

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 25, 2004 LB 559

amendment Senator Baker has before us. I agree with what Senator Bourne has said previously. This is an absolute reversal of a policy decision that we made previously. I don't really understand what's going on. It really seems to me like DMV is trying to figure out a way to...a slick way, I might add, to become a arm, a branch or arm of INS. I think that's completely wrong. It's completely against what we decided earlier, and I am truly offended by this motion. I would turn the rest of my time to Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, and Mr. President, I think Senator Aguilar summed up my feelings very well except I'm going to take it a bit further. I am tired, in fact I'm sick and tired, of these state agencies trying to become policymakers. The DMV is not going to establish this policy. I'd like to ask Senator Baker a question. I'd like to ask him a question if he'd yield.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Baker.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Baker, DMV obviously doesn't need this bill, does it?

SENATOR BAKER: No, they do need it, and that...I know this is your time and I'd yield some if I have any. But if...we're not changing policy here. On section...or page 32 of the Final Reading bill, line 11, current statute says furnish two forms of proof of identification.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Baker, why are you bringing this amendment if two forms of identification are required under the bill as it stands now?

SENATOR BAKER: Because when we changed the driver's license requirement to one form, it caught us in that web and also lowered the requirement to one form in one section of the bill to obtain a state ID card.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we voted for that one form, didn't we?