

SENATOR HALL: But the issue is one clearly of, at some point in time, I believe that the employee no longer is under that scope, no matter how long the arm might be of the employer. The employee is no longer a servant, if you will, in that relationship, and they should have the ability to use those types of products that are lawful. That's really what the bill says. It says nothing more than that. But there are certain cases, and that's why we have the exemptions. There are the issues, as I pointed out, in entirety of Section 4 that address that. I believe that the bill, as it's been amended, is in the best form possible, and I would urge that we advance it to E & R Initial. I've talked to Senator Preister about his issue and he said he still wanted to continue work on it between now and Select File, and I said I'd be happy to try to accommodate that. With that, Mr. President, I would stand ready to respond to any questions but would urge the body to advance 216 to E & R Initial. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Maurstad, followed by Senators Bromm, Vrtiska and Janssen.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I still have just a little bit of the same concerns that I had yesterday, and just to try to provide a little bit of a recap of where we left off yesterday, from my perspective. I think that contrary to Senator Hall's perception of some sort of a servant relationship, I think most business operations today, most employer-employee operations today are certainly more of a partnership type of relationship than one of some sort of servitude. Certainly, I have to respectfully disagree with the good senator from Omaha relative to provision four in that my main concern, as far as there being some behavior, either during or after the use of one of the products mentioned in Section 1, there are certainly some behavior that could occur during or after the use of those projects (sic) that is not outlined in Section 4. You basically have three situations that have to...that are exceptions there. I think there are other types of behavior that would be inappropriate that could certainly reduce the value or ruin the reputation of a particular business organization that I'm very concerned that this bill does not address. And so at this point I think that the bill, while it certainly has some very laudable attributes associated with it, is too far-reaching for my taste and would certainly urge the body to vote no. Thank you.