

going to have the controversy right back in here again. I don't think that this solves the problem and I think that what it does is it makes the statute not be comprehensive enough and we're going to have all kinds of litigation result if we stick a date into the statute. The date seems to be rather capricious. I don't know why 1933 all of a sudden came up. So I would oppose this. I think that the bill specifically states very, very clearly that only the remains that are identifiable with a family or a tribe and the burial goods that are identifiable with specific skeletal remains would go back. I think that is about as specific as we can get because if we find records later on that predate 1933, we're going to have the controversy all over again. So I would urge the body to simply reject this amendment. I think the bill is very, very clear and spells it out and has it defined closely enough that we can keep track of what goes back and what doesn't right now without putting any dates into the statute. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The member from the 46th District, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, upon reflection, I will oppose the Warner amendment on the basis of the line of questions that Senator Chambers just exacted. The 1933 date, I know in my informal discussions actually has come with discussion with a society who have characterized their recordkeeping to me and, upon first blush, seems clear that Senator Warner's intention is do no more than what the bill intends to do. However, Senator Chambers' line of questions shows us clearly that, in fact, these two things aren't the same thing. The bill is a process, a series of definitions and then a way to carry the obligations that attach to those definitions out. It also has a process for resolving how to apply the definitions. It is possible, Senator Warner concedes under questioning, that there might be a burial good prior to 1933 that would have a record justifying its attachment to a skeletal remain which under the bill should be returned. If that's the case, the burial good should be returned. In fact, we are relying on only the characterizations that I can think of from the Historical Society about their own records to give rise to the 1933 date. And upon reflection there are other institutions around. There is a cross-indexing of records that might occur between those institutions. It might be possible to create a record prior...from something that was disinterred prior to 1933 for which the definitions of the bill would