

External Aid

already been stated by the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather), Dean MacDonald is the dean of the law school of the University of Toronto and represented Canada at the Third Committee of the United Nations. This memorandum sets out the legal background for saying that international law has developed so as to recognize the right of international intervention in cases where human rights are being violated or threatened with violation. The Prime Minister himself mentioned that the resolutions passed by the General Assembly relating to the practice of apartheid in South Africa are an illustration. Perhaps international action in the case of apartheid is futile; perhaps not much can be done about it. But this is not to say that there is no legal right to intervene. It cannot be denied that the most fundamental of human rights is the right to live, and yet this right is being taken away from hundreds of thousands of people.

The Prime Minister has stated in the house that there is no right of intervention. Maybe it is not the wise thing to do, but let him not shelter himself behind a false interpretation of the developing rules of international law, because I tell him the law is quite different. Another eminent constitutional lawyer, Dr. Edward McWhinney, said the same thing, as did Dr. John Humphrey, a distinguished Canadian who for many years served the United Nations in the field of human rights. Surely countries which have accepted without protest the arming of the combatants by various European countries cannot seriously suggest that intervention by an international body to bring about a cease-fire is an intervention which can be likened to the other dangerous form of intervention. One is international intervention and the other is national intervention. One is to bring about the end of war and the other is to fan the flames of war and enable its continuance. I find the talk about intervention nauseating. What we are calling for is international intervention for the sake of humanity and in the interest of human rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brewin: I am sorry the Prime Minister is not here now because I should like to say that I do not think he could have been serious when he compared this proposed intervention, by way of a resolution in the third committee calling for a cease-fire, to the massive armed intervention of nearly half a million troops by the United States in Viet Nam and

[Mr. Brewin.]

the extensive bombing of that unhappy country. The Prime Minister has indulged in some very extraordinary analogies, and this is one of the strangest of all. When he intervened in the debate I hoped he would take the opportunity to say that he was not serious when he spoke in this way, any more than he was when he compared the starving Biafrans to the Nazi invasion at Stalingrad. Surely this was one of the most shameful examples of—

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member suggested that the Prime Minister was not serious. I am wondering whether that is a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is a matter of debate.

Mr. Brewin: In one form or another we believe that the fatal error in this matter, which has dictated the attitude of the government of Great Britain, the government of Canada and the government of the United States so far, has been what can be called the quick kill theory. The war was to last two days, two weeks and then two months. When the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) and myself were in Biafra nearly six weeks ago we were told, to our discomfort I might say, that the war might be over in a day or two, that the final push might come then. We were a little afraid it might come when we were there, but today, six weeks later, there is no sign of this final push being any nearer. In fact, if there has been any military development in the past few weeks it has been in the direction of a military stalemate. I could present direct evidence to bear this out, but anyone who has been near that country knows that the Biafrans are determined to carry out continued resistance and they are well fitted to do so. They have keen determination, based upon a well-founded fear of extermination. The dense forest makes it a natural area for guerilla warfare. Indeed, when we propose a cease-fire we are not doing it just for the sake of the Biafrans but also for the Nigerians. I would hate to think of the unfortunate Nigerians being involved in a military occupation of the area because it would be a sad and bloody spectacle continuing probably for years.

If this quick kill theory is rejected, and we believe it should be, then the international world in the interest of humanity must seek a different solution. A cease-fire through international action and further negotiations is the only alternative. In this whole issue there is