

International Relations

We cannot think of El Salvador, or any other Third World country, and the wrenching agony under which they are living, and leave our emotions behind. Nor can we leave our reason behind. We must approach this issue with some kind of understanding. We must demand some kind of commitment from those governments which will honour the values which are important to us, that is, human values.

The second point I wish to raise in the few minutes which I have left to me is the following. We have been speaking in circuitous terms of the new world economic order. But there is another new world order on which UNESCO is working, and that is a new world information order. Mr. Speaker, that is even more terrifying than the new world economic order, since the new world information order is based upon the recommendations of the McBride commission which worked mostly with Third World and eastern bloc countries. That commission has come out with recommendations which have the effect of calling for information agencies in each of the countries of the world. That in itself appears innocuous until it is realized that these information agencies will be the conduit, the funnel, through which all news agencies in each country will receive its news. As one newsman described the situation to me today if the news agency provides a piece of information, for example regarding a UNESCO report, to a reporter, or to UPI, that information must be accepted *holus bolus*. If that reporter wants to phone back to UNESCO headquarters or to another country to obtain more information, or contrary information, that is not allowed.

I come back to where I started, Mr. Speaker. It does not matter if it is the right or the left, both are attracted to the new world information order. Once information is controlled by an information agency in any country of the world, democracy is doomed. Freedom rests on information. If it is a rightist regime, as exists in Panama, or if it is a leftist regime, as exists in Allende's Chile, it makes no difference. They both have the same goal—controlling information so that power can be consolidated.

The journalist with whom I spoke today told me of a friend of his in Panama who wished to attend a radio broadcasters' conference. He called to inform a friend that he could not attend the conference because the police, the military, had come to his studio and smashed his equipment. They put him on the first plane leaving the country, the destination was of no consequence. At the same time the journalist told me of a friend of his who owns a chain of radio stations in Chile. During the days of Allende's regime he gave a radio editorial which mildly criticized Allende. He drove home at seven o'clock that night. On the street in front of his house he saw jeeps, military vehicles, machine guns in place in the yard with soldiers camped there. They were there for 30 days. Did that owner of the radio station tone down his criticism of Allende? I think he did.

● (2150)

The Leader of the New Democratic Party said that terrorism is everywhere. If we allow the recommendations—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please, I am sorry, but I have to interrupt the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant).

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I must admit I was a little surprised by the self-righteousness and phony piety expressed by the last speaker. He is obviously a little sensitive at having his "right-wingedness" thrown in his face. This comes from a member of a party which, for the last week, has heckled the leader of my party simply because while on a mission of some importance, a mission which we are debating today, he happened to stop in Cuba. I might point out to members of the party to my right that Cuba is one of the major players in that region.

Mr. Gamble: You are right.

Mr. Sargeant: In opening my comments tonight, Mr. Speaker, I had planned to say that I am pleased to participate in this debate, but after spending most of yesterday preparing a speech that I was not able to give last night, and after spending the better part of today revising that speech and only having about eight or nine minutes available, I am a little disappointed. But as my friend, the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) suggested, perhaps I should save the speech and if I am fortunate enough to stay in this game, in another ten years we might have another opportunity to debate external affairs in this House.

Mr. Gamble: The speech will be the same ten years from now.

Mr. Sargeant: Unfortunately, if members of the party to my right, or even the government opposite, is still ruling, I am afraid I will need the same kind of speech.

Mr. Breau: You won't be here.

Mr. Sargeant: Don't bet on it. I had planned to expand my comments to deal with the arms race, disarmament, and how these methods affect the Third World. I had planned to discuss the absurdity of a world that would spend \$600 million on weapons of war while 1 billion or more people starve or do not have an adequate standard of living.

I wanted to expand on the ludicrous situation in which we find ourselves where the major powers maintain the capability of destroying the world some 14 or 15 times over, yet they want to add more nuclear weapons—to be able to destroy the world more than 14 or 15 times over. Surely once is too often. Unfortunately, in the few minutes remaining to me, I cannot get into that question.

Let me direct a few comments to how the arms race affects the Third World and perhaps a few comments to the way that Canada is part of that game, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) in his comments earlier this evening.

I was struck by the comments of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday when he expressed concern for the 800 million or so citizens of this earth who barely manage to stay