

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

which are now vacant in the city of Toronto. The houses would be taken on a prime lease of between three and five years and we would, of course, offer the federal subsidy as if these were newly-produced, public housing units. This would disperse the units throughout the community and would alleviate the shortage to some degree.

I am anxious to look into the public housing interim policy as soon as possible. I mentioned in a comment in December that this matter had taken longer than I had expected, mainly because of the very definite need to consult with the provincial governments. We have all their recommendations, the last one coming in just prior to the Christmas holidays, and I am hopeful that we can put before the provinces a composite recommendation. We shall keep the hon. member's comments in mind in any changes we hope to introduce at least in the 1970 program.

*[Translation]*EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—NIGERIA—CANADIAN  
ACTION FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

**Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, on January 14th last, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) if he would address a protest to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, following his statement that the UN would not tolerate or recognize a secession in Nigeria. Furthermore, I asked on what authority he took it upon himself to make such a statement and whether he had jurisdiction to declare that present boundary lines were immutable.

Moreover, immediately after U Thant's statement, the Russians found a valid excuse to ship to Nigeria powerful guns which crushed Biafran resistance. In my opinion, when the Secretary General of the United Nations makes a pronouncement without being authorized to do so he shows irresponsibility. The African countries inherited boundaries established by former colonial powers and a number of governments object to them.

Moreover, I know that the Secretary General of the United Nations was well aware that the rebellion of Biafra was the result of a series of assassinations and the Secretary of State for External Affairs also knew that England having some economic interests to protect had only to undertake some military operations on July 6, 1967, which were only supposed to be a march designed to prevent the Shell Company from paying to the Biafrans 90 per cent of its production.

The Secretary General of the United Nations answers that Russia was also an arm supplier. It is true that Russia supplied some arms. After the events of Prague and Budapest, we have nothing to expect from that country. Since we are making a stand against the communist ideology, we should not, in my opinion, consider as normal the strange alliance between Russia, Great Britain and the United States.

When the Cameroons wanted to recognize Biafra, the American delegate, Mr. Joseph Palmer, was sent to that country to say that American aid would be cut off if the Cameroons took such a step. This only appearance of Mr. Palmer on the scene of the Nigeria-Biafra conflict was a turning point. Besides, through its secretary John Foster Dulles, that country often declares: "The United States have no friends, only interests."

In this conflict, even Pope Paul VI expressed the fear of retaliation. He is against the massacre of unarmed people. It seems to me that if the United Nations did not intervene to promote a peaceful settlement of the war, they had no right to condemn the secession of Biafra. I ask myself the following: On what authority do the United Nations or U Thant act this way? The world is so full of areas of friction and conflict that such a clear-cut attitude appears provocative.

I conclude therefore that the United Nations Secretary General is at the mercy of English and American trusts, and his attitude will lessen what little regard countries may have had for his authority. Through such gestures, the UN wants to act as a world government which would have the right of life and death over all nations, and soon it will be said that the control exercised by the UN and its Secretary General represents an economic dictatorship and that without their permission nobody will be able to live.

Mr. Speaker, if the Rockefeller Foundation, Standard Oil, Esso and the Manhattan Bank supply more assistance to Lagos University than to seven of the poorest states of the American Midwest, because there is no oil in Kansas, we have a clear proof that U Thant is the puppet of those financial tycoons who do not hesitate to destroy a nation in order to protect their interests. To let 4 million people die to keep, in collusion with the United Nations, the control of the oil reserves of a country, constitutes in my opinion a criminal act.

Mr. Speaker, when Canadians are misinformed by the C.B.C., when the parliamentary secretary to the minister falls back on