

February 26, 1976

time on this particular hearing and delved into this deeper than any one issue that we heard this session. Repeatedly, from both organizations it was asked where is the feud? Where is the problem? The answers were somewhat hazy, it was impossible to pin it down, occasionally as Senator Bereuter mentioned when you have two strong organizations with strong personalities there is bound to result in some disagreements. That is just exactly the answer that we got. That the disagreements could be worked out under the existing frame work. We also identified several specific areas in the state which seems to nurture these disagreements. We put on the agenda of the interim committee study which will be attended by Mr. Kivett of the Historical Society and the Game and Parks Division primarily Dale Bree who is in charge of our Parks System, who together with this study group will attend and will visit, and will discuss each one of these areas that have caused some problems in the past. Now this is the way to solve the problem. It is to get the dissenting members in the same room with the Legislature at the point of disagreement. This has been...the ground work has been laid, it has been scheduled, and both sides have agreed to come together with this committee and attempt to work out these few differences. Now, this bill, 835, as we saw it in committee creates two heads. One body with two heads. One organization with two leaders. Now, everybody in this body knows that that will not work. The people that drew up the legislation knows that this will not work so they had to put in another level of bureaucracy on top of the Games and Park Commission, on top of the Historical Society to adjudicate the conflicts that will result out of this disagreement. Now if you will look at 835 we are creating another level of authority to adjudicate possible disputes that will be created by this bill that do not now exist but what this bill will create. This bill, the executive has one vote and actually the executive has two votes because one of his appointed heads will be a member of that Commission, also a member of the park and also a member of the Historical Society and a member of the University of Nebraska. So, the bill in itself by the creation of this commission recognizes that it is going to create the very problem that the proponents indicate exist now. I would suggest to you that that problem does not exist other than picky, small personality type differences that seem to rise and go to their favorite Senator and it just...the problem is not as serious now as the problem would be if this bill would be passed. I again will have you look at that bill. It is a creation of this new commission, the creation of this new bureaucracy, this new head to solve what we are now solving under existing statute. We also do have some problems within the statutes as to definitions. I would like to ask Senator Bereuter just a couple of questions to highlight the problem that exists. Senator Bereuter, to your knowledge, can you define what a historical site is as opposed to a historical park? Now I asked this question over and over in committee and we have never approached this problem and this seems to be the crux of one of the problems. We are not putting that definition in this particular bill. The questions that I ask this committee were not answered. If there is an answer to it, I yield myself wrong. Can you give me a definition as to what a historical site is as opposed to historical park?

PRESIDENT: Senator Bereuter.