

March 11, 1981

LB 51, 549

to add his name to LB 549 as cointroducer and at the same time to withdraw the Business and Labor Committee members as cointroducers.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Hearing no objection, so ordered. Do you have any other motions? Will the Legislature please take your seats so we can proceed with Final Reading? We will proceed with Final Reading as soon as all legislators are in their seats. We are all set for Final Reading as soon as all legislators get in their seats. And there is a motion on the desk, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wesely moves to return LB 51 to Select File for specific amendment, that amendment being: To strike the Rumery amendment adopted on March 4.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I think that this motion is more to discuss the merits of the bill at this point than even to pursue in detail the specific amendment but let me call to your attention the fact that the bill as introduced was heard by the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member of. It was amended back to a position where we felt that it would more accurately reflect the needs of the state. At that point it was advanced on the floor. The committee amendments adopted. It was advanced to Select File and on to Final Reading. And then, cagey, wily Senator Rumery was able to discreetly pull the bill back and amend it to its original form that the committee had amended and put it back to where it was in the beginning. Except for Senator Lamb, the rest of us were all not quite paying attention and Senator Lamb called that to the attention of some of the committee members, including myself, and so I thought it was important that we put the motion up there to reconsider the Rumery amendment, which was not debated at that time, to consider whether or not we want to accept it or consider the alternative of returning to the committee's original version of the bill as amended. At this point all I can tell you is that the bill, I think, has a lot of problem all the way around. My impression was when I voted against the advancement of the bill out of committee was that perhaps we didn't need to touch this statute in the first place, that things as they were were quite sufficient, and that any change really probably was not justified. As a matter of fact, I think what this bill deals with, in fact, is an incentive to have a full time county engineer, I believe it is, and my feeling is that perhaps we should just strike what we already have on the statutes,