

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 17, 2004 LB 963

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is there any possibility of double-dipping? And I'm asking these questions so that we have a record of what it is we're doing and why.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I understand. And I don't believe so. But again, the representative from the Guard is out in the Rotunda, and we will get you a definite answer.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then here's...I'll phrase the question so that it will be easy for whoever out there in the Rotunda to answer.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is the only time that the Adjutant receives any compensation from the federal government when the Adjutant is called to active duty? Is that the only time that the federal government compensates the Adjutant General? That is my question. And I will begin to discuss this while we await an answer. Members of the Legislature, I am not opposed to what the thrust of this bill seems to be, nor the direction this amendment is taking. I do not believe that there will be double-dipping, but I don't know that for a fact, and I would like to have it established in the record that there will not be. What I mean by double-dipping is this: While receiving the full salary paid by the state, the Adjutant General will also receive reimbursement or compensation by the federal government at the same time, and at this juncture that I'm discussing the Adjutant is under federal orders to carry out a federal function. There was a time when I was much more aware of the interplay between the federal government and the state government as it relates to the National Guard. In reality, the National Guard resides in the state. But I consider it a federal operation, because I believe the bulk of the money which the Guard receives comes from the federal government. So I will ask Senator Schimek a question.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schimek.