

argues that it is better to allow the Commissioner of Labor to determine what program should be approved...what drug program should be approved or alcoholism program should be approved than it would be to allow the Department of Health to get into the area of labor and the issues revolving around unemployment disqualifications. Well, I would argue that that's madness and that what we should do here is use the system that we currently have in place and that system is one that has the Department of Health approve all the drug and alcohol treatment programs that are eligible in the state. It's very simple. We use the system that's in place. That's all we do. We take and allow the system that's currently there that we have approved, that works, that's on line, and allow it to function in that capacity, allow it to function in determining what programs a person who wants to be eligible for unemployment, if they're disqualified and go into treatment, can use; which programs are out there, which programs can we use. That's all the amendment does. It doesn't do anything else. It does, in the second half, strike a sentence that says we're going to have the Commissioner of Labor execute releases to allow, you know, or have this individual in treatment execute releases to allow the commissioner to accurately monitor their program. That, I think, is, first, unnecessary and, second, I don't really know what that means and I think it's been pointed out by debate on this amendment to the amendment that clearly it is convoluted and we're not sure what it means. But, by striking it, you in no way take away the issue of guaranteeing whether or not that individual is going to be in the program and whether or not, I guess, we're going to be paying someone benefits, unemployments benefits whether they are in treatment where they belong. If you look at what the balance of the amendment deals with, it deals with the issue of satisfactorily completing, satisfactorily completing the program and who has completed such a program after discharge. Okay, we talk about, farther on down in the amendment, attending an approved drug treatment program. We're, in every aspect of the amendment, as Senator Coordsen offers it, other than this one sentence, we, in order to get to that end, you've got to do what falls in the middle. You've got to have the ends necessary to achieve that end and all we do, in my amendment, is strip away report that says, yeah, they have been in attendance because the exchange between Senator Chambers and Senator Coordsen shows that there is no guarantee of what satisfactory or accurate monitoring of progress amounts to. So let's take that out because if they're going to be eligible and if they're going to satisfactorily complete the program, that is inherent in there,