

Government Orders

what has to be one of the world's most important issues, the increasing indebtedness of the developing countries.

My hon. friend knows that what this legislation does. When I say that it maintains the status quo, it worsens the *status quo*, Mr. Speaker. He knows full well that it imposes additional sanctions on countries that are unable to repay their loans.

In other words, if you are so poor that you are simply unable to pay, they are going to impose heavier sanctions and make it impossible for you to even hope of paying it in the future. This is not good legislation.

Mr. Manley: What's your proposal. Give it away?

Mr. Riis: There are many proposals. The Liberals want the little catch phrase. The Liberals want some of these television quotable quotes. Their leader, Jean Chrétien, has not said a single thing in the entire byelection. Try and find out where they stand on anything.

For example, we look to economic development as a role for the IMF to play. But the role is not to impose Conservative or Liberal—same thing—ideologies on developing countries. Absolutely not.

Look at international assistance and ask yourself the question: "Where does the most appropriate international assistance occur?" You have to say it occurs at the NGO level.

I realize that this is not exactly what this bill is about, but it is the only opportunity we have to discuss Canada's role overseas in terms of assisting economically or in other ways. These are the kinds of proposals we ought to have an opportunity to discuss. But, since we do not seem to be having that, I would like to propose a motion. Therefore, I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I must say to the hon. member, and I know he has been around here for a long time, that Standing Order 25 states, and I quote:

When it is provided in any Standing or Special Order of this House that any business specified by such Order shall be continued, forthwith disposed of, or concluded in any sitting, the House shall not be adjourned before such proceedings have been completed except pursuant to a motion to adjourn proposed by a Minister of the Crown.

The hon. member realizes that. The motion is out of order.

Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few comments to the discussion that has already taken place on this very important bill.

As the House Leader of the New Democratic Party has clearly pointed out, there are serious questions about the increased debt on Third World countries. How much do we pile up? When do we say enough is enough? When do we stop imposing on the threat of that Third World debt our goals for an economy and our solutions for economic problems? How much austerity can we suffer in Canada and how much are we demanding that we impose on the Third World countries that are subject to the debt? Are we indeed the harbingers of some kind of Milton Friedman hard right wing policies that suggest that the IMF's role is to be a debt collector rather than some imaginative development of programs in the jurisdictions in which we are loaning the money?

If the government and opposition members argue that this should be a collecting agency, is there not a moral responsibility in the initiation of the loans to do some planning with the people who are borrowing the money? Are we making surrogate economies based on what we think is right? Or, are we focusing on what should be the force coming out of an indigenous need of those countries? Does the IMF take any time, as the Liberal Party raises the question about our policy, to express a desire that the indigenous economy was what should be supported and enhanced rather than impose some kind of unproven economic theories that are pursued in this country as the model?

It is very interesting to casually talk about what we hope to do and what we want to do. But, we always end up in effect imposing our views on the Third World countries and then expect, because we have loaned them the money, that they should be successful based on our views. We have done more to harm Central American and South American countries because of that attitude than we have to help them.

Sometimes it is best to have people help themselves, let them define what they need in terms of help rather than impose a regime that we think because it may or may not be appropriate for us, it certainly has to be appropriate for them. We have not been a good model, and if anybody wants any evidence of that, just examine what is happening in this country today. It is very