

are that people have been led to believe that over some period of time that tax forgiveness in fact came back when you considered everything. And if that's not true then you ought to take everything out and not have a facade up there of something that's not.

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

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. I, as you all probably know, sit on the Revenue Committee as well, and of course this presents a huge problem because as this debate began in the committee, long before we started, it was my impression that the Revenue Committee was trying to be of some assistance in putting in and formulating some cost-benefit analysis. And I went along with that. I believed that to have been, at that time, a good policy. And I think that the Legislature is obviously going to have to decide here in a few minutes whether that is good policy or not. But I guess what bothers me about the whole debate is, and Senator Warner referred to it, but is the cost-benefit analysis in general. You know if we could net out, and I knew I had hard and fast numbers, but I talk about spin-off jobs, how do I know what those are? I don't. How do I know how much sales tax? How do I know how much value is added or whatever analysis you use? Obviously it's whatever we determine it to be. And the policy that this body is going to have to decide is the formula, one that's fair. In other words, is somebody going to be able to achieve that when you look at all the factors? I could contrive a formula that would look good on paper, but in practice probably would be unachievable. One side says that this evening. The other side says, this evening, that it is a good policy, that you take into consideration what the Revenue Committee has put into fact. Perhaps both are correct, I don't know. But my frustration with it is I guess I've kind of come full circle, that the cost-benefit analysis becomes political fodder, that there are no hard and fast numbers, it becomes whatever model we can make it. And if you're on the side that you wanted this to pass, you'll say that this is a wonderful thing for the state and it will pay. If you don't like the project, ultimately you will find some figures and say that it doesn't work, it doesn't pay, and that these figures will be used later on in other political discussions. I'm to the point where I guess I've reached my frustration with these formulas, I would vote to take them out entirely. I don't do cost-benefit