

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

February 18, 2004 LB 963

that this bill is trying to bring too many things into play when they are simply on state active duty.

SENATOR VRTISKA: But I guess what I'm trying to point out is some of these, you talked about for state active duty, some of these National Guard people are called in, for example, to guard around at airports. And when we had this problem a few years ago and they were at nuclear sites, they were under state sanction but they were performing a natio...a federal...under a federal act. So I think that's where the duplication or the importance of this piece of legislation comes into play.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But recently when the federal government wanted them to function at these airports after September 11, the state didn't want to pay for them to do that. So the federal government paid.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I understand that. I understand but they're still National Guard people and they are not involved in...engaged in active...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But they were put in a federal status.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, I fail to understand your objection to this but then I...you have a right to that, and I guess right now what I would like to do is spend some time off the floor trying to resolve the issues that you've brought up and perhaps be able to move this bill. And I think we can do that if we can get together and I don't think we can do it here on the floor...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR VRTISKA: ...because it's going to involve a great deal more in time than we'd like to take. You know, if you'd want to do that, I'd be willing to work with you to try to bring this measure up to where you think it needs to be and still keep it consistent with what the issue is. With that, do you have anything else you want to add, Senator Chambers?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Only to say that on the face of what it is you're suggesting, I can consent to doing that, but I want to at