

be done and if Senator Hoagland has conceded to me as he has, and if he said it to you, I don't see why there is even any argument. The state will have nothing to do with the marriage license operation. The county will assume it. Let the county get the money. There is no reason to continue giving it to the state. That's almost like the protection racket where somebody will come into a community and say we will let you operate your store if you give us a cut of everything that you make, but the one you're paying protection to is the one you'll be protected from. If you don't pay the protection, they do damage to you, your business, and make you wish that you had paid because it's cheaper to pay the protection than to pay for the damage that they would do. If the state gets into that business, I think it's wrong and whereas I don't think the state is going to do anything to the county as the old protection racketeers would do to the merchant, the concept is the same. It is extorting money for no service that it is performing. It has no right to that money. There is no justification for it, so I don't think this is a good thing for the Legislature to do and I'm very strongly opposed to it.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Sieck, please.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President and members of the body, I'm going to agree with Senator Chambers. I feel these are hidden taxes that should not be. Let's be up front. If we want to tax our people, let's tax them in a proper way. To me this is not right and you're taking something away from the counties which should be the counties' and I notice that we're constantly doing this and I feel it is wrong. And I agree with Senator Chambers 100 percent. I think he is right on track, so let's oppose this amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Warner, would you like to close on your bill, on your amendment I mean?

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, as I indicated in my opening remarks, the amendment is a pure revenue raiser or a blatancy of a revenue loss. Currently, seeing the fiscal note, the state is collecting around, in the average of \$137,000. It runs a little over \$20,000 for the cost of the issuance. It means net, \$116,000, revenue to the General Fund. The bill as proposed eliminates the revenue to the state. It would all