

they should be confirmed, you'll vote for my amendment. If you believe they should be allowed to serve a full term without ever being confirmed, then you'll vote against the amendment. I think the purpose of the language that is existing in the amendment is designed to give the Legislature a token role to play in this hoax-filled situation. The crumb that it offers us I do not want to see lost because the language used to give us that crumb is not tight enough to enclose a Governor who may decide to behave like a renegade or a rogue. So if you're for confirmation, you should vote for my amendment. If you don't think confirmation should be necessary, then you should vote against it.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I believe the language that's in the amendment is what we traditionally have used. After looking at Senator Chambers' amendment, I began to recall and I...it seems to me that when Attorney General Spire was in office that there was an amendment or rather a letter, been trying to see if there was an Opinion because that what I...ran in my mind but haven't been able to find that, but as I recall there was indication that the Legislature must, in fact, take positive action to reject and that would mean 25 votes to reject, or if there was not 25 votes to confirm, they would remain in office. I believe that is correct. I don't have a problem with the language that Senator...or the concept that Senator Chambers is offering. Again, Senator Chambers, Senator Beutler, visiting a little earlier, indicated that there might be some language that apparently has been developed by the Game Commission that I think does generally the same thing that might be something to look at or we could look at on Select File, far as I'm concerned. But the only...I'm going to vote for your amendment, but with the understanding that if, as I recall, Spire's letter was a constitutional issue that he raised and I...I may be in error on that, but it seems to me that the requirement was to...that we...constitutionally we had to take action to reject, and if that's not the case, why, then what your amendment is, is fine. I would agree that as a matter of policy in the future we probably ought to not use the old boilerplate language if we can do it by statute. That makes it clear that a failure to get 25 votes to confirm is, in effect, rejection, but I think that runs contrary to that other opinion. Conceptually, I have no problem