

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...I don't know whether I can support Senator Hall's amendment because it may make that which is totally objectionable somewhat palatable.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Coordsen, please, followed by Senators Morrissey and Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, Senator Chizek raised several issues that I think we need to be aware of this morning and that is the importance of accuracy and the necessity when we're looking at what the result of the failure to pass a drug test might be which, in a number of cases, up to the option of the employer certainly could be dismissal. I think that this particular amendment, although I don't know that much about how it fits the overall context of our drug-testing law, my impression of it is that it clarifies, strengthens and protects and from that perspective it is probably a good measure to be amended into 315. I would remind you that we do have a workers' compensation bill and we moved into a somewhat different area this morning. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Morrissey.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members, I guess something that...my problems are the same problems Senator Chambers has. I guess maybe...think of a...Jay Gould used to be a big railroad magnate back in the 1860s. He made a nice little statement at one time, basically said, I can hire one-half of the working class to kill the other half, and that is a statement on arrogance of people such as Mr. Gould and the plight of the working people in this state and in this country. And when we get into drug testing, as Senator Chambers said, we're just foaming at the mouth to go out and slap these working people around and make them straighten up, do what we can to them, no matter what the cost. In this case, eliminate their unemployment compensations for the way...for reasons and the way the amendment now reads that could be any reason that the employer desires, anything that could make a slight connection to the employment relationship and I think that is completely wrong. We finally, finally passed an increase in unemployment, meager as it was, and now we're putting on all this excess baggage. One of the reasons that there was probably no opposition to Senator Coordsen's amendment that gave the slight