

whether it is the responsibility of business, particularly when we, in government who have the main responsibility, I think, are providing these types of benefits toward families, programs that improve the structure of the family unit, and we proved unable to do that in the past. I don't know as we ought to be shirking our responsibilities over to business. I like the idea of parental leave. I think it ought to be there in any business in the state and I think most of the businesses that are opposing this at least give lip service to that concept and many of them do provide this type of benefit. But I think it ought to be one that the business provides because it makes sense for business purposes, because it makes happier employees, it makes more productive employees that they are able to maintain qualify employees and I think it ought to be one that if we are going to institute this as a state policy, at least at the beginning it ought to be mandated on us only. I found it interesting that when it became apparent that the Bernard-Stevens amendment made it clear that this would apply to state government, some people who were otherwise silent on it suddenly became excited that this is a bad concept because it applies to state government. But I think we ought to, if it's a good policy, we ought to be leading by example as opposed to leading by mandate. So, with that, I am going to support the Bernard-Stevens amendment and I know full well that now after I've given a speech that probably fully 30 more people in here will also be supporting it. So I think I've rescued you here, Senator Bernard-Stevens, with my remarks.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Madam President. And since Senator Withem has probably brought 30 votes on I'll speak and lose about 25 of those. Quite honestly, I appreciate Senator Withem's comments because we need to bring, as Senator Baack talked yesterday, kind of a reality check back to the body. LB 145, as it now stands, includes state employees so that's not the issue at this point. What is the issue, and I want to comment on some things that my good friend, the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee talked about, because if you weren't careful you heard some of the numbers but not..not part of the rationale. He kept throwing out that it could and I will be fair, he said it could cost somewhere between the two hundred some thousand that Bernard-Stevens talked about and up to 1.5 million. Let me talk about how they actually calculated the