

even read it. I don't even know if it's properly drafted. I don't even know if it does what it says it's going to do but, because of who brought it and the nature of the subject matter, the Judiciary Committee is going to send it out here. I have said it years past. I will continue to say it as long as it happens. As far as saying in the committee statement that this deals with felonies, I didn't put that on there. Am I not supposed to mention it? Well, maybe some people think I shouldn't but I will. I'm not here to be anybody's friend. I'm not here to win a popularity contest, unless by saying what I think is right will make me popular, which it never has for anybody at any time in history. And why should mere, humble mortal, such as myself, expect to be treated any differently? So, all of those things aside, this is not a good bill. This is not sound public policy. But once it has been done for this particular type of offense because some people have some specific cases in mind, then others can start saying, hey, I know about a burglary that occurred and I didn't know about it until three years and a week afterward because I went to looking around these things that I have and they were gone and then I noticed there had been a forced entry. So I think what you need to do is extend that statute of limitations because no burglar should be allowed to get away just because three years and a week passed. Then the legislators will say, well, yeah, that sounds good to me. It will be put into the Judiciary Committee and I could probably tell you who will bring it and it will zip right out of that committee. Then somebody will say, well, if a burglar shouldn't get away, why should a sneak thief? Are we going to tell these criminals that all they have to do is lay low for three years and then one day after three years they're home free? We're encouraging crime, then sneak thieves, then every manner of thing. And that's the way the Legislature, in a lot of instances, operates and I can't stop it. But I'm going to speak against it. I'm going to try to stop it and do what I can. When I cannot stop it I want the record to be clear on how I distance myself from it. There are bills where I was the only no vote and the Supreme Court will strike down the bill...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...as unconstitutional because it was passed on the basis of emotion and high public fervor at the time. That can't sway me and it doesn't sway me...oh, did you say time or a minute?