

proponent of the bill, representing herself. She said that the employer called her in and told her that if she didn't come down to the Legislature and testify on the bill, they would give her her job back. That's the kind of folks we're talking about. That's the kind of issue that we're dealing with here. They did not want to have the kind of publicity...and I'm not using their name and I won't use their name, they didn't want to have the kind of publicity that they knew had already come to them. They didn't want it to continue. They didn't want it to be an issue in the Legislature. Well, it's exactly the kind of thing that happens out there that when people are, I think, hurt unduly that we've got a responsibility to respond and some folks will look at this and say, oh, it's just a tobacco bill or it's just a liquor bill. I say it's a freedom of movement bill. It's the ability for individuals, once they're beyond the scope of employment, to partake in whatever activity they so desire as long as it's lawful. And there's even an exemption in there that was adopted as part of the committee amendments dealing with religious organizations. There's another exemption in there that deals with nonprofit organizations. And I know Senator Preister asked me about that specific area and is there a way to possibly change that or expand it to make sure that it includes every organization. And I'm willing to talk about that. That clearly is something that I want to make sure folks are comfortable with. But I do believe that the purpose and the intent of the bill is something that needs to be addressed. We need to have, I believe, good debate. I think we ought to have state law. I think it ought to be public policy in this area that employers don't have the ability to come home with you. They don't have the ability to get in your car. They don't have the ability to go into your bedroom, that at the point in time you check out, you punch the clock and you leave, your relationship with them ends in terms of their oversight of your behavior. Granted, in certain cases, it has to be extended. We'll try to recognize those in the drafting of LB 216. But I believe it's good public policy. I don't know of...I have not heard yet, I guess, any great argument other than the one that folks talk about with regard to the health issue and things along those lines. This bill also deals with the ability of employers to have health plans that discriminate against those types of individuals' life insurance policies, that discriminate against those types of individuals who smoke, for example. They can continue to use those kinds of things. That's not prohibited under this bill. It just says that when I leave work the oversight for my activity, as long as it's lawful and as