

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...a decision, after the rendering of that decision then in rendering or presenting their opinion about the decision they have to expedite that. They have to write that opinion sooner than they do anything related to a civil case or a noncapital matter. But if you were trying, which I don't think you can, but if you were trying to make the Supreme Court handle death penalty cases quicker, you would have had to say they must expedite the reaching of a decision, not the rendering of an opinion. So this language does nothing and that's why I don't even care about it and didn't fight it that much because I'm going to have a chance to mock, which I can do now, and taunt. What dumbbell wrote this provision in the bill? Did this come from the Attorney General's Office, Senator Lindsay, this language? Do you know?

SENATOR LINDSAY: The language on page 19, lines 21 through 23?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR LINDSAY: That was taken from the bill that was introduced last year...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: By whom?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Uh...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Saved by the bell.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President, colleagues, and Senator Chambers, I will return the cordiality. I guess one thing you said stirred me up a little bit and that is that, in your opinion, it makes no difference how we spend the two hours, and, to me, that...I guess that goes against my grain because we've got forty...forty some people, maybe 49, two hours is a lot of time and the work that we're doing is extremely important. And I find it extremely ironical that you, whom I have a great deal of respect for in the way you craft laws and the way you improve laws many times with your amendments, finds that it's not productive to work through this bill and work through the various sections that a lot of us have questions