Q.-Have you a doubt of it? A.-I have very little doubt of it. Q.-Have you the slightest doubt of it? A .- I guess it is his handwriting all right enough.

Q.-Why do you hesitate? A.-I can't swear it is his handwriting. Q.-Have you the slightest doubt it is doubt it."

This is a very good illustration of the necessity of having an able artist on crossexamination. (Applause.

cents per hundred pounds for the erection moment that the cost of erecting a bridge at Sussex, putting up the false work, etc., would be anything like it would be in put-"There would not be a great dimerence in those prices because the Sussex bridge may be considered a very light structure, being short spans as against the Lefebvre bridge." Further evidence is as follows:

Q.-Apart altogether from the relative cost of the structure and supposing the bridges were similar, so far as the relative weight was concerned, would you say the cost of erecting a bridge across a small stream like the Trout Creek in Sussex would be anybridge across a tidal river like the Memrameonk in which there is a rapid running tide both outwards and inwards? A .- It should not be as great in Sussex.

Q .- Woul! It be nearly as great in Sussex? A .- No. there should be a considerable

a -- Would it not in your judgment, be . nearly double in a river like the Memramcock, with a rapid running tide, with a seed deal of mud, where you would have to drive long piling, would it not be about dunkla across a river like the Memrameook than across a little stream like at Sussex which is almost dry in the summer season? A .- It would be very much greater. I would be guided-

Q.-Would you not, speaking fairly, say it would be about double? A .- I would go as far as I would care to go in saying it would be very much greater.

Q .- You could not acquiesce in my view without considerable hesitancy? A .- I have stated as far as I would like to go. Q.-You cannot give any definite idea. You see you leave us much leeway. We might say it would be three times as much. A .- I would say it would be considerably greater, but double is considerable-very much. I think it is too much.

Q .- Suppose we make it about it would be nearly double; that would be about right? A .- O yes; mind you, I do not say it is double. It is very much greater and it is as near one as the other possibly. That, of course, is understood, if you are going to erect similar spans at both places.

Later on, referring to a plan of a steel bridge for the Intercolonial Railway, a 100 foot span, he was asked, "Looking at that would you not say that with the base price of steel at \$2 per hundred paun and allowing 10 per cent. for duty by reason of its being under the 35 pounds per lineal yard, and allowing for freight and allowing for the labor, would you not far that a bridge like that could be constructed for \$3.22 per hundred pounds and leave as large a margin of profit as that which would be received from the construction of the Lefebvre or Hampton bridges at 61/2 cents per pound?" and replied, "I couldn't say because I don't know anythir about railway work." And this was followed further by question and answer

"Q .- You know this, do you not, as an expert-you know that railway bridges are very much heavier than highway bridges? A .-! know it as an ordinary citizen. Q .- You do not know it as an expert? A .-Wall. I know it as an expert as well as an

Q.-Do you know the price at which your company tendered for railway bridges during the last two or three years. A .- No,

ordinary individual.

I den't know anything about it." This, mark you, is a gentleman who has came here with a tabulated statement, in whose hands is the possession of all the data and material necessary to make up that tabulated statement which has been prepared by him with the very greatest care; and yet he says here he knows nothing about the railway bridges which his company have tendered for. (In proof of which Mr. Mott read the following from Mr. Roy's

Q -Do you know that your company tendered for the erection of bridges upon the Intercolonial Railway in 1899? A .- I presume they tendered. I don't know anything about it as to date or time or where they were. I presume they tendered as that was

Q .- You know they were tendering? A .-I wouldn't know how they were tendering. Q .- And do you not know that their tender was \$5 per hundred pounds? A .- No; I have already explained that I know nothing about the railway business in any shape

Mr. Law, the manager and chief engineer of your company, that their tender was 5 cents per pound? A .- No.

(!.-And have you not been informed by

Q .- You have no knowledge upon that subject one way or the other? A .- None what-

Q .- You would say would you not that 5 cents per pound for a bridge like this standard plan which I have shown you would yield a larger profit-a very considerably larger profit-than 61/2 cents per pound upon the Lefebvre or Campbell bridges? A .- I wouldn't say because I know nothing about

Q .- And can you give the committee no information? A .-- Not in connection with rail-

Q.-Except as you stated this morning, that it would be very unfair to make a comparison between the two? A .- I would consider it would be unfair. Then again, with knowledge such as Mr.

Roy must necessarily possess, upon the competing conditions in this particular industry in the West, with an intimate knowledge as he must necessarily have of its comconcern having given up business, in view cf the fact that their highway bridge buildin- business was not satisfactory to them and that it was because of their being badly located, the honorable gentleman who conducted the cross-examination asks respecting the Dominion Bridge Company, a company very prominent in this connection, one that I daresay holds the first position in Canada, and from whom his own company must receive the very keenest competition,

this is his expert evidence: "C .- I will ask you as to the situation of the Dominion Bridge Company's works? Are they or are they not favorably situated for doing business? A .- I couldn't tell you. Q .- Dont' you know where their works

are? A .- Yes. Q.-Whereabouts? A.-At Lachine. C-A few miles from Montreal? A .- Yes.

Q-They have both railroad and water? A .- Ther have as I understand it. Q .- Are they not right on the Lachine canal? A .- I couldn't say as to that. Q.-They would have the advantage of the Grand Trunk and C. P. R. would they not? A .- I don't know whether they would have C. P. R. connection

Q.-Don't you know that Montreal is a city most favorably situated for manufacturing? A .- I couldn't say. Q-Don't you know that labor in Montreal is quite reasonable. A .-- I do not.

Q.-Do you know to the contrary of that? A .- I do not. Q.\_\_ will call your attention again to the Hampton bridge, and if, as I propose to show, the tender of the Dominion Bridge Company for the Hampton bridge was 77-10 cents per pound, or nearly 8 cents a pound, for a bridge which you say today your company could build for the price which you have named can you offer any explanation of the Dominion Bridge Company, when tendering for that bridge under public advertisement, putting in a tender based upon a price of nearly 8 cents per pound? A .- No.

I do not know why they did it.

I have been looking through the figures tendered in this statement (producing paper )that remarkable statement submitted by him after very much constraint, mental Mr. Law's handwriting? A .- No, I don't | constraint which came to him and which he felt under the decision ot the committee to report back to this House his disobedience of the subpoena issued by the committee; the statement which he claimed should be To another question "You there allow 75 held by him because of the private information in it-information which by the way of the bridge and do you suggest for a he had prepared for his own use in this investigation-and though he had covered some 65 bridges built by this company in '92 and '99 he selected for the purpose of ting it over a river at Memramcook in which giving testimony before this committee only there is a very rapid tide?' he says in reply four bridges." Respecting that tabulated statement I ask the House to note the evi-

"Q .- And in respect of that bridge wouldn't your tender be based upon 5 2-10 cents per pound? A .- I couldn't tell you that. Those ngures of course speak for themselves to a certain extent. Recollect, I do not guarantee the correctness of those figures. You understand it was a memorandum made for my own private use, taken from the documents of the company, and those documents thing like what it would be in erecting a at the time I took this memorandum may not have been complete, and in some cases they may have included more than should have been in any particular contract."

And yet, gentlemen, those are figures he prepared with a view to giving testimony.

(Applause.) Mr. Hazen-They were not submitted for that purpose at all, as he distinctly stated. Mr. Mott-Mr. Roy when called upon for the purpose of producing this statement, which had been already shown-he spoke on oath from information gathered from his own statement-and when called upon to produce the statement he claimed it was private because it was information he had himself prepared from the data in the department of his company. Mr. Hazen-Exactly, but not for the pur-

pose of his evidence. Mr. Mott-At all events I do not think any honorable gentleman can complain when I am reading from the very mouth of the witness. He says, "Those figures speak for themselves to a certain extent." It is well the witness made a mental reservation in regard to the statement. The honorable gentlemen will recognize a little wisdom on the witness' part in making that

I had marked a number of other sections in this gentleman's testimony, if not for the information of the House, at least for their -version, but I think perhaps I shall re- complished fact, and no honorable gentle-

frain from dwelling on it. He was asked "Is it not true the railway

"Q .- Could you say to the contrary? A .-I don't consider it. I consider my work is er important as the balance of the work. Q.-Is it as important from a financial standpoint? A .- I think that statement | policy I think has been such as may well should convince you of that.'

The honorable gentlemen will remember that answer when I call their attention to a feet I will refer to later:

"O - it convinces me the less you do the better. You can give me no idea of the value of that part of the plant fairly considered as being operated in connection with the building of highway bridges? A .-

Q .- Can you come within \$10,000 of it-\$50,000, \$20,000 or \$75,000? A.-No sir, not within-I can't tell you anything about it. I don't know what the value of the whole

Q.-Can you form no idea? A.-If I did know the value of it I couldn't tell you what Q .- Would you tell me what would be re-

carded as a fair and reasonable manufacturers' profit on the capital invested? A .-N .. I couldn't tell you that. I know noth--- about their capital or investment. Q.-Whether 5 or 10 or 15 per cent. or hai? A.-No, I couldn't say. My instrucof profit on highway bridges.

Later on he does not know whether this company declares any dividends or not. He knows nothing about the profit they make. Except two, he even does not know the directors, and those two he comes immedistaly in contact with in connection with the work and that is the only reason he

knows them. I don't know that I need weary the House with going through this gentleman's testimony further, but merely say that honorable gentlemen interested at all in that important class of evidence might have very rich food for thought if they examined especially the evidence which he gave under the recross-examination, under the direction of the honorable member from Kings.

That gentleman who came here figuring

as an expert, came here as I say with a statement to submit to the committee of a list of 65 bridges built by his concern in the years '98 and '99-though he had been directed by the committee to submit the contracts of his concern for the years covering which those charges had been especially made, he came here disregarding that direction and referred only to the bridges in this statement, and only then under the constraint of the committee. He had selected four especially calculated to support his contention in that regard. But I would like to ask the attention of this House to a brief statement of the facts. Sixty-five bridges. are in this statement for the years '98 and '99, which are only a portion of the years charged, and out of those 65 bridges on six of them his company made losses ranging from \$66.30 to \$213.56; on 45 of them the profit ranged from \$5.19 to \$946.57, of which on only three bridges the profit ran over \$400 each, on only nine of them ran over \$200. On 23 of them the profit is less than \$100; on 11 of the number the profit is less

of them no lumber is mentioned. Possibly that may furnish a key to honorable gentlemen for an explanation of this statement of the witness where in answer to the examination he says that he would build certain specific bridges named in the questions | placed before the House and the country | tee and the country, (Applause). at figures running far below the actual cost of the department. It may perhaps furnish another explanation of his statements in that regard when it is brought out that one of the bridges out of which he made a profit of \$496 it is shown that profit accrued to the firm by reason of the fact that old iron was used in the construction. (Applause.) If it appears that the profit on that one

particular bridge was made in that way and as there are other bridges on which a very much larger profit accrues, it would apply not only to that bridge costing \$496 but to all the bridges on which he made profits of over \$200.

I need not dwell longer upon this evidence; perhaps I have quoted enough to give the House the information which will lead them to agree with me in this connection that expert testimony is not always to be relied upon. At all events, the honorable gentleman has had the fullest opportunity of selecting testimony. All over the country and all over the Union are men easily available to come here to substantiate the charges he has submitted, but out of all the army of expert testimony open to him these gentlemen only are selected, but in that connection I would remind the honorable gentleman that there is one gentleman whom he did not put upon the stand. whose information given during the last election was in itself said to be positive proof that the policy of this government was one of absolute robbery, the information of one gentleman who for a time was known to the electorate of New Brunswick as the nameless engineer (applause) who gave it as an undoubted fact that these bridges were being bulit at treble the cost they

na. so far as you know? A .- I presume to this committee, and though for a time in attendance here and it was easily open to the gentleman who conducted the prosecution to call him and put him on the stand that was not done, and we are today without the evidence of this great and very valuable witness in this regard He was subpoenaed and was here in attendance and while the case was going on for the prosecution. I know it is said there are good and valid to compare the cost of steel roofs to the reasons why he did not appear and why he was not called, that had he come here and given his testimony he must have given it at very great personal loss to himself, because of the fact he has been since engaged at very remunerative figures elsewhere. I want to tell to this honorable House that it is my opinion after that gentleman had committed himself as he did to the figures he gave to the country at the time of which I he had any evidence to give which was speak, and pledged his reputation to the at all relevant to the inquiry, but they accuracy of those figures, it would be very much more, in my opinion, to his interest that he should come here and substantiate them by his oath, than that he should receive filthy dollars in remuneration for the work which he is now doing as stated. (Ap-Diause.)

> Without entering into detail upon the other evidence submitted before the committee I think perhaps this fact has been fairly established that by the initation of the policy which was largely due to the foresight of the gentleman who occupied the position of chief, commissioner of public works, it has been found a fact that the bridges being built by concerns outside of the province of New Brunswick were being built at figures that were higher and in excess of what he as chief commissioner thought they should have been built for. He initiated the policy of home competition with those concerns. He lent encouragement as a departmental officer to the establishment at nome and building up of concerns who could do this very same work, and in that way he circulated through the ordinary commercial channels of our own province the money that would otherwise go abroad, and following out the policy as worked out by him we find that the cost of permanent bridges built today is very greatly below the amounts which were paid when the policy was in its experimental stage. (Ap-

plause.) No honorable gentleman who gives thoughtful attention to this subject but will be willing to recognize that where you start out with an endeavor to experiment along these should be times and must be exigencies arise where there will be greater prices paid than when the policy becomes an acman of this House will find fault with the then honorable chief commissioner when in at home firms to compete with those abroad with the ultimate object of reducing the cost, and in my judgment he has been very successful in doing that. The result of his and worthily take place with other policies that have characterized the management and administration of the honorable gentleman who now leads this government. (Applause.) I think perhaps one of the policies that claims the greatest approbation and consideration at the hands of the electorate of this province is the policy now known as the wheat policy, so called. (Applause.) I do not think for many years there has been an act or movement in the way of administration in this country that so deserves the approbation of the electorate, but I say the bridge policy of the honorable gentleman while he occupied the position to which I refer is such that it may worthily stand with that. The thoughtful attention and valuable time of that honorable gentleman has been always given to building up such a policy and doing all things here at home as will well mark a new and progressive era in the active commercial life of this province. (Applause.) And I have much pleasure in moving the following resolution,

seconded by Mr. McLeod: Resolved, that this House do concur in the report of the special committee to whom were referred the charges made by Mr. J. Douglas Hazen, a member for the county of Sunbury, against the Hon. Henry R. Emmerson, premier and attorney general, on the 12th day of March last past, and submitted on the 7th day of April instant." (Applause.)

# DR. PUGLEY'S GREAT SPEECH.

A Masterly Exposition of the Inherent Weakness of Mr. Hazen's Charges--The Attempts of Upper Province Concerns to Ruin N. B. Industries.

Following Mr. Hazen, Dr. Pugsley said ier he felt that he had in some degree reflected credit on the profession to which was proud to belong. He would like to be able to congratulate the leader of the opposition on having in his speech the truth and the facts brought out on the investigation, but he was not able to do so, because he felt that he had not done justice in his remarks to the gentleman who had been made the subject of atack in these bridge charges. The leader i the opposition had not presented the facts as they were brought out before the committee, and he had also atempted to drag into the discusion statements which were not in evidence and so influence this House and country by heresay statements -statements not made under oath, but statements which have been made by gentlemen who are interested in the prosecution of these charges and which are not fortified by the testimony of a sworn witness. (Applause.)

# A Fair Inquiry.

The gentleman (Hazen) has said that there was not a full and fair investigation into the charges by the committee. He (Pugsley) would assert without fear of contradiction by any disinterested pera comittee of any parliament which was must give the prices which they fairer, which was conducted on broader principles, and which gave greater latitude along the lines proper to be pursued than was the case in the investigation provinces where they are probably trying

Q .- They were as favorably situated, were | whose information was so very valuable did | in the city of Halifax. The committee | by Mr. Roy's evidence. In one case they | bridges for two cents per pound is conthey, for doing business then as they are not come forward or submit his testimony did not refuse to subpoena Mr. Donald, made a profit of \$496 on a certain bridge, cerned, we have it in evidence that the but they did refuse to place on record a statement that they would, at the expense of this country, call from all parts of this province and the dominion witnesses to produce books and papers which could by no posibility have the slightest bearing upon the charge which they were called upon to investigate. They wished cost of highway bridges. They might as well ask to have witnesses called to show the prices paid for anchors and chains and a thousand and one articles which were constructed out of metal but which had no bearing on the case. The committee stated that they were perfectly willing to hear Mr. Donald's evidence if refused to hear his evidence as to the cost of steel roofs. Mr. Donald was not called. Mr. Laforest stating to the comittee that as Mr. Donald could not be subpoenaed to produce all his books and papers bearing upon the question of steel and was prepared to give every informaroofs they would not have him called as tion as to the contracts which he had a witness at all. One might have thought | picked out and brought with him. The that they were serious in their desire to committee asked him to extend his have Mr. Donald appear as a witness, but | courtesy a little farther, and instead of when Mr. Peters, from whom Mr. Donald purchased his steel roofing, was upon the stand, having all the books of the Record Foundry Company here showing all their abling them to determine the question I say if an engineer skilled in this way Ontario, a span of 75 feet. The total cost business of every kind and description in connection with their foundry work, the gentleman or his counsel had not a question to ask him as to

## The Cost of the Steel Roof

put upon the station at Halifax. The second ground of complaint of the gentleman was that the committee had forced Mr. Roy to produce a document which he had prepared for his own private information, and that thereby a great injustice was done to him. He would state to the House what took place in that connection. Mr. Roy came here as the engineer of the Hamilton Bridge Company. He went upon the stand and swore that his company would have built the bridges in question a reason for making that statement he lines it is only nautral and reasonable there swore that his company had tendered for bridges in the province of Quebec at that price and had erected them for that figure. In the course of his testimony Mr. Roy drew from his pocket a blue print and on the way. He (Pugsley ; had then asked the witness what the statement he had read from contained, and the witness said it showed the number of bridges built by his company, length of span, quantity of cost of erection, freight, the contract price, and the profit or loss upon each bridge. Mr. Roy stated that the document was tendering for these various contracts. It | tee. (Applause). was a document which had a material! left the witness stand enjoying a very difthe province with the reputation of a reputable and honest man. On the contrary he left the stand and he left the province stamped as a man who was seek-

# Deceive the Committee

and seeking to place upon the records statements which he knew were absolutely false. He had sworn that his company were building bridges at four cents a pound, but in that statement bridge after bridge will be found in respect to which his company received all the way from six to seven cents and in one case nearly eight cents per pound. Yet this is the man who complains that, having in his pocket the evidence showing that his company received from six to eight cents per pound for highway bridges-who complains that he was not allowed to leave the committee room after giving the impression to the that the honorable member who had just | committee that the price his company had taken his seat had done him the honor of charged for these bridges was only four saying that he (Pugsley) was one of the cents per pound. (Applause.) He combest cross-examiners in the province. If plained that his company might feel that he had intended by that to imply that he he was giving away private information. (Pugsley) was able to bring out from wit- Then why did he pick out and bring here nesses the truth and lay the facts before four contracts which would necessarily a comittee or a jury as the case might be, show the profits which his company had and that he was able to drag from a re- made on these contracts? Surely it did luctant witness facts which he wished to not lie in his mouth to give information conceal and which were material, then he as to certain contracts, and then say in (Pugsley, accepted it as a compliment, be- respect to others that he was afraid to cause he thought that the object which produce them because his company might every lawyer ought to have in view was to think he was giving away something of a elicit the whole truth. Very often wit- private nature, and thus place himself nesses are disposed to keep back the truth, in an awkward position. The leader of than \$50; on five of them the profit is less | and he was sorry to say that this was the | the opposition has stated that he is glad than \$25, and on three of them less than case in the bridge inquiry which had just that statement was produced. All he closed and if he had in any way been able | (Pugsley) could say that if he was pleased In the statement submitted by the witness. to draw the truth from the witnesses who he had a very strange way of of showing fair to inquire as to his experience in conon 18 bridges out of 65 he has not included had been brought by Mr. Hazen to give the pleasure which he felt. He (Pugsley) nection with the building of highway duced, and he would be able to show to the House that that statement completely discredits Mr. Roy and contradicts the testimony which he gave and shows that he was attempting to deceive the commit-

The Next Ground of Complaint of the gentleman (Hazen) is with regard to the treatment of Mr. Phelps Johnson, the manager of the Dominion Bridge Company, which he (Hazen) characterizes as a travesty upon justice. The facts in that connection were these: When it was announced that Mr. Johnson was coming here as a witness he (Pugsley) had asked the chairman of the committee to notify Mr. Johnson that he would be required to produce the various contracts entered into by his company for the construction of bridges during the years 1895, 1896 and 1897, and for a few years preceding and a few years after, that is from 1891 down to 1897. Was that an unreasonable request? Mr. Johnson was coming here just as Mr. Roy had come-picking out a few contracts for bridges constructed by his company-selecting contracts for bridges constructed at particular places and at particular prices. It is no use to say that he had contracts for bridges constructed son who has followed the proceedings that | in Nova Scotia, because in order to get at | of iron entering into wknol,rTa?toqlamiw there was never an investigation before the fair and reasonable cost of bridges he He (Pugsley) would admit that so far as

# Charged in Their Home Market,

in another \$346, another \$314, another angles actually cost Mr. Ruddock at his \$189, another \$655, another \$946, another \$395, another \$322, for bridges built in their own provinces, but for the one bridge which they built in the province of Nova Scotia, and in respect to which Mr. Roy had picked out the contract they made the magnificent profit of \$6.58. (Applause.) That was a bridge which appears by the contract to have been undertaken to build at the price of \$4.20 per hundred pounds, and it had only a 12 foot roadway, (Applause.) This was put forward as a specimen of the contract showing the prices which this company received for their highway bridges. These men were not coming here as disinterested witnesses, and he (Pugsley) had felt justified in asking that Mr. Johnson should be subpoenaed to bring contracts showing the prices charged by his company in their home market. Mr. Johnson came before the committee, and he stated that he had come out of courtesy to the committee picking out those contracts which suited his ideas, to bring those contracts which would be of value to the committe in enwhich they were called upon to determine. Mr. Johnson was asked to return to Montreal and bring back with him all the told him that all

### His Expenses Would be Paid.

Mr. Johnson said he would go back to Montreal after the necessary documents, and that he would inform the diairman on the following Tuesday or Wednesday as to whether he would be allowed to bring the papers with him. He went away, but he did not come back, and what was the excuse? He said that his secretary would not let him bring the papers -the secretary would not let Mr. Phelps Johnson, who is the general manager of at the rate of four cents a pound, and as | the company and has absolute and entire charge of the company's business-who is in fact the Dominion Bridge Companywould not let his records be depleted by sending the papers asked for. When it is borne in mind that the committee stated that he might send them by express, if he referred to the numbers of some bridges | did not care to bring them himself, and work is the most important part of the work | carrying out and moulding that policy he and said that those were some of the that every care would be taken of them, did my friend come to that conclusion? 1,200 pounds per foot, as good a highway your company does?" and replied "I couldn't perhaps paid a little more for building those bridges in respect to which he had sent and they would be returned to him free Was it on the 12th of March when from bridge as any of this government, and a that," and this question was followed bridges than what they might have been for the contracts and which were then of charge, it will be seen how slim was his place in the House he charged the great deal of labor relative to the pound, secretary would not allow him to deplete the records. He (Pugsley) was willing to leave it to the fair judgment of the House and country if the course pursued was not metal, cost of metal, cost of shop labor, a reasonable one. The gentleman (Hazen) says he wanted a

## Full and Fair Inquiry,

made up from information furnished him | but he did not have produced one single by the accountant of the company, and | contract for a bridge built in the province the object in having it made up was to of Ontario or Quebec, the home market of enable him to tender upon bridge work and | these companies, where and where alone to give the information upon which he it would be possible to ascertain what are could say to the municipalities or to the the usual and customary prices being governments that he would do their work | charged by the company for bridges confor certain prices. It was not private in- structed by them. These were the whole formation, but it was information which grounds of complaints of Mr. Hazen with he had made up for the company of which | respect to the course of the committee, he was the engineer-for himself, if you and he (Pugsley) repeated that the investilike, as the engineer of the company to gation was one of the fullest and fairest enable him to do the company's work in ever held before a parliamentary commit-

The leader of the opposition had made bearing upon the evidence which he had his bridge charges, but he has not sought given, and if it had not been produced to prove that the Record Foundry Combefore the committee Mr. Roy would have | pany or Mr. Ruddock have got out of their | contracts more than a fair and honest ferent reputation from that which he now | price. Mr. Ruddock, who is a man of the enjoys-he would have left the stand and highest reputation and standing, has sworn that on the Mill Cove bridge he only made a profit of \$400, and on the two spans of the Blackville bridge a profit of \$500, or a total of \$900 on the two bridges. This was not an unreasonable profit and he (Pugsley) felt that the people of the province of New Brunswick were willing that the Record Foundry Company and Mr. Ruddock should get a fair profit on the bridges constructed by them. The leader of the opposition says we should give these bridges to the upper province concerns if they underbid our own local companies, no matter whether they build the bridges at a loss or not. He (Pugslev) did not believe that was the feeling which actuated the people of this province. He believed that if the Record Foundry Company and Mr. Ruddock did their work thoroughly and up to contract and specification the people were willing to pay them a fair and reasonable profit on their work. The gentleman says the prices are too high because Prof. Swain and Mr. Roy had said so. While he (Pugsley) had a great respect for Prof. Swain he denied that he had such a practical knowledge as would enable him to speak with any authority of the cost of bridges in this country. Prof. Swain on cross-examination admitted that he

Knew Nothing of the Cost of Metal

in 1897 and previous years, that he knew nothing of the cost of shop labor, of duty, of freight, or as to manufacturers' profits. He knew nothing of these, and yet he swore that these bridges in New Brunswick could be built for four cents per pound. That being so it was fair to criticize Prof. Swain's judgment, and it was been consulting the engineer of the Boston subway also for the Charlestown bridge and of a bridge at New Bedford. He admitted that the Charlestown bridge was almost as heavy as a railway bridge and was built largely of plate girders, which was the cheapest kind of metal work it was posible to have in a bridge and he stated that the Bedford bridge was almost as heavy. The copy of the contract for the Charlestown bridge showed that for the 600 feet contained in the eight spans the contract price was \$75,000, or upwards of \$100 per lineal foot, proving that the bridge was an unusually heavy structure. bridge was an exceptionally heavy structure. Prof. Swain admitted that the cost bridge of that character relatively to the pound would be no criterion at all to enable one to judge as to the cost of highway bridges in this country. When it is considered that that is about all the experience Prof. Swain has had in reference to highway bridges it will be seen that his opinion as to the cost of highway bridges in this country would be of very little value indeed. Prof. Swain stated before the committe that the structural work of the Boston subway was very much the same as that in the Trueman Pond bridge. the angles are concerned they are similar, but so far as beams and channels and girders are concerned there is no comparand not the prices charged in the lower ison, because he did not believe there was a beam or a channel or a girder in the just closed. The first complaint of the to drive out the small local concerns, and Trueman Pond bridge. The bridge was should have been done for. That gentleman a steel roof put on a railway station | Hamilton Bridge Company, as was shown | from Prof. Swain being able to build the | weight.

works in Chatham \$2.20 per hundred pounds or 20 cents per hundred pounds more than Prof. Swain said the bridge could be built and erected for. This only goes to show how far astray the house and country would be in placing

## The Siightest Reliance on the Evidence

of that gentleman. Prof. Swain gave the committee to understand in his evidence per hundred pounds as high as \$2.50 per hundred pounds, was simply for the material delivered on the Boston Commonpractically the raw material, as there was very little work done on it. The material consists of beams and channels and is all of the very heaviest character, and different altogether from the material that went into the Trueman Pond bridge.

terial governed the 'JfitD Gs,aeitse vbgbg These gentlemen talk as if the best metcontracts asked for, and the committee | the other and so produce a light structure | Roy's statement, by the Hamilton Bridge bridge and therefore in respect to the are mysteries about this bridge building heavier bridge.

That is Why There is no Comparison between the railway bridges and highway paid for railway bridges? Was that not the charge then put forward, and let me ask in good faith if that was not the charge Mr. Archibald was brought here

Mr. Hazen-I will answer that in good faith and say no.

which my friend has made, and I will tell | the Hamilton Bridge works. you why. During the last campaign Mr. Archibald was quite a prominent factor bridge charges, said that when the House and he wrote to the newspapers. I think adjourned last evening he was proceeding he took an active part in the organizing to consider the cost of the Mill Cove on behalf of the opposition and I find in bridge from the standpoint of its length. the Daily Sun of February 7, a letter as because he thought that was a fair mode, follows. (The letter is signed by Mr. or one fair mode at all events, of con-Archibald). "For 20 years I was the re- sidering the question as to what is a fair sponsible head of the engineering depart- price for a bridge. He had endeavored government put together. My duties, as every contractor and engineer in the country know, put me in a position to know the character and market value of all kinds of bridge material. Tenders for different classes of bridges were called for yearly and awarded to the lowest bidder. the Intercolonial Railway has for the past six or seven years been buying bridges, the character of which in every respect is fully equal, if not superior, to those you (Hear, hear).

## Mr. Tweedie--It looks very much like it. That is the Charge.

seems to have been framed on the information given by Mr. Archibald in that calling for greater workmanship and for letter. And my honorable friend charged what against the chief commissioner? That he had paid for highway bridges in this province double the price the government of Canada had paid for bridges spects a better bridge than one in which on the Intercolonial Railway. At the very comencement of this inquiry Mr. in respect to which the design was in-Archibald was present. My honorable ferior, the object of obtaining a relatively friend got a subpoena at the first sitting superior bridge had been accomplished, and Mr. Archibald was present and very much in evidence indeed, but, sir, after I had cross-examined Prof. Swain and Mr. Roy, and after they both admitted it would be unfair to make any comparison betwen the cost per pound of railway bridges relative to highway bridges, Mr. Archibald suddenly remembered he had business elsewhere. (Applause.) He deas he must necessarily have of its competitors there, in speaking of one particular bridges out of 65 he has not included had been brought by Mr. Hazen to give the pleasure which he felt. He (Pugsley) peritors there, in speaking of one particular bridges. It appears that Prof. Swain has bridges. It appears that Prof. Swain has bridge, even under the circumstances under we have not the benefit of his evidence, and you can see, Mr. Speaker, when my honorable friend talks about not being able to get gentlemen from Nova Scotia, not being able to get Mr. Murphy or Mr. Stewart or MacNeill, and says how handicapped he has been, here he had right in his hand a gentleman who, according to himself, for 20 years has been a responsible head of the engineering department of the I. C. R., and during all these years, including the years that those bridges were built, says he knew all about the prices of bridge material, and no person in the country is better qualified to give better judgment on the subject; he says, and charges the chief commissioner as Mr. Hazen did on the 12th of March, with having paid two prices for highway bridges as compared with what railway bridges cost. When he speaks of Nova Scotia bridges he should have availed himself of the valuable evidence of such a witness as Mr. Archibald. He would have proved the price of railway bridges per pound at probably 31 cents per pound in the year 1897. He would have proved a Mill Cove bridge was not an exorbitant standard span of the Intercolonial Railway cost in 1897 31 cents per pound, and this was the charge, the government was paying in the vicinity of seven cents; they | bridge. He would say the evidence proved said double the price per pound, and if you could get a lighter bridge and by this was the charge, the government was reason of a superior design and by means paying in the vicinity of seven cents; they of the increased labor you have to pay said double the price per pound of rail- a little more per pound but make it up in way bridges. Well, said Prof. Swain, so | the cost of the total length of the bridge, it ought to be, in effect; so said Mr. Roy you are exercising a wise economy and in effect; so said Mr. Ruddock, in effect; you may have a better bridge at less so said all the witnesses called in effect; money than if you had more metal and it ought to be double the price per pound, paid a less price per pound. The cost of gentleman is that the committee did not therefore are willing to do the work at made up entirely of angles, which was the that bridge paid to the Hamilton Bridge subpoena Mr. Donald to bring all his a much less rate than they charge in their most expensive kind of iron entering into lighter the material the greater the labor Company was \$29.26 per lineal foot, and books here showing the prices he paid for owr narket. That was the case with the the construction of bridges, and so far necessary to be put upon it relative to the this does not include the lumber and the

### The Same Remark Will Apply

in reference to the Boston, the Charles-

town bridge, in respect to which Prof.

Swain had experience, and respect to the Boston subway, with which Prof. Swain had experience, and upon which he based his judgment, because as Mr. Ruddock says, all that material is from three to five times heavier than in the Trueman Pond bridge and therefore the labor was very much greater in the latter relatively. Dr. Pugsley gave some attention to the Mill Cove bridge, respecting which the that the prices which he named for the heaviest claim of an exhorbant figure is Boston subway were for the material | made. Mr. Pugsley showed that an entire erected, and the gentleman (Hazen) had change had to be made in the plan after put questions to Mr. Ruddock as if those the construction of the bridge was begun. prices wer for the material erected. It under the plans of the chief engineer, bewould be seen by the contracts, however, cause those plans provided for steel apthat the prices which ranged from \$1.97 proaches. It was found that instead of the former crib work approaches being hollow they were filled with stone and could not be removed, except under great expense, hence the change in the plans.

The material left over, while charged to

the Mill Cove bridge, was used in the

Trueman's Pond bridge and the province

The reasonableness of the price paid for

was out nothing by the transaction.

the bridge was shown by this statement which Mr. Hazen said he was glad to have, the statement of Mr. Roy: take al governed the prices of the structures. bridge No. 985 if you like, at Ramsay in can so design a structure as that by hav- of the bridge, or contract price was \$2,ing light material he can make one add 454.45 for a span 75 feet in length, and strength to the other and give bearing to for a 16 foot readway, tender as in Mr. of careful design requiring a great deal Company, costing \$32.72 per lineal foot; more labor than upon a heavy structure. only 16 feet wide as against the Mill Cove If he produces an equally good and strong bridge of 19 feet wide which cost \$20 per structure, but more graceful, we must al- foot. (Applause.) Yet does not my honorlow for the labor on that bridge just as able friend understand the difference bewe would allow for the metal if a heavier | tween a heavy and a light bridge? There weight, if you have per pound a light which requires to be explored to thoroughhighway bridge the cost necessarily is ly understand it, and I tell my honorable very much greater than with respect to a friend if he will take home with him at the close of this session one of these blue prints and see the prices of the various bridges constructed by the Hamilton Bridge Company, and the means of arriving at profits by throwing in heavy mabridges, so far as weight is concerned, and terial here and there it will surprise him you must have been amused, and I think and account for much we see with regard I had better refer to it just now, by the to prices in Mr. Roy's statement. But statement of my friend that he did not how striking it is that here is a bridge, wish to trouble the committee in bring- splendid so everyone says, against which ing before them any comparison as be- no one has a word of criticism to make. tween railway and highway bridges. When capable, if I remember rightly, of carrying commissioner of public works had paid and yet it only cost the province, under for highway bridges in this country as the circumstances I have mentioned, \$20 much as double the price per pound as a foot, against a bridge three feet narrower which this generous company that wants to get in here to build bridges for us, charged the municipality of Ramsay at the rate of \$32.72 per lineal foot. Is not that a striking figure, and the fact that this province has a bridge equally as good, and better I venture to say, and better in appearance and stronger than I can say Mr. Speaker that we receive the one at Ramsay at \$20 per lineal foot, many surprises in this world. (Applause). having a 19 foot roadway, against 32.72 I can say I never received a greater sur- for a 16 foot roadway, which the muniprise than I have from the statement cipality of Ramsay was obliged to pay to Mr. Pugsley, resuming the debate on the

ment of the Intercolonial Railway, where to convince the House that in the erecthe annual expenditures were double those tion of bridges the cost depends upon the of all the departments of the provincial metal and perhaps even to a larger extent upon the workmanship which is put upon the bridge, and it had appeared before the committee by the evidence of Mr. Peters and others that the cost of labor upon many of the bridges of the province was very much greater than even the cost of the material, and it was proved that in respect to bridges designed like the The records of the department will show Campbell and Lefebvre bridges the cost of workmanship is necessarily very much greater--in respect to some of the sections from 10 to 12 times greater, and in respect to the bridges as a whole from two have been erecting for the province, and to three times greater, than it is upon at one-half the prices you have paid." bridges erected from the companies' own designs, and where the members consist merely of rolled bars and not of made sections. Those points were very clearly brought out in the evidence of three witnesses, namely Messrs. Sefton, Lockhart my honorable friend put forward on the | and Arnold, to which he would refer later. 12th of March, one of the charges against | and he thought the same fact was admy honorable friend the premier. He mitted by the witnesses called on behalf charged, and if I were to be allowed to of Mr. Hazen. Therefore he claimed that imagine anything, I would say, the charge | if a company, by reason of the design calling for a larger expenditure of labor, less heavy metal, could as a result give a bridge equally good in character, of a better design, firmer in its construction. likely to last longer and being in all rethere was a greater weight of metal but and therefore the government ought to receive credit for having a design of this superior character prepared rather than to allow the bridges to be built according to designs prepared by the company, and under which the desire is and every effort is put forth to produce a bridge of the most inferior character at the highest possible price. He would cal! the attention which it was paid for, and which called necessarily for the equitable consideration of the chief commissioner, the price paid was only at the rate of \$20 per lineal foot, and if you take the contract price for the Hampton bridge at \$11,400, it being a bridge about 600 feet long, it will be seen that that bridge cost about \$20 per foot. He was not, however, limited in his comparison to bridges in this province, as the statement dragged out of Mr. Roy under threat of imprisonment showed that in 1898 his company was paid \$32.72 per lineal foot for a bridge at Ramsey, a bridge with only a 16 foot roadway, or three feet narrower than the roadway of the Mill Cove bridge; and that in the same year they built a riveted bridge with a span of 80 feet at a cost of \$2,341, or \$29.26 per running foot, as against \$20 per foot, which has been claimed was an exorbitant price for the Mill Cove bridge, and that bridge had only a 14 foot roadway, as against a 19 foot roadway on the Mill Cove bridge. This, he thought, showed conclusively that the price paid for the. It spoke eloquently for the economy of the government, the price of the Mill Cove

bridge is five feet narrower than the Mill