

to follow, .01 or whatever standard they have on the alcohol up to .04. On the drug side, there is no question what they can do. So the amendment, in essence, would say that if they go ahead on the alcohol side and take the administrative cutoff, which is .04, or they go down to .01, we would then give them the exemption. Otherwise, if they don't want to do that, we would not give them the exemption. And I think it's relatively straightforward and I will leave it at that point, Mr. Speaker, and answer any questions if people have questions at this time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. For a discussion of the Bernard-Stevens amendment to the Wehrbein amendment, Senator Chambers, would you care to discuss it? Senator Coordsen next.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, even though we're on Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment to the amendment, I would like to ask Senator Wehrbein a couple of questions about his primary amendment, if he will answer.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I'll try, Senator Chambers.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Wehrbein, there is nothing in your amendment that tells us what the guidelines under this federal program, which is created by federal law or regulation, would be. Correct?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: True.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So whenever the federal guidelines change, then the conditions faced by employees of these employers would change also.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I assume that's possible, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So if there was a move afoot in Congress based on what one particular employer who would be covered by federal regulations would want, could result in a change, then there would be a change for all these employers who were covered by that federal statute, right?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And the employees could be subject to the