

particular initiative could not stand the scrutiny of the kind of cost benefit analysis that the Revenue Committee thought was appropriate. Now, I know that the argument was over whether you had double counting and some other arguments, but my personal conviction is that, at root, the argument was over whether the cost benefit analysis was indeed effective. And, of course, it was amended in a way to make it ineffective and then it was gone. But be that as it may, the issue is whether or not we should have any cost benefit analysis performed, at least if you listen to Senator Maurstad. Senator Maurstad, I believe, ought to have some conversations with the Department of Economic Development. It's my understanding that they use cost benefit analysis all the time. And in fact, my recollection is that the cost benefit analysis that was recommended to this body by the Revenue Committee was based on a model that is used by the Department of Economic Development. Now somebody may educate me and advise me differently, but that's my current belief. They use cost benefit analysis for these kinds of programs. Other states, cities, other folks interested in economic development use cost benefit analysis. It is a perfectly rational piece of the policymaking process. To turn a blind eye is not responsible for policymakers in the State of Nebraska. And I have privately said a number of times that I don't care what kind of silly things other people do in terms of economic development, but if they're silly enough to ignore cost benefit analysis to determine whether or not a program is cost effective and works for them, I see no reason to blindly follow their path. I think we've always been responsible as a state when we're examining these issues and I would expect us to continue to be responsible and I do consider a part of our responsibility an examination of whether or not these programs will do what they say they will. They are always promoted as being a benefit, deriving a real dollar benefit to the State of Nebraska. If that's true, show me. We're operating in the business arena, we're making what are, in effect, kinds of business decisions. You won't make those kind of decisions in the private world without the analysis. We should do the same thing. So I'm obviously opposed to Senator Maurstad's amendment and I am adamantly opposed to his suggestion that we should chuck cost benefit analysis altogether as an item in our public policy discussion of these issues.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I,