

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 11, 1999

LB 105

will suggest that everyone will be subsidized because, at least when I was very young, I was always told there's no such thing as a free lunch, someone is paying for it. And so, while there may not be a direct subsidy, there is an indirect subsidy, and for that reason I can't say that we can have unlimited incomes in the facility. The...I believe that development in the private sector for the private sector spawns more tax revenue and stands to bring down everyone else's taxes across the board rather than in a more targeted fashion. And throughout the committee process and some debate here, perhaps there have been, I would say, some logical arguments as to why there should be varying incomes within a facility, and I appreciate those. But I guess I would say that if it takes someone of a higher income to teach someone else, their neighbor perhaps, how to better keep their residence, whatever it might be, I think is rather narrow-minded and perhaps even elitist, and to suggest that it's only income-driven I think is in error. And so, while we are discussing some of these things, I think that we really need to look at the intended purpose. What will we achieve? If...if these amendments are not sufficient, we can find out and address those later. But I believe that we need to rein some things in and narrow the scope perhaps and end up helping those in need rather than those not in need, and where we would end up hurting more individuals than we help. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Smith. Further discussion, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Smith's amendment is being drafted now and, while we're on this subject waiting for that amendment, there are some points that I do want to make. Those who have been in business, and many of you have been in business, those who make purchases from businesses, which all of us have done, understand that the more dear a thing is the higher the price will be. That is why diamonds cost more than sand. Sand is readily obtainable. Those who know anything about the diamond trade know that there is no scarcity of diamonds, that they're released onto the market in a very controlled manner to artificially keep the price high. But, again, the price is high because, although artificially created, there is a scarcity. So if you have a category of persons to whom the entire housing market is