

NATO—European Defence Community

East, world students have consistently told us to keep an eye on western Europe, particularly Germany. That being so, Mr. Speaker, any decision which involves Canada in obligations or guarantees towards Germany is a decision which ought not to be made hastily, and certainly not without the fullest possible measure of inquiry into every detail of our undertaking as well as into all the implications of that undertaking.

I feel sure the minister must know that neither the timing of his resolution nor the form in which it is presented before us now permits of the thorough investigation and discussion by members of parliament which such a gravely important document requires. One is led to ask, of course, why the protocol was not referred to the external affairs committee. I realize that it has not been in existence very long, but I believe it has been in existence long enough to allow it to have been presented to that committee for thorough discussion and investigation. I believe that one could be excused for asking why, at the present time, there is no opportunity to consider the protocol in the committee of the whole, where by a process of question and answer the members of the house could ascertain just what we are doing and at the same time let the people of Canada know exactly the type of contract to which we are binding them.

The form of the resolution which places the protocol before the house today does not permit of that kind of discussion. I think it is a pity. I am asking in all seriousness why it was not introduced in a different form. Surely, that could have been done. We would at least have had the satisfaction, when we had completed the discussion, of feeling that we had found out all that there was to be found out in the course of our questions and answers. Only then would we be in possession of sufficient knowledge to enable us to make a choice as to whether or not we would commit Canada to the protocol.

The minister says that he believes, dangerous as the situation may be after we have committed ourselves to the protocol, that under the circumstances it is the best preventive of war. The minister, of course, is in possession of a lot more information than are the members of the house. He has the advantage of advisers who doubtless are ready to advise him on that particular score, but we in the house are not in the possession of these things. It seems to me that before we do commit ourselves to such a proposition as the protocol we ought to know a great deal more about it.

Much has been said today, Mr. Speaker, about the rearmament of Germany. I want to say a word on that topic. To my mind

the rearmament of Germany is fraught with the gravest possible consequences to the whole world. Under the present circumstances it may be necessary to rearm the German people if we are to prevent war with the Soviet bloc. On the surface, it does appear to be so, but what will be the long-range result of rearming the German people? That is a question to which I think we ought to give the most careful consideration.

I have always felt that the defeat of German arms in world war II did not put an end to that country's ambitions, and consequently Germany will try it again. Of that I am sincerely convinced, and particularly if the western powers continue to insist upon terms in peace treaties which impose upon Germany such things as trade restrictions and the gold standards which are involved in the most-favoured-nation trade clauses and in Bretton Woods. I think everyone who has read anything at all during the past few months must have come to the conclusion that Germany has made a most remarkable recovery since the end of the war. I know that when I travelled in Germany in 1948, even that soon after the close of the war, there was evidence everywhere of recovery. Labour was at peace. There were no strikes. The people had an inclination to get down to hard work without complaints. Everywhere there was determination to bring Germany back just as quickly as possible to a position of strength.

Down through the Ruhr valley, where a few months before those seas of smoke stacks had been without smoke, in 1948 they were belching smoke and the whole area was a hive of activity. In recent months there have been reports in various publications, notably a February issue of *Life* magazine, containing the whole story of the remarkable recovery of Germany. These publications have carried detailed stories about what has been happening in Germany. I want to say right here, Mr. Speaker, that these reports have filled me with foreboding, because as soon as Germany brings herself back to a position of real strength in her industrial capacity, such as she had during the war, then the rest of the world has to begin to fear, particularly under the type of trading arrangements that we have been following in the past few decades. In one way I am glad to see Germany coming back and making the remarkable recovery that she is making. But, Mr. Speaker, it looks to me as though the recovery of Germany is going to complicate matters now. I say that with sincerity, and I believe the minister realizes that it is so.

It does seem insane for us to take a position of restriction in trade treaties and in such things as Bretton Woods, and to be imposing these things upon a conquered