

Oh, this is characteristic:

—"that there was so much as a suggestion of any plan for the general training of British pilots in Canada."

What kind of training was it to be? But listen to this sentence:

"Partnership in the Empire was never mentioned," said Mr. King.

How amazing! Before he would know, I suppose, that we were partners in the Empire, it would have to be mentioned! Why that is inserted passes my comprehension. But listen further:

"I pointed out to the British High Commissioner that, apart from any possible controversy which might arise, for the Government of the United Kingdom to own, maintain, control and direct any air training establishment in Canada would involve certain questions of jurisdiction and administration.

"I explained that our position in the British Commonwealth demanded that all military establishments in Canada should be under control of the Canadian Government. With that stand I believe all true Canadians will agree."

Now I proceed to discuss the effect of all that I have quoted. The replies given to me in this Chamber are, I believe, not ultimately attributable to the leader of the Senate (Hon. Mr. Dandurand). They were given, I doubt not, at the direction of the Prime Minister of Canada. Obviously they should have been so given, because he is head of the department that has to do with this subject. Furthermore, on July 1, 1938, referring to the questions which had been asked here and the replies given, he confirmed the accuracy of those replies by saying he did not want to add anything at all to them. Therefore he is responsible.

Now, where does this place him? In May he was approached by the British Minister in Canada and asked what would be our attitude towards a wish of the British Government to establish air training facilities in this Dominion. I ask the honourable leader of the Government who sits in front of me: Does he think the Prime Minister of Canada gave us an honest answer when he told us no request had been made? Does he?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It was not in the form of a request.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the distinction between a request and what the British Government did? I will tell you the distinction. In what they did they took care that no difference should arise between them and this country. That care they always take. Even at the price of flattery and extreme courtesy they will always take care to have no difference with Canada. If they had made a formal request and received a negative answer, there would have arisen a difference

between them and this country, which might have been harmful to the Empire. No; their request takes another form. They inquire what our attitude would be, and say they would like to do certain things. We say, "No, you cannot." And the Government of Canada tells Parliament that no request at all was made. I ask, can we trust the Government of Canada again?

Never was there a more direct request. Yet, not only was Parliament informed that no request at all had been made, but when I followed the matter up I was told by the Prime Minister of Canada, through the honourable leader of this House, that it was none of the business of the Senate or Parliament what the Government's attitude was toward the British inquiry. We were told that policies going to the very root of our right to live can be determined by the Government and concealed from Parliament, and that conversations entered into for the purpose of finding out what we are ready to do are none of our business. We were told that by the Government which is in office to-day, the Government which is conducting this war. This is the Government which tells us it is in consultation with the British Government, and wants us to infer that it is doing what the British Government wants. This is the Government upon which, in the blackest hour we have ever faced, we are asked to depend. When I asked whom those conversations were with, I was told that the information could not be given. In Germany it is the custom to decide upon policies, no matter how vital they may be, without the knowledge of parliament and behind its back. Is that to be the case in Canada?

Now, what are the consequences of the refusal to give this information? The first consequence is to destroy trust in the Government of this country. No longer can we rely on its answers with respect to subjects the most vital to Parliament.

The next consequence is this: two years' delay in the provision of the most vital arm that is going to save the Allies and ourselves. In the name of the sovereignty of Canada! "Ah," we are told, "all they wanted were just a few men." I do not know how many they wanted, nor on how large a scale they desired to train, but I know the nature and the reasonableness of the request, and I know that the living up to the opportunity, if it had been given, would have been, or would have become, commensurate with the peril. But the gates of Canada were locked to our partner who desired to help in the defence of this country, as of their own, in the air. What a record! Who in this Dominion cares whether British officials or our own train our