

genuinely apply. Would we not want the skeletal remain and the burial good to be returned if that was the case? The Warner amendment, if it is adopted, will preclude that from happening. And in that sense the Warner amendment can see that a different result is reached than the existing process in the bill. Since those two things, in fact, aren't the same, since, in fact, it would be possible through better scholarship or the use of the records of another institution besides the Historical Society to create that unjust result I was just talking about, I will oppose the Warner amendment even though I understand its rationale. I think it's trying to do the same thing as the bill, but the Chambers' line of questioning establishes that it does not accomplish the same thing. And since it doesn't, I'll oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Warner, would you care to close on your amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I appreciate the difficulty perhaps following this, but much of some of my thinking has changed significantly from as to procedure with the adoption of the Conway amendment on 1140, page 1147, last week which requires any institution or agency, organization or other entity of the state, upon request, under the provisions of a time frame to the act to provide 90 days prior to the date for when return is to be done by statute, an itemized inventory of any human skeletal remains and burial goods that are subject to return of a requesting relative and so forth. And it would seem to me that with that provision that there are a whole host of...there's a number of institutions, a number of museums and other entities that can be given a list that would...could include virtually every item in that museum that had any relationship to being excavated from any burial site or location. And I'm trying to...want to do what I said I was trying to do was to have the bill at least reflect a known, at least what has been described to us as the known likelihood and, true, including of this language may well exclude some burial goods that a record exists somewhere, I do not know. But I also believe very strongly that with this other provision that has been adopted that there is virtually no item that...or excuse me, no institution but what it could have the requirement to identify everything that is in that institution, for failure to do that correctly, probably subject to some time of penalty in the future. So the reasons for it is because of the strictness of this amendment we have adopted, the requirement