

It is a position we developed jointly with the industry supported by all parties in this House. I am sure when it is voted on today, the motion will receive the support of all parties in the House. That will continue to strengthen the ability of Canada to carry the message forward and have our position accepted.

**Ms. Copps:** Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the fact that the Cairns group comprises more than one party.

The minister should also be aware of the fact that his own official said yesterday that it was the Americans who were the stumbling block.

We know that this is an American and European fight. We also know, contrary to the minister's statement a few short minutes ago, Canadian supply management has not been responsible for the dumping problem. We are not part of the problem. We should not be the sacrificial lambs in the solution.

The minister said earlier that in fact some of the reasons for these changes had to do with dumping. I did not talk about dumping. The minister himself defended the potential eventuality of tariffication by suggesting that something had to be done because of the unleashing of forces of the international marketplace.

The minister should be aware that quite clearly, supply management in Canada has been a domestic solution to a domestic supply issue. It has not touched, nor has it dumped, nor has it impeded, nor has it infringed, nor has it in any way abutted on to either the American or European agricultural problems.

We have been dragged in and fingered as part of the solution. The minister's officials said yesterday quite clearly that the Europeans are prepared to come and support us if we can get the Americans onside.

I want the minister to go back to his Prime Minister and tell him: "Mr. Prime Minister, your strategy up to

last January has failed and failed miserably. Your trip to Kennebunkport yielded nothing. Now is the time to rethink your strategy and we want to know specifically what you are going to do—"

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois):** Order, please. After considering the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Algoma, the Chair is now ready to rule on the matter. This motion is inadmissible because it brings up a new concept foreign to the amendment.

In other words, the subamendment exceeds the scope of the amendment and is therefore inadmissible. I may refer hon. members to Beauchesne's, sixth edition, citation 580 (1).

(1) The purpose of a sub-amendment (an amendment to an amendment) is to alter the amendment. It should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment. If it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the Member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment.

• (1640)

[*English*]

**Mr. McKnight:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is my understanding that members in this Chamber could come to an agreement as to what would be in order. I think that is well within the rights.

**Mr. Foster:** Mr. Speaker, I would rather not get into a long discussion but clearly the main amendment and subamendment deal with article XI of the GATT negotiations. This is simply proposing ways in which article XI may be amended.

Because you have suggested that it may be out of order, since the minister has already indicated his support, I would like to ask for the unanimous consent of the House as proposed.