

in the bill. I understood Senator Robak to say that a driving test is required in the bill. I think that was what I heard. When I look in the bill I see page 2 and it says that the applicant shall satisfy an examiner that they can operate a driving vehicle. That is basic law right now. How many of you have actual road tests when you go back though? In fact, it is a hit or miss proposition, isn't it? They don't test everyone. There is not, if I am mistaken, I want you to read me the sentence because if it's there, I sure want to make sure I get it right. There is no sentence in this bill that says in your annual review you will drive a car and show an examiner. That is not in this bill. Now, it does say that they will satisfy an examiner, but that doesn't require a test. If the examiner doesn't ask for you to drive, then the examiner could be satisfied and that is different than a mandatory test. I want to distinguish those situations. This bill does not require a mandatory test. If I'm mistaken, I want chapter and verse read to me. Secondly, Senator Withem said what this bill does is put drivers back on the road. We would call that a grandfather clause, wouldn't we, where you had a preexisting right taken away and then it was...then those people who had it were given it back? This bill is not a grandfather clause. Senator Withem misstates this bill if he says this only applies to previously acceptable drivers. These are to be the standards from hence forth, not just the drivers of the past. In other words, new untrained people who have not had experience, who have no driving record would be able to qualify under this bill. This is not a grandfather clause. I reject the characterization that this only puts back on the road people who have good driving records. Number one, we don't know that they have good driving records other than the ones you have contacted, and I can sure understand why they would, but we don't have a body of evidence that says that. As a matter of fact, we have a body of evidence that says something different than that. Secondly, it does not apply just to those experienced drivers, it applies to all new drivers. What I am saying to you is this. If you want bioptic lens driving, which I think is reasonable, there should be reasonable limitations. If you are a new driver, there ought to be some training. If you are a driver with...I think daylight driving limitations seemed reasonable. I think a mandatory testing seems reasonable. That is all I wanted to say, and that is that I think there are some characterizations about this bill which are not accurate reflections of what is actually in the bill. This is no grandfather clause and this does not require mandatory testing. Reasonable limitations should be added to