

Koch wants to overrule that, he is more than in his right to try that.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Chairman, when I say a clarifying amendment, I am going to clarify accreditation because accreditation has entered the high and low and Senator Remmers knows that, and if we expect the State Board of Education to make any kinds of decisions based upon some kinds of substantive decisionmaking, then we might as well forget the whole issue of freeholding. It is a clarifying amendment on an amendment that we tried before and it is on accreditation because right now it is like the Platte River, a mile wide and an inch deep and has no meaning whatsoever and all we are going to do is we are going to be in the courts with litigation on that issue.

SENATOR CLARK: The question before the House now is the return of the bill. As to whether it is a technical or clarifying amendment or not would have to be up to the body when it comes back. However, I have ruled he has a right to bring it back. Senator Remmers.

SENATOR REMMERS: Well, I just wanted to speak to that technical and clarifying amendment. Senator Koch has...

SENATOR CLARK: Well, that really isn't before us yet.

SENATOR REMMERS: Okay, so I will pass.

SENATOR CLARK: Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, because of some things that have happened during this session, I am even more keenly sensitive to the Constitution and its requirements, the necessity to maintain it as an inviolate document as much as possible. Now I have no interest in this bill one way or the other. I voted for it on Final Reading. If you asked me everything that the bill does, I could not tell you. It is one of those that did not seem to cause any great amount of harm, so considering that it was one that the Legislature was going to pass, I tagged along. So I am clearing the air on that issue. I wrote a few comments, because my opinion had been asked about the propriety of bringing a bill back once it had been passed by the Legislature, so to save time I am going to restrict myself to what I wrote, and then if you have any questions of me, I will answer them. But what I would say first of all is this is not a reconsideration motion. This is an attempt to get a bill back from the Governor and that is not a motion to reconsider. So the particular rule that was