

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members, I rise just to offer a couple of comments to...comments raised by Senator Wesely and Senator Schmit on this report, and I thought it would be fair to point out that both senators do raise some good points. These points I think were addressed by the committee and these points were, as a matter of fact, addressed by the Governor's Task Force and the allocation that she finally came out with. I do have a tendency to agree with both Senator Schmit and Senator Wesely and I think some of those comments are pointed out in our report and that is that we wanted to try to see if we could get as broad a base distribution as we possibly could and we wanted to try to see...try to encourage to make sure these distributions were based somewhat on need. With regards to the loan program that Senator Wesely has expressed some concerns about reinvestment, I think...I think the way the program has been set up, however, there may be problems with it and, however, there may be some questions with it as far as interest rates and such, two things I think are worth pointing out, one, yes, it would be a revolving type of a program. The buy-down or the buying back of half the loan, that doesn't mean the loan wouldn't be paid off. The loan would be paid off. The principal would be paid off. It would be interest free as far as the state is concerned. However, the principal would return back into the fund and be used for redistribution again. You would be losing the interest on that but the principal would be repaid so you would have a revolving loan of sorts going on, it would be a no interest revolving loan. Also, Senator Wesely pointed out that maybe Senator Schmit might be asking for a 100,000 and then realizing the credit restrictions said maybe more like 10,000 as far as the loan. The energy office did describe to us their "envisionment" of this program and, while it does not state in the actual presentation, the intention was that they would have a cap on this program to be later determined, but the intention was somewhere around a \$3,000 mark as far as these loans. So their efforts to try to keep the cap down low for weatherization programs on an individual basis and loan basis would be to spread that \$10 million over a very broad base of people. So we wouldn't have large amounts of money being asked for with that weatherization program. The interest rate, I assume that they would have some way of trying to see that we're dealing with market rates and competitive rates and not allow for, obviously, some possible abuses there but that would be in the hands of the administration to see to it that that didn't happen. With regards to tribal Indian agreement, we did discuss that in committee. We had presentations from the