

in opposition of the motion to reconsider, but this is a legitimate motion. It is the one that we probably should have started with on the...on the substantive issue of the...the Hall amendment, Hall, Lindsay and Chambers amendment, that was the MacBride Principles that was adopted to 1066. The proposal is one that we've talked about and, again, I apologize to Senator Haberman if I misled him. I did not mean to. What I said was that I would not delay the advancement of this bill or take up time on the amendment, that there was a motion before the body to divide the question on it, that I had no intention, on the amendment, I had no intention, if it was going to be long, drawn out debate to bring that to a vote, I would pull the amendment before that happened. What happened was, there was no debate, for the most part, outside of...or at least opposition, outside of I believe it was Senator Crosby and there were some questions by Senator Schimek of the issues contained in the amendment. I know that Senator Haberman has opposed this. He approached me on it. He has known that this is before the body since mid-March when we had this as a discussion on General File and that there was comments made that we would address this on Select File as an amendment. He has talked to me a couple times about it and said, you know, what are you going to do with it? I said I'm going to run the amendment, I want to run the amendment, but I'm not going to do it to the detriment of either Senator Chambers' bill or to the detriment of using up time here on the body. I won't...I wouldn't do that. It appears that we're going to use up time here in the body. To reconsider the motion is probably the fairest approach to address that. If the body chooses to reconsider the adoption of the Hall amendment, so be it. If they pull the MacBride Principles out of 1066, if folks feel that that is the way to solve this problem, to have Senator Haberman win the day and have us basically remove the policy decision in the MacBride Principles from 1066, that's fine, I'll live with that. I don't...I'm not going to fall on my own petard on this issue. I believe that it's important. I believe it's clearly germane to this issue. It deals with the investment practices of this state, as did 1066. That is not a question that is appropriate at this time since we've adopted the amendment to the bill. What the amendment says and what the MacBride Principles do is they say that the investment officer of the state should look at companies that have adopted affirmative action plans in Northern Ireland before investing in them. We recommend that that is what they do. We also say that there is not divestment necessary, so there is really no punitive measure in this proposal. It is about as lukewarm as