

law and we'd all voluntarily follow it. You have to have punishments to make the law have some meaning, it's a conditioned response. What we're saying here, and I hear Senator Chambers say, go ahead, let's don't punish this until some wrong occurs. Not true. That's not the way to do it because drunk driving is preventable. It's not curable, we can't do away with all drunk driving, but you've got to take some position and you've got to implement some systems to do it. We've waited ten years to reexamine this. Do I think we ought to do drunk driving laws every year? Absolutely not, I don't think so. There's another...there's other higher priorities in the state. We've waited two or three years for administrative license revocation. We've been hesitant. We've been cautious, we've gone back and studied it. It's a good policy. In other states that have gone to this system they have had a reduction in fatalities, alcohol related fatalities and accidents, they've had ultimately some reductions in drinking and driving from arrests because people were doing it less, and that becomes a double-edged sword, because people say, well gee, if you arrest more, we must be doing better. Well that just means the problem is bad. Ultimately you'd like to limit the number of arrests. One punishment, the presumption, let's say for example, isn't the key. It, by itself, isn't going to solve the drunk driving problem. That's the reason you have to have a system from beginning to end, and you have to have an attack plan, that you attack it at each area that you can. I venture to say some people don't like this because it seems harsh. That's exactly what it's intended to be is harsh. It is not unfair, that's the key distinction. And minors who have alcohol, we've decided that they shouldn't possess it. Then why in the world should you let them drink and drive at all with it. Why is that a good policy? The key is it's not a good policy. And you've not going to prevent every one, I understand that.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I would still oppose Senator Hall's amendment. I think that you're going to find when you reduce that period of time to five years you're going to let a lot of bad cases slip by. Alcohol is a life...for people who have alcohol problems it's a life long problem, you're never cured of your alcohol problem, you learn to live with it and you learn to control your behavior. That five year period of time, I think in the idea world you wouldn't have any time period. We've chosen ten years as a line to be fair. But if you can show, for