

March 23, 1989

LB 340

differences should they occur. I would be more sympathetic to some of the other proposals that I see pending in the Journal.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Goodrich, on the amendment to LB 340.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Madam President and members of the body, I also came up with the same concept of an arbitration committee, and, Senator Bernard-Stevens, if you could give me your attention for just a second. The only difference between yours and mine, I think, are as follows: My arbitration committee would be made up of, number one, the State Historical Preservation Officer, or, in other words, Historical Society representative, number two would be the Executive Director of the Commission on Indian Affairs, and the third member would be appointed by the Governor for a term of four years, such member to be appointed from a list of not less than three candidates submitted and mutually agreed upon by the permanent committee members, that is the Historical Society and the Indian Commission member. Those two have to pick three people, send them to the Governor, and she, in turn, can appoint from those three. The appointed member shall be trained in...should be a trained historian not associated with any museum or historical society. Decisions of the arbitration committee may be appealed to the district court. Would you kind of respond to that particular alternative to your proposal?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Yeah, I would be delighted, Senator Goodrich. If I understand, if you are referring to the amendment that you have printed, AM0904,...

SENATOR GOODRICH: Yes.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...your amendment certainly does a lot more than just that part, but I will respond simply to the question that you asked concerning the committee. In dealing with this issue as I have from the outside, really from the outside, I have been tremendously impressed with the intransigence of a particular group to the point that when we get into a discussion as to a time frame, we cannot get any type of decision. So I guess I, when we get into the question of a mutually agreed third party, I am not convinced that the Historical Society would agree to a third party that simply was not something that they wanted. In other words, I would say if I were the Pawnee I would get a list of three people, and tell