

next speaker, I would like to introduce some guests of Senator Haberman. We have Blaine and Megan Hesse who are the children of Senator Haberman's legislative aide, Annette Hesse, and they're under the north balcony. Would you please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. Thanks for being with us. The next speaker is Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the advancement of the bill for a number of reasons, many of which have already been stated. Here's one aspect in particular that would concern me as I read the bill, it requires all land to be sold. Obviously, there is not a lot of land in eastern Nebraska, but there was one tract of land that was not sold but traded in my district just in the last few months. It's farmland, 160 acres. The value that was given for that, the sale price, was 3,000 an acre, 480,000, in which actually the purchaser bought other land and traded for it but nevertheless the value that was received was an amount of \$480,000. And, obviously, that didn't sell as farmland. It sold for development potential. There are other tracts similar to that. I don't know about any location in the state, obviously, that would not be a fact. But I know there are, what the few acres, and I think it's something around a 1,000 in Lancaster County... I know there are other tracts that would have that same potential. There's another problem that I'm aware of and this, I think, is probably unique to Lancaster County, but some of those tracts also would be salt wetlands. There was a story in the Lincoln Journal. I think it was just this last Sunday, or maybe a week ago. But I do know wherever there have been potential for wetland involvement in the purchase of land a lot of people get pretty nervous about purchasing it because of the indefinite situation with the federal government what is or is not wetland, if there is even the slightest possibility, you are very hesitant to bid because you really do not know if you're buying something that you're going to be able to utilize or you're not going to be able to utilize. And I'm sure that there has to be other instances around the state where at least the tracts that I'm aware of may have a similar position and the mandatory sale of all of them would not, I think, be in the best interest of the purpose for which the school lands fund was established. Now having said that, even if the bill is amended to make it discretionary in some of these instances where you could identify a potential value for some other purpose which probably is pretty difficult, in many instances at least, to forecast the future, I still would have a concern and would not