

archeological reason for it, or if it is just a delaying tactic. Where has that scholar been for 50 years? Where has the archeologist been for 50 years? Was he sleeping per chance like Rip Van Winkle, and the introduction of this bill suddenly stirred him from his slumber and now he sees a burning need based on his ethics as an archeologist or scholar to study bones that have been unstudied for 50 years. Poppycock! I favor Senator Baack's amendment, and when Senator Wesely and Senator Goodrich offer theirs, they have a foretaste of what my position is.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Further discussion on the Baack amendment. Senator Goodrich, followed by Senators Warner, Landis, and Abboud.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President and members of the body, I would like to engage in a little discourse with Senator Baack.

SENATOR BAACK: Certainly.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Specifically now you are referring to other statutes governing the more ancient remains, for example, the mummified, that sort of thing, isn't it your understanding that the more recent statute passed prevails over a conflicting statute that already exists on the books?

SENATOR BAACK: Sure it does.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Then wouldn't this statute actually replace the previous statute provision that you were quoting to us?

SENATOR BAACK: It may, it probably would but it is no more onerous than what we already have on the books.

SENATOR GOODRICH: So, consequently, there would not be protection for the display of King Tut remains or that sort of thing or to his burial goods?

SENATOR BAACK: There isn't protection now.

SENATOR GOODRICH: There, what?

SENATOR BAACK: There isn't protection in statute now to do that.