

might improve on what it is that you're offering should that be the amendment that the sheep decide to accept as they follow your lead blindly, unquestioningly, and mindlessly. Would you yield to a question?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Madam President, I'll yield.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, don't sound so downhearted. Everything I said was designed to be complimentary (laugh) and the question is not going to be diff....

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Just trying to stay calm, Senator Chambers. I'm just trying to stay calm.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, I thought you said you're trying to stay humble.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: I don't want to go today either, you see.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (Laugh) Okay. Senator Brashear, where you have the word "employee", would you be adverse to adding "or employees" so that it wouldn't, the way you draft it, restrict it to one employee? It could be a situation where maybe one employee, pursuant to their agreement, might do this, but maybe based on the agreement it would be something that the employees collectively would consider. So what I am looking at is not putting in the statute a situation where, because of the way it's drafted, maybe only one employee could be present at the session when they're doing it. So if I acknowledge that you have bludgeoned me into submission to give me a scrap to maintain my dignity, what little bit of it I have left considering that most of it is in tatters now, could you see what I'm trying to get at when I say we add the words "or employees"? Then whatever else you put in there, then I'm going to ask you a couple questions about that, would not be indicating that should this negotiation occur it's not going to be a situation where the employee side is limited to one employee. Do you understand what I'm saying?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator Chambers, I do. I would welcome the amendment. I think it clarifies. Whenever I put in too many words and try for too much clarity, why, the bill drafter