

a result of pictures on driver's licenses. Look at the situation Senator Goodrich is not recognizing in this country. Fads are fads in this country. What woman, and in some cases man, is going to look the same way four years from now as today. Suppose hair styles change. You are saying when a person purchases his driver's license, he or she must maintain that appearance for four years, locked in by the requirement of the state, and if you change your appearance, in that case, the driver's license does not tell who you are. It tells who you are not. The one carrying this driver's license four years from today is not the one who got the driver's license in the beginning. What kind of nonsense is that? That is almost as bad as some of the things that Senator Lewis brings up over here when he is trying to be serious. Now the photo on the license is going to also end liquor violations and that doesn't even look like you. I won't say your name for the record. He held up a picture over there, which if it was on the wall of a Post Office, they would come after him and offer a reward and he doesn't look anything like that kind of picture. I wouldn't want to have a picture like that on a driver's license if I was stopped by the law. Senator Goodrich, what you ought to realize is not all people drive automobiles. If this driver's license picture is, in fact, suppose to be an official state identification which I could see occurring in South Africa or perhaps in Nazi Germany or some other totalitarian country where every citizen must carry state certified identification. You are discriminating against the person who drives the automobile. He or she must carry a color photograph to say that he or she is who the driver's license says he or she is. A driver's license is not identification. It should not be the first step toward requiring everybody to carry identification. But since the only ones that would have this card would be the drivers of automobiles, I don't think it is accomplishing what the merchants want and this is a merchants bill and Senator Goodrich knows it. He says it ought to be accepted because it will be a secret hidden tax to zing the citizen, only 25¢ a year, but if Senator Goodrich remembers his history, and if he forgot it, Senator Lewis can remind him, when this country started, they said millions for defense, not one cent for tribute meaning that those who tax ought not tax those who are not represented and this particular type of tax, I think, is the most insidious variety because there is no choice about having a driver's license. You need that to authorize you to drive on the highways, but in being compelled to purchase this right to drive and this evidence of it which is all the driver's license is, you should not be required to be penalized by having your picture on the license and it is a penalty, I feel, for a state to require a citizen to carry identification of this kind. I think that Senator Rasmussen is 100% correct today. So maybe he is on the road to mending now and I want to commend him for making the move that he did and I hope that the members of the Legislature will recognize that it is not our duty to fill in the gaps created by careless merchants who are so willing and anxious to cash checks that they are willing to risk getting some bad ones. I also have an amendment up there in case the kill motion is unwisely rejected which would make the makers of these affairs