

the Veterans Affairs officials because they weren't even providing much help to us because they said, well, it depends on the status. If the person is serving stateside and is relocated down to Fort Hood, Texas, or who knows where, his family may have additional amounts of money for relocation. He may have, depending on whether he is living on a base where there is food provided or housing provided versus not provided, tell us what you want to know and we can give you the answer, and we were unable to do that. Again, it was certainly a noteworthy concern on the part of Senator Horgan and his co-introducers of the bill, and we wrestled with the question but we were not able to come up with any answers. And, again, Desert Storm, then, came to somewhat of an end during that period of time and so the committee felt that it was really unworkable. I think in the form that it is in it is unworkable. The amendment that Senator Horgan introduced, I was about ready to discuss its germaneness by virtue of the way that it is designed because we have got a combination of things amending the committee amendments, and then coming right back and amending the bill, without actually having made that proper step in the meantime. So the amendment, itself, has some rough edges, but I rise in opposition, not to the concept, and as a person who was called to active duty as a guardsman and served in Vietnam, I understand the difficulty and the plight of an individual who falls into that situation. But in its current form without better information, without better cooperation from the military, per se, rounding up what all these...all of these various listings of benefits that may or may not come your way, depending on your status, whether you are on temporary duty assignment, and that is your identification, whether you are permanently assigned to a unit, whether you are displaced from your home or from your known base into another base, all of those things create these various formulas for pay. By virtue of that confusion, it was literally impossible for us to say is the state employee doing as well financially, and this thing was directed at the financial concern, doing as well financially in this status as they were as a state employee. All of those kinds of calculations need to be done and the information within, the guidelines within the bill as written, it was impossible to do that. So, I don't think it is necessary. We did not have very many people involved as it was. I don't know how many of them are still on active duty. I think we are down to a very few. There was only like 27, I think, state employees who were called to active duty anyway, and several of those are already home. So I really don't think the bill is necessary at this time.