

Lindsay at his face saying he doesn't want to impact ALR, but as you can see with our discussion that, with our bypass that was put into it, we certainly may be affecting ALR, in fact, I think we are. If the county attorney never files the charge, you'll never lose that license at the end of 30 days. So, Madam President, I would urge this body at this point and perhaps it will be some indication of the strength up or down of the bill as well and we can determine if other people, what they want to do with LB 779, but, at this point in time, I think it's wise to bracket it. Let's find out the impacts and present the amendments that we want to present so we get an accurate answer. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Speaking order is Senator Hall, Lindsay, Bromm, Bernard-Stevens, Hudkins, Crosby and Pedersen. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise to oppose the bracket motion. Senator Kristensen, I appreciate it, but your less than sincere approach when you put up a June 1 bracket motion and then say let's sit down and talk about it, when we only happen to go until June 8 on this issue when we have a consent calendar bill, came out of committee unopposed, was unopposed in committee and is now here on April 21 on Select File, all of a sudden we want to sit down and talk about it, when, in fact, the burden should be on those who are the opponents to show just in fact where the loss of revenue comes from. It isn't there, Doug. It flat out isn't there. As you know under the judicial bypass as it exists under ALR, what will happen and the same thing that will happen with the pretrial diversion provision in LB 779 is we'll become, in effect, a data state. They're going to come in and they're going to say, okay, look, states, you have the ability to put these kinds of provisions in place, but if we find out, as we collect data, that you have circumvented ALR and that everybody is going into diversion, everybody is following through with the judicial bypass, then and only then will you be in jeopardy of losing those funds. It doesn't exist now, it doesn't exist now. We all have constantly for the last five years or so been hit with these threats of loss of federal funds, no matter what the issue may be, time and time again and I quoted earlier from that, from 408, the section that said, look, the states have the ability to have some flexibility here. What we're interested in ultimately is stopping the problem. That's what diversion programs do. That's what judicial bypass allows for. It looks at