

is already revised upwards from \$500,000,000, as estimated by the Minister of Finance on February 19, and is subject to further upward revision. The actual war expenditure for 1915-1916 was \$166,000,000.

I could perhaps continue with some further details. The actual cash disbursements for the first eight months of the war are more than double those in the last war. Some of the factors increasing Canada's war costs are the following: (1) No air force, no air training in the last war. (2) Increased naval expenditures: the estimate for 1940-1941 is more than thirty times the actual expenditure for 1915-1916, and more than three times the whole naval expenditure in the last war. (3) The cost per man of maintaining an army division has almost doubled since the last war.

Conditions have changed since 1914. There is now no United States borrowing, because of neutrality legislation. There is no United Kingdom borrowing. Instead, Canada is repaying the United Kingdom loan to provide Canadian dollars for British purchases in this country.

Now I revert to the remarks of my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen), who vehemently condemned the dissolution of Parliament in January and the appeal to the people by the Government. He knew full well that the session beginning in January was to be followed by an election. The Prime Minister had announced that. And the Prime Minister stated, just before or at the time of dissolution, that he would have dissolved the House the day after the Ontario Legislature passed a condemnatory resolution, if he had not promised Hon. Dr. Manion that there would be no dissolution before Parliament met.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not his promise at all. I have it right here, and shall read it to my honourable friend:

As to the question of a general election before another session, my honourable friend has been kind enough to say that I told him some time ago I would not think of anything of the kind or countenance it.

We had a session, had we?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: If my right honourable friend will allow me to add an explanation, he will understand why that statement was made. It was made because Hon. Dr. Manion was afraid there would be dissolution before he had time to visit Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I speak whereof I know, for I was in daily contact with the Government and the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister had promised Dr. Manion

that there should be no surprise dissolution, that there should be no dissolution before the House met. The House met—

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He did not say "before the House met."

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: No, but I am explaining that the reason for his statement was a conversation with Dr. Manion, wherein Dr. Manion said he was desirous of co-operating, but did not want to be taken by surprise, and asked whether he could be assured there should be no dissolution. And the Prime Minister said there should be no dissolution before a session. Then, a session having been called, and there having been no dissolution in the meantime, the Prime Minister's promise had been fulfilled. He then arranged for immediate dissolution. Hon. Dr. Manion was thereby given two extra months, from that time up to the 26th of March, to carry on his campaign throughout the country.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Surely the honourable gentleman does not think the rights of this House depend upon some private conversation between the Prime Minister and Dr. Manion. We have the word of the Prime Minister of Canada in Hansard, and that word he broke.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have told of the statement that was made between man and man. My right honourable friend says we had the word of the Prime Minister. But what harm did the Prime Minister do to the Senate of Canada, or to my right honourable friend?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He did more harm to himself, I admit. He broke his word to the House.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It was not a word given to the Senate.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It was a promise to the country.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My right honourable friend has a right to say, "As a member of Parliament I was called here, and shortly after the Speech from the Throne was delivered immediate dissolution was announced." He has a right to ask, "Why did you bring me here to listen to the Governor General, and then dissolve?" Well, it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister to do so, and he did so for a very good reason, a paramount reason.

Hon. Mr. HOWARD: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He had nothing better than a poor excuse.