

decade, let alone 15 years, and I would hate to see us compromise at 20. By taking out the net incentive provision that's in the equation I think you really have totally emasculated the entire process for purposes of the cost-benefit analysis. I would urge you to reject the amendment as presented under Senator Brashear's name.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Members of the body, Madam President, I rise in support of this portion of the amendment, I do, very honestly, with some reluctance because I know the Revenue Committee has been extremely helpful. These bills obviously would not be here at this point had the Revenue Committee not taken their responsibilities very seriously and spent a lot of time improving the legislation. But I do feel as I look at the options before us at this point, and intellectually I'm trying to see if there may not be some other way of doing this cost-benefit analysis than any of the alternatives that are here. And I, as yet, have been unable to do so, at least to my own satisfaction, obviously not to anyone else's. The disagreement though really is the fundamental disagreement between those that believe that economic development incentives really "incent" individuals to do things that they would have done otherwise...anyway. To adopt the...to continue to support the Revenue Committee version of this you really have...as I understand this, and I'm still open for more and more education on this. But as I understand this you have to adopt the assumption that these are, in fact, giveaways of the existing tax base, because that's what it does. It does subtract the tax incentives over 15 years, takes those out of our calculations and assumes that they would have been there, the tax liability over 15 years to the state, and subtract out of that the incentives. It assumes that they would have been there. In this particular case I don't think that is reality. And it gets back to...we've had this argument on 830, had this argument on 829, we've had this argument every time, and it really comes back to the central issue. These projects will be ones that would not otherwise be in the state. As a matter of fact, and I hope Senator Lindsay doesn't mind I'm stealing a little bit of his thunder, because he pointed this out to me, that is one of the things that the board is supposed to evaluate, whether or not this project would have been there anyway. If the project would have been there anyway then, yes, the Revenue Committee assumptions are correct. If it would not have been there then