

in the price of housing. But whether or not those standards are good or bad, I think we ought to look at directly not to suggest that simply because government has put some things in place that, therefore, government ought to make additional payments. And as an example of that, I would talk a little bit about farm policy in the United States and what's happened with farm policy over time, and the fact that right now we're swinging back to a more laissez-faire view of what farm policy should be. It used to be we tried to justify the payments, the target price payments, huge in amount, that were being made to farmers by suggestions that it was government policy in the first place that got us into the problem. Government policy with regard to trade. Government policy with regard to Russia. Government inspection policy, and this and that. And therefore we, because government didn't perform well in one area in the opinion of some, it was used as an excuse to...to supplement the payments to farmers, and now we've finally come full cycle on that, haven't we? And we've decided, wait a minute, we've got to look at root causes and can't start building one wrong on another. And the farm bill that we're going to get this year, notwithstanding whatever the government may not have done right, in seven years will take us back to a situation where the government is no longer subsidizing payments to farmers. Now I think most farmers think that is good. I only bring it up because it's an example of a...of a devastating kind of cycle you can get into if you start arguing that because the government's done something wrong in one place, the government now has to make it up by paying you for it. If the government's done something wrong in one place, we should go back and examine that place where the alleged wrong was done and ask ourselves whether or not that's correct, not merely proceed to add to government expense and taxpayer expense by justifying subsidy on bad government policy in the first instance. I also continue to be astounded at the way just the magic words "economic development" seem to win out over everything these days. And now, such a basic thing as housing is economic development. It doesn't take...you know, whether you talk about liberals or conservatives, if there's a winning catch phrase, it doesn't take long for the other side to identify that and to start attaching their favorite programs to that catch phrase. And that's what's happening here. My God, if residential housing is related to economic development, what's not? What's not? Maybe we should have a government program to bring workers in from Texas and set them up in homes here and pay for their first