

underwrite that conduct which was duplicitous and not honest. We are being asked to accept a cutoff date.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'll tell Senator Warner why I kept talking about the 50-year period. That was in connection with the skeletal remains that all of a sudden everybody was interested in studying. My point was that they had had those for over 50 years and any study they intended to do could have been done. That issue is aside. We're talking now about the philosophy of the bill relative to burial goods and through compromise after compromise we have narrowed that definition to apply to specific remains. Now, if there are records or if there are means by which the burial goods can be linked to specific remains, a date is inconsequential and I think it would be inappropriate for us to accept this date. I'm still opposed to Senator Warner's amendment because without it, if we're going to be honest in enacting this legislation and we're not trying to write one of those duplicitous so-called treaties that used to be written where we give the impression we mean one thing but we say something else...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...then this bill will take care of it because the remains must have the burial goods linked to them specifically before they have to go back.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The member from Kimball, Senator Baack.

SENATOR BAACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members, I, too, rise in opposition to this amendment also. I think by getting into the idea of specifically naming a date, which I'm not sure exactly where it comes from or why that specific date is named of 1933, we're going to continue the problem that we have with the burial...with the reburial of Indian remains and burial goods because this isn't going to solve that problem. Now we're going to have people coming back in here, they may find some records at some other institution. I think what this 1933 date refers to is the data that has been gathered by the Historical Society relating to Pawnee remains alone. That's what we're talking about, this 1933 date. That's why that date was chosen. But we might find remains and burial goods at some other institution in this state that may be linkable pre-1933. At that point, we're