

house, so some way or another we must stop that kind of thing, when you lose a little baby like that because the water was pouring on her. So this task force I know will be taking all of those things into consideration and perhaps we, eventually we will come up with a workable and affordable housing scheme so people will have decent places to live, and that's the whole thing for me, that they have decent housing. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Crosby. Senator Witek. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President, Madam President, I would like to yield my time to Senator Beutler.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Lieutenant Governor Robak, members of the Legislature, I oppose the amendment, and I...and I do so with some hesitation because I don't want to be misunderstood, and I want to be as accommodating as possible to Senator Wesely in his efforts in this particular area, but I think that this amendment is essentially a kind of shell game that simply reestablishes in different words the very same thing that was in the green copy. That's not completely accurate in the sense that it doesn't...it will not leave the green copy completely...it will not leave low income and very low income completely undefined as in the green copy, but it moves the standard way back up to where it would essentially cover roughly 40 percent of the consumers out there; 40 percent of the consumers out there. Why in the world do we need to establish a program, or even think about establishing a program, that's designed to subsidize 40 percent of the consumers? We can't...we can't even reach agreement or handle properly the, what, 10 percent or so we have on welfare, and all the way...and here we are with this amendment setting up a program that zooms all the way up to 40 percent of consumers and suggest that government resources should be spent to that extent on one particular area of concern, which is housing. There's also medicine, and I suggest to you that catastrophic medical problems and medical insurance are much rougher on poor people, or at least just as rough on poor people as housing, yet we are not able to get up to 200 percent of poverty there. We are at 150. I reject setting out one category of expense and suggesting that that's worthy of so much more support than another category of expense. We should treat people as a whole,