

I don't think that's our primary objective here is to worry ourselves too much about the income tax consequences to the party who owns the land. However, it is a fact that you do have an extended period of time to reinvest the money, and my recollection is three years in the event of eminent domain or threat of eminent domain. On the other hand, there are ways around that, such as trades, an agreement to exercise an option in the future giving the landowner an opportunity to find replacement property, it happens all the time, it's happening in our area because of the growth of Omaha to the west. People are buying some time on a voluntary sale basis. The people that have the tax problems will be okay. There are ample tools for them to use, they don't need the eminent domain feature in this act to protect themselves taxwise. There may be reasons to have eminent domain in there, but for tax advantages to the owner, in my opinion, is not one of them. Secondly, the history of eminent domain or the taking of property, private property for public use in this state is one that was a necessary one. It was necessary for schools, necessary for a well field for a town, probably necessary for an airport, necessary for easements for water lines and sewer lines and so on and so forth, for the public good. I have to stop and ask myself, however, and ask you to think about when the dust settles on this project we're speaking of a project that will belong to private individuals or a company. We are allowing the use of eminent domain ultimately for the private ownership of property, to acquire property of an unwilling seller, apparently, to eventually place it in the hands of a private owner and there are those who have just said for the good of the public. That may or may not be. I mean in the eyes of those who are supporting this bill this is for the public good, and any of these projects will be for the public good. That is in the eye of the beholder. There are those who would question that very, very seriously. And to some their land, their private property in Nebraska, United States of America is the most important thing to them. And if they found themselves in the throes of one of these projects, quite unwilling to sell, they would be very, very unhappy to find that a municipality could come several miles outside of their jurisdiction, zoning jurisdiction and acquire their property whether or not they wanted to sell it or not. Now I, unless someone can give a compelling argument for why this is necessary for the Micron project, which is this...what this is all about here, or another project, if anyone knows of one, I see no reason to include eminent domain in the bill. And I will support the Wickersham amendment, unless someone has a