

Legislature, Senator Beyer pointed out that in the bill there is no requirement in the statute that a signed statement be obtained from the employer and that's correct, that is not in the bill. But I think it would be difficult to prove by clear and convincing evidence that a person needs to work and that he or she will be fired solely because of this without some kind of comment from the employer. But something that is being ignored is the use of the word "may" when it comes to the court issuing the permit. It doesn't say that the court "shall" issue such a permit. There will be a hearing and I'm certain if the evidence is presented that this person has driven before under the influence even if no conviction has occurred, then there would not be the issuance of such a permit. I think the judges would tend to be a bit more discreet in this area than some people think that they have been in others, but I'm still looking at the basic equity or inequity of drawing these artificial boundaries that include some people out, in, and exclude others. Either you have a right to make a living or you don't. Either we feel that when a person has taken a drink and driven a vehicle should be excused from the human race or we don't. I don't think so and I know there is great bitterness toward those who have been under the influence and caused serious injury to other people. It is inexcusable. Adults should not do these things, but you have to look deeper than just what you see in the form of a symptom. Every time, practically, a senator gets an invitation to any of these functions put on by lobbyists they have a cocktail hour. They feel that the senators must be pined with liquor. They call it attitude adjustment or mood modification, but it's hard to get one of these invitations without finding that in it. It is hypocritical to me for the senators to stand up here and express so much opposition to alcohol in the form of these kind of bills or opposition to these types of amendments and then not tell these lobbyists to at least have the decency to exclude from these invitations the notification that alcohol is going to be there flowing freely and costing nothing. If our friends get caught in one of these nets, we become sympathetic and understanding. If a person has enough political clout and happens to be arrested by an officer who either does not know the person's standing or disregards it, the matter can be taken care of very easily by the prosecutor and these kind of things have occurred. So there are only certain groups and individuals who are going to be affected by these laws anyway, but I think if you're going to offer an