

be filed and then he can claim that as a result of this being filed that he is being fired because of it. I think placing the burden on the employee is just not that major of a change, as Senator Landis would have us believe. I think the burden should be on the employee. I don't see it as that major of a change, but I think it will make the bill a lot better. It will probably make it good enough so I will probably be able to support it. But without this amendment I will not be able to support the bill. I urge the adoption of Senator Beutler's amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Haberman, then Senator Higgins, then Senator Wesely. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, I just rise to support Senator Beutler's amendment. I think it is a good amendment. It will help keep this from becoming a frivolous thing. I just wanted to add that word, that I do support his amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Higgins, please.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Beutler, would you yield to a question?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Could you tell me again, briefly, your amendment is to protect the employees?

SENATOR BEUTLER: No.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Protect the employer.

SENATOR BEUTLER: From Senator Landis's point of view it would probably be just the opposite. I see the bill as giving broad additional rights to the employees, which is fine. I am in favor of the bill, in fact I like all the provisions of the bill, with three or four small exceptions. But this one is an important exception. Basically I don't want the employees to force the state to prove that what they are doing is not because of their report of wrongdoing. This gets very convoluted. The state, already if they are going to fire somebody, has to prove just cause. That is the way the law is now. I don't want them to come in in addition and have to prove that the reason...that not only