

going to be made public, that they may not want to tell the Department of Revenue. An example would be it may be how much money is going to create new jobs or how much money is going to go to some other area because of 775. I don't know, but obviously there is some information the Department of Revenue feels it does not want to make public unless it is absolutely forced to do because I assume it will infringe upon their ability to collect that information. And it goes back to the committee hearings that we had again last year on this particular topic, though this bill is somewhat different now, and that is the Department of Revenue really has a difficult time in the final analysis, actually finding data that will give us accurate information on 775. Whenever you get down to it, it's very, very subjective. The information is subjective. You ask a company how many jobs are created because of 775. Now, don't tell us how many jobs you would have done, I mean, look into that, how many jobs would you have done on your own and then how many jobs would you not have done but you did because of 775 and then you give us that information. It's very, very subjective. And we'll have other bits of analysis. I suspect what the Department of Revenue is saying, and I don't know because I haven't talked to them on that, is that if we require them to do so, they'll have no problem providing the information, but then here is what we're going to have. Forty-nine individual state senators having a pamphlet with expanded information giving us more information that all of us are supposed to go through and look. Well, I would put to the body that only a select few of the body is actually going to go through and look to find the subjective information to use that material for whatever purpose they want to use it for and we're going to have even more confusion. So my amendment is quite simple. If the body is actually going to do this and we're all going to get this expanded version of information, then we might as well hire a half-time FTE person in the Fiscal Policy Office so that we can have one person who, at least on a half-time basis, which is what we had previously, will go through and actually look at the information provided to us and give us some analysis of it. So we have one person give us some, hopefully, unbiased analysis rather than having 49 biased analyses. And, again, the thought that enters my mind at some point is, since much of the information is subjective and now some of that information that previously was not going to be disclosed will be disclosed, will that type of information be as easily obtainable? I don't know, I don't have the answers to that. But I don't think this bill is, particularly the way we have