

March 11, 1981

LB 51

if I had my preference but the county engineers would like to up their incentive pay. That is what Senator Rumery provided for in his amendment. The committee did not go along with that, in fact cut that down, and I think that we ought to consider whether or not we want to take the step Senator Rumery proposed in this amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Lamb, your light is on. For what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR LAMB: To discuss the Wesely amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay.

SENATOR LAMB: I rise to support the Wesely amendment, Mr. President. This is a classic example. Senator Rumery did a beautiful thing the other day and I don't think anybody noticed that he had the amendment in the Journal and he merely returned the bill to Select File for specific amendment, called attention to the page of the amendment, and nobody challenged it, nobody looked at it, and he very quietly returned the bill to the original provisions which the Public Works Committee had objected to in the first place. And the real issue is whether or not a county should be penalized for having a...not having a full time county engineer. This is the crux of the thing. He puts back in the...well, the funding from the state is reduced by one-third if a consulting engineer is used rather than a private engineer that is a full time engineer. Some of my counties would benefit, some would lose, under this proposition because I have counties in both situations but we would like to call your attention to the fact that the committee decided that it was not in the best interest to require a full time county engineer. I support the Wesely amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I don't know what Senator Rumery's attitude with some of us have talked about it today without having given him a chance, but I rise to support what Senator Rumery did and I did read the amendment in the Journal, Senator Rumery, and if somebody didn't, that is their problem. But I think what you did in the amendment is right and for two or three reasons. First, the intent is correct to...in '69 was to encourage a county to have a full time superintendent and to be compensated for it and all the money comes out of the county's funds, doesn't affect anything else. Secondly, if it is part time, then the reimbursement ought to be on that basis. That is only right. But the most important thing