

discussed by Senator Kristensen. does show a movement in the courts, does show a movement in the Legislature, does show a movement in the executive branch where once Nebraska was very cautious about taking a public power and reaching out and using that power to benefit a private purpose, that we're very cautious about taking a public strength through government and opposing that strength upon private property and private individuals for private purposes. And we have moved away from that and even with the adoption of the amendment that allowed for tax-increment financing, now just 18 years later or however long it has been since that was adopted, we are now again trying to redefine that in a much broadened way that I think doesn't fit what was passed to the Constitution, and was intended by the Constitution, what this bill is attempting in this section to say, yes, it does, it still does. And the point I guess I'm trying to make is that there is an evolution of thought here and is it, in fact, the direction people want to go and it's typically thought that a liberal is someone who is progovernment and a conservative is someone who is antigovernment, that a conservative is someone who doesn't want to see government power increased, wants the individual to have more power. Yet it seems as though you could identify those that are strongest in support of this bill as being more conservative, giving government more power to use eminent domain, to use their power as a government to provide for assistance for private purposes. And in my view, you know that's a question we have to think about philosophically. Is that in fact what we think we ought to be doing? I passed around for you a cartoon that shows a fellow who wants somebody to get government off their back, well, in fact, they're standing on the back of government, and the point of that, the interpretation for some that didn't understand what that meant, is that there seems to be all kinds of people wanting government off their back at the same time they're standing on the back of government, whether they be a business out there trying to get eminent domain to condemn land for them or an individual who receives assistance through this or that program or whatever. But you see so many people making demands of government, wanting things from government and then turning around and saying government is an evil and they want it off their back. So it seems again that we want it both ways here, and philosophically, it seems like up is down and down is up in terms of philosophy here. But the question is, and we rejected Senator Wickersham's amendment, but I thought he made an excellent point about what power do we want the government to have to benefit private purposes and can we really take farmland