

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, here's something of substance in line 9.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I am opposed to giving grants to companies of this size. Why would we want to give grants to businesses employing more than 100 employees?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Senator, that is...the language there may be a bit difficult, but it actually restricts grants to companies with more than 100 employees to 25...less than 25 percent of the fund. But I think you're saying that there should be zero going to those?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No grants, the possibility of loans is all right.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But I wouldn't want them to get a grant, so I'm asking you, why would we want to give an outright grant to a company of that size? Well, let me ask it a different way. Would you be opposed to eliminating grants?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Well, I think I would, Senator, and I will try to explain briefly.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Sure.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: I would also offer amendments on Select File which would require a cost-benefit analysis for grants insuring that over a 15 year period of time we have a positive return. So I would oppose that because I recognize that you can do some things through grants, you can do some things through loans. But added to the concept of grants I would personally seek to have the state assured that we have a positive rate of return on the grant.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But, Senator Wickersham, if a grant has strings attached, wait, let me ask it a different way. You say that you want this cost-benefit analysis, well suppose the cost-benefit analysis turns out to be incorrect, the conclusions are incorrect and you wind up just giving this money over to that company. If it's a grant they don't have to have...offer any collateral.