

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schmit. Senator Schmit. Thank you. Senator Morrissey, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: On the Hefner amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Correction. Thank you. You are absolutely right, on the Hefner amendment.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members, again, it seems fairly simple to me now, let's get on with it. If we adopt...if we adopt these amendments, they go into effect this summer and the good increases, the moderate increases we have provided won't go into effect till January. So in our yeoman effort to raise unemployment compensation, we have adopted increases, very moderate, that will go into effect in January of '91. But these restrictions that we are placing on them now will go into effect this summer and that bothers me and I know it bothers some of the other members. We are simply trying to raise the compensation rate that was very justified and needed raising and now we're adding all this extra...extra weight on this bill and all the restrictions and they go into effect before, well before the compensation rates do and we started talking about this last year. So it's going to be '89 when we started talking about it, when it should have been done, if not before then and it's going to be '90 before it does go into effect, but yet the restrictions that we're trying to impose upon these people go into effect this summer. That's...that's just one of the problems I have with the bill. Again, how does someone being disqualified for something that affects an employment relationship, how does that drive to the point of eliminating drugs from the workplace? It doesn't say anything about that. It says an employment relationship which is some sort of unclear term that nobody understands and no one has been able to explain how it drives to the part of...to the heart of making the connection that is needed in federal law to impairment on the job. No one has explained that. That's the first question I asked when we started way back when arguing this bad amendment. And no one has explained how that clearly makes the connection as required by federal law to on-the-job impairment and I am still waiting for that connection to be made, that clear connection. And if any of you see the clear connection, go ahead and vote for this bad amendment. But if you agree with me, that it is very unclear, very ambiguous, allows for random discrimination at a bad employer's option,