

attached to birth certificates and marriage licenses. I've tried quickly to see where they are located and I think in the committee amendment the only fee mentioned is the one on birth certificates in Douglas County. I guess that's the one they're talking about. And I'm going to try to strike those fees throughout the bill. If the bill is doing something that is worthwhile and if some kind of registry or whatever is being set up is of value, there should be a general fund appropriation. Simply because people who get married generally have children and simply because birth certificates represent a record of the fact that a person has been born does not make those two items the types of things that ought to be taxed in the way that people who use the highways are taxed through gasoline to pay a user fee. I think what was attempted by those who want this proposition is to find what would be considered something associated somehow with children. So they say birth certificates and marriage licenses. I've always been opposed to these hidden taxes. When they've tried to tack additional money onto court costs to take care of the Law Enforcement Training Center or put money into the judges retirement fund, I've been opposed to that. When they've tried to raise the entry fee for the parks which I've felt in some cases might hinder certain people from using the parks, I've been opposed to that. When they tried to add additional money to the drivers license for drivers education and other things, I've been opposed to that. Now they are coming to something which I also am opposed to. If a copy of a birth certificate is needed, and again not having been able to go through it thoroughly, I guess it's just a copy that you have to pay the \$3.00 for, I'm opposed to it, charging the additional fee and sending it to this fund. I definitely am opposed to the \$5.00 additional cost on a marriage license. I can't say whether the state should do anything in the line of encouraging or discouraging people to marry, but once the state has decided to issue a license to a person to embark on that venture, I don't think it ought to be encumbered in a way like this that has nothing to do with marriage as such and it certainly has nothing to do with the license. Nobody can show that the cost of performing a marriage has anything to do with the cost of the license. When you buy a marriage license that money does not go to the preacher who performs the ceremony or the judge except indirectly. The state has seen a way to get some money. Now they're going to burden it down even further and I don't think it is appropriate. Who in this