

*Government Orders*

that is something that the government has chosen not to do.

I am always saddened by the language of security and its obvious inadequacy. How many times recently have we witnessed on the national news stories about beaches being destroyed by oil spills. We wonder how we are going to clean up the beaches and save the sea birds, the fishery, maintain the scenery for the tourist potential and all those things.

In the meantime, while the very foundations of life in the sea are being threatened, navies all over the world with their submarines with sea-launch cruise missiles, destroyers, cruisers and aircraft carriers cannot do anything against what is really now threatening the planet, now threatening the human prospect, and against what is really threatening creation.

How pathetic is the human consciousness when we consider all the money and effort which is put into preparing to kill each other in such a variety of phantasmagoric ways. Yet nature itself is poised to render us extinct because we do not have the common sense to act together to defend ourselves from this common threat to human security, the environmental threat.

• (1640)

That is why we need to show more respect than this government has for the whole notion of international law for those laws which exist now, for those laws which are waiting to be ratified and for those laws which have not even been written. Only through developing that kind of global consciousness will we be able to save ourselves, if we can save ourselves. What does Canada do?

There is a convention of the International Labour Organization with respect to asbestos and the occupational health and environmental human health consequences of the use of asbestos. What does the Canadian government become noted for in international circles? Ignoring that convention. Ignoring that conclusion of the ILO.

Canadians like to pride themselves as being a bit ahead of the Americans on some of these issues. We are even at odds with the United States of America. When it comes to asbestos we have been absolutely shameful. We have been participating in campaigns of disinformation with respect to the records on asbestos and encouraging

countries to ignore the ILO Convention, encouraging countries to ignore the record with respect to asbestos in countries like Thailand, for example.

What does this do for our international reputation? What does this do for our ability in the councils of the world to argue for stronger international law? Is it just so we can selectively disobey it when it suits our purposes? I hope that is not the case and yet in so many ways that appears to be the case. Time and time again we have appeared to be willing to turn a blind eye to what is going on with respect to the environment or with respect to the record of certain governments in order to pursue the economic self interest of our country.

One is reminded of the fact that not far from here at this very time there are a number of people in the city from Iran who are on a hunger strike to call attention to the massive human rights violations which continue in Iran despite the death of Ayatollah Khomeini and the coming to power of the new Prime Minister, Rafsanjani. These people are doing their best to call attention to the fact that from the way that regime treats its own people it clearly deserves to be isolated by the international community and clearly deserves to have some action taken against it, such as a boycott of arms sales or a boycott of oil imports. Yet what did the Canadian government do? It resumed diplomatic relations with the Iranian government on the basis that it wanted to encourage the moderates. These people are the moderates. This is like the moderates that the government talks about who are in charge of El Salvador.

I have taken the opportunity in the context of this bill to say not only that we support the coming into force of these protocols and Canada's contribution to that by ratifying them as we are in the process of doing here today, but also to say that we would support the government if it moved to be much more creative and much more courageous in attempts to prevent the kinds of situations which these protocols address in attempts to create a world in which our concept of security is much broader and deeper and takes into account the environmental and social dimension.

We would support the government if it moved to incorporate those insights into its entire foreign policy which it clearly did not do when the hon. member across the way was the Minister of Defence. It brought in a white paper which, even at that time, was colder than the cold war and which now has fallen into complete and