

line when we have some problems, and that depends on a lot of other revenue, and I don't want to get into that at this point. The issue, it seems to me though, is one whether or not you want to assure that the revenue that is collected for this purpose is sustained. And there is much to be said for a concept that was used, it could still be misused because at one time it was. But it's harder to misuse, or at least redirect those funds if they are deposited to a specific fund as opposed to being deposited in the General Fund, and that is what occurred and how it was set up. I do not recall what the distribution formula was prior to 1903, but conceptually the fact that the state had a responsibility, and I suspect it was a minimum salary level, no different in '89, has precedent and has reasonable public policy. The problem I'm having with the amendment is, I have a feeling that half of those who, or some portion of those who are voting for it are doing it on the assumption that, in fact I believe they stated they would not then support the Schmit amendment as amended by the Withem amendment. So maybe there was no point in doing it. I'm going to withdraw the amendment, but...or the motion, but you ought to give really serious thought, we've got a lot of things mixed in in this issue and I'm still, for my own self, thinking about it. But there is much to be said, on occasions, and there needs to be an exception, there is much to be said to give thought to designating a fund for a purpose if that purpose, you feel, is high enough and as a matter of public policy shouldn't be easily subject to the whims of future Legislatures as to the level of appropriation. They can obviously still change it. But nevertheless, there would give a stability to at least that portion of educational cost that what we normally or traditionally have done, what I've traditionally concurred in, there is much to be said to give some thought. So rather than continue this argument on today I would hope that at least thought would be given as this bill advances, should it do so, that there is a very good policy argument based upon what has happened in the past. And, if you feel strongly the state should have a direct contribution to the teachers salary at some minimum level, there is very good historical reasons to also look at that funding mechanism that is less subject to whims of future sessions of the Legislature based on whatever they feel they can appropriate that given year. You have to understand, I think, the first amendment that went on was directly related to that concern by school boards, that in the event we fail to make an appropriation that then they had no obligation to maintain that salary. That had to be in part, I'm sure, because of