

the energy department in awarding these grants. They look at payback period, primarily payback period. Is this a project, by updating this school in this particular fashion, will this energy savings pay for the cost of this repair. The quicker your payback period the more likely you are of having that particular grant approved. In this way, over a long period, we are saving taxpayers money on the local level. For these reasons I think this program has worked well. We have seen evidence that there is still a need out there that exists in the state. It may not be back in the Papillion-LaVista School District, it may not be in your individual school district, but there is a need, throughout the state. I think we should leave this program in effect. For that reason, I urge you to vote against this kill motion.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator DeCamp. May we have order in the Chamber, please. (Gavel.) Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DEKAMP: Mr. President, Senator Remmers gave you a partial history of this program. I would like to give you some facts that maybe he had forgotten. LB 257 was a bill, sponsored by myself and a number of others, back at the height of the energy crisis. Senator Remmers brings up the date in the legislation for terminating this program. For those of you who want to go back and check the record, and I'm sure Senator Remmers can confirm this, a termination date was put in because I and others supporting the bill said, give us a few years to either prove this program works, and if it doesn't then it will terminate, but if it does give us those few years and let's prove it does, and then if it does we should be entitled to renew it. That is why we are back, because we put a date in there to put the burden on us to prove our program. Now what about these funds. Let me tell you, which can also be verified by some of the older members in here, what was happening to these funds back when we started this program. These funds were tied up in investments of 2.5 to 3.5 percent, that's right, not only these funds but hundreds of millions of dollars of state controlled investment money, of the teachers pension funds, the permanent school funds, these things were tied up in investments that weren't producing because state law, at that time, required and limited the investments to those kind of things. With the opposition, with the opposition of the Wiley Remmers and the school boards and the teachers, we changed those laws on investment. And because we changed