

pretty well defined now. I think, and if we get an arbitration force set up to deal with the disputes, I think we can live with this. I think that we have narrowed it down so much here and we have it so specifically identified as to what are burial goods that there will be actually very few disputes when we do come to trying to resolve whether or not these are burial goods. The other language that we added and is added to Section 8 of the bill, and the purpose of this language is to prohibit the display by publicly funded or recognized institutions of disinterred human remains that are "reasonably identifiable as to tribal or familial origin". This just says that you cannot display those items that you can identify with a tribe or with a family. But this is only talking about the human remains, it does not talk about the artifacts at all. This does not say that you cannot display the burial goods or the artifacts. Another interesting thing to note is that I know that there was some concern that we were going to preclude such things as the Egyptian mummy displays and some of those things coming to this state if we have this in statute. The legal counsel for the Government Committee noted that under present law under Section 28-1301 that it already has language which states and I will quote from this. It says, including, well, it says, "anyone including a museum official who 'receives any dead human body or the remains thereof knowing or having reason to know that the same had been dug up, disinterred, or removed from its place of deposit or burial, commits the offense of removing, abandoning, or concealing a dead human body'". So we already have language in the statutes that talks about this, and if there is a fear there that we are going to prohibit...that there is going to be a problem with displaying things such as King Tut's remains, there is already a problem under statute right now, and the offense described in the present statute is a Class I misdemeanor, so we are not...and we have no intention of trying to prohibit the display of these things, of the mummies and the other prehistoric items, so I think this clears that up as we deal with it. The next part of the language is, in the original bill, it said it would prohibit the display of extremely important human remains and burial goods that cannot be linked to any tribe or family which is probably prehistoric items, and this amendment would strike that language. So such remains as prehistoric and burial goods that are prehistoric could be displayed by the museums and the other entities that do that. The last part of the amendment is part of an agreement that we worked out. I suppose that we wouldn't even have to offer this because the actual negotiations fell apart at the end, but I