

hard to find words to precisely enclose and encompass everything we're talking about because the subject itself sometimes defies actual description or definition, so that is no reason for us not to deal with burial goods, but they are not such a mystical concept that we cannot properly define them. And if the only reason we keep these items is so that others can look at them, we say that what they look at is more valuable than the values of that society and culture that they were taken from. And, Senator Warner, technology is so masterful now that I would defy you to know the difference between a real bone and certain replicas that have been made and utilized even in anatomy classes and when it comes to us, you and me, who have been in this world probably as long as most on this floor and longer than many others, if we hear a certain recording, I would defy you or myself to determine whether it's real or whether it's Memorex.

PRESIDENT: Time. Senator Warner, please, followed by Senator Coordsen, then Senator Conway.

SENATOR WARNER: Members of the Legislature, I wanted to make one thing clear because I perhaps didn't clarify it enough in my initial remarks, and that was the change in the amendment from the Journal and what is being offered now and that dealt with Section 11 of the bill, as the original amendment included Section 11 with the removal of the words "burial goods" and that Section 11 is the one that has reference to people who are...go out to, for primarily I suppose for profit to indiscriminately dig up unmarked graves. The penalties would remain in...under this amendment that covers all those kinds of situations. Reference has been made to the number of items saying numbers aren't important and I'd be inclined to agree with it. What the number issue tells me is only one thing. It gives you some perception of the vast number of decisions that probably are included under the language of the bill that someone is going to have to interpret, and I've looked at those reports from both sides and I would readily admit I am not an archeologist, I'm not trained in those areas, but nevertheless, I see where people who are come to totally opposite conclusions. At least it appears to me they do on specific items. I'm inclined to agree with what Senator Baack said and that's what I said in my opening remarks. I don't think you can define by statute other than a continuing argument from now until I don't know when. Either you replace all goods back, or probably none. I don't think it's possible to make that separation and for those