

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, I support the bill, recommend that it be advanced.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vickers, on the bill.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, I wonder if Senator Wiitala would respond to a question, please.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Yes, Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Senator Wiitala, as you may know, we discussed in the committee as to whether or not this bill applied or was applicable to any other state-owned property and quite frankly I have not had the time to really check that out, and furthermore was surprised to find this bill on the agenda quite this soon, and I was wondering if you had had an opportunity to check as to whether or not this did apply to areas that may be owned by the Game and Parks or some other department of the state, and as to what the potential impact may be in some of these other areas. Have you had an opportunity to do that?

SENATOR WIITALA: First of all I would like to state that one of the reasons of the impending importance of the bill is the fact that the race season begins in I guess late summer or early fall, and at that time those children will be faced with the predicament. Secondly, it is my understanding the way the bill is drafted it does not apply to other state properties, but that matter might be brought up and largely for the reason that it limits the term of enrollment to 90 days. So we are only talking about students that are enrolling for 90 days, that that would cover the racetrack season and then they are gone. You know, it is sort of a nomadic vocation and the parents are gone to another racetrack. So I don't know if that answers your question or not.

SENATOR VICKERS: Well, let me ask you another one. If, in fact, we did find out that there were the other areas that we owned here in this state that perhaps children were at that were having to pay, or their parents paying their tuition, perhaps between now and Select File, if we found those places, would you be perhaps amenable to trying to examine and address those situations as well. Even though it may be for more than a 90-day period, it seems to me that it would be somewhat unfair to grant this exclusion for somebody for 90 days if we are going to ask somebody living on our property that may be there the year round to have to pay tuition for their children. Would you agree to that?