

currently that would be appropriated, at this time at least, for LB 91. It would set a stage for future years that the Legislature is on record saying we want something done to encourage and enhance teachers that are doing a good job. We want some performance-based criteria out there. And, quite honestly, there was performance-based criteria put in LB 89. Senator Abboud was correct. They originally asked for 150 million, but 50 million of that was in a property tax concept, so really the proposal was 100 million, and LB 91 did have performance-based in. The teachers were wanting to put money into performance-based. They thought it was a good idea. They were supportive. It was in their bill. But when the monies got down to the \$20 million, actually the \$40 million for the biennium that we finally came down to in the session, the decision was made at that point that while we stripped the other sections of it, since we are only down now to 40, which is, as I say, only, I say that tongue in cheek because that still is a sizeable sum of money, we need to put that in simply enhancement of teachers salaries. And there were a lot of intents on the floor. Senator Landis says it was his intent, when he voted, it was his understanding that it was a one-time thing, and I guess I would have to... I understand. I certainly am not going to quibble with David's reasoning on it, certainly that must have been his intent, but I find it interesting that some people in the body may have voted it as a one-time thing when LB 89, when it was presented to us, did not have a sunset, and LB 89, even in its inception, was going to be an ongoing thing that we, as State Legislature, make a policy statement that in order to get better teachers, in order to keep teachers that are good within the system, we have to put ourselves on the line and say, what are we going to be able to do to help get salaries up there. And that was going to be an ongoing thing. It was only in the last part of the session that the sunset then was put on, which changed then the parameters. Now I assume those that are saying that they voted because it was a one-time thing were saying the sunset may have brought them on board, which I assume would imply that they would not have been on board without a sunset. I don't know that. We may find out on this vote whether that would be the case on LB 91. But the Withem amendment to me makes a lot of sense. Actually, I was a co-signer of the amendment in its original form that would have taken a third from the original 15, but I understand the version we have now. It makes sense, the version we have now, and I think it is important for the Legislature to put in statute in LB 91 a clear message...