

Government Orders

It is despicable, it is disheartening, it is sad, and it is a black day for Canada when it comes to the role it could play in terms of international development and assisting Third World countries.

I would like to close my comments by saying a very important Canadian was quoted recently in the news by saying: "The patient is very sick, but the medicine will only hasten the death." This was an outstanding Canadian talking about the plight and the challenges of many Third World countries as they struggle to survive, not even necessarily to advance, but simply to survive under unbelievable challenges.

What does the government do? It makes it worse, just as it is making it worse for the people of Canada. This ought to come as no surprise. This is an ongoing thesis now. It has developed almost monthly for the last two years.

Canadians, small business people are struggling to survive; farmers right across the country, struggling to survive; small manufacturers, struggling to survive; families, struggling to survive. What are the figures as a result of this policy which the Minister of Finance says is a policy of pain? It is going to be a scorched-earth policy because he says we want to inflict pain on the people of Canada in order to dampen down the inflationary fires.

• (1420)

They have done it admirably. They have killed off initiatives. They have killed off both so that there is an increasing sense of despair.

So I plead with my hon. friend across the aisle who is responsible for this particular initiative at this stage to rethink what the government is doing. While it is too late now, there has been pain that has been inflicted upon the people of Canada as a result of this federal government's policy. Let us not repeat that same pain and suffering for those people who are living in the developing countries.

Mr. John Manley (Ottawa South): Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to what the House leader for the New Democratic Party had to say. I was hoping that with the events in Ontario that he referred to earlier this year, when an NDP government was elected, and perhaps with the success that they are temporarily enjoying in the polls, the NDP would come forward with something substantive and serious; something that would give

us a clue to what they might do, if it ever befell us, that we had an NDP government in this country.

I could only conclude from having listened to him that either he has not given any serious thought to Canada's role in world institutions, or that he thinks that we should withdraw from the International Monetary Fund. That is the only reasonable conclusion to draw from his remarks.

The bill before us provides for two things. It provides for an increase in the amount of the deposits, the quotas, that are held by the International Monetary Fund to reflect the increased size of world trade and it provides for a means for the IMF to collect amounts owing from debtor nations, or to provide that they should pay them.

As I pointed out earlier today, many of us agree with the comments in the parliamentary report. Many of us agree with the sentiments which the House leader for the NDP is expressing in terms of what the IMF does in the context of granting its loans.

As I said earlier as well, many of us, including myself, have urged the Minister of Finance to take into account the emerging understanding of development issues in loans that are being granted by the IMF, for example in Brazil.

For the leader of the NDP to get up and say that the bill before us distinguishes parties, his and ours, for example, on those issues simply because this bill provides for the ongoing function of the IMF, is totally ridiculous. Why can he not get up and say specifically what he thinks Canada's role should be with respect to this quota system and to the collection of debts on an ongoing future basis?

Does he think that loans from the IMF should be without recourse against better nations? Should they be just simply gifts? In that case, why do we need an international clearing house like the IMF? What is it that the NDP has for a policy? In fact, do they have one at all?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, to answer my friend, there is much to say on this issue. That is why we wanted to debate this issue. I do not understand why the Liberals want to curtail this debate.

This is the one opportunity we have for all members from the Liberal Party, the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party, to express their party views. It is an opportunity for members of Parliament to speak on