

they ought to be addressed in that respect where, you know, if you want to argue what the tuition ought to be or if you want to argue how much other tuition or remission should be or if you argue what scholarships there ought to be generally available to the population, that is one place. But this is not the place for that, that is one argument but this is not the place for that argument. The argument here is whether or not the current limitations proposed by the committee amendment is adequate to meet the goal of the policy which is to retain the hundred percent strength of the Guard and I believe it is. So I urge you reject the amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hoagland, please. The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, to cease debate.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Debate has ceased. Senator Vickers, would you like to close, please.

SENATOR VICKERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President and members, first of all, the philosophical question that I am asking you to address yourself to was not addressed, in my opinion, by either Senator Landis or Senator Warner, quite frankly. Senator Landis pointed out the fact that we have got situations where perhaps a major who is two years away from retirement is getting tuition credits to take ballroom dancing. The other amendments, the other provisions in the committee amendment prohibits that. But the number limitation would not prohibit that. I would suggest to you that that major who wants that tuition tax credit to take ballroom dancing is going to be among the first in line for tuition tax credits because of his position and because of his understanding of the situation. Whereas, the raw recruit, which is supposed to be the purpose of this, just came into the Guard last year, wants to be a medical student, wants to apply to go to premed, is going to be 1201 and is not going to get any assistance. Now, I ask you, does it make sense to say that, no, we don't want people to take ballroom dancing, we don't want people to be taking flute playing, or whatever, and so in order to prevent that from happening we are going to put in a first-in-line mechanism? That doesn't make sense. It simply doesn't make sense because you are still not going to prevent that person who wants to take flute playing, basket weaving, ballroom dancing, or whatever, if