

The afternoon session of the McKendree MUN for the General Assembly has started, and the delegates are prepared to wrap this last session for the day up in a neat little bow.

After roll call, the committee continues to debate on the amendment known as Amendment 3-2-5.

The first motion was to change the time limit from 30 seconds to 2 minutes, allowing for more time to address the situation at hand more thoroughly.

Ironically, the second motion was once again issued for a speech time limit change. The motion was used asking if the speaking time could be changed from 2 minutes to 3 minutes, adding even more speaking time to voice a delegate's opinion. This motion was also passed.

After this second motion, the speakers' list was then continued right where they left off.

The delegate first speaking is the delegate from Kuwait, and is voting con on the amendment for the defense of continuing funding for education, especially for young girls. But, the delegate says that the amendment isn't effective in making that happen the way it currently is.

The next delegate, this time speaking pro, is the delegate from China, who also is greatly fond of this amendment and believes it should be passed to help funding for education.

After China's speech, an unmoderated caucus is motioned and passed, with a time limit of 4 minutes to spruce up the amendments.

I managed to talk to the delegate from France and have him answer some questions. Here's the conversation:

"Hello, I'm with the IPD, and I was wondering if I could ask you a few questions?"

Delegate from France: "Sure, go ahead."

"Thank you. Now, I was wondering, what is your current standing on this amendment being debated right now?"

D from F: "This amendment isn't very contradicting. It calls for a summit, which I do support, but I don't like that it cuts funding and it doesn't accomplish the summit by doing so, thereby making it contradict the amendment's goal."

Unfortunately, the caucus had ended before I could ask some more questions, but the delegate from France seemed to point out lots of areas of the amendment that the delegate feels isn't effective in supporting itself. The delegate also seemed to be sure of himself, and provided a great amount of information relating to the committee's subject at hand.

It seems that the turn of events is unfolding in an interesting manner, and that it seems that some of the delegates have plans to motion for Previous Question, as there have been 5 pro speeches and 4 con speeches, and you need 5 pro and 5 con speeches in order for a Previous Question to be in order.

The delegate from Luxembourg, as expected, motioned for an R-34: Previous Question, immediately after the 5th con speech from Kuwait. Previous Question passed the consideration vote, and was then voted on to see if it would take effect, with a 2/3rds majority needed to pass, which had happened.

Following the Previous Question, the amendment was voted on to see if it would be added to Resolution 3-2, and succeeded.

A new amendment has been submitted to the chair, known as Amendment 3-2-6. this submitted amendment is currently under debate right now, and is being spoken about on whether or not the amendment is worth putting it in the resolution, should not be included at all, or if the amendment should be edited before it can be added fully to the resolution at hand.

The General Assembly, all in all, is working extremely hard on passing the resolution and making sure it's as perfect as possible.

-IPD Okawville Delegate