

cannot do what he wants to propose but recognizing the problems that he has identified, we have talked to Senator Koch. Senator Koch will be proposing an amendment which would provide for a review of the situation after two years by the Appropriations Committee to ensure that what we anticipate to be a very critical problem is indeed that problem and to the degree that we have found it to be and, but still for only a five year period would we allow this change in the permanent school fund severance tax. But, again, if after two years the Appropriations Committee wanted to change that through the information they receive, they will have that authority. So Senator Koch does have an amendment that I think takes care of a lot of the problems that Senator Remmers has but still allows the flexibility that we need to carry out the programs that we identified. So I would say that the Senator Remmers amendment is not wise. It is not necessary and that is not in good form at this point and although I know all of us are perhaps wondering how many phases we have gone through with this bill, nevertheless, I think at this stage one more amendment, the Koch amendment will put it in very good form and should be passed in that form.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I vigorously oppose returning the bill and I would submit to you that it is not all as complicated as Senator Remmers made it sound with his explanations of bureaucracies and so on and so forth. The bill is ultimately simple. It does simply this with the bulk of the money. The money now coming, new money, not old money in the permanent fund as Senator Remmers indicated by the way, simply the new money coming in from the severance tax would be put directly into weatherization of school buildings. Now what about all this bureaucracy and all the new things? All that work has been done, done. We know what needs to be done in the schools. We know what the savings will be. That is all done and I am going to use a couple of simple examples of actuality. There are three schools that I am dealing with here, Waverly Senior High School, Waverly Junior High School, Malcolm High School. Studies were done to see how much specific things could be done for, what the savings would be and here is an example. Waverly Senior High School with an investment of \$55,603, Waverly High School could reduce its energy consumption by 26%, with an '80-'81 cost savings of \$15,261 on fuel bills, one year with a \$55,000 investment. Next year it will probably be \$20,000 savings in one year. On one school specific things they did that were identified, replace existing