

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

May 18, 2005

LB 478

requirement under Nebraska law of equal protection of the law? Those issues have not even been touched. I haven't heard...I'm going to steal some words from Senator Landis that he used earlier this morning. Those things have not been discussed by any of the people who support this bill. I can understand the Revenue Committee being in a magnanimous mood and wanting to help Senator Cornett get her first priority bill out here, but the bill is so significant in its ramifications that I cannot go along with it, and I think it is inappropriate to do something like this. If there are other people doing this exact same kind of work but they don't have a high security classification because their phase of it doesn't need it, they...you mean if they're doing this kind of work and they're retirees, they don't get this tax benefit? What does security clearance classified work have to do with anything in establishing a class of taxpayers who are going to be given tax breaks? Has nothing to do with anything. If they lose that security clearance then they no longer qualify for this benefit? Will they have to pay anything back? I think the committee just wanted to give Senator Cornett something, and I think, as she stated, anything that's a step is satisfactory. But as with other things that come out here, this now belongs to the Legislature, and I don't think it's appropriate. The last sentence says, "In order to receive the exclusion provided in this subsection, the taxpayer shall submit a certification that the employer has received authorization to perform classified work for the federal Department of Defense that is signed by the employer's facility security officer." That sentence should be constructed differently, and I know how to do that, but I'm not going to go into that right now. This is talking about the qualification of the employer to do this work. The employer is the one performing the security classified work, so the employer could be doing security classified work but maybe not all the work that the employees do fit into that category. We don't know that, and you don't know it from this language. And is there some way to establish that if a contractor performs security classified work, whatever that is, that every employee also has security clearance? That doesn't say it in here, and we'd been told that they can't make reference to that. It's very loosely drafted. It seems to say something, it has been discussed as though it says something, but there is nothing about what the