

he has chosen. And if you look at that letter also, he mentioned that without having had a chance to review the bill, that that was going to be his opinion. He had not reviewed the bill. This is not a pretrial diversion that takes the place of anyway. The intent of this pretrial diversion is to get first-time offenders into education. It's to get them into rehabilitation, is to stop the drunk driving, it's not...instead of just tossing everybody into jail. That is the intent of this legislation. It is not intended to play around at all with ALR and ALR simply is not affected. No person losing their license under ALR, and I want this absolutely clear for the record. No person losing their license under ALR is entitled by reason of this statute to have that affected one way or the other, absolutely not affected. If we need to put that in black and white so that Mr. McPherson can read the statute better, we can do that for him but any interpretation of this bill is very clear. It does not impact...I'm, frankly, very offended that the United States Department of Transportation, after the federal government has dictated to this state how we will and will not act not only in our DWI laws, but in so many other areas that we're getting federal mandates, that now they're telling us which laws we can't pass because in their personal opinion they oppose the bill. In their personal opinion, some pencil pusher in Kansas City opposes the bill and I don't think that's appropriate for this body to be listening to that kind of stuff. As I've said, I've had several people looking at the regs, nobody can find where he is basing this opinion. We do not lose money. The money we do lose, a letter that we've gotten recently from the department prompted by this letter, it's the money that we would, the A bill would be increased a little bit because we would lose license reinstatement fees.

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR LINDSAY: And that's legitimate. I can accept that. We'd lose about 125,000 in license reinstatement fees. I assume there is some correlation on who has, since there would be less work, that there would be some reduction in expense too. We haven't gotten into it that far yet. But bottom line is, this horror story of losing \$5.5 million which I think is referred to in one of these letters that the bottom of Mr. McPherson's letter is that possibly Nebraska receiving a maximum of 5.2 million could be jeopardized. It's just wrong, dead wrong. This bill is intended to cut down on DWIs. It's intended to rather throw people in jail for seven days or 30 days or