

actual annexation to the real property and that is a major change but that is one that I believe will aid LB 7 and the other bills that we've passed so far or will pass very soon to give us some assistance with those 240 other cases. So I would add my support to it. It's not perfect and there is certainly ways to go after it, but it does the job that we need to do and I would support it 100 percent at this time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. The member from the 26th District, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I'm pleased to hear the confidence expressed by Senator Conway and Senator Lamb and Senator Kristensen and whoever else has expressed their confidence in this legislation. I, however, have a lack of confidence in this legislation and I think it's based on the track record that we make it clear why we should all have at least some skepticism about anything that might be before us considering that we've only had it handed to us in the last hour or so. This would strike all of the bill as it is presently constituted by the Conway amendment and other amendments. Let's go back a little bit. We had LB 1 introduced which was the "dog is cat, roses-tulip" bill, changing what once had been real...personal property, turning it into real property, and then we had amendments brought in to that bill and committee amendments were attached and then that bill came before this body just yesterday, 24 hours ago, whenever, and that was thrown out essentially. And Senator Conway had his definition in, now that is thrown out and we've got this definition in and in the matter of days, is there any wonder why I'm wondering if we really have got the right proposal before us. I know that there is probably similarities between what we've had looked at before, but we just haven't quite gotten it right yet at this point, and perhaps another 24 hours will pass and we'll think of something different again. So I'm just kind of curious about exactly where we're at and whether or not we truly have found out what we need to. I looked back at the Enron case and I'm not at all a legal expert as Senator Kristensen is, but they went through the process to try to determine what was real and what was personal property and they spent quite a bit of time going through that and came to the conclusion that pipelines were personal property. Now we have, I suppose, the power to come in and say what the court just did was wrong. We can do it if it's based on a rational...for rational reasons. I don't know if we've particularly reached that rational basis yet. I'd