

attorney. It's really a...this particular bill is more of an antiattorney piece of legislation because it reduces the amount of business that's available for them, but it does such an outstanding job at reducing the amount of or at least making an attempt to reduce the amount of substance abuse in this state. I've always kind of admired the program. Now, not every state, not every county can do this. Douglas County, for example, I feel has had some problems just because of the cost involved. You know, Douglas County handles so many different drunk driving cases it's just very difficult for them to take the time to deal with it, but for the counties such as Sarpy and those with a lesser population, it certainly is something that is affordable and it actually helps the people which a lot of times when you're involved in criminal statutes you really wonder if we're punishing the people or helping to rehabilitate. This clearly helps to rehabilitate and I'm quite surprised that the federal government has a problem with it since it is existing currently in two counties and since actually the program was a pilot program in Sarpy and Dodge in an attempt to try to deal with drunk drivers in a different manner, so it was brought into the state under a federal program. But as we're aware, with administration changes there's always change in philosophy and I assume with the Reagan-Bush years being gone we'll probably have a different approach with Clinton and we'll...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR ABBODD: ...probably have a different approach when it comes to corrections, with prisoners, with the Department of Transportation. I thought it was interesting, one of the articles that...there was a good article in Forbes Magazine about the Justice Department and you might recall during the 12 years of the Republican administration a lot of money was pumped into the Justice Department. Now the Justice Department is under attack and a number of individuals are looking to make major cuts in that particular department and I think that that's probably a healthy process because it's part of evaluation and evolution that takes place in government and I assume that maybe Senator Hall talked to someone in Washington that was one of the, maybe one of the new people involved in it and maybe this guy in Kansas City is one of the holdovers, I don't know. It's confusing to me that since we have a program that was helped to be established by the federal government that they would come back and say, well, we're going to lose federal money as a result of...