

Mandatory drug testing

[Health & Medicine](#), [Drugs](#)



On September 15, 1986 President Reagan signed Executive Order 12564 as an attempt to establish a drug-free Federal workplace. The order constitutes the condition in which employment of all Federal employees to refrain from substance abuse even when off-duty. After the Executive Order, the Drug Free Workplace Act of 1988 was created to intensify the intention to create a drug-free environment in the workplace. It is a general knowledge that over the years, there has been the increase of drug use and abuse evident in the society.

Thus, this creates an alarming realization for companies to maintain a strict requirement of employees and future employees free of drug use. The need for the mandatory drug testing policy both has its advantages and disadvantage. But on a personal view, the advantages outweigh the disadvantage. This can be attributed to one of the major factors; the company should not take the risk. (LaFoyette, 2001)

The company over the years had provided society with the best and quality equipments that aids patients during the crucial heart and lung transfers. Life is the main concern of the company more than gaining profit from the sales of the equipments. Thus, this entails that risks should not be taken at all cost. Life as the matter in which the company holds its integrity to protect must make it a point to ensure that vision with the confidence of having employees fit in the kind of demand the company requires. The mandatory drug testing policy addresses that.

Why enforce the drug testing policy?

The first point for employing the mandatory drug testing policy is due to it being a constitutional right. The United States Supreme Court has agreed that mandatory drug testing of employees is constitutional permissible and one-third of both private and public corporations have adopted this policy. It is of fact that companies deserve the right to accept or deny employment from a person for reasons that maybe undisclosed by the employers. This attributes the right of the company to seek the best among its employees.

The second is the right of the employers to make it a point to hire the best and most qualified employees.

Third, there is the concept of “employment at will”. This concept describes that an employee can either accept or protest his employers’ drug testing policy with the notion that he or she agrees to the terms and agreement between him and his employer. By law, this relates that if the employers wish to change the company’s policies, then the employee either complies or quit the job.

Fourth, there is the concern in society to stop drug abuse and it has been clear that one of the greatest problems affecting the health and welfare of our population is the use of narcotics. Thus there is the need and the concern of the general public to stop one of the cancers in the society.

Fifth, a reasonable employer will create a simple substance-abuse policy as he or she may deemed fit. This will begin by putting a blanket of prohibition among the employees in the use, possession and distribution of drugs and alcohol in the workplace. It is also wrong for the employee to work under the

influence of drugs. And there are disciplinary actions taken for violation of the policy.

An employers may see the possibility of misidentifying an employee under the influence of drugs but this can be relieved if proper documentation happens of the discharge decision is advisable and there lies the importance of “reasonable- suspicion for the employer”. There is the employers’ right to state in the employees contacts the provisions and abnegations of the two in the matter of drug testing. With suspicionless drug testing of employees, there we maintain the quality of employees we have and seek.

The company’s integrity and credibility

We should always keep in mind the company’s reputation at being the leading manufacturers of health equipments responsible for other people lives. The legal grounds of the drug testing policy being permissible are valid for us to make the necessary and objective decision in having this policy taken into effective. I asked whether we should take the risk.

I say we do not. It is the company’s policy to maintain its integrity and credibility, and we should do that by maintaining the quality and fitness of the employees. The company may sacrificemoneyand risk unlawful dismissal lawsuits, but it will be worth it if the company is made sure of its employees. The life of the company’s consumers is at stake, risks should never be taken in place of their lives.

Reference:

Anonymous. (2007). Drugs, Police and the Law

<https://assignbuster.com/mandatory-drug-testing/>

Drug Testing. Retrieved February 28, 2007, from [http://www. drugpolicy. org/drug-testing-policies](http://www.drugpolicy.org/drug-testing-policies)

LaFoyette, H. (2001). Mandatory Drug Testing [Electronic Version], 17. Retrieved February 28 from [http://www. usfsp. edu/home/](http://www.usfsp.edu/home/).

McKinney, J. R. (1999). The Effectiveness and Legality of Random Drug Testing Policies. 1(1),

Niznik, J. S. (2001). Job Searching: Technical Supports Equal Opportunity Employment [Electronic Version]. Retrieved 2007 from [https://www. thebalance. com/employment-law-advice-best-websites-2071543](https://www.thebalance.com/employment-law-advice-best-websites-2071543).