

write into statute words which in all probability are dependent upon someone's subjective judgment as to what is associated with remains and what is not associated with remains that it becomes impossible probably to draft the language that reflects it. In fact, I would suggest that from at least for both logic and for administration it would be more logical to use the burial goods as part of the remains and not try to distinguish as the bill attempts to do now because I doubt that you can, or at least I doubt the (inaudible) and I gather from some of the amendment that is coming up, that's even recognized where the public counsel is to be an arbitrator in where there are disagreements. I know that at least, and as we all know, in at least one instance, one tribe that there have been a variety of people who have reviewed these goods and have made the determination. I, like the rest of you, have seen the differing opinions as to what is included and what is not which is only indicative to me of what will continue to be a problem in the future. My reason for offering it, however, is not one of disrespect, but of respect. I think it's important, at least it is to me, that we can retain, for people to see, items of history and I can appreciate where some of these items perhaps were not acquired in a way that we would accept today but, nevertheless, they do exist. It is more meaningful to see an object that is real than a picture or a plastic replica and I'm offering the amendment solely out of that thought that these items ought to be preserved for history for future people to view, and that's even beyond burial goods. There are a lot of things that are preserved in museums and elsewhere that would not make me very proud of the human race, but I also think we need reminders of those things, how cruel we sometimes can be, have been and probably still are. My problem is really simple. There's not much more to expand upon. It rests solely with the fact that I do not believe that you can write words that will clearly identify the things that we verbalize. I have no idea, I have absolutely no idea and I suspect no one else does either, how many locations in this state that there may be similar instances that can be repeated time after time where arguments will develop as to what was appropriately or what was not appropriately associated with the remains. I have no quarrel, disagreement that remains should be reinterred. I don't know that anyone has any disagreement with that, at least one shouldn't. The amendment simply, and there is nothing more to say, it simply separates those items that are identified as burial goods, as I believe, number one, they should be preserved; number two, I don't believe that they can be