

need, then maybe then, but not until. Revenue Committee reported out, yesterday, five to two, the Union Pacific bill. Now I'll be happy to vote for the Maurstad amendment if this body isn't prepared to open its coffers and give Union Pacific millions of dollars of breaks, millions of dollars of assistance in tax forgiveness so we can build a \$100 million building if, at the same time, we are then honoring the Maurstad pledge of no funds for affordable housing. I'll tell you what you treat Union Pacific and poor people alike, and I'll vote for the Maurstad amendment. I'll vote for the principle that Bud Robinson which is, don't give them the money until they need it. I'll tell you what, put in the Union Pacific bill that once they build the \$100 million building, then we'll give them a tax break. I'll do that as well. All you've got to do is be consistent between affordable housing and Union Pacific, and I'll be happy to vote for the Maurstad amendment, I'll be happy to do exactly what Bud Robinson does. But when Union Pacific comes down here, we open the checkbook, we write it first, we don't ask whether or not state funds are appropriate or not, we open our bottom pocket, our final coin purse and take out the money necessary to buy that kind of social welfare. I would hope that we would do no less for the poor of Nebraska than we would do for the Union Pacific. But if we adopt the Maurstad amendment and pass the Union Pacific bill, we will have two different standards, one, that there is lots of state largess for Union Pacific, and there's no state largess for low income people who need affordable housing; or the Bud Robinson theory, which is only come to us when you can prove that there is a need and, in fact, you have a project on the books and it's up and running. I think that's not an unreasonable position, except it's not what we will be asked to do for the Union Pacific. We'll be asked to write a law, prepare the rules, and then it's at their leisure whether they wish to take advantage of it or not. I will do anything that's consistent here. But what I think Senator Maurstad asks us to do, with what I would predict, will conflict with the choices that this body will make for the Union Pacific, and that rubs me the wrong way. We're going to have two different standards when we get done, one for a wealthy corporation, and one for low income people. And who's going to get the better of the deal? Who's going to get the more consideration? Who is going to get the assistance of the state and its financial resources? Not the needy, but the giant. And that's what I think is disturbing to me. But I can vote for the Maurstad amendment under certain conditions. That's a...and