EMMERSON'S NEW BRUNSWICK FIRST

an Overwhelming Majority of the Members of the Legislative Assembly--Complete Collapse of Bridge Charges--They Had Been Made as an Election Dodge in the Provincial Contest and in the Interest of Upper Province Concerns.

The Charges Revived With the Hope That They Might Cut Some Figure in the Coming Dominion Campaign--The Opposition Built Entirely Upon Misrepresentation, Falsehood and Slander.

How the Truth Had to Be Dragged From a Prejudiced Witness---Positive Evidence that New Brunswick Made Bridges Are Superior to and Cost Less Than Those Made In Quebec or Ontario.

report from the committee appointed to investigate the bridge charges, also the evidence taken by the committee.

The evidence occupied 889 pages of type-

sembly of New Brunswick: "The committeee appointed to investigate certain charges preferred by Mr. Hazen, a member of the assembly, against the Honorable Henry R. Emmerson begs

to submit the following report: "Your committeee held its first meeting on the 13th day of March last past. On this day and subsequently subpoenas were issued at the request of Mr. Hazen to the following persons: A. R. Wetmore, T. B. Winslow, George F. Swain, R. Maitland Roy, Joshua Peters, Alfred E. Peters. John Stewart, Alfred Haines, Martin Murphy, Peter S. Archibald, A. G. Beckwith, Wilar Kitchen, W. B. MacKenzie, Phelps Johnson and William E. Brown. The names of the witnesses who were called and gave evidence on behalf of Mr.

Hazen will be found stated below. "Although Mr. Archibald and Mr. Haines were both present and remained in attendance for several days neither was called. "Mr. Ruddock, being compelled to be absent through sickness before the close

of Mr. Hazen's case, was subsequently called by Mr. Emmerson's counsel. Mr. Haines having attended under the subpoena issued at the request of Mr. Hazen. and not having been called, retured, as was stated, to the work on which he was engaged of inspecting the erection of the Kingston bridge and which urgently re-

quired his personal attention. "Mr. Phelps Johnson, the manager of the Dominion Bridge Company (Ltd.), of Montreal, attended the committee in response to a subpoena issued at the instance of Mr. Hazen, and was sworn, but on it appearing that he had not produced contracts for the construction of highway bridges by his company in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, which he had been required to produce, and which, as it appeared to the committee, would be very important and absolutely essential to enable your committee to ascertain the average charges made by that company for stee lbridges, but had only brought with him certain contracts which he had selected, your committee acceded to the application of the counsel for Mr. Emmerson and decided not to take Mr. Johnson's testimony until he was given further opportunity of producing the contracts required. In his connection it may be observed that Mr. Emmerson's counsel and your committeee offered to pay all Mr. Johnson's expenses to and from Montreal. committee that he would return to Montreal and would on the following Tuesday or Wednesday telegraph the chairman of the committee whether or not he would comply with the subpoena which had been served upon him to produce the said contracts. This he did not do, but subsequently Mr. Hazen informed the committee

gentleman stating that he Did No Intend to Return.

Consequently your committee, much to their regret, were deprived of the benefit forded by the production of the contracts, from two to three times greater. particularly if they had been accompanied by plans and specifications in enabling the portance cannot be attached to the advantcommittee to determine what prices had age of a thorough inspection of the bridges, been paid to his company in its home both during construction at the works and market, where fair and normal prices would likely be paid, during the years when the New Brunswick bridges in respect to which the charges were made were constructed, and in the pears imme-

diately preceding. "As Mr. Johnson had also been subpoenaed to produce the contracts and spection could not be had at the works, specifications for railway bridges constructed by his company during those years their production would have had an important bearing on that portion of the charge which complains of the fact that the highway bridges constructed by New Brunswick government cost as much as double the price per pound of railway that the highway bridges constructed by the

bridges. "Your committee also regret that Mr. Hazen's counsel saw fit fit not to give the committee the benefit of Mr. Archibald's experience and knowledge on the subject. Mr. Archibald had been for many years and down to quite a recent period, chief engineer of the Intercolonial Railway and in that capacity would necessarily have an intimate knowledge of the prices paid for were: railway bridges constructed for the Interhis evidence would have been important. Bridge Company, \$11,400. The committee may reasonably assume that "For the Sussex bridge the tender was:

In the Legislative Assembly, Saturday, way have to helped to sustain the charges April 7th, Chairman Carvell submitted the he would have been called on Mr. Hazen's he would have been called on Mr. Hazen's | were: have a right to assume, that if Mr. Archi- adian Bridge Company, \$4,113. briges, and that, by reson of the cost of mated weights which are as follows: estly wise discretion, not to place Mr. Archi- completed rady for traffic as follows: bald upon the stand.

Witnesses Called by Mr. Hazen.

"The witneses who actually testified on Mr. Hazen's behalf were Mr. A. R. Wet- per pound. public works of the province, Prof. George F. Swain, of Boston, Mr. R. Maitland Roy, engineer of the Hamilton Bridge Company, of Hamilton, Mr. T. B. Winslow, secretary of the public works department, Mr. William E. Brown, who has had experience in erecting bridges for the Dominion Bridge Company and others, Mr. Willard Kitchen, a contractor, and Mr. A. E. Peters, president of the Record Foundry and Machine

"The evidence of these witnesses will be that i in their opinion it absolutely failed but on the contrary clearly established that the prices paid were only fair and reasonable and such as were necessary to afford the usual and customary profits of a manu- the cost of material and of the shop labor.

dence your committeee were of the opinion | that Mr. Emmerson was not called on to these three bridges, delivered at Moncton to mak any defence. His counsel did, however, be 6% cents per pound. At this time the call the following witnesses, namely: Mr. J. M. Ruddock, of Chatham, who is engaged kinds, boilers and steamboats, and also steel was remedied and after workmen became bridges; Mr. Lockhart and Mr. Sefton, who are and have been for many years employed on bridge construction upon the Intercolonial railway; Mr. W. H. Arnold, of New York, an engineer of large experience, and

What the Evidence Showed.

"Without going particularly into the evi

to say that they established beyond a doubt constructed by the New Brunswick government under the very elaborate and carefully prepared plans of Mr. Wetmore, the chief engineer of the department, are much been erected by Upper Canadian companies, notably the Hampton, Sussex, and 'Salisbury bridges. The evidence of three entirely disinterested and experienced wit-Mr. Johnson accordingly stated to the nesses, Messrs. Lockhart, Sefton and Arnold, who had examined the Lefebvre and Campbell bridges, constructed by the Record bor bridges, which completes the list down Foundry and Machine Company, and also to the close of 1898, of the bridges conthe Hampton, Sussex and Salisbury bridges, structed by this company. Mr. Emmerson, ity of the former, and from their evidence your committee are satisfied that the two that he had received a letter from that former bridges will endure longer and re- order, they should be able to do the work quire less expenditure for repairs than the

these witnesses is the fact that the work- undertake the erection of the bridges, and manship on some parts of the Campbell and finally the contract was given to Mr. A. E. Lefebvre bridges, notably the truss posts, Peters at 6½ cents per pound, which was of any evidence which Mr. Johnson might would cost from 10 to 12 times as much as to cover construction of the bridges, freights, give, and of the undoubtedly valuable in- on the Hampton and Sussex bridges, while as erection, painting, laying the floor, and in formation which would have been af- a whole the cost of workmanship would be fact everything but the lumber. It will

"Your committee feel that too much imat the site during erection. This alone will ensure thorough and guarantee to the people full value for the money expended: by having the work done in New Brunswick this inspection can be had, while in the case of the great majority of the bridges they being comparatively small structures, if the work was done outside the province, inexcept at a much larger expense.

"Your committee deem it well to refer to the conditions under which the government inaugurated the policy of having steel bridges constructed within the province.

Tenders Compared.

"Attention has been particularly called to bor, (constructed under contract with the the Hampton, Sussex and Salisbury bridges, government for 61/2 cents per pound) comand as different Upper Canadian firms ten- | pleted, erected and painted and ready for dered upon these bridges, and it appears traffic the government finding the lumber. from the evidence of Mr. Emmerson that he Total cost (including erection) \$52,320.97. carefully considered the tenders, and contract prices of these bridges before adopt-1 ing the policy which is now the subject of attack, reference may, in the opinion of your committee, properly be made to these. "For the Hampton bridge the tenders

"Central Bridge Works, Peterborough, paid for the first three bridges constructed colonial Railway during the years when the W. H. Law, proprietor, amount \$13,587; Do- by the day. This is accounted for by the New Brunswick bridges were erected, and minion Bridge Company, \$12,000; Canadian introduction of a complete bridge plant, and

"Hampton bridge:

"Canadian Bridge Company, 7 3-10 cents

"Dominion Bridge Company, 6 4-10 cents

"Salisbury bridge: "Dominion Bridge Company, 5 2-10 cents

ly: The Cusack, Elgin and Douglastown to prove the charges made by Mr. Hazen, bridges, by the day, for actual cost adding count, as the evidence shows, was kept of

building machinery, and the cost would no in the building of machinery of various doubt be somewhat greater than after this

for three small bridges, namely: The Grand Manan, Dingee, and Saunders Brook bridges. pound less than the actual cost of the three

The next bridges constructed by the Recthe Petitcodiac and Port Elgin bridges, built in 1895 for Mr. Willard Kitchen, and for which he paid the company at the same rate of 61/2 cents per pound.

"Next in order in bridge construction bell, Lefebvre, Blackville, Nepsiquit and Taly equipped plant which the company had occheaper. He also urged that they should undertake to erect the bridges as well for a stated figure. The company declined to thus be seen that there has been a gradual reduction in price of the bridges constructed at the Record Foundry and Machine Company's works.

"The bridges and cost are as follows: "First series-Cusack, Elgin, Douglastown, built by the day and charged for at actual cost, 6% cents per pound, delivered at Moneton. Total cost (exclusive of erection) \$13,631.22.

Second series-Grand Manan, Dingee Stream, Saunders Brook, (constructed un-(der contract at 61/2 cents per pound) klelivered at Moncton. Total cost (exclusive of erection) \$1,676.45. "Third series-Petitcodiac, Port Elgin,

(constructed for Willard Kitchen under contract at 61/2 cents per pound) delivered at Moncton. Total cost (exclusive of erection) "Fourth series-To the close of 1898, Campbell, Lefebvre, Blackville, Nepsisquit, Ta-

New Brunswick Bridges the Cheapest.

"It will thus be seen that by far the larger portion of the amount paid for the bridges constructed at the Record Foundry and Machine Works has been at the rate of probably 1% cents per pound less than was probably somewhat by the reduction in the cost of material, of both of which factors the If Mr. Archibald's testimony would in any "Dominion Bridge Company, amount \$2,730. province has got the benefit. the report of the special committee to whom the special committee to whom

chief engineer of the department at \$3,837. Mr. Rudock was given the contract for this tion of the bridge and had all the material bankment and roadway, so that only the of 64 feet, completely erected, and was erty of the government. Most of the metal | last past, and submitted on the 7th day of

"The price of \$1,280, or \$20 per foot, almore costly bridge than the Mill Cove must have required relatively a great deal to the Trueman Pond bridge. The evidence

"The remaining bridge constructed by Mr. ord Foundry and Machine Company were Blackville bridge, and upon these he says

> committee desire to say that very early in port the Emmerson government in that elections the control of the compare its cost of the cost of railway bridges being much heavier-or- I need only say that as a result of the your company and the Dominion Bridge Comhe says, "I will admit that in the majority dinarily four or five times—than highway campaign the Emmerson government came pany are really the only large companies of cases the cost of highway bridges and

have been wholly disproved.

mportant public works.

"Respectfully submitted. "Frank B. Carvell, Chairman, "C. E. Fish. / "Alex. Gibson, jr., "P. H. Leger,

"John Young." The report was adopted.

resolution:

connection to refer to the three bridges, Douglas Hazen, a member for the country of they held before the country was principally examination of the specifications can you namely, Mill Cove, Trueman's Pond and Sunbury, against the Hon. Henry R. Emmer- | this, that in comparison with the cost of | tell how many pounds of beams were used

He shows that Roy was so favorable to the Opposition that any Evidence Against that Party View Had to be Dragged Out of him--A Splendid Presentation of the Case.

attorney general, on the 12th day of March

same price as that at which he had been paid ; honorable members of the House were to be of submitting their expert opinion, we find ! congratulated that the report of the com- at the very outset these gentlemen called honorable members would feel had been the view, that the cost is grossly excessive, that fullest and freest of any investigation ever at the very outset, the very element of comof the Conservative party in this province the honorable gentleman who leads this government and to take their places in the one that the attorney general had always I know in the professional opinion of the to follow, and the Conservative supporters policy saw the necessity of presenting to the out of their desire in this respect was born with that experience, that the higher the the bridge charges. The opposition press That with regard to the charge that he 'paid | public mind became so excited by the efforts who are now listening to me what opinion double and in some cases more than double of the opposition in that regard that the they would form of the expert testimony \$1.75 15-100 per hundred pounds? A.—Probper pound what was paid by railway com- merits of this administration were not con- of a gentleman who admittedly comes here, ably it would. panies in Canada, the Intercolonial railway sidered in any other connection. He re- frankly admitting it in his testimony, in the Coming again to the con and other governments in Canada, during membered in his own constituency that an interest of a firm whose policy is such as the same period for steel bridge superstructions opposition gentleman of a highly religious to drive from the competitive market all out to establish. On the cross-examination, tures equal in every respect in material and | temperament took the neld with the canvass competitors, and as he himself says, to drive in reply to the question, "Would you or workmanship to the steel and iron super- that no man who had any regard at all for out of the province of Ontario all the lesser would you not think in estimating the reasstructures erected in this province,' your the blessings of the Almighty could sup-concerns competing in the market with onable cost of a light highway bridge it

back to this House with a majority un- that are left in the upper provinces?" he railway bridges cannot be compared." And of the increased cost of workmanship rela- equalled in the history of this House. (Ap- says "they are the only large companies, to the question "And therefore it would be tively to the pound, this statement would plause.) The confidence of the province of but I would like to be able to say they very unfair to attempt to make the com-New Brunswick in any administration was are the only companies." "Your committee, therefore, have only to never better emphasized than in the cam- I would like to say to the honorable gentle- in the majority of cases it would." report that in their opinion the charges paign of '99. (Applause.) The honorable men of this House what would they think

Then again, in line with my suggestion which they were appointed to investigate have leader of the opposition came here under of a gentleman who gives testimony of this that expert testimony is not always the most not only completely failed of proof, but those conditions, well recognizing that that particular type? being the principal plank in his platform of To the question "I want you to tell me "In conclusion, your committee desire to that campaign, recognized that there was whether you will swear that the 20,003 and this I am well aware is true of any say that while the expense to which the necessity for opening up to the country the pounds of bolts used in one span of the class of expert witnesses, the class called province has been put by reason of this in- accounts of the public works department Lefebvre bridge did not cost at Moncton, by one side as well as the other—and I am vestigation has necessarily been very great, and of establishing the matter which he had before being manufactured at all, \$1.641/2 yet the money will not be wholly lost if the submitted to the people of the country; but cents per hundred pounds?" he answered not pay much regard to the testimony of any result should be to confirm the legislature having regard to the clamor and howl of "I don't know what they cost." and the people of the province in their the ranks of the provincial opposition I wish To the question "Will you swear that the determination to continue to have the steel to say that the honorable gentleman's rethe same price?" he replied "I give the bridges well designed, thoroughly constructed traction which was made at last session— the same price?" he replied, "I give the the opinion of any one of them. I recognize in that retraction the char- same answer to that. I know nothing about work done, so far as may be consistent with acteristics of courage and manliness which the price of metal at Moncton or anywhere prudent and economical expenditure, within have always characterized the honorable in New Brunswick." the province, and so keep in circulation gentleman in my opinion. (Hear, hear.) I Here is an expert whose knowledge is among our own people the moneys to be ex- want to pay to him, though a follower of such as to qualify him to give testimony pended for labor in connection with these that government which he opposes, a tribute of that calibre. which he deserves, and to say in my opinion Mr. Mott reads from the evidence queshe did a manly and correct thing when upon the floors of this legislature he faced the Q.-Will you swear that there was in one clamor and howl and took out of those span of that bridge 10,250 pounds of beams? charges that which constituted its sting, A .- No, I don't know anything about it. and took from it that element which affected Q .- You say you know nothing about it. the honorable chief commissioner person- and yet you have examined the specifications (handing paper to witness.) A .- I can't ally, and there was nothing left but the ques- with such care? A .- The specifications say swear whether it is or not. "Mr. Mott gave notice of the following tion of the policy of this government and nothing about the beams. of that department. (Applause.) . | Q.-Do the plans show the beams?. A.- I am fairly familiar with it. "Resolved that this House do concur in The honorable gentlemen will remember; No, the plan I saw didn't show the beams. Q.-Can't you tell me that is his hand-

honorable gentleman had extracted the elepresent session of 1900, when the charges and upon which a duty of \$7 per ton had lature and the committee is freely granted the charges made by J. Douglas Hazen, a It was granted according to the prayer of member for the county of Sunbury, against the petition, as it were, presented by the you anything about the prices of the metal

stated that when you come to estimate the cost of highway bridges you should not serious, has fallen to the ground and there does not remain anything to entitle it to

it at any great length, but I would like from the Hamilton Bridge Company submitted he was well qualified to give such evidence as would support these charges. expert. I say that advisedly and with some ability, the clever the expert who comes

wer to the question, "Is it not true that per pound with that of a railway bridge?"

tion and answer, as follows:

me, having only a lay mind and with no bridge 17,697 pounds of channels going over

\$1.641/2 before any work of manufacturing people on that charge the people of the was put on at all? A .- I couldn't tell you. not there were 39,377 pounds of bar iron used in one span? A .- I could not. Q.-Would not a fair price for that at Moncton be \$1.50 per hundred pounds? A .-I couldn't tell you as to that.

of labor was put on it? A .- I could not tell

Q.-You have no knowledge of what the freight would be? A .- I have no knowledge Q.-Would you say there would not be

11,942 pounds of angles in one span of that bridge which went under 35 pounds per lineal yard?A .- I can't say. Q .- And would not the fair price of that at Moneton be \$2.041/2 per hundred pounds? A .- I cannot say, but it strikes me as being

an exceedingly high price.' And so on he goes down to the end of the with reading the evidence but I think perhaps this is worthy a little attention and I (Mr. Mott again reads from the evidence

Q.-Would you undertake to say that the cost at the works, and putting it at a fair price, \$2,097.43, the metal that went into one

span? A .- I could not say I am sure what Q.-Would you undertake to say that would not be a fair sum to pay for the metal used in one span? A .- From my point of view I would not think it was. You must understand I am working on a Ham-

Q .- I want you to work on a New Brunswick basis if you can, and I want you to tell me whether you would say that \$2,097.43 would be a fair amount to pay for the metal that went into one span of that bridge, denot consider it an exorbitant figure at all. Q.-There are 119,749 pounds in one span

of the Lefebvre bridge, are there not? A .--No, not as I understand it. The return of the weight is 237,944 pounds for two spans. Q.-That would be the finished weight? A .- I presume so.

Q .- That being so would not the weight the material be a little more? A .- 0 yes. slightly more.

Q .- And therefore you would say that if the finished weight was 237,944 in both spans the weight of the metal as brought to the works would be 119,749 in one span? A .- Yes, that is very reasonable. Q.-You have said that the price of the

metal-\$2,097.43 would not be exorbitant. Would you divide the \$2,097.43 by the weight of the metal and tell me if it would not make the average price per pound of metal,

parison, would it not?" he replies, "Well,

reliable testimony to stand upon, coming of them-I am prepared to respect the opin-

This gentleman when on the stand is asked to confirm the handwriting of a gentleman who for a long time was proprietor and general manager of the company with which he himself was connected, a gentleman whose hanwriting he must have been most familiar with, a gentleman with whom he must have been on terms of the greatest personal intimacy, and yet this is his sworn testimony regarding the proof of that handwriting: "Q.-Is that in Mr. Law's handwriting?

Q .- Don't you know his handwriting? A .-