

of error is really truly remote. Remember first of all at the very beginning of the process the authorized attorney is required to send, by certified mail to the home of the person supposed to be delinquent, a notice. The notice is outlined here in the bill, it sets out all of the relevant factors, the person is going to know what is alleged and can immediately react with the alternatives outlined in the bill to either get the correct situation identified to the authorities, or to correct the situation, if in fact it is true, whatever the instance may be. Beyond that there is a second notice. At such time, if he does not respond, at such time when the certification for revocation is sent over either to the licensing bureau or to the whatever appropriate board is involved, at that time another notice is sent to him saying that is being done and another opportunity to respond is provided. So, I truly think that the likelihood of error is remote. Secondly, I would ask you to compare the situation to the situation of wage withholding, which we have now. We know the reason that we are doing today what we are doing today is because there is a block of people out there that we don't really get at the way we get at with people who have wages. We withhold their wages and it is automatic wage withholding now, and what if there is an error? I mean, you can make the same circle, the same arguments, and the same gee whiz, what if situation for wage withholders. But, what has our experience been? It has not been that we have caused problems with wage withholders through erroneous information. It is true that some of the information and some of the clerks of the district courts office is not as good as it should be. But, that is easily correctable. The authorized attorney is going to verify it in the first instance, they are going to send a notice to the person in the second instance, another notice in the third instance. The likelihood of harm, the likelihood of this happening is small and we should treat it the same as what we have done with wage withholding, which has been a good and positive experience, nothing to be afraid of. Third and last, this sets a bad precedent. The government does many, many things in many, many areas that could potentially harm citizens. But, we do not go out and give a right of action against, for everybody on all these different regulatory functions when the government is trying its best, for the good of society as a whole, to perform a function as cheaply as possible. If we want to create situations where we give causes of action for the thousands of different things that the government could be