

in Nebraska and that could get them, couldn't it?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yes, it could.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now suppose we had a situation similar to what Senator Beutler was asking about earlier where a person had been a bad actor in another state and moved to Nebraska and had lived a relatively exemplary life and had been here for some years then wrote some bad checks, and two of the other felonies in this other state had been violent, and the person had been to prison and got out and left that area because he or she felt there would be no likelihood of making it there, then a bad check conviction gets that person a mandatory 25 years here. Is that true?

SENATOR LINDSAY: No, because bad checks would not be in the violent crime category. They would be down in the lower level of habitual criminal which would be the ten-year.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. So then if a person had committed two violent felonies someplace else, then the third one would also have to be a violent felony.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Except conspiracy.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Conspiracy to commit a violent felony.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But that is not a violent crime, is it?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Conspiracy, I mean, it depends how you look at it. Conspiracy, itself, conspiracy to commit murder I think is probably as much a violent crime as murder.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, violence means the infliction of force or violence upon...

SENATOR LINDSAY: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...another person. Conspiracy does not do that.

SENATOR LINDSAY: The conspiracy itself does not do that, but the product of that conspiracy would be the imposition of a