

basically, as he says, almost the identical amendment that we just voted on, had 17 or 18 votes. I voted for it, at the same time I think it is time to say, take your shot and quit and get these bills rolling one way or the other. We have got to get this process moving and I think one shot at an identical thing is enough on what is ultimately a relatively minor bill. So I would just suggest we withdraw the amendment, but I doubt I will get that done.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, then Senator Landis.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I would rise to oppose the amendment. We are attempting to mix two policy issues. I will repeat again, when the bill...when the law was passed, the purpose of the law was not to provide general scholarships and the point that Senator Vickers is arguing is that we should allow as many people as meet the criteria to qualify for the scholarship assistance. The purpose of the law is to maintain the Guard at a hundred percent of authorized strength. That is why it was enacted originally. Now, at the time it was enacted there was a lot of other reasons as well that people were hesitant, perhaps, to join the Guard, I don't know. It has been a number of years ago. But the bill has worked. The law has worked and the restriction of 1200 is not arbitrary. The restriction of 1200 is sufficient to provide the purpose of the bill which is to keep the Guard at authorized strength and that is the only issue. There is none other. Now, there is a cost containment feature. That is also correct. The cost containment feature is that, at least it is estimated, that the cost could probably be...the cost avoidance could be up to \$100,000 a year. But if you want to increase some kind of a scholarship program, you know, then do it where everybody is eligible. Don't tie it to one segment, those who belong to the Guard. This is not a general scholarship program. It never was intended to be a general scholarship program. It was intended to provide incentive to keep the Guard at a hundred percent of authorized strength and the number in the bill does that. Now, the worst thing you can do then is gut that provision and start reducing the reimbursement. As a matter of fact, as you lower that, then the tendency there is less incentive, less incentive for more and the end result may be that the goal for which the law is there, which is to retain the hundred percent strength, may disappear. It may no longer be effective. I would urge that you reject the amendment. I understand where Senator Vickers is coming from but the issue here is what type of program is an incentive to retain the Guard at hundred percent