

Government Orders

Furthermore, Beauchesne's Fifth Edition further clarifies the concept of a subamendment at Citation 438, paragraph (2), which states:

A subamendment must attempt to explain the substance of the amendment and may not substitute an entirely new proposal.

[Translation]

Another important criterion is explained at citation 441(2): A sub-amendment must be relevant to the amendment it purports to amend and not to the main motion.

The amendment, now before the House, proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition reads as follows:

That the motion be amended by adding immediately after the word "Kuwait" the following:

"through the continued use of economic sanctions, such support to exclude offensive military action by Canada at this time."

[English]

The amendment to that amendment which the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona proposes to move goes far beyond the terms of that motion. It introduces a variety of entirely new concepts, for example, the notion of democratization in the area, the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, and the idea of an international peace conference.

While these concepts are perhaps germane to the very complex issue being debated, nonetheless, from a procedural perspective, they stand well beyond the terms of what could be considered an acceptable amendment.

Accordingly, the Chair must find that the proposed subamendment is not in order and cannot be proposed.

SUPPORT FOR UNITED NATIONS

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am continuing my speech from last evening which was interrupted by the adjournment at midnight. Since that time, the critical hour for war in the Persian Gulf has arrived.

Madam Deputy Speaker: If I may, just to put things in the right order, we are now in the 10-minute question and comment period following the hon. member's speech. There are eight minutes left in that period.

Mr. Allmand: Madam Speaker, I understood that. Last night a question was asked by the hon. member for Bourassa. After she asked the question, and before I had the opportunity to answer it, you stood up and called the adjournment.

Since that time, the critical hour for the war in the Persian Gulf has arrived, but fortunately both sides are holding their fire and there is still some time to pursue a peaceful settlement.

As I stated, at the end of the debate last night the member for Bourassa asked me why I continued to support the economic sanctions to settle this dispute with Iraq when there were leaks, according to her, along the Iranian and Syrian borders. Consequently, she said that the sanctions would not work.

Today, during the Question Period, the Secretary of State for External Affairs made similar statements. He told the House, without giving us the sources of his information, that the sanctions could not work as far as impacting on Iraq's military capacity. That is one view of the sanctions. That is the view of the hon. member for Bourassa. Obviously, it is the view of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. There is another view with respect to that question.

In my speech last night, I referred to the study carried out at Harvard University which was reported on Monday of this week in *The New York Times* which stated in effect that the sanctions were working and they would bite even harder as we went into the spring.

Also, in my remarks last night—and I will repeat it—I referred to the debate in the American Senate and House of Representatives. A good number of senators and congressmen said their information was that the sanctions were working. They challenged the American government to give them evidence to the contrary and the American government failed to do that.

I also referred to the statements made by the CIA and the American administration before the American elections in November. At that time, the CIA and the United States administration said that the sanctions were working. After the election, they changed their tune and resorted to military alternatives.