

sure that Alberta is not in as good a position as any province. The reason is that the Government of Alberta killed or slaughtered the credit of that province. If they could not borrow, they could not spend; therefore their cash position may now be the best of any. If something similar happened this Government, our position in a few years would be better, not worse. I am not giving credit to the Aberhart administration for what they did. I cannot think of anything more stupid. But it had this effect: it paralysed their borrowing power and made them live more economically. It is true that they put on more taxes. If they would keep their taxes down and reduce their Government charges, Alberta would be the most prosperous province in this Dominion. That I say only by way of illustration.

I come now to another subject. I shall not have much to say about it, for I have talked about it in years gone by and have nothing new to add. The Speech from the Throne refers to the necessity of increasing our defences. Two or three of its paragraphs are very manifestly directed to the conciliation of those elements of our population who are against war expenditure of any kind. The Government have been convinced by the developments of recent months—and likely the process of convincing them has been going on since long before—that more must be done in the way of defence expenditure and preparation than we have been doing in the past. I am in accord with that view. Undoubtedly we have to do more, and undoubtedly this expenditure—an expenditure which employs—cannot be avoided. I shall offer no resistance to the plans of the Government in this regard, but shall welcome them. However, from reading the Speech from the Throne one would think that if we just spent five millions more here and five millions more there in the way of defence, or maybe ten or twenty millions more, we should be safe in this little home of ours; that as we were taking care of the situation, we could look after ourselves, bid defiance to the world, and sleep at night. The Government do not believe that for a minute.

Hon Mr. DANDURAND: They do not say that.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but that is implied. There is not a reference to co-operation. There always was in days gone by. Up to five years ago, in any reference to defence, the principle of co-operation with real defence was the feature emphasized. But this Government do not emphasize it. Why? Why all this hypocrisy? Why all this pre-

Rt. Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

tence that we are going to look after our own defence? The leader of the Government knows we never did so and never can.

An Hon. SENATOR: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no such thing as a separate defence of our country. I ask again, why all the hypocrisy? We have to do our part, it is true—

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Why does the right honourable gentleman speak of hypocrisy when he approves of the expenditure that is going on?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly I approve of expenditure to strengthen our defences; but only to the extent that the money is used in a policy directed towards co-operation with the real defence of this country is the expenditure justified. Therefore there should be reference to that co-operation. When the hour of trial comes we cannot defend ourselves. We never did and never dreamed that we could. Why can we not say we are working in co-operation with that great country which has been our defence all through the life of this Dominion of ours?

I know why the Government do not say it. They know it; everyone, I think, knows it. Did we not have the Prime Minister last September issuing a statement telling of the terrible anxiety and the terrible toil through which he had passed, and the immense amount of work he and his officials had done during the crisis of that month? I can realize that he went through days of anxiety. I do not know what days of toil he could have gone through that necessitated three weeks of recuperation in the Caribbean. If there was toil, let us know what decisions were arrived at. What was the harvest of that toil? Tell us what the Government decided to do. Did the work consist merely of decoding cablegrams from England? If it did not, there must have been products of the toil and the deliberations that almost wrecked the Prime Minister. Let us know what those products were.

I said I could understand the anxiety. Why was there anxiety? Nobody was threatening war on Canada. Then why the anxiety? The anxiety was felt because the Prime Minister knew, the leader of the Government in this House knew, every member of the Government knew, that a peril to the power of England was a peril to us. They knew there was peril in the whole atmosphere of Europe, and the peril to Britain's power was a peril to the security of Canada. I do not wonder that the Prime Minister was worried,