



December Bonus Quiz

If you look at the chart on p. t.4, the motion to **Amend** is applicable to the motion to **Limit or Extend Limits of Debate** (even though the latter motion is higher in precedence on the chart than the motion to **Amend**). Thus, if a motion to "limit debate to two more speakers on each side of the debate" is being considered, a motion to amend by "striking two and inserting three" would be in order.

This month's bonus questions: In the above scenario, could a secondary amendment be in order to strike "three" and insert "four?" And how much debate time should the chair allow for the consideration of the motion to **Amend** or the motion to **Amend an Amendment**?

Answer from Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 11th Edition:

A motion to **Amend an Amendment** would certainly be in order in this instance to attempt to perfect the motion to **Limit or Extend**, but according to *RONR* (11th), p. 397, ll.17-20, "A motion to amend an undebatable motion is undebatable, because to allow debate on it would be contrary to the purposes of the other motion's undebatability." Thus, neither a motion to **Amend** nor to **Amend the Amendment** would be debatable in this circumstance since the motion they are being applied to is in itself undebatable.