

employment or are fired, if the employer becomes aware that they have an orientation of this type, they would have recourse. They would have the opportunity to continue holding a job which they had been performing in accord with all the requirements of the job. The only reason they were fired was because, and it can be merely a perception that they have a certain sexual orientation. I think that is grossly unjust and therefore I am offering this amendment again.

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

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, just briefly. I want to take an opportunity. There was reference made earlier about some amendments we had discussed yesterday that I had...I'm sure had indicated at least that I thought something would be done. I wanted to clarify that if the bill gets advanced these are not...they were not casual comments, there are amendments that are being worked on, will be offered. And there is one that I don't think we've talked about yet that will also be done. But the one amendment I indicated Senator Beutler had visited about it, it was one I also had looked at, which was clarifying the qualifications or the experience of the people who are being appointed as commissioners, so that that was clearly said what I described it to do. Secondly, the amendment that we did adopt that dealt with the confirmation of the Legislature of appointees, both the commission, as well as the director, is spelled out in the bill. The issue was raised whether or not... The amendment we adopted states that if the Legislature fails to confirm with a positive vote why then the individual would no longer be eligible. And I raised the issue that came up some years ago relative...and it was involving a letter. I don't...we can't...I don't believe it was an opinion as such, but a letter from the then Attorney General Spire that suggested that in order for an appointment to be rejected, under the constitution, it was a revision of the constitution, in 1972, that we had to take positive action to reject, or a majority vote to reject. As the amendment is proposed, if we fail to confirm, they are all, as I indicated, I have no difficulty with the concept behind it, but I did raise the issue that it probably needed to be reviewed if there was any constitutional problem. If there isn't, I have no problem with leaving that. And then there was a third one again that Senator Beutler brought to my attention, and that was in any case...it's on page 39, if an individual