

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

May 10, 2005

LB 614A

second. And therefore, I will repeat, I'm not going to support advancing this bill, this A bill. But I won't wage my main struggle at this point. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek, followed by Senator Pahls and Raikes.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes. Thank you, Senator Cudaback and members. As I said at the beginning, I didn't mean for this to be an extensive debate this morning. Although, as Senator Chambers says, maybe this is the place we ought to have it. But I need more information before we get to that second round of the debate tomorrow. But let me just say, I put my button on because of something Senator Redfield said. And I'm aware of the bank examiner issue. I'm also aware that those folks had to leave the collective bargaining unit. In other words,...in order to receive their additional benefits, their additional salaries. And so now they're not protected employees at all. They're not part of the union anymore. And I don't think that that's what we want to encourage in this particular case. I'm not even sure that the people involved want that. So that's...that was one point I wanted to make. Also, somebody mentioned, and I think it was Senator Pahls, but I don't remember for sure, some...or maybe it was Senator Pederson, mentioned that these are Cash Funds only. But I believe that we have either some kind of a policy, or maybe it's even a state statute, that says, just because somebody has Cash Funds doesn't give them special privileges over agencies that aren't Cash Funded. I mean, that's not the way we've generally operated. Last night, I think, on the...or, night before last, I guess--I'm getting confused--it was mentioned that this has been an agreement between the unions and industry. Well, that's not who the agreement has to be between. The agreement has to be between the two parties that made the agreement in the first place. Needs to be between the state and the unions, not industry. And what we would be doing in this bill is giving to a totally independent board the right to set salary levels. And I...that boggles my mind. I don't think we want to do that. The salaries do need to be adjusted. I don't think it's a good policy to have people who have oversight over other people making lesser salaries than those journeymen, in this case, who