

placed upon the Dominion government an obligation which has to be met from time to time, there being no promise that in the immediate future the structure as a toll bridge will pay interest on the \$19,500,000. I may say that further investigations are being carried on to ascertain why the expenditure was so great.

Mr. COOTE: Will some other opportunity be given during the session to discuss the matter, or will the Prime Minister at a later date give some further statement to the house in connection with this bridge?

Mr. BENNETT: I think—I am speaking subject to correction—that in the main estimates there is provision for this matter, which will afford an opportunity for discussion.

Mr. COOTE: Is the report of the auditors in connection with this bridge available to members of parliament?

Mr. BENNETT: It is not available to members of the house. It was made to the department and merely indicated how much money had been spent for various purposes. The investigations that have been carried on are not as to how much each portion of the structure cost but as to why it cost that much money, and that investigation has not been completed.

Mr. HEAPS: Will the Prime Minister later on give an itemized statement to show how the amount was arrived at?

Mr. BENNETT: If, as I think, the matter can be referred to by reason of there being a small item for interest in the main estimates, I shall be glad to give the hon. gentleman such information as I possess in that regard. I cannot, however, furnish the other information mentioned.

Mr. COOTE: When the investigation is completed, will the report of the investigators be available to the house?

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot answer that at the moment because part of it is being carried on by the investigators without the submission of any report. I have not myself received a report, except verbally as to a portion of the expenditure.

Mr. COOTE: I believe there is an opinion which is very general throughout the country that some public statement should be given as to the reason for the great increase in the expenditure over what it was estimated that the bridge would cost. I hope the Prime

[Mr. Bennett.]

Minister will be able to give that statement to the house when this investigation is completed.

Mr. SPENCER: Is the investigation which is taking place departmental or through a commission?

Mr. BENNETT: No commission has been appointed. Price, Waterhouse & Company made a report as to the divisions of the total cost of the structure. That is to say, they indicated how much went for steel, how much went for land, how much went for law costs, how much went for commissions, for interest during construction and matters of that kind. All that was carefully examined. The rest of it has been a departmental inquiry, and I do not think it is in the public interest to indicate further the character of the investigation carried on for the purpose of ascertaining why the structure cost \$19,500,000.

Item agreed to.

#### GOVERNOR GENERAL'S WARRANTS, 1931-32

Expenses of the Royal Commission on Transportation (governor general's warrants of December 9, 1931 and February 4, 1932), \$35,000.

Mr. GRAY: Is this the \$35,000 referred to by the Minister of Railways for expenses in connection with the commission?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. GRAY: In his speech the hon. gentleman gave the names of the commissioners, referred to the excellence of their service and commented upon the impartiality of the views they entertained. I have already made some remarks with respect to Mr. Loree and Sir Joseph Flavelle. One of the gentlemen referred to by the minister was Lord Ashfield. I wish to quote briefly from *The Statist* of London, England, of February 27, 1932, in which there appears the report of a speech made by Lord Ashfield, and I do so to show the impartiality of this particular member of the commission. Speaking with reference to the underground electric railways group, Lord Ashfield says:

The change of government which ensued upon the national crisis affected the fortunes of the London Passenger Transport bill, upon which, however, the proceedings can be resumed in the present parliament at the stage at which they were discontinued in the last parliament, if a motion to that effect is proposed by a minister of the crown and passed by the House of Commons.