

bill. Is the court going to be better able to determine the qualifications of these two particular drivers than the license examiner who has them physically in front of him?

SENATOR HABERMAN: No, but, Senator Schmit, it might save another court case.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Okay, thank you, Senator.

SENATOR HABERMAN: I've heard you address here before on this floor, Senator Schmit...(interruption)

SENATOR SCHMIT: Wait a minute, Senator, I'm on my time...(interruption)

SENATOR HABERMAN: ...because something is in the court, maybe we should back off and wait a few...oh, am I using your time?

SENATOR SCHMIT: No, no, no.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Oh, that's all right, go ahead.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Push your button. Push your button, Senator.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schmit, this is your time, your floor.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you're on my side. I need the help. I just want to say this. Senator Haberman is saying there is...two people have filed in the federal court. Now I have a high respect for the judiciary, as I'm sure we all do, but I am sure that the judiciary are not going to say, we're going to let that person drive even though the drivers' license examiner says no. I'm willing to let the examiner be the final determinant and I think the people who use these additions to their spectacles are willing to do that also. I don't think we need to wait for any federal court decision and I think that we can resolve the issue here. We say, okay, if they meet the certain standards, they can drive and that ought to be good enough. There is no reason for us to harass and impugn the ability of these individuals. Senator Lynch, I think, raised an excellent point. There are many individuals, I have a relative who is an epileptic. That person has to subject themselves to certain restrictions if they have a seizure because if they go seizure free for a year, they are not restricted in their driving capacity, notwithstanding the fact