

March 5, 1996

LB 1044

have a job in the future. For the few people we're talking about here the advantages to state government are many. And in my view again this would be the wrong way to go, and I'd urge your opposition to the Witek amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Thank you, Madam President and members of the Legislature. First of all, I'd like to say that I am supporting the concept that is presented in 1044. But I also have to consider, and my constituents are continually asking me about and are concerned about the cost of government increasing. And when I first heard about this concept I thought, yes, there will be more efficiency, we'll probably be able to cut costs. But I'm really having some concern and when we talked about not actually increasing the number of political appointments, I'd like to address a couple questions to Senator Wesely.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Yes.

SENATOR STUHR: Actually, now in the system that we have, we have, what, five appointed positions. Is that correct?

SENATOR WESELY: Five for any agency with more than 1,000, yes.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, so that we do have. We haven't talked at all about this partnership council. Could...isn't that part of additional political appointments?

SENATOR WESELY: Well, they would not be employees, they would be..

SENATOR STUHR: Okay, that's what I wondered.

SENATOR WESELY: Right. They'd be a political appointment to advise the agencies, but they actually wouldn't be employees and they would not have actual authority to take any action.

SENATOR STUHR: So...but there will be, I mean in general there will be more political appointments when we get through with this entire process because of the council involved.