into that same system and we would (a) not be bringing minimum salaries to 18,000, nor would we necessarily be giving money to those areas that need it the best or need it the most. And I'm not really quite sure where you're coming from. If we're just trying to cut down the expenditure so it's less expenditure, you know, let's be up front and say that. We want to save other monies for other A bills. If we're truly trying to get salaries up to 18,000 in some of those areas and trying to help teachers' salaries then I suspect your amendment is not going to do that. So I would vigorously oppose the amendment on those grounds, as it not only...as it not only takes away the intent of 89 but it destroys the very basis of 89 and that is set in the minimum salary for 18,000 which your amendments or the amendments would not do if they were agreed with. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Lynch, please, followed by Senator Withem. Senator Lynch, please.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President and members, again I reluctantly rise. The amendment to the amendment, I think, was a reaction to Senator Moore's consistent concern and principle and arguments with the need for state aid rather than the formula as developed in 89. I'm concerned with the amendment to the amendment only in that if it's successful and then the amendment is successful, the whole nature and character of the legislation could be changed. At this point in time, I would rather take...I would hope that we should take our chances. On the bill passing, I guess at this point in time without the tax provision and it's the reaction, the chain reaction that happens when these amendments to the amendments develop, I'm not quite sure if, even with this, if it would be in such a shape that Senator Moore could, in fact, support it in Appropriations Committee and others could do the same thing. We never have that assurance any time somebody amends anything on the floor. And, at this point in time, it seems like I know efforts are being made and I think the effort that Senator Moore has made with his amendment and now the amendment to the amendment indicates that he does, in fact, favor a state aid program rather than a specific amount of money put in a particular fund described in the statutes specifically for teachers' salaries. And so, for those reasons, I would suggest, Senator "Bradford", "Ash Bradford", that we probably not support the amendment to the amendment or the amendment itself.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Withem, followed by Senator