

folks please stand and be welcomed. Thank you, we're pleased to have you with us. Discussion on the advancement of the bill. Senator Chambers, followed by Senators Baack and Kristensen.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, it's hard to talk just about the bill, because there are so many issues associated with it that brought it before us. So I've got to digress from talking about the bill to make one other point, at least while I'm speaking this time. When the World-Herald decides to do investigative reporting it's always directed toward the victims and the witnesses and designed to discredit them. They can find out mountains of information about those individuals, but they never investigate the alleged perpetrators, never. Sunday they ran a long article about Gary Caradori and talked about background information on him, none of which he provided, because he didn't talk to them. But they got out lickety split and got this information, and it was designed to discredit him. They quoted some investigators who said that he should have conducted lie detector tests before the matter got as far as it has gotten. That's preposterous because the World-Herald knew that one of the original victims had passed multiple State Patrol lie detector tests. Oh, no, you don't have to...if you hit one of them on the head with it, I'd accept it, Mr. Speaker. But just to hit that wood won't do it. (Laughter.) Thank you. And I'm saying some things for the record at this point. One of the original victims had passed multiple State Patrol lie detector tests. The then existing statute of limitation on those abuses had not run. The Washington County Attorney chose not to take any action. So, if, when the existing statute of limitations would have allowed prosecution of abuse...abusive conduct towards young kids and foster children at that, and the county attorney, who had knowledge of this information, refused to prosecute, why should we believe that if we extend the statute of limitations now there will be any prosecution, especially when the special prosecutor with the grand jury doesn't even think it's important enough to be there. I didn't vote for adoption of the committee amendments. I'm not going to tell anybody not to vote for the bill. But I'm not going to vote for it. I don't think it's a wise and appropriate way to legislate. When things in the nature of legislative changes are forged in a crucible filled with great pressure and conflicting signals, the end product may be good and it may not. But I don't have comfort as a legislator in voting for what is being proposed here today. And I'll probably be the only one to vote no. And I'm not going to be upset that others vote yes. I'm