

Bretton Woods Agreements Act

Taiwan is an example of some success; perhaps Hong Kong and perhaps South Korea. I know the Hon. Member would rather see some other types of political organization and political administrations in those locations, but, notwithstanding that, I am sure the Hon. Member would agree that all of those countries are somewhat better off than they were in 1944 when the Bretton Woods Conference was held.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I will take the Hon. Member's remarks, if I may, as asking whether I do not credit the World Bank and the IMF with improving the condition of impoverished countries. I do not consider what has happened in the majority of cases as typical. Granted, even countries such as Great Britain may get loans from the International Monetary Fund. The main operations of the IMF and the World Bank are not exhibited there or in Japan. They are exhibited in a country like the Philippines where during the 1970s, under the direction and control of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and American banks, real wages were cut in half. The price that workers would pay for rice grown by the local farmers was cut in half. Farmers were driven off their land. These problems have been with us for a long time says the Hon. Member, but that is false. The people in the Philippines were feeding themselves before the World Bank got there. The people in Jamaica were feeding themselves before the World Bank got there. The people in Ethiopia were feeding themselves before the World Bank got there. Their number one problem is the World Bank and the IMF.

Ms. Jewett: Mr. Speaker, I was just listening to my hon. friend. Would he not also agree that many of the so-called rapidly developing nations like Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore are basically within the ambit of U.S. strategic needs and doctrines? Would he not agree, at least as I read the history of the last many years, where either super power determines that it is necessary for a nation's own security in strategic terms that it will help make possible a certain kind of development, inequitable though it may be, that that seems to make the country more advanced than the way in which the Hon. Member for York East (Mr. Redway) was talking? For example, Peru is not seen by the United States as necessary for the implementation of what it feels to be its security. Therefore, Peru gets no help at all. Would the Hon. Member not agree with that?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, countries such as the Hon. Member has quoted which are not a strategic area are also areas of competition between the two super powers for influence. But one of the super powers has the World Bank at its disposal; that is to say the United States controls the World Bank. This has been demonstrated by documents from the World Bank itself, and also in documents from the American Congress which point out that 85 per cent of the decisions in the World Bank went in the direction the United States asked. This was pointed out in order to answer some extreme far right America-firsters who said that the United States should not put any money in the World Bank. The Government answered them by pointing out that the World Bank was a far more

powerful instrument of foreign policy in the economic field than any direct intervention by the American Government itself. Through the World Bank they greatly multiplied their effects, using the money contributed by Canada and other countries. The United States Government itself has admitted that the World Bank is an instrument through which it uses the poor countries for strategic purposes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate. The Hon. Member for Etobicoke-Lakeshore (Mr. Boyer) who has one minute.

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Etobicoke-Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I had just thought that I had yet another speech I could put in my file entitled "the greatest speeches I have never delivered". As I sat here listening this afternoon to the many interesting and informed comments, I was reflecting on a number of points, some salient, that I wanted to make with respect to the Bill before us. However, the hour now being five o'clock at least this day will pass without me delivering this speech.

An Hon. Member: Better luck next time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Member's Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS— MOTIONS

[English]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the House to proceed to item number 43?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1700)

THE SENATE

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE ON SENATE REFORM

Mrs. Mary Collins (Capilano) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of convening a constitutional conference to explore means of reforming the Senate of Canada in order to ensure that representative, responsible, and democratically-elected institutions have sufficient primacy in Canada to allow them to fulfill the mandate they were elected to implement.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to speak on my first Private Member's motion, the subject matter of which has been the centre of controversy over recent weeks. In the time available today I should like to talk a little about why we are having this debate, about the history and significance of the bicameral system of government under which we operate in Canada, about the need for reform of the Senate, about some of the options which have