

think to put this kind of provision into the statute would be very, very shameful. I think it would be ethnocentric and I think it would be totally indefensible.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You're saying that the remains that predate 1933 cannot be retrieved, but those after 1933 can. I don't see a basis for making that distinction. I'm opposed to Senator Warner's amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Baack, further discussion.

SENATOR BAACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members, I also rise in opposition to this amendment. I see no reason for it. If it's a fact that the records will not verify that any of these remains can either be identifiable or that the burial goods can be linked to any disinterred bodies that were maybe disinterred before 1933, those bodies aren't going to go back anyway. This seems to me to be redundant because if we don't have the records to do it, and that's what the justification said, well, we don't have any records that predate 1933, well, then those bodies and those burial goods aren't going to go back anyway if we don't have the records. That's what the bill says. You have to be specifically identified and the burial goods have to be identifiable with a specific remain. So I see no reason for this amendment whatsoever. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, on Thursday Senator Baack offered a similar type of amendment which would allow the tribe to extend the deadline for the return of those remains. Senator Warner, ironically, was the one who argued that that could be done anyway and you don't need to put that kind of provision in legislation because the tribe can make that extension without it, so it is unnecessary to put that into the statutes. Now here he comes with an amendment that has no validity and no necessity because if, as he indicates, there is nothing prior to 1933 that would establish a tribal connection or a familial connection, then when why have the statute? He is offering it because he or whoever gave him that amendment knows that prior to 1933 there is the possibility of linking some of these remains with relatives who are alive today. If he means what he told us, and I believe he means what