

May 18, 1989

LB 211

that I would consider, and I think many others as Senator Smith mentioned, would consider just...as just deserving.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Do you have any specific problems that you know of with, let's see, we did forgery and the other one with arson. Is there any cases that were problems in particular out there on that one?

SENATOR HALL: Again, the same argument that these two received special privileges that I don't feel have been warranted. When there are other crimes that I would consider more deserving. And we are dealing with a specific provision to a specific crime in LB 211 that would add additional time to another area, but yet not give it the same standing as writing a bad check.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, in general, would you be for a repeal of all statute of limitations and saying, look, if we could prove a crime, no matter what time it occurred, you ought to be held accountable for that, and we ought to be able to convict you and punish you? Would you be for repealing the statute of limitations on all crimes? I mean after all, if they've violated the law, we ought to be able to go after them, right?

SENATOR HALL: No, I would not.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay. And how would you make some distinctions between that?

SENATOR HALL: I would start by striking these two and leave treason and murder in there.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, so you're...what you're saying is it's okay in the other cases, but you want to make a policy decision for just those two.

SENATOR HALL: At this point in time. I may have another amendment that would add additional to these. But this is where I would begin.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, thank you. The reason that you have things like arson and forgery in there is because of the nature of the crime. And particularly forgery is very difficult, because you may not know for a period of time that the article has been forged. That article may well be a stock or a bond, it may well be a contract or a negotiable instrument, that may be