

struction and Development as well as from commercial markets, because it will not be able to receive the same amount it had received previously from the International Development Association. This could mean that by 1986, borrowing on markets may account for over half of the disbursements to India. India cannot afford such a situation.

Between 1981 and 1983 the per capita incomes of the sub-Saharan African countries declined. Since then, we know the conditions of these sub-Saharan African countries. It is a human disgrace for these conditions to exist at this time, and to have allowed this to happen.

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) talked about the deficit. His remarks were very important and well appreciated by Members of the House. However, we must not consider the deficit only, because the problem does not end there. There are problems in Canada with respect to the needs of low income Canadians, those who are unemployed and pensioners. There are problems in areas of this country which are experiencing economic difficulties and suffer from severe regional disparity. Of course, there are the problems of these very poor nations in the world today, particularly those that are receiving the funds from the International Development Association.

These African countries cannot restructure their finances on their own. Africa's share in the International Development Association rose from 25 per cent in 1980 to 37 per cent in 1983. Even by increasing Africa's share a further 5 per cent over the sixth replenishment and taking the seventh replenishment which exists now, sixth replenishment levels would yield less additional resources from the \$9 billion in the International Development Association than retaining the \$12 billion share which exists with the sixth replenishment. Even now, with the seventh replenishment, if we increase Africa's share by 5 per cent it would not make up for what Africa received under the replenishment in 1979. Africa will have a 21 per cent reduction in real terms compared with the commitments in 1979 in the sixth replenishment. This will not only apply to Africa but to other countries as well.

● (1730)

It is an extremely serious situation as 40 per cent of the loans of the International Development Association have gone to agricultural projects and 25 per cent to human development projects. Where will it end? We are seeing the situation now. We see tragedy in Ethiopia. We see the tragedy in other sub-Saharan African countries. The question is, what are we prepared to do about it?

We in Canada, as can be the case in other countries, can ignore it. However, it is very difficult to ignore. I find it extremely difficult to ignore. It bothers me considerably. What will the world position be? Will we continue to send the relief aid which is necessary? We cannot let people die by the millions, as would be the case otherwise. What will we do to restructure the lives and the countries of these people? Will we allow the situation to continue to deteriorate? Will we allow it to become so awesome, so completely tragic and catastrophic

Bretton Woods Agreements Act

that world opinion, and the opinion in this country, will only respond to the most frightening and serious situations? Will we allow the situation to deteriorate to the point where hunger, which was considered a travesty 10 years ago, will no longer be considered frightening? This is what will happen if attention is not paid to this very important question.

Through the amendments to the Act we will allocate funds to the World Bank through the Estimates. We in the House of Commons will not have the chance we had in the past to debate this very important question. It will be another lever which will disappear, another opportunity for Members of Parliament to speak, research and inform people across the country of the seriousness of the problem which exists and will continue to exist. The situation will get worse.

The International Monetary Fund provides a very real function. What the World Bank does not do through its three agencies the IMF will do. However, the IMF is not reaching African countries. Its record is particularly bleak in sub-Saharan Africa. Its programs have fallen well short of the targets. For instance, the growth target of the IMF in these countries was reached in only five of the 23 African programs; the inflation target in only 13 of the 28 programs; the trade target in only 11 out of 28 programs. The association between IMF programs and net bank borrowing is much stronger for low development countries. The point is that the IMF is not reaching these countries.

What are we prepared to do? I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) will discuss this question at the summit with the President of the United States. It is a concern. We as Members of Parliament or as Canadians cannot completely ignore this question. We must have it as a consideration in addition to our problems with respect to the deficit, unemployment, people with low and fixed incomes, and regional disparity. If we do not, the problem will get worse. As a matter of fact, it is worsening at a geometric progression, not an arithmetic one. This is a serious situation, and it has to be kept before the House of Commons and before the country.

I hope we in the House, although we will be losing the opportunity in future years to discuss this question through amendments to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, will from time to time continue to discuss this very important question. All we are doing now is fighting the results. We are attacking the symptoms, not the core problem or reasons for starvation. We are not attacking the reason for Third World countries, particularly the poorest of them, continuing to lose ground to the rest of the countries of the world.

There are Third World countries which are making progress, a lot of them at the expense of Canadian industry. We are importing their goods, and products made in this country are being forced out of the market. These are the countries which people will use as examples of progressing Third World countries. However, there are at least 50 Third World countries which are not progressing, that are falling further and further behind the rest of the world. This must receive the attention of the House of Commons, of the Government and of other Governments concerned about fellow