

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Warner, is it your intention with this language to return, I'm sorry, to deal with burial goods prior, disinterred prior to 1933? Or in the alternative, is it your intention to dispose of, through this language, skeletal remains and burial goods disinterred prior to 1933?

SENATOR WARNER: It was...my...the thing I wanted to get at was burial goods or artifacts which is what I understood could not, there were not adequate records and I am redrafting to reflect what I...

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. All right, I think Senator Chambers has sharpened the analysis of the language because, again, the language does not comport to the concept, and Senator Warner recognizes that, he is redrafting it. The concept that Senator Warner says is, we do not have any documentation to support prior to 1933 the linkage of any particular burial good with a particular skeletal remain. Let's acknowledge that in the law and make that as one of the qualifiers. Senator Chambers points out that if you use it in the way that Senator Warner has written it, it applies not only to burial artifacts, but to skeletal remains. Senator Warner is redrafting. We are now, with the redrafting, and if we get down to burial artifacts, we are at a point in which there is no real controversy, no real difference of opinion which doesn't mean that we won't stop disagreeing with each other. We'll probably continue to disagree with each other, even though there is at this point...at that point there would be no basic difference. My suggestion is this. If Senator Warner withdraws this amendment and draws an amendment that says burial goods disinterred prior to 1933 will not go back, that I can vote for because it is the same concept as to what is in the bill now and that is you return burial artifacts when there is sufficient documentation to justify it as being linked to a skeletal remain. And if Senator Warner wants to say that two different ways instead of one way, I don't mind saying it two different ways if it means the same thing. That's a chimerical difference of opinion as far as I'm concerned, and I could accept that superfluous language because it does...it would simply recapture the concept of the bill. And I can extend what the largess of patience here to somebody who has that attitude to make sure that those kinds of adjustments are made so long as there is no real change in the concept of the bill. And if the Warner amendment is redrafted, there would be no major change. Under those terms, I'd suggest that we adopt it. Even though it is superfluous it