

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

February 17, 2004 LB 963

would depend somewhat on the extent of the situation. I mean, if it were something that was going to require, say, a week's worth of work on the part of the Guard, of course they probably would be living away from home for a while.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And you're not going to have time to answer this, but my quick question is this: Is it the intent of the bill to help those Guard members because they're away from home, or because somehow they have...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...reduced income because they're on Guard duty? Which is the rationale? Because it makes a difference, I think, in terms of the applicability of the...

SENATOR CUDABACK: I'm sorry, but time is up, Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...applicability of the bill.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. And Senator Beutler kind of got ahead of the...what I was going to do. I was going to take it step by step, but the 30 day, or 31 days, whatever the term in the bill is, had hit me the same way it did Senator Beutler. And that phraseology does appear other places in the bill. But since Senator Vrtiska has agreed to insert the word "consecutive" before the 30 days, it will take care of what could become a problem. I'm going to leave Section 3, which is the subject of the amendment that I have up there, so that any part of the committee amendment may be discussed. I would like to ask Senator Vrtiska a question. Now,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you yield?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Yes. Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...now, Senator Vrtiska, I'm looking at the committee amendment as it appears in the bill. So if I give a