

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President. Members, the question here is, how do I do this when there's 15 or 16 members out of the body? And I clearly understand that I don't. So it's a measure where the bill has had a...I think some good debate, I really do. It is a proposal that I think if you were to take back to your constituents and say, hey, you think your employer ought to have the ability to tell you what to do off the job? I would guess that 95 percent of them would probably say, absolutely not. If we were going to be representative government, like we like to claim sometimes, we would find out, in fact, that if we did one of those polls, we surveyed our constituents, we would find, and I know this will never show up in the chamber of commerce poll that's done around the state, but if we were to ask that question of our constituents, the answer would come back a resounding no, they would just flat out say, absolutely not. The people you hear from want two things, one of two things. They want you to help them fix a problem in many cases, or they want you to get government off their back. Those can be one in the same, but not necessarily all the time. The issue here is, how far do we let employers go into the personal lives of their employees? And this is a way in which government can actually help the employees, help our constituents. The vast majority of our constituents are employees, like it or not, I guess, depending on your perspective. And it is vitally important that from time to time we balance the scale. And right now 216 tips the scale, I guess, to a certain extent, and I don't think we should have to, but we do. But it tips the scale towards the employee, towards the individual, towards those folks who we represent. And it says, look, you're right, at the point in time you leave that employment situation you ought to be able to use lawful products, you ought to be able to smoke, you ought to be able to go have a toddy, if that's what you want to do. You got to do it within the law, confines of the law, but you ought to be able to do that. And if there are certain situations where the scope of employment goes beyond the eight-to-five kind of situation, then the employer even then should have the ability to say, no, in these kinds of situations I still have the ability to regulate your use of that product. That's not a problem in 216. LB 216 takes care of that, it really does. I mean it is a very well drafted bill, I believe. If there is a problem in terms of the issue of proprietary interests, that Senator Bromm pointed out, fine, let's offer an amendment and clarify it. I think it's covered, but I'm willing to spell it out so his English teacher is happy with it. That doesn't bother me one bit. I'm