

it had been compiled in court rather than through these other hearings, you would have to conclude he would reach the same conclusion. And because of the nature of the action by these two individuals, they should be held personally accountable for this money. The last time we disapproved it, I think there was about \$1,000 that each of them had been assessed, but after disapproving those claims, the matter was discussed additionally, and the amount of individual damages, rather than \$1,000 for each individual, was reduced to \$750. So I think we ought to stick by the decision that we made at that point. We ought to establish a policy that we discussed the other day, that when an employee has damages assessed against him or her in their personal capacity, they should be required to respond for those damages. If there are lawyer's fees, court costs, and other amounts of money assessed because the individual was acting in the scope of his or her employment in general, those costs can be reimbursed by the state because the person was acting on behalf of the state and the wronged individual should be able to recover from the state for that damage done to them by the state's employee. But when you get outside that realm of what is allowable, when you do those things that clearly your boss should disapprove of, such as, the sexist remarks, the denial of a promotion on the basis of gender, the references to a woman's pregnant condition in a disparaging way, the discussion of the kind of food that they eat and what it does to a female's figure, nobody on a job should have to put up with that kind of conversation. And Judge Urbom had laid some of these things out in his opinion. So based on that, I believe we should vote to disallow the two claims that my amendment deals with. I am hoping that you will see it the way that I do, and vote again to do this year what we did last year, and I also think it should send a message that we don't want these claims to come back year after year. It could conceivably be brought back again next year. I don't think it would be. I am almost sure that it won't be, but I hope that we will bring this kind of thing to a halt by again rejecting these claims.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Coordsen, please, then Senator Wesely.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. Far be it from me to engage in conversation with Senator Chambers over legalities. I would come into that fray almost totally disarmed, I am afraid. However, these two cases, and we are not a court of law I think, we are a court perhaps that