

to act like a business. They come in, they analyze, then they make a decision of whether or not to invest in us, we ought to do the same sort of thing before we invest in them in terms of a tax break or in this case, a loan or a grant. So, in my view, the concept of cost benefit can be applied to other areas and we should look at that, it's being talked about. It particularly makes sense in this area because this is exactly the way the decision is being made on the other end of the coin and we ought to be doing that in the same fashion. As to this is hard to do and that sort of thing, I think that there is work being done now. We're looking at some economics professors in the state who are doing some benefit modeling. We can come up with a model. We can come up with a way to do this. It's not impossible, those states have done it, and so I think that we simply ran out of time on Micron as to the specific plan but there can be cost benefit done. It's not that difficult to do. So again, in my view, we made a mistake when we backed off in 829. Let's not do it again. Let's include this. It's a modest proposal. Fifteen years is what this is talking about. I've had proposals saying 10-year payback. You know, when 775 passed they said, well, we'll have a payback in six years, seven years at the most. Of course, now it's 17 to 20 years that the payback is, so I think keeping people at their word, having them do what they say they'll do and protecting the taxpayers in terms of the investments we make with some of these tax breaks or loans or grants is absolutely the right thing to do and so I rise in support of the Wickersham amendment and in opposition to the Maurstad amendment.

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Wickersham, followed by Senators Warner, Maurstad, Chambers, Hillman and Wesely.

**SENATOR WICKERSHAM:** Thank you, Mr. President. I am kind of surprised at a couple of Senator Maurstad's remarks. I will admit that I indicated that I thought the portion of my and Senator Engel's amendment that he's trying to strike was a toothless tiger but the other comment that he made with regard to the cost benefit analysis that had been contained in 829, my recollection is that that was struck from the bill not because it was ineffective or not effective. In my view, that was struck from the bill by the proponents of the bill because the cost benefit analysis provided was too effective. In other words, it did what it was supposed to do and that's the reason it was changed and that's the reason it was taken out, that that