

Senator Warner, anything further? The question is the adoption of the Warner amendment to LB 340. All in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of Senator Warner's amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The amendment is adopted.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment I have to the bill is by Senator Wesely. Senator, I have AM1061 in front of me. (Wesely amendment appears on pages 1345-46 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. The other amendment that I had dealt with two issues, one was the amount of time in which we held these remains and burial goods and reviewed them before returning them. Senator Warner just took care of that problem, at least to the degree of one year's additional time. I had hoped for a year and a half, but we're at one year now and that is better than what we had before. The other amendment, provision that I had earlier was dealing with the question of how we resolve disputes and, if you remember, I talked about the idea of having each party designate an individual and those two individuals would then designate a third individual. Senator Chambers made the argument that if you do that, the Historical Society, because if no resolution occurred, would have the upper hand and no action would be taken and the status quo would prevail. I had to agree that that would be the case. At the same time, the other proposal that we adopted earlier by Senator Bernard-Stevens which provided for the Ombudsman to provide for arbitration had me concerned for a number of reasons as did Senator Warner. Although I eventually did support that amendment with the understanding that a follow-up amendment would be offered which would set up a process along the lines of combining both the idea I had as well as the Ombudsman idea that Senator Bernard-Stevens had. The amendment that I've got before you was sent around, I think probably by mistake by Senator Bernard-Stevens, and it is a mistake because this version of the bill was a first draft of that attempt to merge the two ideas. I have seen a second draft by Senator Bernard-Stevens and Chambers and Baack and Landis which appears to be a better drafting of this amendment, so I