

Anything for the record, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Yes, Mr. President, I do. Mr. President, your Committee on Agriculture gives notice of confirmation hearing. That's signed by Senator Rod Johnson as Chair. Health and Human Services, Chaired by Senator Wesely, reports on a gubernatorial appointment confirmation hearing. That will be laid over, Mr. President. (See page 105 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, the next amendment I have to LB 1 is by Senator Conway. (The Conway amendment appears on pages 105-06 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Gerald Conway, please.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, on your desk before you, you have an amendment that I would like to offer to LB 1. For the most part, this amendment, if you will find the GAC sheet on your desk, is basically a one-page. It stretched itself out into two by virtue of necessity to strike some of the other language that's in the existing LB 1 as amended. Short of that, the LB 1 amendment, as I offer it, would be an amendment and a bill that would only consist of one page. I would like to take you back to about nine months ago when the Enron case and some of the other concerns with real estate and personal property was being discussed in the courts and concern was being raised and, at that time, I sat back one evening and thought to myself, with a background in real estate and working in the theory of real property, personal property, for transaction purposes for the conveyance of title and the other kinds of particulars that we do deal with real estate besides taxing purposes that, as you look at the Enron case or you look at some of these other techniques by which we have defined property, that they weren't in line, that if you look at Enron, for instance, we would find that the gas pipelines are such that if they belonged to your eye, if they were well casing rather than a conveyance for gas or natural gas or whatever, it would be called real estate. And so, at that point, I felt that the definition was wrong. I didn't do anything about it at the time and when the governor's office and the Department of Revenue came forward late summer and suggested that some of these definitions were not proper, I was somewhat excited about it. I thought that's good, now we've got people working on these definitions in such a way that not by virtue of the owner for taxing purposes but by virtue of the nature of the property that