

possess controlled substances in the work place will also be disqualified from any unemployment. This amendment was amended to provide that for those that are fired for possession, use or failure or refusal to pass a test would be given a window of opportunity to receive unemployment, if they entered an approved drug treatment program. This bill also includes LB 1062, which is a further definition of our drug treatment procedures in Chapter 48. It's nobody's pet. The reason for the bracket motion, as that has been expressed to me by those who oppose the drug treatment or the disqualification section, that they would rather see the bill die than have that particular section added into law. There are others who do not want an increase in unemployment without the disqualification section. And there are those that do not like the inclusion of 1062 in this measure. We have a bill that, if enacted, on January 1, 1991, would grant to people who are unemployed, if their qualification wages would place them in that position, a \$10 increase in the weekly benefits, followed by another \$10 increase on January 1, 1992. But it would also provide that those who were fired for possession or use or refusal would be disqualified from benefits, benefits that in some cases they can attain after the seven to ten week disqualification period for people who are fired. Series of amendments that could take the rest of the afternoon... We have a bill, and you're going to have to make a choice, I think, on this bracket motion on whether you think that a bill that provides benefit increases for all of those people who are legitimate employees, who were laid off through no fault of their own, or for people who quit or are fired for various and sundry reasons and are found to be disqualified from benefits for those reasons, for a period of seven to ten weeks, and then if they're still unemployed can begin to draw whatever employment that they are entitled to, or with the defeat of this bill we would not increase the benefits for legitimate workers. And, in doing so, we would not provide a hurdle to jump through for those that are found to be disqualified because of drug use, nor would we provide an incentive for people to enter drug treatment programs. Less than 300 people in the State of Nebraska, last year, were disqualified, under the gross misconduct section of statute, from accruing benefits. I don't know what percentage of them might have been for drug use, possession or refusal, probably not very many, some percentage of less than 300. And, in trying to protect those who use illegal substances, we are willing to deny increased benefits to those who are laid off, then let it be so. It's my opinion that we should make that decision now rather than later this