

a third person the Governor would select from a list submitted by the other two individuals, again, trying to find that person who could be the arbitrator between the two sides. The concept I have in another amendment that is pending would have each applicant, group, or individual have a representative, the institution that holds the remains in question have a representative, and then those two sit down and pick a third party that they can mutually agree to, and so that is a third idea of how we can make the difference. It has already been alluded to by both Senator Chambers and Senator Bernard-Stevens that the problem is, although the concept I have is one frequently used in negotiation, it is a common concept, you sit down, you have two sides, you pick out somebody, the third, that you both feel that is trustworthy, and then you go forward, is that there is so little trust left between these two sides, that there is so little feeling that there is any cooperation left between these two sides, that, as Senator Chambers talked about, they will never get to the third person, and so I am a little frustrated with that knowledge that we have come to the point where we have dipped down to a level that we can't even really cooperate very much on this, and it is not one side or the other. I think, particularly, it seems like both sides are so angry at each other, and so I am a little frustrated because I think we all agree that we have to figure out a way to resolve the differences, because there will be differences. We don't agree on what remains are going to go back, and what aren't going to go back, that definitions can't be that precise, and so we are going to have to go through a process of making that determination. There are three ideas out here, all of them good faith efforts to find a compromise. I am not sure how we resolve it, frankly. I am at an impasse. I would feel comfortable in some ways with the public counsel, although Senator Warner says, you know, the problem here is that is an individual without an expertise in this area, and so that is a legitimate point. In addition, I did work with the public counsel on the study committee that we had on the Historical Society and my view of the public counsel is very a positive one. Marshall Lux is that individual. I respect him. I think he does an outstanding job, but I think on this particular issue from working on that committee and looking at the results of the research and just, you know, observing, I can't feel that there is an unbiased individual involved there, that I feel that from his research and his work in this area that he would be critical of the Historical Society and probably justifiably so, and so I would tend to view that as not a particularly unbiased source of