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

May 18, 2005 LB 478

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...separate legal analysis of whether you can get away with this on a...under either the intergovernmental immunity doctrine or the equal protection doctrine or the special legislation doctrine. Because it just seems like either way you do it the whole thing is pitted with danger areas, in a constitutional sense, unless you simply treat all different categories of pensions the same across the board. And I would just invite your comment on that.

SENATOR LANDIS: This is our best attempt to create, I think, a rational distinction which I think will survive in this case, because it doesn't...it's not by one kind of government to another...

SPEAKER BRASHEAR PRESIDING

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...kind of government.

SPEAKER BRASHEAR: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, here is something that I want to call to everybody's attention. There is nothing in this language that says the taxpayer is performing security classified work. The taxpayer doesn't have to have any kind of security clearance at all. All the taxpayer has to do is perform...is be employed by the employer who performs this work. So if the employer is going to construct a facility or renovate a facility, this doesn't say the employer is a member of the United States military. This is a person hired by the government. This person pays an amount in wages and salaries, which means a worker or somebody who is not given an hourly wage. This could apply to a consultant to this employer. The language says an employer performing security classified work, not the employee. In the last sentence, when talking about the certification that the taxpayer provides, the certification is that the employer has received authorization to perform classified work, not that the taxpayer is performing classified work. So where do you all get off