

and change it. It's just like certificate of need where Senator Hall and I have talked about for years about that one. You know when it first got in there we thought this is going to do something, this is going to stop unwanted projects and going to make us more efficient, but you know the first time it really did that, they came in and they weakened it. They watered it down and then it didn't do it anymore, it didn't do what it was supposed to do. And any other example you find where we actually put something in place to say no, to try and distinguish the good from the bad, to try and actually prioritize things, it just seems like we never quite get it done in government. And I thought this would be an attempt at it and I always thought it might be the solution and now I've got to throw it out the window too just like Senator Warner is with this amendment because in the end the powers that be are going to get what they want. You put a cost benefit in, it works as it is supposed to work, they'll just throw it out when they need to get, throw it out even if you put it in. So it's really more than just losing the amendment, it's also losing the illusion that maybe this might solve a problem that every state faces as we battle with one another over tax incentives to attract industry. It's a sad day for me.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body, I rise in support of this amendment that I cosponsored with Senator Warner. I, certainly, Senator Warner and I don't agree completely on this bill nor the provision that we are seeking to strike right now and while I supported the Lindsay amendment that he sponsored on behalf of Senator Brashear earlier, I would urge you to adopt this amendment because I think that the cost-benefit analysis that the Revenue Committee put in there was not completely accurate. I believe that in fact the cost-benefit analysis that is currently in the bill by virtue of the amendment that was adopted is not completely accurate. And I would question whether any statutory cost-benefit analysis can be completely accurate because we are talking about economics and finance which are both inexact sciences. They are things that are subject to a variety of interpretations, many of which are subjective as opposed to objective. And I think that to require something like that statutorily is something that is simply not the wisest thing to do in the context of the bill that we're talking about now. I think certainly that the commission that has been assigned to approve these projects in