

you and your teachers with you and, teacher Ginny, if I mispronounced your name, please forgive me. We also have guests under the south balcony of Senator Chizek. They are 15 members of the Nebraska State Electrical Council, Nebraska State Utility Conference. Walter Smith is their president. Would you folks please stand and be recognized. And thank you for visiting us today. Senator Chambers, sorry to interrupt you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's fine. It gave me a chance to find out from Senator Hoagland exactly what this is dealing with that we're talking and as he explained it to me, it will double the marriage license fee from 10 to 20 dollars, and although the function will be shifted to the county, he does not want the state to lose any money, but the state will not be doing anything in this procedure. It will give them a windfall and I don't think that is appropriate. Marriage licenses and other licenses of this kind ought not be for the purpose of generating revenue for the General Fund and, if they're going to call it a user fee and say those who get the benefits of the service are the ones who should foot the bill, that is one argument and an argument could be made even about that. But if you're going to accept that, then there is no reason under any rational argument that I can think of, why the state should get the same amount of money as the county when the state is not doing anything. If these are hard times, maybe if you'd jack the cost of a marriage license high enough, people won't get married, but I don't think you should try to tax marriage out of existence. You should try to educate people to what it is they're getting into and if they decide to stay out, let it be because they think that would be an unwise move. But this, to me, is an extortion type activity by the state. Senator Hoagland mentioned that the state would lose over \$100,000 if you don't allow them to continue plundering the public in this fashion. I think plundering is wrong. I think there is not excuse for it and no justification whatsoever. There will not be anybody else probably to speak against this amendment other than myself because it deals only with those who some day will decide to get married. They have no way of knowing what is going to befall them. They are not an organized constituency. They don't even exist really as a constituency right now. So this matter will be resolved on the basis of what we deem to be proper taxing by the state and this is worse than a tax. It is an extortion type activity. I think it ought not to