a test and see if this will solve the problems that people have. But if it gets so that it will be burdensome, then I think we will have to do something different, because if this is going to cause everybody to be appealing a decision, that might be a problem in the future. But I think it might be a good thing to try to see how this will work. So I support the amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: I would like to ask Senator Johnson a question, if I may.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes, Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Senator Johnson, does your amendment address the employer and the employee both?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes, it does. It is kind of interesting, Senator Vickers, when I first drafted the amendment I used the word "claimant" and I thought claimant would cover the waterfront but Senator Maresh called it to my attention that claimant really only will apply to the employee, so I made sure that the words "or employer" were put in the amendment. It covers either side, or both sides.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, thank you very much, Senator Johnson. And with that explanation I, too, rise in suport of the Johnson amendment. I don't see that that is any.... this is a....as most of you realize this bill is in a very delicate balance but I don't think that this amendment will upset that balance at all, and so, therefore, I do support the Johnson amendment.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Johnson, do you wish to close? Senator Landis, pardon me, is on. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: I have had my light on. I would just like to ask Senator Johnson a couple of questions.

SENATOR CLARK: All right.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Johnson, many times the claimants in these actions are individuals who have been unemployed for a while and are not people of means, therefore they go through the process with Legal Aid attorneys so that they have representation before the tribunal. And then if they go to the District Court, they are represented oftentimes