

tests, but I can tell you they're run, they absolutely are run. There's a whole battery of tests that are run any time blood is taken for purposes of insurance, some are kicked out because they're not applicable, but they're run. Now, will somebody ever have the ability to access that information? I don't know. Do I think at some point in the future, if you don't do these kinds of things, look at protecting the individual, will they happen? I'd be willing to guarantee that they will. As a matter of fact, they're already here in some cases, and that's why there is such a need for this type of legislation. You need to protect the individual, not the business. This is one case where I would think your constituents...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Even though Senator Hall has made some persuasive arguments, I still rise to oppose the bill. And some of the other points that I wanted to reiterate, I guess, to the body was that there's no question in my mind that this bill will create some grey areas that will result in litigation. And I don't think there's any question about it. When a person is discharged from a job they're unhappy, and lots of times rightfully so. And if there is any way that they can fit into one of the categories protected by this bill, they will certainly do that. And there will be questions about whether or not they fit into the parameters of this bill or they don't. What is a lawful product? What is a proprietary interest? I guess I would have... I don't see Senator Hall, Senator Chambers, could I ask...oh, Senator Hall is here. Missed your chance, Senator Chambers. Okay. Senator Hall,...

SENATOR HALL: Yes.

SENATOR BROMM: ...we talked about the Ford dealer and the...and you said, in fact,...

SENATOR HALL: And the Chevy.

SENATOR BROMM: Chevy dealer?