

*External Aid*

Incidentally, this is not the first time that England refuses a people the right to self-determination.

Mr. Arnold Smith, secretary general of the commonwealth, said very clearly to the committee, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch), that:

The economic advantages to be derived from seizing the fabulous oil fields discovered recently play a very great part in domestic conflicts and, externally, in the interests of the various governments. They constitute important factors. I would not say that these are dominant factors, for I do not believe in the predominance of external factors. But they are very important.

Further on, he adds:

In my opinion, however, as far as conditions are concerned, the advantages represented by these oil fields greatly influence negotiations.

Later, Mr. William McNeill, of the Canadian University Overseas Service, voiced the following opinion:

As I understood it, the oil industry was, to a great extent, controlled by British Petroleum and by Shell, most of whose shares were owned by the British government.

I have here the evidence of Mr. André de Bloney, secretary general of the Interparliamentary Union, who wrote, in his report to the 56th conference in Lima:

However, although he could on several occasions have given up his stand and rallied the federation, the Biafran leader did not give in. At the beginning of July 1967, General Gowon took a decision of great importance, that of reducing dissidence by force, by provisionally detaching from Nigeria the oil-rich part of the territory.

Were foreign interests thus led to influence the course of events? Naturally, that is impossible to know, but the right to oil dues was to be an added cause of conflict between the two parties and the concessionary companies.

A little further on, Mr. De Bloney adds:

In order to carry on a fight which continued, both sides had to seek from the outside the arms they needed. The Lagos government looked to Great Britain first and the shipments authorized in its favour due to their size, prompted some criticisms in the British capital. As far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, it also granted its support to the federal government.

As to Biafra, it tried to get some money for its oil resources in order to obtain not only military equipment but also the assistance of mercenaries who might lend a helping hand in a fight which, month after month, became more and more difficult.

At the same interparliamentary conference in Lima, a Swiss representative (Mr. Renschler) stated:

Economic and political interests are behind that mortal aid. Without the military help of Great [Mr. Laprise.]

Britain, the Soviet Union and a few other countries, the Lagos military government would never have been able to wage a war against the Ibos.

As far as Biafra is concerned, things are hardly better. France and Portugal support secession, also for selfish motives. By supporting Biafra, they hope to get some interests in the oil resources of the Delta of the Niger. It is urgent that no arms be sent to either side; the protection of economic and political interests, through the supplying of arms, is a form of neo-colonialism.

This confirms the general idea that if foreign countries had not interfered and encouraged slaughter by shipping them weapons, this massacre would not go down in history.

What are the causes of the war? The Ibos—and not the rebels as the right hon. Prime Minister and several members call them—have been mistreated and butchered. It was reported that Nigerians threatened to throw the Ibos into the sea, to crush them, to keep them in their own place and never let them reconquer again the economic and political supremacy they had acquired through their work and skill. Not feeling accepted any longer in the federation and unwilling to remain slaves, these people decided to recover their security and to ensure their economic development through other channels, since they believe they can do it on their own, owing to their skill, intelligence and desire to progress and develop.

And now, Mr. Speaker, not only do the other Nigerian peoples, but also the foreigners, disallow them this right, thus practising a new form of neo-colonialism.

At the United Nations, at the commonwealth meetings or at the Interparliamentary Union conferences, resolutions are passed, basic principles recognizing the right of the peoples to self-government are agreed upon, but when it comes to applying such resolutions and principles, things are different and everyone gives a different interpretation, according to his own interests, and Canada is no exception.

On the border of Rhodesia and Southwest Africa are located the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique. Portugal suggests that these are not colonies but provinces across the sea. This proposition is rejected by the majority of world states, including Canada, who feel that the inhabitants of these territories should be free to decide their own future. But what goes for Angola and Mozambique no longer goes for the Ibos.

Canada should follow a more coherent policy in its stands in the field of external affairs. What proposal should Canada make