

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

February 17, 2004 LB 963

I don't know, but that...I'm just telling you what the pattern is that presently exists. They can come into the Guard without a loss of service. So they would be, if they had already served at least four years, they would be eligible for a position like this. And if you want to know about the pay and so forth, I expect that they wouldn't get the same kind of pay because it's not the same kind of function or duty. When they come into the Guard, they may not be on a full-time status at that point. They may be on a part-time status at that point.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then it's...well, when I said "pay," the amount of pay that a person in the National Guard would receive had he or she been in as long as this regular army person, when you take that regular service and combine it with the time in the Guard. For example, if that person had been in the regular army for 15 years and comes into the Guard and brings with him or her that prior service, would he or she receive as wages the same amount that a person would have who had been in the Guard for 15 years?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: And I don't know. I would have to check on that, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And if he or she would not, it means that that service is considered for certain purposes only in the Guard but not for all.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yeah, and I don't know.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So it might not serve to cover these four years. Maybe that's something somebody just said off the top of their head and they don't have any reason.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: No, this was the legal counsel to the Guard that gave us that information, so I doubt it was off the top of his head.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And what's that supposed to mean? What's that supposed to mean?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Well, generally speaking, legal people are