

the body. I think the debate that we have had on earlier bills illustrates the disagreements that one can have concerning cost-benefit analysis, how they should be structured, how they should be used. Hopefully, we'll be able to resolve those. I'm not attempting to resolve those in this amendment. I'm simply attempting to keep before you, as a legislative body, the concept of cost-benefit analysis and to require that there be a cost-benefit analysis in this program and that it demonstrate that that cost-benefit analysis demonstrate a net benefit 15 years after the approval. And I hope you agree with me that keeping cost-benefit analysis as a concept alive within this body is worthwhile and appropriate. There are other clarifying amendments or provisions in the amendment. One of them, again, has to do with the purposes of the plan and it requires that the projects consistent with the purposes of the fund are only those...are the only ones that are going to be funded. One other provision, and I would call this particularly to Senator Beutler's attention because it changes a floor amendment which he caused to be adopted, there is a provision in what is subsection (f) of Section 4, I believe, of the E & R amendments that says that there will be a finding, with respect to each loan and grant, that competition from another state is a factor in the qualified business's decision to establish a qualified business or expand a qualified business. In the context of that section, that section has to do with the promulgation of procedures, so you can't have a procedure that self-constitutes a finding. What we're amending is striking the word "finding" and then requiring that they adopt a policy which requires a finding by the commission, if you see the distinction, Senator Beutler. The policy, itself, can't be the finding. The commission has to make the finding. You had a...it's a good idea but perhaps in the way the floor amendments came out it didn't work out that way. The finding requirement is still there. It would be imposed by a policy that would have to be adopted by the commission pursuant to legislative direction. But the policy, itself, can't be the finding. So that, I would characterize that as largely a clarifying amendment. It also...the amendment, as is presented to you, also broadens the reporting requirements to the Legislature. As it is currently drafted, you could read it to have the commission only report to the Legislature the projects that they approve. Personally, I would have been just as interested in the projects that they did not approve. So we are offering the amendment to require them to report activity on all applications so that the report that comes to the Legislature will deal not only with the projects