

employees for the type of coverage or the price of coverage, based upon the use of lawful products and the differential premium rates charged reflect the differential cost to the employer and if the employer provides the employee with a statement delineating the differential rates. What does that mumbo-jumbo mean? It says that, hey, look, if you smoke and there's a difference in the premium, the employer could charge that back to you. Nothing against that. Sub (3) says, nothing in this act or nothing in Sections 1 and 2 of this act to prohibit employers from establishing permissible blood content levels for alcohol, prescription drugs and other medications while the employee is on duty in the workplace or is using or occupying any property of the employer. And then it goes on to (4), talks about establishing and enforcing policies regarding employees using lawful products outside the employer's premises during nonworking hours when such policies are communicated to the employee, relate to use of a lawful product and involve (a), an employee's duties and obligations required by law be in compliance with fiduciary responsibilities or see a legitimate conflict of interest policy designated to protect the employer's trade secrets, proprietary information or other proprietary interests. It takes care of the employer. It really does. The bill is drafted in a way that no employer should be impacted, and when you add in subsection (3), with the exemptions as they currently exist, in many cases, in virtually all, the employers are protected where they have a vested interest for one reason or the other. I'm more than willing to work with Senator Preister on some language that we can agree on. Now we may never agree on language, but to strike the provisions as it relates to nonprofit organization, at this time, opens the bill up and it, in effect, defeats the purpose of it. I would urge you again to vote no on the first half of Senator Preister's amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Senator Hall. Seeing no one else wishing to debate this portion of the amendment, I would recognize Senator Preister to close.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all, I was a little surprised that Senator Chambers didn't change his opinion and now support my amendment, considering he is opposed to adultery and other forms, after Senator Hall said that these two amendments cohabit, I thought certainly he would switch his opinion and he would now be in support of my amendment. However, I will get over my disappointment and I will ask that