

suddenly taking an interest and you would see people at the state level talking a different way. But, in any...at any rate, I'm opposed to what Senator Lindsay...

SENATOR HALL: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...is offering us.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Chambers, your light is next.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is Senator Lindsay anywhere near?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Lindsay. He is available, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Lindsay, why is it necessary, since we're talking about creating a situation where more people are going to go to prison for a longer time because of the mandatory minimum 25-year sentence, and even though we somewhat mitigated it, it includes people who have committed motor vehicular homicide, why is it necessary to include offenses committed in other states or pursuant to federal laws?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why is it necessary to do that?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Well, there are...is it necessary? No, it's a question of policy decision that the Legislature would make. But the...but the reason for it is that especially in border areas you will have people who are...who may be committing crimes in their home area, but the border isn't necessarily going to be a division as far as stopping their conduct. You might have in, I believe, out west, I think Scottsbluff is fairly close to like Torrington, you might have...you might have crimes committed in one state there or in another. The same thing in Colorado down close, I guess, to Kimball, or in Omaha with Council Bluffs, or South Sioux with Sioux City, and in those border areas you will have people who are not going to be bound by state borders in the commission of violent crime.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask you this question. If a person had committed two felonies in another state, or under the federal jurisdiction, then all they would have to commit is one