

everything, rent, personal property tax, inventory tax, transportation, you name it, he pays it. Sure, the employees work for him and a lot of them, folks, are glad to have a job. You walk up to an employee and you say, what would you rather have, a part-time job or have this law into effect? I will wager they will say, we'll take the part-time job. You walk up to them and say, do you want a full-time job or do you want this law to go into effect? They're going to say, I'll take my job. The job is what's important. I haven't had any employees come screaming to me, we want more time off, I want time off for this, I want time off for that, it's due me, it's owed to me. No, I don't think, and maybe I could be wrong, I've been wrong before, that the labor unions are stirring up all of their members for this type of legislation. I would like to...I would like some time to sit down and analyze this body and see how many people have actually met a payroll, have actually had employees and met a payroll and been in business. That would be very interesting. I know Senator Lynch has. I have. I've been in business. I had 35 employees. I know what it means to meet a payroll. I even know it can go so far as I know what it means when government sticks its nose in my business, way back when. So I'm sorry, I can't support LB 145. And I ask the members of this body who are paying any attention to not support LB 145. It's not good legislation, if you stop to think about it. Put yourself in an employer's position. Do you want the government dictating to you what you shall do with your employees and what you shall not do? No, I don't think you would. I ask you to oppose LB 145. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Haberman. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a few points that have been raised here. First off, Senator Haberman talked about this Legislature being antiemployer. Of course, by voting against LB 145, could you be characterized as being antiemployee and perhaps antifamily? There are two ways to look at it. There are two perspectives here, one of being the employer, one being the employee, and Senator Haberman chooses to look at it from the employer perspective. I tend to take the view of the employee. Now that question about meeting a payroll, let me answer the question, and I think the answer in my case is yes. I worked at SRI where we worked on a daily basis trying to make sure we had revenues to cover our costs, as part of the management team to try and deal with meeting our payroll and I know it's not an easy thing to do. Also, at LT&T