

March 23, 1989

LB 340

SENATOR GOODRICH: But you just quoted us one that said, in essence...

SENATOR BAACK: I quoted a statute that said that if you did display those, you could be subject to a penalty of a Class I misdemeanor. If you followed through with the statute, you could be subject to a Class I misdemeanor, even as a museum official.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Baack, would you speak into the microphone. It is a little hard to hear you.

SENATOR BAACK: Yes.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you.

SENATOR GOODRICH: That goes from both directions, I couldn't hear what you said either, but that is all right. On the mutual agreement on the extension of time, what, for example, would happen if, say, the Indian group would not agree to it, then we automatically are blessed with and hung with the 9/10/89 date, wouldn't we?

SENATOR BAACK: That is absolutely correct.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Then I would suggest that what we need is an additional amendment which will be coming up later anyhow to extend that September 10, 1989 time, plus I think we need some clarification on what we mean relative to this statute going on the books, and if this going the books prohibits us from a King Tut display, for example, or something else, then we had better know about it now before we pass it.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I just ask whether or not I can have a division of the question on item 6 of the Baack amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner, your question was a division...you are asking for a division of the question.

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, item 6, if that could be considered separately and last. In the Journal at the bottom of page 1094, those amendments are numbered 1 through 6, or 1 through 8, they