident cases, you just can't do that. And what he is doing is saying, well, let's just hurry up all the criminal cases because those are the ones that I think are most important and we'll forget about all those other cases, we'll make them wait. Well, that is what has got us in trouble now and you're waiting two years and it's going to get worse. I'd urge you to defeat the amendment by Senator Chambers. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The Chair recognizes Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Mr. President, I'd yield my time to Senator Chambers.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kristensen, you know the instance that they often give of a lawyer who asked one question too many. No, no, I'm going to give an example and I may have used it on the floor before. There was a trial underway and a lawyer's client was accused of having bitten a man's ear off and this lawyer was questioning the state's key witness and he asked the question, did you see my client bite the man's ear off? And the witness said, no. The lawyer should have stopped, but he felt so good that he asked the next question. Then how can you say that my client bit the man's ear off? He said, because I saw him spit it out. He asked one question too many. What Senator Kristensen has done, he has brought me around to seeing the validity of his position, that what I ought to do is not include all criminal cases, but simply reinstate the word "felony" which exists in the Constitution right now and we will deal only with felony cases having the right of an appeal to the