

External Affairs

had been delivered. It is proposed to set up a new ministry of information, but that is a very harmless title for a very dangerous experiment. It would control press and public relations, and all German propaganda, including radio, television and films. It would issue a "Government press summary" which press and radio would be obliged to quote without comment or criticism; control absolutely all foreign broadcasts, and prepare laws to make newspapers and radio organizations partly subservient to the government. The drafts of these laws indicate their intention. Newspapers would be silenced for periods up to six months for "opposing constitutional order". Editors and journalists who print what is called "distorted news directed against the state" would be fined 100,000 marks, and imprisoned for two years; journalists who came under the ministry's condemnation could be barred from practising their profession for five years. These phrases smack too much of the old dictatorship and of modern Russia and her satellite countries, to be read without apprehension. The vagueness of some of them does not make them more palatable. Almost anything, for instance, can be read into "opposing constitutional order". It was indeed a nazi expression that could be interpreted to mean just what the authorities wanted it to mean. If western Germany is contemplating the muzzling of the press, and the rigid direction of publicity, she would do well to think again. Few things would more quickly raise the suspicions of the free nations, give the communists an easier excuse for another accusation of the destruction of freedom, or do the Federal German Republic more harm in the eyes of that part of the world with which it has expressed its determination henceforth to ally itself.

I mention that because, regardless of the best intentions of the democratic elements in Germany, their best intentions will be pushed aside by the very people to whom I have referred—former generals in the nazi army, members of the former German general staff and those connected with former monopolies, as well as large industrialists.

I have here an article which appeared in the *London Tribune* of March 5, 1954, under the heading "Go to War With Russia, Says German Army Chief." I do not always agree with this newspaper, but I quote it because when it makes quotations from speeches or documents those quotations are absolutely reliable. It is a very trustworthy publication to quote from, so far as the facts are concerned. The article states:

Herr Bodo Zimmerman, formerly General Zimmerman, and chief of operations to Field Marshal von Rundstedt, wants a German army. And he has a simple reason. He expects and wants a war.

Recently Herr Zimmerman was appointed official publisher to the future German armed forces with the blessing of Dr. Adenauer's shadow defence ministry. He will soon be in business publishing manuals for the German army. He is waiting only for E.D.C. to be ratified.

And these are his views recently given to a *Sunday Express* reporter and featured in an article by Milton Shulman which appeared in the early editions of last Sunday's *Express*. "As I see it," he said, "war is inevitable and the side which strikes first with all the force of atomic weapons will win. The future lies with whoever wages a preventive war.

"The tension between East and West will continue indefinitely and will be broken only by war. It would be foolish for the West to sit idly by until Russia has accumulated the strength to defeat the West by striking first. That is why the West, if it is to defeat Russia, ought to launch a preventive war, using all the atomic weapons at its disposal".

Others in Bonn have ideas about the proposed German army rather different from the rather comfortable notions propagated by Mr. Anthony Eden and Mr. Herbert Morrison in last week's debate.

Reporting from the West German capital, Sebastian Haffner, *Observer* correspondent, wrote last Sunday: "There is now a tendency in German military planning circles to regard the modest figure of 12 German divisions laid down by the E.D.C. treaty as already obsolete and to think in far larger numbers. Very moderate and responsible governmental circles talk of 12 active and 12 reserve divisions.

"There are, however, also some semi-official German military experts who speak in private of 60 German divisions, to be raised in a few years".

Will not all these hotheads be held in check by Dr. Adenauer, hailed by Churchill as the greatest German statesman since Bismarck?

Dr. Adenauer sometimes talks more tactfully today. Speaking in Hanover in December 1951 he said: "Our chief reason for wanting to enter the European army is to be able to recover our eastern territories".

I speak with some concern and agitation when we start out on the path of rearming Germany—12 divisions in western Germany and in the part controlled by the Soviets, perhaps 25 divisions. It solves nothing. We would just be reliving the history that followed two world wars. Actually we would be preparing the seeds for a third world war.

In conclusion I should like to recall an observation made by the late Field Marshal Wavell when visiting in Ottawa in 1949. Upon being questioned about the international situation he said, if I may paraphrase his remarks, that regardless of our fears of any other country or any other countries, in his opinion and as a result of his wide experience, the greatest menace to world peace in days to come would be a rearmed Germany.

I wish to express my unqualified opposition to proposals for the rearmament of Germany. I believe we would do far better to follow the advice given in Ottawa by the late Field Marshal Wavell—and when I say that, I am not speaking alone. I know I am expressing the views of many Canadians, including many Canadian veterans, who would consider it wiser to follow the advice given by the late Field Marshal Wavell than the advice we are receiving from some quarters concerning this question at the present time.

Mr. Elmore Philpott (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I want to take part in the debate chiefly to make comments on some of the remarkable statements and misstatements made by members in the opposition.