will not get into a drug and alcohol problem. If they get a problem, this Legislature is saying we want you to do something about that problem. We want you to get into I think we should also be saying to employers, we want you to do something about the problem too. We want you to have coverage or pay for the treatment that these individuals need so that they might deal with their problem. It can't be just a onc-sided solution to the problem and right now this is a very punitive bill in my estimation without recognizing the cost involved for the treatment. If we don't provide to pay for that cost, you aren't really solving the problem. For the individual out there who has lost their job, has a drug or alcohol problem, to tell them you could get your benefits back if you go into a drug and alcohol program and to not have the money to do that is of no consequence to them. They may want to, they may want to deal with their drug and alcohol problem, but if they don't have the money to pay for it, how do they get into a program? Well, they don't, and so you haven't really solved the problem. way you solve the problem is to take what you've got in place in this legislation and then add my amendment. By adding the amendment, you find the financing mechanism to help these individuals deal with their alcohol and drug problem and to solve that problem. So, personally, I think it logically is the next step forward to deal with this very important problem of drug and alcohol abuse in our work force, we want a drug free work force and workplace, but we also have to recognize we can't just say no, we can't just say you're fired, we have to say we're here to help and we've got a program to do something about it. You've got to take that next step. This bill doesn't do it at this point, but this amendment would and I'd ask your support for the amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on the Wesely amendment, Senator Coordsen, followed by Senators Crosby, Hefner and Elmer.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, reluctantly, I think I must rise to oppose the adoption of the Wesely amendment, not that he doesn't raise a valid concern with his amendment as to who pays for the program. Basically, two reasons that I object, one of which is a very great reluctance on my part to amend labor law on the floor without quite a lot of effort to make sure that we comply not only with state law, but with the federal compliance regulations. This amendment may do that, may be in compliance, there again, it may not. This