

International Relations

industrialization which is fueled by increasing amounts of energy. The World Bank estimates that the energy requirements of the developing countries will grow at a faster rate than those of developed countries. In the agricultural sector, increased productivity depends in part on supplies of petroleum-based products such as chemical fertilizers. This was a major factor in whatever success has been attributed to the Green Revolution. The transport sector, which is vital to better distribution of agricultural products and the development of industry, is still largely dependent on gasoline powered vehicles. Thus the very process of development and modernization has made the oil importing developing countries extremely vulnerable to problems of energy supply and price.

This predicament illustrates the vicious circles of development: countries, already too poor to invest adequately in human or industrial development, require both for development; their ability to invest is diminishing daily because of mounting oil bills; and aid donors often offer assistance in the form of technology and equipment which consume even greater quantities of oil.

That is the most important thing which the central institutions can decide this year.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (2050)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Gloucester has the floor.

Mr. Breau: I am happy that the government has accepted the basic thrust of parliamentary task force report. I am happy particularly that the government has accepted the position that the energy affiliate is one of the most important things that can be accomplished in the short term.

I mentioned earlier that the task force, comprising seven members of Parliament, could agree on a coherent political statement which has now been accepted in its basic thrust and orientation as government policy. I believe this augurs well for Parliament. This concept of a parliamentary task force, which was started by the Clark government when it was in power, was seeded at that time and now is being developed further, is a concept that will work well, where elected members of Parliament can really get together and negotiate their differences, whether they are party differences or philosophical differences. When that is done, the government will study the recommendations and if it accepts them, we will fulfil a role as elected parliamentarians by orienting policy which the bureaucracy will then follow. That is the way Parliament should work. It can work when there is a will to make it work.

As I said before, we should realize that the whole question of reform of parliamentary institutions sometimes has to do with the reform of attitudes. When members can get together with this kind of mandate and authority, it is good for the future of Parliament.

I want to touch briefly on a point raised by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). He made a good, eloquent speech. He explained the history of the problems encountered by most countries of Central America, particularly instances where there has been revolution. However, I have two comments to make about his speech. First, I do not think it is good enough continually to build political support for a position against the United States of America.

Miss Jewett: Who is doing that?

Mr. Breau: The United States of America is our neighbour; it is our ally. The new administration has just received a mandate. Although I disagree with that administration, I have to respect the fact that the people of the United States of America elect governments the same way as we elect governments here.

Miss Jewett: So what?

Mr. Breau: It is the same way as members of the New Democratic Party are elected here. It does not help the situation in El Salvador or in the South to have people basing their positions on some anti-American feelings. That is not good enough for the formation of foreign policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Miss Jewett: A lot of Americans are critical too. What is wrong with being critical?

Mr. Breau: Of course. But I would like to remind the spokesman on foreign affairs for the New Democratic Party that she is not in the Congress of the United States. There are people in the United States who can speak—

Miss Jewett: It is an independent country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Miss Jewett: Let him continue.

Mr. Roche: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) has exceeded his time, but with the consent of the House and with the consent of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), is it possible to put a brief question to the hon. member for Gloucester?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to extend the time allotted to the hon. member for Gloucester?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Miss Jewett: On that point, I would like the hon. member to continue his speech.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) to put a question to the hon. member for Gloucester?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in what amounts to a debate on North-South relations. I am even more delighted because at last we are having such a debate. It is high time that international development were given a thorough hearing and discussion on the floor of the House. The infrequency of foreign policy debates in this chamber is worth noting and lamenting. As the