

misunderstanding that took place. Honorable people, as we all know, from the debate and discussions we've heard the last couple of days, correct their mistakes. Senator Haberman, for whatever reason, had an honest understanding that this was an amendment that was just going to be discussed for a short time, period. He may have been right. He may have been wrong. He operated under that assumption. For that reason, he did not challenge the germaneness. I think he has a very good point on germaneness. I agree with Senator...I understand Senator Hall's argument, it is not a clear cut, but I think he has a very good case. He chose not to do that, to not take too much time. Consequently...then the amendment was, in fact, adopted, somewhat easily but a surprise to a lot of people as easy as it was adopted. I voted for it. On an up or down vote on the MacBride Principles, I'm for the MacBride Principles, at least as I understand them at this point. He's now in a position though where the amendment has been adopted that he thought was going to be pulled and he is not in any...and he gave up his opportunity to ask a very legitimate question about germaneness. So I'm going to vote for the reconsideration motion and I think everybody in here should also for the same reasons that have been given the last two days when we talk about we, as a body, that trust one another, when mistakes are made, when there are misunderstandings, we move to correct those. And I believe that that should be done. I also am becoming concerned about the process. We've done, I think, a pretty good job this last week or two of working the agenda and working the legitimate priorities. As the person setting the agenda, I'm beset on an hourly basis with people who have ideas to leapfrog the system, and, by and large, I've been...been discouraging those. The MacBride Principle was a bill. It was introduced. It could have been prioritized. I'm...I'm not comfortable with using our precious few last hours when we do have lots of priority bills ahead of us that have not been considered on a matter that has not been prioritized. Senator Chambers did prioritize his bill and the concept of the South African...the repeal of that language is appropriate to be before the body. I question using this time in this manner to deal with a matter that has not been prioritized. I am going to vote for the reconsideration motion. I think Senator Haberman deserves a fair shot at his question of germaneness. If the reconsideration passes, it is as if the amendment had not been before us. It will be reoffered. At that point, it will be legitimate to ask the germaneness issue. I think he deserves a fair shot at that. And I also think that...I'm also mildly concerned that some people evidently