

Bernard-Stevens and am intrigued with the idea. I know in our country we have a very successful treatment program for people who are convicted of drunk driving, that are diverted into treatment programs. My question to Senator Bernard-Stevens, I give him the rest of the time to respond to this, involves the cost of such a program, that it's a relatively expensive program, and we in Sarpy County, in the past, have been criticized for having a...a system where those that can afford to pay for it get the treatment, and those that can't don't get the treatment. And I think they've made provisions in the Sarpy County area to...to scrape up the dollars necessary. But if we're going to impose this as a statewide requirement on individuals, where will the funds come from for paying for the treatment? Senator Bernard-Stevens, if you'd respond.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Bernard-Stevens, will you yield?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Yes, I will. And I appreciate the question very much, because I think that should...that is the one key question that needs to be asked. And Senator Withem is right, Sarpy County has sometimes unfairly been criticized, and they do have a tremendous treatment program, and they've tried very, very hard, as I think most areas have, particularly at least in in our area, in the North Platte area. And the problem always arises of who's going to pay for it. This amendment, to be very clear, this amendment simply says that the eff...they were going to be...they are going to be sentenced on the first conviction, or if they have not been ever...ever had treatment, they will have to take it. It does not address the funding. This amendment does not address the funding. So, in all practical purpose, Senator Withem is correct, the person is going to have to pay for it out of their own monies. Now, if they don't have the money, that is a problem, that is a problem. Personally, I want...I felt it was...it was important enough that the body make a decision on do we think treatment is at least a step that the Legislature wants to take for people. So I drafted the amendment to give the body a simple decision. On the first offense, or if they have never had treatment, do we really think that the person needs help? Should we go that extra step for the individual? If the body then says, yes, we need to, then I suspect then on Select File there would have to be, or maybe later on General File, but I think it would be more reasonable on Select File that the fiscal staff would be able then to look at the amendments that are agreed to, they would decide how much possibly it would cost, if we requested them to