

much the same conclusion as did the Public Health and Welfare Committee but there are some differences of language. With respect to the syphilis test or the serological test for marriage, there is no maximum that I can recall in the Appropriations Committee. There is a maximum of \$5 in the amended version so that we both attack the same concept. That is actual costs should be charged, however there is a cap in the language that is presented to you. Currently that cost is roughly \$1.80 to perhaps \$2.00. That is the fee that will be charged out in the field in the event either version is passed. There is, however, a provision in the language that I've offered you that says in the event you are an indigent and you apply for a marriage license you can waive this cost by the signing of a statement to that effect. No such language exists in the Appropriations Committee bill. Secondly, there are two kinds of fees that are covered in the amended version that I've placed on your desk that are not covered in 966. Some of them are for specimen costs and these are the providing of certain kinds of materials for the making of specimens and the second one is a test, a particular test for a microbiological examination. The sum total of difference is roughly \$20,000 of revenue raising that will occur under the amendment that I have passed out to you that occurs in 966. There is also some very explicit language in the amendments that I have handed out to you in which fees may not be charged. That list is meant to be much the same as in 966 but is drafted I think in a more superior way in the amendments that I have handed out on your desk. I've talked this over with Senator Warner and perhaps he has some reflections on it. Also if there are any comments by the members of the Public Health Committee I simply warrant to you that this language had a public hearing. It had the Governor's Task Force recommendations and is consistent with what they asked for. It was drawn in conjunction with the Department of Health and Andy Cunningham and for that reason I would offer it as a substitute for the language in 966 which seeks to do much the same thing. This language will raise roughly \$20,000 more than what is in 966.

SENATOR KAHLE: Okay, we have a list of names here that we had from the committee amendments. Senator Kremer, do you wish to speak to the Landis amendment? Senator Wagner. Senator Haberman. Okay, Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, a question of Senator Landis, please.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Landis, do you yield?

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes.

SENATOR KAHLE: Okay, go ahead.