whim of political winds blowing through Congress.   Is that right?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Which would be a normal situation, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would we, in Nebraska, have better control as a Legislature over the conditions under which employees in this state would be tested if we make the employers comply with state law rather than federal law?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I would say in theory although that would be possible I could see where it would be difficult for companies operating in multistates to meet all of these different requirements, but probably for Nebraska's viewpoint we could, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Tell me...they keep talking about it's difficult.   Why would it be difficult?   Where...where is the difficulty with administering a test in accord with what the state standards are? What's difficult about that?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I wouldn't think it might be the standards testing but it would be knowing which set of rules you were operating on, dependent on what state you were in.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, if they are lawyers, they know what the standards in that state would be.   If you're going to take a urine test, then somebody urinates in a bottle, the state tells what is done with it.   And you mean to tell me that these railroads with their lawyers and others can't...they can't understand that?   Or does urine mean something different in Kansas City than it does in Nebraska?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, the standards do, I would guess.   But the thing would be when you're operating on a line you don't have all your time...a lot of time for these decisions to be made.   You usually would have to be prompt in a blood test, prompt in a urine test and there would be room, I would think, for error in doing these things promptly.   That would be...I could see the...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm going to leave Senator Landis a bit of this time but I want to...I want to ask you this.   If the railroads are passing through eight states, you mean to tell me that railroad would not have, if they're going to be subjected