

those who cannot afford drug treatment programs. With Senator Wesely's amendment the only people we will be discriminating against is those that refuse to admit they have a problem, those that refuse to go into drug treatment. Those are the people that will be disqualified. If you have a problem and you go into treatment, you won't be disqualified unless you can't afford it. With the Wesely amendment, if you have a problem and you can't afford it and you admit your problem, you won't be discriminated against, you will be going to treatment, you will be able to address your problem. The only people with the Wesely amendment who won't be...who will be disqualified are those who refuse to admit they have a problem, and those people will be disqualified from unemployment and possibly that is the people that should be, those that refuse to admit they have a problem. I have problems with that too, but under Senator Wesely's amendment is a more fair way to address this program and I urge you to support Senator Wesely's amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Crosby is announcing the presence of 23 fourth grade students from Lincoln Christian with their teacher in our south balcony. Would you folks please wave so that you can be recognized by the Legislature. Thank you. We're pleased to have you with us. Further discussion on the Wesely amendment, Senator Coordsen followed by Senators McFarland and Chambers.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, with my amendment that was added to the bill, there was a question in my mind of triggering something in state and federal law called unreasonable disqualifications, and that is that the disqualification procedures by federal mandate must be, meet the test of reasonability. We ran my amendment past the Federal Regional Office in Kansas City of the Federal Department of Labor for...to see whether it met those particular requirements on the federal level. The amendment that I will be offering a little bit later has, from their interpretation, met those qualifications. When I first spoke on this issue I mentioned my great reluctance to support any changes in disqualification statutes without a thorough analysis of how that might impact the whole system. And I would suggest to you as an example that in the Wesely amendment it says, or the use or possession of a controlled substance shall not disqualify a person for benefits unless if that employer does not have health insurance coverage. It's entirely reasonable to assume that we could have a situation in which an employee was distributing, not using, but