

structure in western, northern, or Atlantic Canada, such is not the case.

Even in our own country, the overwhelming majority of Canadians are saying that the government's policy in terms of economic development is haywire. It just does not make any sense anymore. On top of that, the government is going to impose a whole new set of taxes now called the goods and services tax.

I just returned from a visit to Japan and looking at its government's recent imposition of its version of the GST. The Japanese government decided that it was in its best interest to impose a GST of only 3 per cent. What did the people of Japan do at the first opportunity they had to indicate what they thought about that? They turfed out the government. I anticipate that at the first opportunity that Canadians have to show this government what they think of its economic policies, they will do the same and turf out this government.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Milliken: And elect a Liberal government in its place.

Mr. Riis: There is some noise from the Liberal benches about their future. I suspect that, if we look at their future—where could we look? We could look, I suppose, at what is going on in the province of Ontario. That would be one place to look. But will set that aside, Mr. Speaker. It is not worthy of even a response, quite frankly.

• (1410)

I should clarify the point. The point is that the government's view of appropriate economic policies to develop Canada's economy are wrongly placed. That is the same mentality that now is being visited upon Third World countries. There are governments such as our own here in Canada saying to Zambia and a whole set of other countries: "We know what is best. We are the big brother. Our country may be in a shambles economically, but our ideological view of what is best ought now to be imposed upon you. You have no choice, because if you expect support, indirectly and directly, from organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, you have got to do what we are telling you to do."

Government Orders

That is not the way the world ought to operate. I do not think Canada, the United States, or anyone else has the right to impose a particular ideological view on another country. That is not what the global community ought to be made up of, the imposition of certain views by some on others. That is why we have some concern in terms of the way the International Monetary Fund is progressing.

We recognize that the purpose of this bill is to provide for an increase in Canada's International Monetary Fund subscription by \$906 million special drawing rights, about \$1.2 billion. Another purpose, under section 1, is to provide for the proposed amendment regarding the suspension of members voting and relating rights. Relating to that are sections 2, 3, 4 and 5, as you well know, Mr. Speaker.

As I say, we have grave concerns of the implications of this particular legislation. I probably do not have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that in the 1970s and 1980s the IFIs told the developing world to focus on exports to provide their balance of payments situation. Instead of growing food for internal consumption, these debtor nations grew cash crops such as coffee to finance their debt and to draw hard currency for imports. The subsequent glut on the commodity market has worsened the debt situation and left many of these nations unable to feed themselves.

In other words, they were following the dictates of countries such as our own in terms of saying: "We know what is best for you. Rather than develop sound food crops, you should be developing coffee, bananas, sugar, and so on for export." That is fine, as long as these things can be sold.

We know what it is like to be a farmer in western Canada or any place in the country now in terms of being able to compete in the international marketplace. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, what it is like to be a food producer in a developing country, without the hundreds of millions of dollars in support systems, or may I say billions of dollars, that our producers receive.

We think we are being treated unfairly. You can imagine the concerns that the people in the developing countries have at the near collapse of the GATT discussions that have just recently occurred.

I simply point out that our direction in the past has been demonstrated to be the wrong and inappropriate direction, and it has caused even further indebtedness of