

my which we can hand to our children. The Canadian people are saying, for example, "Why are you not interested in the pulp and paper industry?" It is slowly going down the drain and needs the uplift of a financial commitment. Surely we have the human resources and the people ready, willing and able to work. How long are our industries going to be second class citizens in Canada as opposed to world industry? It is no wonder this government did not go to the people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that our motion is merely stating—

An hon. Member: Keep on going.

Mr. Alexander: An hon. member has said to keep on going; I certainly will.

The hon. member for York-Simcoe spoke on the crisis in Peru. This is certainly a disaster, and the hon. member does not even know what is going on.

Mr. Paproski: Lots of hanky-panky.

Mr. Alexander: I would like to quote from, I believe it is, the *Toronto Star*, but I will hold it up in case some members wish to have their research assistants follow it up. The heading of the article is "Canadian bankers nervous as Peru nears bankruptcy", and it says:

The Canadian Export Development Corporation, which in effect ensures Canadian investment and sales abroad, stands to lose a further \$72 million if Peru goes belly-up.

It seems everybody knows about Peru except the Export Development Corporation and the Liberal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Paproski: Jack Horner.

Mr. Alexander: I will not even mention his name.

Our motion states that rather than allotting \$26 billion, which is up from \$8 billion in terms of financing guarantees, the EDC should be happy with \$16 billion. This government should be delighted that we at least let them know we understand there is a role for EDC, but not at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer. That is all we are talking about.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me an opportunity to put forth those few unprepared comments, but they must have struck home because as yet I do not see a member on the other side trying to stand up and say, "Well, the hon. member for Hamilton West has a point. He has been mean, he has been tough, but he has been wrong and therefore I want to challenge him. I want to stand and challenge the hon. member for Hamilton West." I would like to see hon. members opposite let me know, because I do not know everything. I know a lot, but I do not know everything.

I thought that at least there would be one member who would stand up and show me where I went wrong, but as yet there has been nobody, in spite of the fact we have two ministers present, the Minister of State (Environment), who wants to sit on his fanny and throw smart-alecky remarks across the floor, and the Minister of Employment and Immi-

Export Development Act

gration. The minister of employment has nothing to say because he has other work, but I am ashamed of my long-standing friend, who knows what this bill is all about and that one of his roles is to create an environment whereby we have the necessary jobs to reduce that figure of one million and over in the hidden jobless. That is his role, sir, but the minister remains silent. The minister is a member of the class of '68, as I am, and he has had a very meteoric rise. I will not say that I am ashamed of him because I do not think that that would be honest; but I would ask him why he does not stand up and be counted.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see you are just going to rise; I am going to sit.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) is quite right, I was just attempting to rise. Earlier I had expressed some concern about motion No. 5 standing in the name of the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens). A few minutes ago I attempted to indicate to members who are involved or intend to be involved with this discussion that I would return to the chair at this minute in order to try to inject some certainty into the situation. I wanted to interrupt the process of procedural arguments, since we have spent this afternoon on this question and given it some time prior to this afternoon's sitting.

I attempted to sound a warning to the House about the practice that we were following with respect to motion No. 5. I think the Chair must always be careful to distinguish between procedural matters and matters of policy or practice. They can come close together, and certainly this is one of those occasions.

● (1802)

I find that an examination of the precedents indicates that there is not just one but several examples of the kind of motion put forward by the hon. member for York-Simcoe which have become part of the legislation, such as the Air Canada Act, the CNR financing and guarantee act, both of them of recent memory, and quite a number of others which I have collected this afternoon. Therefore, I want to say that I would not be able to justify on procedural grounds intervention in the hon. member's motion. On the basis of precedents I think it would be a departure from the practice which we have followed recently for the Chair to intervene in the motion of the hon. member for York-Simcoe and for the House not to go ahead with debate and decision on it.

However, I think I should warn the House that we began with two rather excellent examples, with two strong cases. The first was the Auditor General's report, and the second was the statutory instruments committee. The House wanted to ensure that the Auditor General's report was automatically referred upon tabling to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. That objective is so meritorious as to scarcely find any difference of opinion in any corner of the House. However, we should remember that we appropriately amended the Standing Orders to that effect.