

September 2009

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE AND HOUSE RULES 306

1 **SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.** Senate Rule 306 is amended as follows:

2 **306. Rules of debate.** No member may speak more than twice on the same ~~subject~~
3 question without leave of the Senate, nor more than once until every member choosing to
4 speak on the ~~subject~~ question pending has spoken. No member may speak for more than ten
5 minutes the first time, nor more than five minutes the second time. This rule does not apply to
6 the Majority and Minority Leaders and the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, or a
7 spokesman designated by that chairman.

8 **SECTION 2. AMENDMENT.** House Rule 306 is amended as follows:

9 **306. Rules of debate.** No member may speak more than twice on the same ~~subject~~
10 question without leave of the House, nor more than once until every member choosing to speak
11 on the ~~subject~~ question pending has spoken. No member may speak for more than ten
12 minutes the first time, nor more than five minutes the second time. This rule does not apply to
13 the Majority and Minority Leaders and the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, or a
14 spokesman designated by that chairman.

NOTE: This proposed rules amendment is in response to the following question:

Does Senate Rule 306, prohibiting a member from speaking more than twice on the same subject, restrict the number of floor amendments that can be submitted on the 11th or 14th order if an "order" is considered the same stage of procedures because under Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure, Section 102, speaking more than once relates to the same stage of proceedings?

Mason's refers to a question under debate rather than the subject, e.g., Mason's Section 102 provides: "No member has the right to speak more than once on the same question at the same stage of procedure on the same day" and "In practice, a member is often given the privilege of speaking a second time on a question after others who desired to speak have spoken ..."

The proposed change of "subject" to "question" is intended to clarify that the limit to speaking twice applies to the "question" under consideration, and not to a "subject" that is under discussion during a particular order of business, e.g., each floor amendment is a separate question and thus the two-time limit would apply to the specific amendment, not to the 11th or 14th order.