

expended for its own uses. This is the one that shows the total expenditures, and you'll see in 1987 and 1988, the board spent \$2,364,000 for operation of the board, personal services, operating and travel and other expenses. That is what it costs. It costs approximately \$2 million a year to administer the school lands. That is what they are spending. And my argument is that if this money was turned into cash and the investment officer was investing it, that \$2 million could largely be eliminated and that money could go to the schools rather than going for the administration of the land. You know land is difficult to administer. You have to have people out in the area and there are a number of them, I think five or six statewide, who spend their time checking on the school land to see that the lessee is doing the proper thing, and it's a complicated system of administering land. Administering land is not easy. Administering funds is much easier and much less expensive and so I contend that it would be much more efficient if we did that, turned the land into money and then invested the money. We could save most of this \$2 million that it costs to administer. And I have another item that I circulated, I think I circulated and it demonstrates to me the attitude of the board...or some of the personnel of the Educational Lands and Funds and that is a fact that they are spending \$20,000 for lobbyists to defeat my bill and that money is coming out of the school fund. That is money that could go to the support of schools except they are spending it for lobbyists. Now I've inquired about that. People tell me that there is nothing illegal about it. They are a state agency but they have that discretion to spend that money for lobbyists and so if two lobbyists, well-known lobbyists, each of them getting \$10,000 to defeat this bill and I think that says something about the people that run the school boards, this Educational Lands and Funds Board. Maybe it says that they strongly believe that the school lands should not be sold, but maybe it means also that they are looking out for their jobs, I don't know. I don't know, but all those legal, I don't think it's the way the money should be spent. I think they could do their own thing, they could make their own case without hiring expensive lobbyists to do it. Again, I would like to ask that you ask questions, you ask questions because this certainly is not a simple subject, it is not a simple subject and it has long-term ramifications for the state as a whole. But I think it is an anachronism that we continue to have land for this purpose when we could, in my opinion, much more efficiently turn the land into money and to then use the income from that money for the support of schools