

out and go to local governments and then from there come back and go out through the private sector. I mean, there's a way to do this in such a way that you start off and save money, bring the money that you save back in and send it out again, save money, bring the money back in, send it out again, save money, bring the money back in and then send it out again, and across the state over a period of time you could have a tremendous impact with \$20 million. I don't see that with this. You buy down the loans and you don't get any of the savings back. I think you spend the money, it's gone. I think there's a way that this could have been set up that would have been far better in terms of a revolving fund returning savings back in and sending them back out and disbursing them across the state and I just simply am disappointed that we aren't able to do more. Now I could and I should get up and offer an amendment to this effect but what difference does it make? In essence, all we're here to do is be a sounding board and then you're hearing me and some others sound off but in the end whatever is decided is decided. So rather than try and make a big deal out of this, I'm just raising my concerns and suggesting maybe some better ideas are there that aren't being pursued and hope that at least somebody might be listening. Oh, okay, I just got the figures. In 1983, the 309 Task Force For Building Renewal had requests from state agencies for energy improvement activities totaling \$17 million, \$17 million. And I just got this so I haven't had a chance to look through it. But it tells you right there, we're sitting on... I don't know where we're at right now, six years later, but I'm sure we haven't made much progress on that, maybe a little bit, but at 17 million in '83, I don't know what that would be today and what we have accomplished since that time, but we're sitting on a lot of buildings that obviously have a great need for energy improvement and it sure seems to me that that should have been looked at perhaps more seriously than it has been looked at. The \$17 million gap that we could have filled...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: ...brought the savings back in and send it out again to everybody else in this sort of style that we're talking about here. I just think we're missing an opportunity.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hannibal, please, followed by Senators Rod Johnson and Hefner.