

to oppose the amendment. The explanation of it is clear enough reason to do this. If that's the policy that we're going to have whether you support or oppose this type of legislation, and I would argue that the way it has been portrayed by the opponents of it, the newly found opponents of this bill, as it's on Select File and was a consent calendar proposal, is misleading. It's not accurate and based on the letter that we got from the individual who works at the Department of Transportation in Kansas City, Missouri, I put a call in to the Department of Transportation in Washington and talked to a Mr. Steve Hattas. He works with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. He handles the digest of state alcohol highway related legislation. He compiles that digest. The question that was asked of him was, does the existence of pretrial diversion programs for the DWI kick out any possibility of a state's receiving federal funds under the 408 or 410 programs? Those are both which are referenced in the McPherson letter. His response was, no. His response was no. He said, I want to go back. He goes, I want to go back and make sure. He says I will talk to the General Council, but he says it flies in the face of what the purpose of those programs were put in place for. If you look at the programs themselves, and I'm quoting now from the Federal Register, Thursday, August 25, 1988, says, the Department of Transportation says the agency believes some portions of the regulations are unnecessarily restrictive in defining the manner in which a state may demonstrate compliance with the statutory criteria. This action, in other words, this proposal, 408, is intended to increase flexibility for the states by establishing alternative methods of demonstrating compliance with the Section 408 criteria to qualify for alcohol incentive grant funds. The proposal itself says that these kinds of things, if you look at 408, you look at 410, they are littered with issues that talk about kinds of things that diversion deals with. They are littered with the issue of education. They talk about things as community service. That's what this is all about. That's what the public law, 102-240, wanted to put in place. It did not want to just, as many people believe, make the penalties stiffer. It wanted to provide viable alternatives that help solve the problem. Many of the people who have serious alcohol problems are never going to be impacted by some of these types of programs no matter what they are. They're not going to be impacted by jail time. They are not going to be impacted by taking away their license, taking away their license plates, their...