

brought, the only reason it was brought is because there are \$500,000 out there of federal monies to be waved in front of the nose of people who say, well, we should do whatever it takes to garner those funds. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I would argue that we should not, that we shouldn't just bend over and have the federal government make us bow at their feet for half a million bucks, to change a system that we put in place, we worked very hard over, we struggled over a couple years ago, and put into place a system that is currently, I think, working and working well. I stated on General File on this provision that I have personal, firsthand experience with drunk drivers. I mean I know full well what can happen to individuals that are family members with regard to this. But, again, that doesn't mean you throw out your whole system of justice in order to protect a few. Yeah, I'd like to protect Jeff and Jim. I wish they hadn't been in the hospital for months. I wish the one wouldn't have his leg still wired up. He was an All American in cross-country, and he can still beat me with a wire in there. But the fact of the matter is every once in a while in a system like ours a few guilty people have to go so that the free people are allowed to be free, except when it comes to drunk driving. And that has traditionally been the case. We have always said, no, in this instance we're going to put on the white coats and the white hats and we're going to say nothing, absolutely nothing comes in the way of getting those drunks off the road. And not one person in this body can prove that LB 799, prohibition or any other law that you can enact will do away with drunk driving. Ladies and gentlemen, it won't happen, it won't happen, but yet that's what we pontificate about here on the floor. We don't worry about whether the laws are appropriate, whether they work and whether they provide justice for those individuals who aren't guilty. We will go ahead and pass the 799 that says, you're guilty. Doesn't matter if ultimately we find out through the courts that you weren't guilty, you're guilty from that moment until you can prove yourself innocent.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: That's reverse justice, at least the way I learned it. It's not supposed to work that way in this country, but in this one section of statute, in this one area we do that. Why didn't we do that when we were dealing with the bill right before this on child sexual harassment, child sexual crimes? Why didn't we put the provision in that said you're guilty until