

it and generally that is true. And in this instance I know it's going to be true again but at least I have put my concerns into the record. And I don't believe that merely because the federal government may require the state, under pain of losing some funds or other, to participate in some kind of an electronic transmittal or retrieval of information system to check on truck drivers is a reason for every piece of legislation that can even tangentially be related to that to be adopted by this Legislature. That cannot be a justification for everything for which there is no justification on its own merits. That cannot fill every gap that exists because we don't have the information. If that is going to be accepted, then we ought to accept the same kind of thing with reference to Highway Funds. If you don't raise the drinking age to 21 years old, you're going to lose Highway Funds, said the federal government, therefore, we ought to pass this bill. We ought to pass this bill because the government will take money if you don't put the drinking age where they want it. You ought to pass this bill because if you don't maintain a speed limit compliance at certain levels on the part of all drivers, you're going to lose federal funds, therefore, you ought to pass this bill. There is no connection. The law uses the term "nexus", two things must be joined together, there must be a relationship and there is none between what Senator Lamb talked about on these truck drivers and what we have here. The federal government, under that law, will not say you are required as a state to use unauthenticated information from another state as a basis to lift the driver's license of somebody licensed in your state. They are not going to say that.

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I have the motion up there and I hope you will vote to kill this bill. It's not going to hurt the department and let them do some of the things that have been suggested already. First of all, contact the Department of Motor Vehicles in Iowa and mention the problem and let them talk to their Legislature and say, authenticate these records. But suppose Iowa responds, you don't authenticate yours in Nebraska, and the Legislature will say, well, gee, we thought we did or we wouldn't have passed this bill, we'd have taken that first action. Does this Legislature look silly in a lot of instances? Yes. Will it look silly again? Yes. Should it look silly? Whenever it does that which justifies it in looking silly. And I think it would be silly for a bill like this to be advanced