appropriate, would it?

SPEAKER BARRETT: We're still on Senator Schmit's amendment. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Mr. Speaker, yeah, rise for a...I guess, a parliamentary point. I would ask the Chair to please clarify for the body exactly what amendment we're dealing with. Senator Schmit had indicated when he first spoke that he was withdrawing his amendment from yesterday, substituting a new one, and I think some of us are operating, excluding Senator Hall, just then operating under that assumption. It's my understanding though that we are, in fact, working with the language as it is currently printed in the Journal on page 1192, with the only exception being the amendment that I offered and was adopted yesterday. Is that correct?

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Withem, it's the opinion of the Chair that we are discussing the Schmit amendment which we were discussing yesterday.

SENATOR WITHEM: Thank you very much.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you for asking. We are then back to the Schmit amendment that's found on page 1192 of the Legislative Further discussion on that amendment. Bernard-Stevens, followed by Senators Lamb, Smith and Warner. Senator David, please.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, LB 89 took a relatively interesting shift yesterday.

SPEAKER BARRETT: (Gavel.) Proceed.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. LB 89 took an interesting shift yesterday and it began as a teacher funding bill for increased pay and now it's beginning to turn into a possibility of teacher pay increase and a vehicle for property tax relief at the same time. And I kind of wanted to say a few comments if I could begin maybe to focus the discussion a little bit so that we don't get carried away on simplistic ideas and move forward in a little bit of blindness here. First, I would like to remind the body of a couple things. Last year, the Revenue Committee, along with other members, Senator Warner, myself and others included, went throughout the state talking