society we are moving away from need-based analysis in our governmental services, in our governmental programs and approaching things much more on the basis of the status of the individual. Are they of a certain age? We have senior citizen discounts. We have senior citizen services. We have programs that are available only because somebody has reached a certain age and that burgeoning political clout, by the way, is now being used, it seems to me, to continue entitlement programs when there are grayer public agendas out there than continuing to foster the political clout of senior citizens. Now, that's not present in this case. This is not a Social Security issue in which the federal Congress can't attack the deficit because you can't attack a sacred cow. But the sacred cow has come about because we have started to see groups of our population as having an elevated status. And if you listened to the opening argument, you heard that elevation of one group of people from another based on what I think is the illusory status of age. If it's wisdom, I don't think that's contained by the arbitrariness of age. If it's experience, I don't think it's contained by the arbitrariness of age. And certainly need is not contained in the arbitrariness of age. We have some programs, for example, that we regularly fund and have had difficulty taking out of our code which gave tax breaks to people, not because they were veterans of foreign wars who fought and had disabilities, because they had the status of an injury obtained in the service of the country, but because they at one time had been a veteran and had an injury outside of their veteran services without any regard as to whether or not they could pay for it, in other words, a status-based tax exemption.

PRESIDENT: Excuse me, Senator Landis. (Gavel.) Can we have it a little quieter, please, so we can hear the speakers. Thank you, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: I understand that the proponents of this bill have created a bill that has as little public cost as possible, but there is a public cost in expanding the size of classrooms. Any teacher will tell you that it's easier to teach 15 than it is to teach 25 and that what they hand out to the other...to the students is reduced proportionally. Secondly, it seems to me that there is a reduced cost by letting out of responsibility those who are able to pay who share in a public benefit, even if the cost of that public benefit doesn't go up. If the numbers of people who are enjoying it go up and don't participate in sharing in the cost of that, I think there has been a cost