

bill was school money. We took it out of one pocket and putting some of it back in the other pocket. We're taking this money that before had gone in the permanent school fund, we had a formula for distributing it, and we put this money into the energy fund, the weatherization fund. Of the \$5 million we take 10 percent right off the top for the bureaucracy. There is another three percent involved in administration, which has been shown by the department's own figures. So when we are taking the dollar out of the school district's pocket we are only putting back about 87 cents at the most. In order to get that 87 cents back the school district also has to spend some money, spend a lot of effort writing programs, come with hat in hand to the bureaucracy and say, here is our program, now please give us a grant to do our weatherization. When we set up a bureaucracy like that it seems like they never end. The bill first must end in...sunset in '83. Then it must sunset in '86. As this bill came in it was to sunset in '92, but I think it...of course, now it's been back to '88. It seemed like it set up a bureaucracy and it never ends. I can't understand why we feel that these school boards don't know enough to take care of their own weatherization. I will admit that some times I have questioned the judgement of school boards at contract time on the value of a good administrator. But I have generally felt when it came to things like weatherization and school buses and that type of expenses, school boards generally were ahead of me. Before this bill ever went into effect, in '82, a number of school districts had already spent a lot of money on their weatherization programs. So when this bill came along, of course, they didn't get their share. Now that we do have the weatherization program no one is doing anything until he gets a grant from the government, from the state government. We spoke of a 16 percent return on our money on this investment. That is assuming that this money would not have been spent for weatherization had it gone directly to the school boards and I think that is a false assumption. I think most of those school boards would have made their own weatherization...taken care of their own weatherization programs if we had not had this bill. Then they would have had the full dollar rather than just 85 cents to spend on weatherization. So the assumption that it's a 16 percent return that we wouldn't have had otherwise is clearly a false assumption. Another thing about this assumption is that the 16 percent is on a depreciating value. If this money had been left in the permanent school fund the return