

January 17, 1996

SENATOR WILL: It could be, yes.

SENATOR AVERY: Okay. In terms of what Senator Dierks brought up, the special order rule, would that be needed if we have this?

SENATOR WILL: The special order is something that has evolved as a procedure that is used in the Legislature that is not set out in rule, Senator Avery. I would think, frankly, that this would probably take the place of special order. It wouldn't necessarily, but I would think that as a practice it probably would.

SENATOR AVERY: Okay. Well, I could see that this would put, I guess, more definite in the rules that a special order...what is going to take place, or what took place of the special order. I would see that we wouldn't potentially need a special order. If he can pick these, why would you need that special order?

SENATOR WILL: Oh, as I said, Senator Avery, probably this would take the place of special order. I would think that having something written in rule that would deal with major proposals like this would probably eliminate the need for special orders, in most cases.

SENATOR AVERY: Okay. I'll ask Senator Bernard-Stevens a minute in terms he had said he had a comment in terms of his thought, and I'd like to hear that on this special order.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Avery.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Will is incorrect when he says this would replace the special order rule. It would not; in fact it could not because, Senator Avery, what this piece...what this before us does is allows the Speaker to pick five. And I believe, if I remember correctly, he has to do it by the 20th legislative day. The special order rule is when we're in the session and we're bogged down or something comes of greater importance that the Speaker says, I think we need to...an emergency comes up in the state maybe, or some emergency funding, or Appropriations has a bill that they need to get. A deficit funding needs to be done immediately, where the Speaker