

conducted here I guess, Senator Beutler. It would seem to me that to increase the age to somewhere near 12 or 14, at least two to four years before that license would be required to be purchased, would make much more sense and would appeal to a greater number of people in terms of increasing the habitat fund. I think that that...that's my only concern here is that we limit it to such a few number of individuals and they've got to think about that purchase in the very early stages of a child's life that before they can actually even participate in these types of endeavors, where if you were to open it up to a greater number of kids, at least those who might have had the experience of fishing or hunting, at least ages 10, 12 or even 14, it would still leave some time before they would be required to have those licenses, that the commission could achieve their end and at the same time, I think, have an operation that possibly might work or be a little more practical. I just think that when you limit it to those who are under the age of five, you're really talking about a very few individuals who are going to look at this as a purchase and it would have to be, as Senator Schmitt pointed out, in the form of a gift. That doesn't mean I oppose the bill. I just think that it is so limited that any experience will be, over the next couple of years, will be, I guess far too little to make a determination. I think if you're going to do something like this, it would be better if it were expanded to a greater group of individuals. The idea is to build up that habitat fund which then throws off interest and, as you now stated, the principal is never attacked or deleted. The question for me is, you know, why do we leave it to kids four years of age or younger. Why not make it something that is available on a reduced rate to a greater number of individuals who actually participate in some of these events or these endeavors? With that I will oppose the motion to indefinitely postpone, but I still question if at some point we shouldn't look at making this a viable test as opposed to one that would only appeal to a very, very small group of individuals. With that, thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body, I, too, will not support the kill motion, but I would like to comment on Senator Hall's recent comments. I think that he has the right idea except I guess my concern is if, actuarially, it's going to be sound. Apparently, from the data that was passed out, the actuarially...the actuarial soundness of it at