

which, frankly, one can drive a train-load of toxic chemicals. It needs desperately to be improved.

First, it does not include clear-cut public enforcement mechanisms. It is not possible under this legislation, for example, for groups to sue the Government over environmental problems which develop. It is not possible for groups to play a public role in the setting of environmental standards. It misses the notion of an environmental bill of rights which could include such important things as the right to judicial review of administrative action, the right to broad access to information, and the onus being on the proponent of an activity to justify an action which may harm the environment. The legislation is extremely vague on what will be done with respect to the Minister's activities. He is given tremendous powers, but none of them are outlined or specified.

Finally, with respect to the emergency powers which are so often crucial in an environmental crisis such as we had on two or three occasions since this Parliament began in 1984, the Minister has to consult with the provinces prior to emergency action being taken. That is surely a ridiculous approach.

In conclusion, let me just say that we urgently need a new philosophy concerning the environment. We need fairness, equality and honesty in our approach to this and other problems. We put this to the Government and urge it to move as quickly as possible to try to remedy this Bill and, we hope, do much better with what comes out of the committee hearings.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It being two o'clock, the House will now to proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

● (1400)

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS--MOTIONS

[English]

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

SUGGESTED ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES WITH DECREASED MILITARY BUDGETS

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in the interest of Canadian security and world peace, the government should consider the advisability of transferring, on an annual basis, 1 per cent of its defence budget to Official Development Assistance, over and above the present expenditure, which would be made available only to those countries which decreased their military budgets by at least 1 per cent on an annual basis.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to debate my motion which, in the interest of Canadian security and world peace, urges the Canadian Government to transfer one per cent of its defence budget to development assistance. The 1987-88 Estimates list our defence budget at \$10,340 million. One per cent of that would be \$103 million. My motion says

Development Assistance

that this money would be made available only to developing countries which had also cut their own military expenditures by one per cent.

The motion, therefore, requires a decrease in military spending both in Canada and in developing countries. I am sure that all Members in this House are aware of the link between military spending and underdevelopment in our world. The most dramatic statement of that link for me came in the spring of 1986 when an Ethiopian Cabinet Minister told me and some other Members of this House that if it were not for military spending Ethiopia could have fed itself during the 1984 famine.

The Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade, in its study last spring and fall of official development assistance, and in its final report *For Whose Benefit?* notes this link. I would like to quote from it on human rights and militarization as follows:

It is alarming when Third World countries spend more on the military than on basic needs such as health, education and other social services. Some of the African countries most at risk from famine—Ethiopia, Sudan, Angola, Mozambique—are also countries torn apart by internal violence. In 1984, the value of arms imports to Africa exceeded that of grain imports. In Central America, too, armed conflicts have devastated local economies and caused untold human suffering. Under these circumstances, programming long-term development aid is very difficult.

Moreover, while high levels of military spending may sometimes be justified as necessary self-defence against aggression, all such cases should be examined critically in regard to continued eligibility for ODA (official development assistance).

The report emphasizes the following:

Our aid should not allow any government to spend more on arms and less on basic needs than it otherwise would. In keeping with our own priorities and values, Canada should ask questions and expect answers in the case of recipient countries whose governments' budget allocations put more emphasis on the military than on programs of social and economic welfare.

More generally, because the issue of disarmament and development is a critical one that ultimately affects us all, the Committee urges Canada to take a leadership role in discussions of this subject in multilateral forums.

Canada should also work with others to control the traffic in arms destined for developing countries.

The approach taken by the committee to this link is basically the desire to use development assistance as some kind of sanction. When there is too much emphasis on military spending in developing countries we should be very careful about the kind of development assistance that we give. I endorse that point of view, but I think it would also help if we took a positive approach, if we used the carrot as well as the stick. That is what my motion attempts to do.

Doug Roche, our Ambassador for Disarmament, quoted former United States President Eisenhower who said:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies in a final sense a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, from those who are cold and are not clothed.

Today world expenditures on armaments equal \$1 trillion or \$1,000 billion. That \$1 trillion is directly related to the death every day of 40,000 children from hunger or hunger-related