

pointed out it isn't even interest on our investment but one dollar above what we put in. If you want to make a change and say it's incentives plus one dollar, you'd have the same result as we have with the presentation made to you by the Revenue Committee. I don't really understand what all the squawking is about. If it won't return the amount of the incentives plus one dollar, why should we do it? I can't imagine, but I'm not going to... I'm still... I'm not in favor of the amendment, I don't want to startle you or surprise you. The bill as it currently stands represents, in my view, correct state policy.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, again I... I've said this so many times, I'm really soft on this. But the one thing that I felt some measure of comfort was that I thought that we had a cost-benefit ratio that I could go out and defend that over X period of time that at least the state's investment in these jobs would be returned. I still believe the policy is right, perhaps the numbers are wrong. I will oppose the amendment, but if it gets adopted then I'd be in favor of just striking any... strike any benefit ratio at all. Why pretend? And that's what I think we'd be doing. We massage the formula to make it work or to reflect what people think it says then you'd be better off just putting it... striking any reference whatsoever. I'm not in favor of doing that in lieu of what we have as a committee amendment, however, because I think that's holding faith with the public, at least what I think the public has been told over the years, and that's what I think is the best policy. Frankly, I wasn't too concerned about this, if you'll look at the thing you add back in, the 6,500 jobs, I always assumed that that could be massaged probably quite a bit to make it fit, but perhaps it can't, and if it can't I feel better the way it's written, I suppose. But I assumed that there was a lot of variables there to make estimates. But my position, I suppose I won't talk a whole lot more on this anymore times, but my position, I think the better public policy is what's in the bill. If you don't like that as a matter of public policy, then I'd suggest it shouldn't have anything in there because there's no point in having a cost-benefit ratio that in fact doesn't reflect the full investment the state is putting in or the taxpayers of the state. I understand, don't disagree, the part that if they weren't here at all it wouldn't be an issue, and that's quite true. But nevertheless, the facts