quire that the old superstructures shall be removed by the contractor, but in many cases it would be found that these bridges tures to remove. This was the case of the Hunter's Mill bridge, built by the Ham-ilton Bridge Company. There was nothing included in the cost of that bridge for tearing down the old superstructure for painting the bridge, and that is the one on which they made that magnificent profit of \$6.53. (Applause). It had been shown that the price of 61 cents per pound was not excessive, and if the cos of removing the old superstructures and piers was reasonable, there was no ground for the charge that excessive prices were

The honorable leader of the oppositio

complains that he was not able to get in formation with respect to the cost of superstructure of the Trueman Pond bridge. With respect to that bridge Mr Copp had a contract for the substructure, Copp had a contract for the substructure, or work in connection with the substructure, and the erection of the super structure Mr. Emmerson produced in evidence a letter written by him to Mr Winslow authorising him to pay the amount due Mr. Copp for his work, but from that letter it was impossible to make from that letter it was impossible to make the division between substructure and su perstructure. It may be that Mr. Winsperstructure. It may be that Mr. Winslow, the secretary of the department, ought to have seen that those papers wer filed so that he could make the division, and if the honorable gentleman had any complaint to make it would be against the secretary of the department. The honorable gentleman had also complained that he could not get information from Mr. Winslow as readily as he ought to get it. He (Pussley) would say this with Mr. Winslow as readily as he ought to get it. He (Puggler) yould say this with regard to the serietary of the public work department, and he was glad to have as opportunity of saying it, that he did no believe there had ever been in the employ of the government of this country a man who was more unright, a man who was more unright. was more upright, a man who was mor desirous of performing his duty, than Mr T. B. Winslow. (Applause), He has served for many years under this governmen and previous governments and this wa then first time that he (rugsley) had eve-heard it complained against him that he has been guilty of dereliction of duty of his sought to keep back accounts that ought to be presented to the committee Mr. Winslow's duties were very heavy and it might be theil by reason of over-work he did not have al these account-at his fingers' ends, but all through the investigation he has furnished all infor-mation in his possession cheerfully and a the earliest possible moment. But the low was able to lav his hand at a mo ment's notice on any particular documen The question is this: Has the money which the public accounts show to have bee paid for these bridges been actually an honestly paid, and has the province go value for every dollar expended by the chief commissioner of public works. H (Pugsley) contended that the evidence shows that the province has got suc value, and that the amounts which the public accounts show as having been pair were actually and honestly paid. The honorable gentleman says that there is an item in the public accounts of \$700 or \$30 which should have been charged to som other bridges. Mr. Winslow when upon the stand explained that the error aros out of the lumber and metal left over from the Mill Cove bridge. He had thought that the lumber and metal which was used had all gone into one bridge and had so charged it, whereas it had gone into three different bridges. Thi gone into three different origies. In was not a very serious matter, and h (Pugsley) thought the honorable gentle man (Hazen) hardly did justice to Mr Winslow when he complained that it was grave error and something that ought to

e seriously commented upon. Continuing, Mr Pugeley said that be fore concluding he would like to call th attention of the House to the evidence given by Mr. Sefton, Mr. Lockhart an Mr. Arnold, three entirely distinterests witnesses. The two first named gentle men are and have been for a long num ber of years employed on the Intercolonia Railway, and were for many years under the direction of Mr. Archibald, forms chief engineer of the road. Mr. Lockhar was formerly employed in the blacksmith ing department of the road, but has rise until now he has charge of a gang of me doing bridge construction work. Mi Lockhart, when here, showed by his ex-planation of the plans of the Campbel bridge that he was a master a the work of steel bridge building. Mr Sefton was sent out to Canada by a English firm which built the first buidge on the I.C. R. He was the inspector of the cartilever bridge at St. John, both during its construction at the works and during erection, and in addition to his experience in connection with railway bridges has also had to do with the con-struction of several hundreds of highway bridges in England and Canada, M Arnold was the inspector at the work of the Woodstock bridge, and since the has been employed by the United State government in connection with fort fice on works, and is now superintendent o a large dredging company in New York Any one who had heard Mr. Arnold give his testimony before the committee would say that he is a thoroughly competen engincer, a careful witness, and a man wh-will not hazard an opinion unless he i absolutely sure of what he is talking

unched in a single post of the Campbell bridge, as compared to some 20 or 30 holes in the posts of the Sussex bridge. See what a difference that, makes in the labor. The truss posts in the lampbell bridge are built posts, and the effect is to give with the lightest

and the effect is to give with the lightest quantity of material the greatest possible trength. You can roll these posts and get the weight of metal, but you will have an inferior bridge. That is the evidence of those witnesses, and Mr. Arnold testified is also did Mr. Lockhart or Mr. Sefton. those witnesses, and Mr. Arnold testified is also did Mr. Lockhart or Mr. Sefton, that the Campbell bridge was superior to the Sussex, Salisbury and Hampton bridges. Without wearying the House by reading the evidence he (Pugsley) could tate that the evidence of those gentlemenhowed that the Campbell and Lefebyr bridges are of superior design, of betterworkmanship and are in all respects very nuch better bridges than either the Sussex, Salisbury or Hampton bridges; and Mr. Arnold corroborated in the stronges; manner possible the statement of the chie ommissioner, that bridges designed and constructed like the Campbell and Lefebyr ridges will last much longer than bridges if the design of the Sussex and Salisbury ridges, and he also said that they woulf-equire very much less expenditure for reairs from time to time. These were important facts, and proved in the clearest ossible manner the superiority of the ampbell and Lefebyre bridges over the ussex, Salisbury and Hampton bridges. Applause). Another important fact rought out by Mr. Arnold, a fact which ad been known to the chief commissioner in members of the government and other netersted in the matter, was that where he government engineer designs the ridge and the company is compelled to

not members of the government and other, he government engineer designs the ridge and the company is compelled to arry but the plans and specifications, the ost will be very much greater than if the ompany was allowed to build the bridge rom its own strain sheet, material sheer will be continuing. Mr. Pugsley said Ve do not want to waste our money, but he people want the steel bridges which re built for practically all time, to be good design, to be thoroughly inspected uring construction and erection, and the carried out in every particular according to the plans, so that we will have it his country bridges which are permanent their character and in which our people will take a just and reasonable pride

about, and everyone on the committee statisfied when the cobes sense of the part la (Linghter).

duce these documents was a reason for the bitter attacks upon him, because the production of those documents had proved the very things they wanted to keep in he darl. (Hear, hear).

From the very day when this investigation started the opposition press from the Bay of Chaleur to the Bay of Fundy and from the East to the International the had claimed that the evidence had not been treated fairly by him and that the honorable gentleman from Kings had been compelling him to shut out every particle of evidence that would have in fluence and veight in the case brought by the honorable member from the county of Sunbury. He felt he would be justified in referring to items contained in various issues of the Daily Sun, the leading opposition paper in the province, concerning the evidence which had been given. On March 19th the Sun contained the following. The Pageley acting on behalf of opposition paper in the province, con-cerning the evidence which had been given. On March 19th the Sun contained the folving: "Dr. Pugsley, acting on behalf of the government, shows a disposition to prevent as far as possible inquiry into the material facts." That had reference to the fact that he had refused to issue a subpoena duces tecum to Mr. Donald Moneton, to come and show what the root of a shop cost in the city of Halifax, and draw from that the prices which they should pay for bridges in the province of New Brunswick. He felt when hat proposition was made it was absurd, that he would be doing himself injustice as a lawyer if he should issue and that he would be deing himself injustice as a lawyer if he should issue such a subpoena and he felt satisfied with the subpoen

And the state of the property of the party personal property personal pro

ter was brought up before the committee
The report was short and would not weary
the House. It was as follows:
"The committee met at 9 o'clock tonight.
The chairman referred to the Sun's report, and Dr. Stockton quoted from the
official evidence to show that the Sun's
report was substantially correct."
That is the report which the Sun gives
of the proceedings during which Dr.

of the proceedings during which Dr. Stockton had to admit that he wawrong, and that there had been no statement made that the accounts did not go before the public accounts committee. He (Carvell) wished to refer to an item which appeared in another newspaper, and which appeared in another newspaper, an which was the gem of the whole collection He read from the Woodstock Press of April 9th, as follows:
"But Mr. Hazen has gone further than

he alleged, and has proven more than he promised. Even a worse scandal than that of the contractors being stockholders wa-unearthed. Mr. T. B. Winslow, of the and give a reason for their insinuations.

Mr. Laforest—We do not know where board of works, gave evidence that thou ands of dollars were paid out to bridg inspectors without any proper order without being entered in detal in the aco look.

Mr. Carvell—You do not believe it went Mr. Carvell—You do not believe it went anywhere else but where Mr. Winslow said it went?

Mr. Laforest—Mr. Winslow does not know half the time.

Mr. Carvell—I submit my honorable counts, and which did not appear in the auditor general's report.

They say there is no account of the money in the auditor general's report, and that is is impossible to tell how much money has been expended. If that was no going one better than any other newspaper

in the province he would like to know it seemed to him that their case m be very desperate indeed when the le ers of the party all over the country ompelled to resort to such tactics at the very inception of the case in order to produce the minds of the public before an evidence was given at all. That must have been the object of the Sun—to make it readers believe that everything was unair, that they were not given half

rair, that they were not given half hance, and that no matter what evidence was adduced they would have their readers believe that the government we quilty, that they were pure and should be placed in power.

Coming to the particular consideration of the facts of the case Mr. Carvell sai

cirgumstances, and he (Pageley) thought it would be admitted that the cost of the control of the payment of a cont estimate of a man's testimony.

Then Mr. Roy picked out four contracts and would have us believe from them that cost of erecting the Lefebvre bridge by reason of the very great difficulties in the way, would cost double what the erection of the Sussex would cost. In the case of the Woodstock bridge eight spans are actually built upon dry land, and of source the false work for one of these pans would answer for each of the others. pans would answer for each of the others hus only necessitating one-eighth of the umber which would otherwise be needed. Then a great deal of labor would be saved then a great deal of labor would be saved on connection with the false work, as it would be very little trouble to take it down from under one span and put it up for another. The channel span of the Woodstock bridge would be the only pensive one to creet. In addition to all this one set of derricks would be sufficient for the whole Woodstock bridge, and one troubles would raveller would answer for every spe hese things would all reduce the cost of rection very materially, and must for very fair minded man to the conclusion that to compare the cost of this bridge with the cost of the bridge erected by the Record Foundry Company and Mr Ruddock is very unfair, and that it would be reasonable to add at least twents per pound to the cost of the Wood cost by the control with the cost of the wood cost by the company it with the

sorts per pound to the cost of the woost stock bridge when comparing it with the set of the smaller bridges built for the New Brunswick government by the Record Foundry Company and Mr. Ruddock. (Applause).

Mr. Hazen had produced as a witness of support his case Prof. Swain of Boston.

snows a great deal about the work. Whave no evidence that Prof. Swain evouilt a bridge; he admits that he know built a bridge; he admits that he knows hesolutely nothing about the mechanica work of a bridge and he knows less of the cost of constructing a bridge in New Brunswick. He gave us some valuable estimony when he said that he had to with two highway bridges, one over he Charles River weighing 6,700,000 ounds, and containing a large amount or late girder work which cost two or three cats less per pound than our highway ridges are worth. It is in every respectively as the carries electricals. My honorable friend (Laforest would not at this stage present the claim to the highway bridge cost double as much

were worth, they were actually charging him with boodling. They did not put it as strong as that, but that is what it comes to. Mr. Roy threw his head back and said to. Mr. Roy threw his head back and said his company had built a bridge, in Nova Scotia, and he could produce the contract. After the committee had extracted the document from him, they found his company had built the bridge, but that neither lumber nor freight had been included in the cost. It was a little bridge, costing two or three hundred dollars, and the freight and lumber had been left out of the calculation entirely. According to the the calculation entirely. According to the statement the company had realized the munificent sum of \$6.58 on the transaction. On the Camden bridge, another cited by him, the company had realized the magnificent profit of \$5.19. (Applause). And yet that man had the hardipood, and my house the control of \$5.19. plause). And yet that man had the hardi-hood, and my honorable friend (Hazen) had the hardihood to put before the com-mittee these two documents and say that they prove that we can build bridges for four and five cents per pound. Continuing, Mr. Carvell referred to the locument which the committee had ob-ained from Mr. Roy. Dr. Pugsley, disamed from Mr. Roy. Dr. Pugsley, discovering that the document was in the witness's possession, thought that it ought o go into evidence. Mr. Roy declined to give the paper up, and it was only when he (Carvell) was dictating to the stenorapher an order to commit Roy for commpt that he gave up the document, her would have us believe that they were hey would have us believe that they were villing to put the document in evidence, ut he could tell the members of this House that the committee had to adopt oercion to get the document out of them. It is absurd for the honorable gentleman Hazen) to come here and say he was dealed to have it put me vidence when ighted to have it put m evidence, when its witness had to be threatened with im-orisonment before he would give it up. orisonment before he would give it up. Hon. Mr. Emmerson—Where is he now? Mr. Carvell—I think I will tell you before I get through with it. I know something about him, that I don't think the est of you know. Two or three days ater I remember that Mr. Roy found it iecessary to pinch himself to see if he was dive. When he finished testifying he expressed thanks to the Almighty that he was still alive and hoped that he would never get into Mr. Pugsley's hands again. Laughter). On his way home, Mr. Roy topped for a short time at Fredericton function, and while there came in conact with a railroad men called Charlic and another called Bill. While sending a elegram to the railway station he heard Charlic ask Bill if he had seen the papers. Bill replied in the negative, whereupon on. Now, Prof. Swain is not a man wh Bill replied in the negative, whereupon Chralie said: "Well, you ought to read about the way Pugsley ripped that bridge witness (indicating Roy) up the back. Laughter and applause). That was the ast seen of Roy, and I think it will be a ong time before the New Brunswick legis ature will hear from him again regarding he cost of steel bridges. (Applause).

the prices paid in New Brunswick were excessive and that the chief commissioner had been guilty of gross neglect—of boodl-

ing, as it were. In charging the chief com-missioner with having allowed these people to get more for these bridges than they