

motion to reconsider shall be in order until the bill has failed to advance three times; for a bill on Select File, no motion to reconsider shall be in order until the bill has failed to advance two times; for a bill passed on Final Reading, no motion to reconsider shall be in order except by the introducer of the bill, for technical or clarifying amendments." Now the Supreme Court has also said, and you all know this, has stated the Legislature operates under their own rules and that is our rule, so therefore, I am not out of order. The argument Senator Remmers presents to you is not germane to the subject of returning from the Governor to Final Reading for the purpose of a technical amendment and I will give that to you later on.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, someone said once that he who does not learn from history is condemned to repeat it, and I well recall one time when Senator Moylan sat in the seat occupied by Senator Kahle now, he had a bill that had traveled a rather tortuous path through the Legislature, we had had about four or five Final Reading copies of it printed, found its way over to the Governor's Office and was resting upon the Governor's desk and Senator Koch asked to have it returned for a technical amendment and the bill died an ignominious death over here once it returned. I think Senator Remmers is touching upon something which needs to be explored a little further. I think that, Senator Koch, you could probably explain briefly to us just what is the technical amendment that you would like to take care of.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Senator Schmit, there are a couple. One is we put in this bill "contiguous to the freeholding area" and it has to do with transportation. Another thing was that we tried to put in for the State Department of Education to make appropriate judgment that there shall be a substantial difference in curriculum offerings. Now according to attorneys who deal with freeholdings, they say there is no flexibility and for all practical purposes nothing can happen. That would be the technical amendment. It lost by one vote here one day when a number of people were absent.

SENATOR SCHMIT: But that would be a substantial change to the bill, would it not? There was a very good argument made for the "contiguous" nature of the amendment, and if you remove that, then you have a wide open situation again, do you not?