

body would speak for those who might get married? Unmarried people as a group do not comprise a lobby. They may not be aware at all of what the Legislature is attempting to do to them today, but the Legislature knows that there are a multitude of ways by which to levy hidden taxes against people who may be unaware of the tax. The mere fact that this can be slipped on and the people affected not know about it does not legitimize the activity, nor does it make it a legitimate action by the Legislature when it comes to taxation. If it's felt that this operation which is to be created under 333 has merit, let there be general fund money because the only justification is that it benefits society. If it is a societal good, all of society ought to underwrite the cost. That is done as much as it's possible through legislation by means of taxation. The general fund is the repository for tax receipts. So an appropriation ought to come out of the general fund for this whole operation. These various special interest groups have learned by watching various things the Legislature has done how to get their programs into law by saying it's not going to cost the general fund, but stick it to a certain segment of taxpayers. This is even different from the tax on cigarettes which some people call a sin tax or alcohol. There are problems created by those substances that society is put to great expense to try to rectify. The argument might could be made that marriage produces societal problems too, but that no longer is placed in the same category as abuse of alcohol and tobacco. Marriage has religious roots, social roots, cultural roots and all kinds of other things associated with it that would lift it out of the category of those who drink alcohol and smoke tobacco. I don't think the marriage license should cost as much as it does right now. I don't think the state can justifiably charge more for a little piece of paper than the cost of producing and providing that piece of paper to the public. So what is being said here is that you can make an unclean thing clean by saying the purpose ultimately is good. Or in other words, the end justifies the means. You can't get more Machiavellian than that and those people who have ethical principles will start often from the proposition that the end cannot justify the means. If the means are illegitimate, the end for which they are designed will not make them legitimate. So the only amendment I have before you right now is dealing with the committee amendment and that is on page 2 of that amendment and it's in lines 4 through 16, 4 through 14. And I believe if I read it