

subsection (2). And since subsection (3) refers back to subsection (2) anyway, the language would also apply to subsection (3). The reason I am not taking the same language and writing it in both sections is that it is redundant and it is unnecessary. So let me state what the amendment does now without giving the terms in it because that might be confusing. We want to find out how to dispose of unclaimed remains that are discovered in an unmarked burial site. There may be some scientific or justifiable historic reason for studying those remains for the period that is allowed under the bill. Where the language is now, it allows that study to occur only with reference to Indian remains that fit that description of unclaimed, unmarked, or unidentifiable. By my putting the language in subsection (2), it makes all such remains subject to the same rules. That is what the amendment does. It sounds more complicated when I explain it than it really is, but I want the explanation to be complete, so that if anybody reads the transcription and follow what I have said, there will be a clear understanding that what the amendment is doing is applying the same rules to all remains, all human skeletal remains, rather than just those of Native Americans. I will answer any questions you have, but I am asking that you adopt this amendment.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schmit, on the Chambers amendment. Pass. Senator Abboud. Senator Abboud passes. Senator Warner. We are speaking on the Chambers amendment to LB 340.

SENATOR WARNER: Just a question for Senator Chambers so I understand. Your amendment includes burial goods, and I am not getting into a discussion of that, is there elsewhere in the act or within the sections, is there an area in here where we will get...where somebody could get into an argument that something constituted burial goods, and the only reason I raise the question, that Senator Bernard-Stevens made a very explicit point on the research that is available with some of the items and skeletal remains. And I am just wondering, if...I have absolutely no disagreement about the skeletal remains whatsoever, but I was just wondering are we indirectly creating a future problem on was or was not something burial goods that was found in the same vicinity? Or is there a process that would resolve that otherwise in the act?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Warner, in recent days when they have