SEMI-WEEKLY SUN, ST. JOHN. N B. APRIL 21, 1900.

103,681 57,640

915.792 4.650

## HAZEN'S SPEECH, | per pound for every bridge construct A Calm and Honest Statement Re the Bridge Charges.

The Evidence on Both Sides Reviewed With Impartiality and Thoroughness.

er

or to

nd one

exclus-

Bruns-

Breed.

a Mari.

eight

news.

especia

DNS.

Β.

of pub-

and Co.,

has re-

several

return-

, where

time.-

as been

Howard

a Easter

spent a

lethodist

ached a

ter sea-

he choir

16.-Jos.

he home

ves. af-

ase. He

known

of the

joddard.

fall, af-

who died

ienic at

as much

m. He

Frank

received

into full

o daught-

er. sed in the

h yester-

venty-two

ersion in

It Baring,

ducted by

Mr. Bel-

ing on.

IA.

Co., April

he butter

ecided to

dwelling

commence

Slipp has

se maker. cently met

Chlipman.

risiting her

at Apo-

tke charge

. April 16.

place and

urst were

O. N. Mott

Frederioton

knees at

days ago

. Several pped to the

od for peo-

work last

t of Three

ughs. Colds.

s Dr. Chase's

at hand, is

serious ill-

of Linseed

ht remedy

ident moth-

throat and

cured their

by using

ntion are

cted or un-

always be

timely use

inseed and

not rob the

dy, at hand.

soothing in

taste and

Dr. Chase's urpentine is

ughs, colds,

on and soreest, cold on of colds in s or lungs. 11 dealers, 01 Toronto.

hen mother

Canada.

antine.

edv

May 1st.

ION.

for

eeves of

3

week.

from

It is.

Treating the Case Not from a Partizan Standpoint, But With a True Kye to the Public Weal.

(Continued from Wednesday's Semi-Weekly.)

The witness further stated that his company had tendered for a great many bridges in Nova Scotia, and had secured one contract in three years. Passing on, Mr. Hazen read the following evidence given by Mr. Roy: Q .- Since you came to the province on this trip have you examined any highway bridges in New Brunswick? A .- Yes, I have examined the Lefebvre, Salisbury, Sussex and Petit-

1898 and 1699

codiac bridges. Q.-In your opinion how does the workmanship and material of the Lefebvre bridge compare with bridges turned out by your company or the Dominion Bridge Co? A.-Speaking of our own work you cannot say much about the material, because it is a very difficult matter to say anything about it once it is in the bridge, and in fact the only way to tell anything about it is to have its surface produced. As to workmanship, the workmanship on Lefebvre bridge does not compare favorably with the work on the upper Canadian companies. Q.-In what particulars? A.-Well! there are several particulars. In the

first place the rivetting has evidence that it is done by hand, and also the "I" bars in that bridge have the apnearance that leads me to believe the heads have been welded on to the body of the bar. Also the boring of the bars in that bridge, so far as I examined them, was poor-appears to be mproperly done.

Q .- You can readily explain the difference between machine and hand rivetting? A .-- Yes. It is a cheaper method for one thing, and is not as goad by any means. The specification for that particular bridge distinctly forbid eny such thing being done. Q .-- How can you tell about the

diagonal and cross bars and the tension of the bars? A .- It is a simple patter to tell that, because you test the bars and find where there are two bars together whether one is slack and the other tight. Q .-- You notice that in the Lefebvre

A.--Yes. Q.-Is that a difficulty of a serious

character? A .- It is of a serious char- average price was less than 4 cents acter, inesmuch as the one bar is car- per lb., and that at a time when rying all the load the two bars should Q.-I think you stated before this more than in 1895, 1896 and 1897, when carry.

d.sparity in the bars is caused by the the Campbell, Lefebvre and Blackboring arror gements; is that correct? ville bridges were built. Then, again, the bridges contained in that list are Q.-What examination did you make searly all of them comparatively A.-Yes. ficiently to ascertain that it was an Campbell, Lefebvre and Blackville had made inquiries as to the cost of take this work. In fact, he says that exceedingly heavy bridge, and in vari- bridges, and it is well known that the lighter bridges cost more per bound to ous points was very much heavier than construct than the heavier ones; and there was any occasion for. The witness named the parts which yet, despite that fact, and despite the he considered too heavy, explained fact that when these bridges were built, material was a cent a how to tell that the rivetting was properly done, and how to tell pound higher than in '95, '96 and '97, whether the members were rigid when the Campbell, Lefebvre and question as to what his company bridges were erected at a sum of over or loose, and in answer to a 3 cents a 1b. less than was paid for would have built the bridge for in the Campbell, Lefebvre and Black-1897, he stated that they would have ville bridges, and a great many cents been glad to have taken the contract less than was paid for the Dingee receive for traffic, including lumber and Brook, Saunders Brook, Grand Manan all other items of construction, for 4 and other bridges. (Applause.) It was true that in some of the bridges concents per 1b., and stated that he artained in that list the flooring was \$2.70 per hundred pounds, f. o. b. the not included, and in a few the freight hundred ins.; erection and painting, 55 those in which the freight was not cents per hundred lbs., and lumber \$15 per thousand. That would make a total of \$2,303.12, or \$3.90 per hundred lbs. Mr. Roy further stated that according to plans prepared by the comrany, such as were in use in Ontario. they would have constructed a bridge as the present Lefebvre bridge and (Mott) had tried to make a point out carried a heavier live load for \$7,476. Mr. Hazen then read the evidence of Mr. Roy respecting the Campbell bridge, in which that gentleman stated that his company would have built the Campbell bridge according to the plans and specifications of the New Brunswick government for \$6,167, including erection and flooring, which figured up \$3.96 per hundred pounds; also Mr. Roy's evidence stating that his company had built in 1896 a bridge of about the same length and weight and of a similar character to the Saunders Brook bridge for \$150; also Mr. Roy's evidence stating that his company would have erected the Campbell bridge, complete and ready for traffic, for \$4.04 per hundred 1bs., according to the plans prepared by Mr. Wetmore. Referring to the Petitcodiac bridge, Mr. Roy stated that the rivetting on that bridge was the worst he had seen on any bridge in the province, and he stated further that his company would have built that bridge for \$5.03 per hundred pounds. Mr. Hazen read further from Mr. Roy's evidence, showing that his company had built the Hunter's Mill bridge, in Nova Scotia, in 1898. That bridge weighed 30,561 lbs., and they had received for it \$1,265, or \$4.20 per hundred lbs., erected complete and ready for traffic. Mr. Hazen read further from the evidence to show that Mr. Roy did not agree with the statement that bridges built in New Brunswick by New Brunswick firms were far better and would last much longer than bridges built in New Brunswick by upper province concerns, and that he claimed that the bridges built by his

1896 Bayfield bridge ... 1896 Black Avan bridge 1857 Little Clace Bay ... 1898 Trupp .... New Brunswick firms for the ament, and had also drawn the

government, and had also drawn the extention of the house to the fact that Mr. Roy had on each stated that his compeny would in 1897 have construc-ted the Lefebvre and Campbell bridges for less than 4 cents per lb., and the Pelifecidise for 5 cents per lb., and also to the fact that Prof. Swain had The average cost per lb. of those bridges was 4.69 cents, and they were the only contracts received in the pro-vince of Nova Scotia between the years 1893 and 1895 by the Dominion Br Cc., as in 19 cases out of every 20 they were underbid by the local bridge builders of Nova Scotia. Continuing, swarn that steel structural work of a character similar to that in the Trueman Peud bridge had been delivered Mr. Hazen referred to the Woodstock bridge, built in 1894 by the Canadian on the Buston Common for a sum in some cases under 3 cents and in oth-ers between 2 and 5 cents per lb. These frois, he thought, were of themselves Bridge Co. under tender and contract, according to plans prepared by Mr. Wetmore, chief engineer of the departsufficient to establish the charge which ment of public works, which bridge he seid was the equal of any bridge in he had made as to the prices paid for bridges in this province, but he had further evidence to offer to the house in the question. His learned friend (Dr. Pugsley) scemed to have got the (Arplause). It would be said that the the province of Nova Scotia, and which company which built that bridge had lost namey by it, and were forced to idea into his head that the upper province bridge companies were prepared to do the work in this province and fail, but there was no evidence of that. There was evidence that Mr. the province of Neva Scotia at cost, or Arneld, who was the inspector of the less than ocet, in order to drive our works, had condemned certain maown local concerns out of business, terial in that bridge, but there was not and that they could afford to do the a tittle of evidence to show that the con pany had been ruined by its losses work at cost in the lower provinces, because of the large prices which they in connection with the construction of received in Cntarlo and Quebec. With that tridge. If the chief commissioner that thought in his mind, the hon. had addried the same course in con-nection with that bridge which he has than Afred Haines, who the governgentleman (Pugsley) insisted that the stakement which Mr. Roy had prepar. in the Campbell, Lefebvre and Black-ville bridges the Woodstock bridge ed of the cast of the bridges built by his company in the upper provinces in would have cost this province \$23,000 more then it did. He had no hesita-SHOULD BE PUT IN EVIDENCE. tion in saying that it had been fully

and amply proved before the investi- been constructed with such a defect He no doubt believed that that stategating committee that this province as is mentioned by Mr. Arnold, even ment would have the effect of comwas paying double for its bridges what admitting that the defect is one of pletely disproving Mr. Roy's stateit should pry. Now what is the justi- | construction. Mr. Arnold says that the ment that in 1896 and 1897 his company fication set up for this condition of relier must have become twisted by would have taken the contract for things? The justification set up in the the formation settling since the budge the erection and completion of the report of the committee as submitted was erected, although he thought this Campbell and Lefebvre bridges at 4 to this house is one that is founded improbable. Taking all the evidence cents per ub. While he (Hazen) convery largely on a statement of fact before the committee and before the sidered it a most unfair thing that Mr. that cannot be proved and has not house, it is impossible to conclude that Roy should be compelled to produce been proved by the evidence. Mr. Em- the bridges built by the Record Founto the committee a document which nurson went on the stand and gave dry Co. and by Mr. Ruddock are sushowed the profits and losses of his what purported to be a history of per-manent bridge construction in this by the upper province manufacturers, company and was a private paper, yet that document had added the strongprovince. He pointed out that in the or that they will last any longer. More est possible strength to Mr. Roy's tesearly years the government built work has been put upon some parts timony that he would have constructbridges out of cld rollway bridges; of the bridges designed by Mr. Weted the Campbell and Lefebvre bridges then they had tenders called for the more, which has in some degrees enfor 4 cents per 1b. That statement Suesex, Salisbury, Hampton and St. banced the cost of those bridges withshows a summary of 48 bridges, the George bridges, which were construct- cut adding much to their strength, or average cost per 1b of which, erected, ed by upper province concerns. Then the length of time they will last. On floored and ready for traffic, was to the system was changed and the presthe company 3.56 cents per 1b, and to ent one adopted, and the whole defence late chief commissioner started out the people who bought them, 5.96 set up in the report of the committee upon his new bridge building policy," cents per lb. Mr. Hazen gave the for that change is based on facts that but, I would ask, did he make proper weights, etc., of a number of the were not established by evidence bebridges contained in the statement, fore the committee and are not capable showing that the prices ranged from of proof. Mr. Hazen read a lengthy prices being paid for steel bridges ? \$3.12 per hundred lbs to \$4.95 per hunextract from the report of the commit- He admits that he did not. He gives dred lbs., running up in three cases tee, and said that the committee by us the somewhat surprising statement to over 6 cents per lb., and in one their statement tried to make the that he did not even know at that house and country believe that the time that steel highway bridges were case to over 7 cents, but averaging, as he had said, \$3.96 per hundred lbs. In cest of the Hampton bridge was 7 3-10 being built at New Glasgow for the one case the company had paid \$800 capis per lb., the Sussex bridge 64-10 Nova Scotia government. He made freight, and in another \$500; but with cents per lb., and the Salisbury bridge no inquiries whatever from the other reads per lb., and the Salisbury bridge mo inquiries whatever from the other machinists of this province as to all that, and leaving out bridge No. 57-10 cents per lb. 'The chief commis-1054, which was the one which had sioner (Emmerson) in giving his evidbeen built out of old material, the ence had stated that he had an estimate of the weight of these bridges are today, several firms in the city of prepared by Mr. Haines, but there was St. John better fitted out to build material, according to the evidence of no evidence to show that such an esti- steel bridges than were the Record A. E. Peters, was worth a cent a pound mate had been prepared or how it had Foundry Co., who were not at that been prepared. That estimate was put time even engaged in bridge work. in evidence, and the chairman stated There was also a large machine shop

act with the government to build the Lefebvre, Campbell and Blackangl not as expensive as the work on some portions of the Campbell dge. He was the only man upon the Lefebvre, Campbell and Black-ville bridges for 6 1-2 cents per pound to witness stand who presumed to by that the life of Campbell and Leected, the government to pay for oring, and as it was shown by ent to pay for the evidence, the government also paid for the painting. No contract was entered into for this work, but several inter-esting letters passed in this connec-tion. First we have this letter :-rebyre bridges would be longer than that of the three other bridges just merikaned, and in this respect he di-rectly contradicts Chief Engineer Wet-m re, Prof. Swein, Mr. Roy, Mr. Serion and Mr. Lockhart, all of whom agreed that it was practically impossible to tell ficw long a steel bridge would last FREDERICTON, N. B., Nov. 6th, 1396. Mr. A. E. Peters, Record Foundry and Machine Company, Moncton: Dear Sir-Mr. Alfred Haines, the bridge inspector for this department, has received written instructions with respect to the College and Hammond River bridges. I have also notified him that I will require him to ret menture that a 200 front snaw for the if it was properly cared for. Mr. Arncld, it is true, does point out a few defects in the Sussex and Salisbury bridges just as Prof. Swain and Mr. Roy found defects in the Lefebyre and

also notified him that I will require him t get constructed a 200 foot span for th Blackville bridge, the same in all respects a the 200 foot spans for the College bridge. did not know where to write him, but has sent the letter to St. Marys, thinking, per haps, he would get it there earlier than a any other place. I have no idea as to h whereabouts at present. The chief engine is forwarding some plans to him in you care, I think. They relate to details of the bridges that are required. I have some a rangements outside of Mr. Haines for the construction of two 80 foot spans for the Blackville bridge. Yours truly, Camptell structures. The most of these defects are of a minor and immaterial character, except as it may be forwing the general class of workmerstip. The most serious defect indicated in any of the bridges was that printed out by Mr. Arnold upon the expension portion of the Salisbury bucce. He says in his evidence that one of the rollers is very much out of place, and that the shoe is turned out H. R. EMMERSON. (Sgd), of alignment with the bridge. If this uns other letter was also written be so, the defect is one, it would seem, upon the same date: which should have been discovered by the bridge inspector when it was under erection. And who was the inspector

FREDERICTON, N. B., Nov. 6th, 1896. Ilred Haines, Esq., Bridge Inspector, St. Marys, York Co., N. E.: Alfred Haines, Esq., Bridge Inspector, St. Marys, York Co., N. E.: Dear Sir-I would like you to order the material for the construction of the super-structure of the College bridge, also for the span of the bridge over the Hammond Rive, sometimes called Campbell's bridge. This is a 241 foot span. Also for a span of the Blackville bridge, 200 feet in length. I want you to supervise the construction of these bridges upon the usual terms, you to make the best arrangement possible in the interest of the department, and have a careful super-vision over the material and the putting to-gether of the same. There are three spans altogether of the Blackville bridge, but two of the spans, which are 80 feet long, I pro-pose to have constructed elsewhere. I want you to take the same care with respect to the matter of the Petiteodia: and Port Elgin bridges, and other structures constructed under your supervision. Make the best pos-sible terms and report to me from time to time as to the progress being made in the work. Yours truly. (Sgd), H. R. EMMERSON. mant put forward as a veritable geniu in the mechanical line. Had Mr. Haines properly performed his duties as inspector it would have been impos-sible for the Salisbury bridge to have

H. R. EMMERSON. (Sgd)

Mr. Haines, acting under these instructions, gees to Mr. Peters and makes precisely the terms which had previously been agreed upon between Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Peters. The result of this bargain was that A. E. Peters received for these three bridges the sum of \$36,219.55. He paid the Record Foundry Co. \$25.631.55, leaving him \$10,588 for the erection of the Campbell and Lefebvre bridges. We find Alfred Haines acting in many capacities and taking many different parts. First, he is a shareholder in the Record Foundry Co.; second, he is a man who makes the agreements between the prevince and his company for the crection of its highway bridges; third, he endorses the notes,

ACCEPTS THE DRAFTS

and finances these bridges for Mr. Peters; fourth, he certifies that these bridges which his company are building for the government of New Brunswick are properly built: fifth, he receives the money for these bridges and hands it over to the builders. A multiplicity of functions, of which every member in this house must agree with knowledge. Mr. Speaker, which The states

the same results would accrue to our province as is the result in Nova Sco-tia, and our firms could yet build on steel bridges, and our laborers s two days' employment upon the where they now get one. Just one thing more I desire to say. Mr. Speaker, before I take my seaf, and that is regarding the utter and absolute lack of justification for the sta ment made upon the hustings out this province in the election can paign of 1899, that the highway bridges in this province had been built for 6 1-2 cents per pound, all completed. Not in one instruce has this been true. As I have shown this house, I think most conclusively, the bridges built in this province under the administration of Mr. Emmerson have cost all the way from 8 to rearly 13 cents per pound. I would refer here to the speech of the hon. ex-chief commissioner, delivered at the Fredericton Opera House, and printed and sent all over this province during the last election campaign. In that speech, the then chief 20 toner said that he would stake the existence of his government upon the statement that the bridges built by New Brunswick concerne would last enywhere from 50 to 75 years longer then these built by upper province manufacturers. Through all the many days of the bridge inquiry, and in all the mess of evidence reported to this house, there is not a tittle of testimony to suffort that statement. We have it upon the authority of Mr. Roy, Prof. Swain, Mr. Sefton, Mr. Lockhart that no person can tell how long these

bridge building work up to public petition and tender? If this were

buidges will last. THEY ALL CONTRADICT

the ex-chief commissioner, whom, we must conclude, was speaking without any authority whatever, and wholly upon his cwn imagination. Take again the other statement of the honcrable nember that he would defy the opposition to produce two reputable ergineers who would say that our bridges are not superior to those of the upper province concerns. We have produced these engineers, they have given their sworn testimony, which is to the effect that bridges built by upper province concerns are fully equal to those manufactured at double the Ince in our own province. The premier's only defense now is to say that these engineers, Prof. Swain and Mr. Rcy, and also Mr. Section and Mr. Lockhart, are not reputable men, which course, I hardly think that even he, in his disperate straits, will venture upon. And what have we to say about the protection of home industry in the case of the contracts awarded to Willard Eddehen? According to Mr. Emmerson, Mr. Litchen was left free to go wherever he pleased for the supenstructure of the bridges anvarded to him. He might have gone to Nova Scottia, v. tose firms are able to un-

dertid even the Untaric bridge builders. Or he might have gone to the Ontario firms. According to the premier's cwn testimony, Mr. Kitchen was entirely free to go where he pleased. If this was so, what about encouragement to and protection of home industry? Great stress that he admitted it not as evidence of here in the city of Fredericton, but we me is not paralleled in this or any had been laid by the honorable the weight of the bridges, but as evidence of do not find that Mr. Emmerson asked other country of which we have any member for Kings (Pugsley) upon the statement that it is tial in building bridges that

while the bridge is under construction.

Mr. Roy, Mr. Arnold and Prof. Swain

have given evidence to this effect,

and we all believe that it is very de-

at the shops while the bridge is under

spection is it which Mr. Haines gives

to the bridges ? We have Mr. Rud-

his shops only three or four times

the two spans of the Blackville bridge

were being built. I leave it to the

honorable members to decide if such

clared upon his oath that the only

practical test of the material was

that made by special machinery at

be-

he Mothervice on persons

> were bridges not very far from the city of Hamilton, and the material had bridges were constructed. been hauled to the site, while the flooring was a very small item and would not increase the cost more than by a small fraction of a cent per lb. The hon. member for Restigouche of the fact that in only a few cases any considerable profit out of the bridges contained in the statement, while in the great majority of cases their profit had been very small, and in some cases there had been a loss. He did not see how that could afout the argument of the hon. member for Kings (Pugsley) that these companies were making large profits provinces, and were doing the work in the lower provinces at cost, or less than cost, in order to crush out the lower province firms. However, there was not much force in that argument in view of the fact that the Hamilton Bridge Co. had only been able to secure one contract in Nova Scotia in three years, in competition with the local bridge builders, Stewart and McNeill. The total net profit on the bridges mentioned in the statement was \$6,578.71, which he thought was a fair profit on the work done. Passing on Mr Hazen said that he had further evidence that this province was paying two prices for its bridges, and that evidence was contained in a statement of the cost of 22 bridges built by the Dominion Bridge Co. in Nova Scotia from 1893 to 1898, the contracts and plans and specifications for which Mr. Johnson produced before the committee, but which he was not allowed to put in evidence. That statement was as follows : NOVA SCOTIA HIGHWAY BRIDGES. Equ'vt Weight. Price. Date. Name. 1893 Fort Clyde bridge 1893 Palmerston bridge 1893 Palmerston bridge 1893 Palmerston bridge .... 82,844 4.255 company were equal if not superior to .201,241 .37,103 . 25,907 the bridges built in other parts of anada. The house book recess till half past 1893 Grand River bridge seven. CARTINIANS after recess, Mr. Hazen said that be had read extracts from 1895 Fiers for Ishgonish ..... 49,714 33,769 13,858 14,607 said that be had read extracts from the evidence of Prof. Swain and Mr. Roy which, in his judgment, bore particularly on the matter now under consideration. During the afternoon he had pointed cut to the house the very large and excessive price paid 1895 Larry's River bridge... 22,508 10,811 22,675 19,287

cost \$3,730, or \$5.29 per hundred lbs.; the weight of the St. George bridge, built in 1893, was E0,031 lbs.: that it cust \$2,470, or \$4.09 cents per hundred lbs.; or an average price per 1b. of 4.97 for these three bridges built by the was not included. In the cases of Deminion Bridge Co. in 1892 and 1895. when metal was higher than in the Campbell, Lefebvre and Blackville

WHAT OTHER DEFENSE

will the hon. chief commissioner make? tempts were made to prove to the committee that the bridges erected by the New Brunswick concern were superior had the Hamilton Bridge Co. made to those of the upper Canadian buildfect the case at all, but it hardly bore gave evidence upon this point, and they say that, while there is more work ipon some parts of Campbell and Trueman Pend bridges, yet they are out of their contracts in the upper in no way superior for the purposes for sex, Hampton and Salisbury strucwere first class bridges of their kind. Mr. Secton, a practical bridge builder, and also one of the witnesses for Mr. Emmerson, sgreed with Mr. Lockhart and said that the Sussex, Salisbury and Hampton bridges were all that was more work in the posts and some they were designed to do, and both rewould lest any longer than the Sussex, 5.191 5.385 4.594 4.436 4.25 3.69 4.231 5.134

6.216 4.542 4.573

ence of the fact that Mr. Emmerson them if they were willing to underthe bridges built by the upper provinces the did not make any inquiries outside I have given this house this evening the inspector should be at the works firms for the New Brunswick govern- of A. E. Peters. We find by the eviment before embarking on his present dence that he went to A. E. Peters fire the committee, facts which canpolicy. He (Hazen) held in his hand and made an arrangement to build not be denied or argued away by the a statement of the exact weight of the Custac, Elgin and Douglastown ex-chief commissioner or the speakers exich piece of n.etal that went into the bridges, they to keep an account of upon that side. And what defense can simable that the inspector should be construction of the Salisbury, Sussex the material used in the actual labor end St. George bridges. That state- put upon the bridges, for which, with ment showed that the weight of the Salisbury bridge, built in 1892, was 75,- was to pay them. The result of this structed by upper province concerns is 194 lbs., that it cost \$3,600, or \$4.07 per was that the three bridges named cost hundred lbs.: the weight of the Sussex 6 3-4 cents f. o. b. at the company's bridge, built in 1892, was 51,577; that it works at Moneton. This price is before the committee. Another line of during the three or four months that hon. member, according to his own showing, says that he paid for the Sussex, Salisbury and Hampton bridges. Mr. Emmerson now says that he thought 6 3-4 cents per pound was too high a price to pay for these bridges, and that the company, years 1895, 1896 and 1897, when the having acquired the plant and having the experience, should have built the group of bridges at a less rate. HE ACCORDINGLY MADE a new agreement with the Record The defense has been sought and at- Foundry Co. and secured a magnificent reduction of one-quarter of one cent

the strength of this supposition, the

inquiries? Did he inform himself as

to the average and current market

their ability to construct highway

bridges. There were at that time, and

per pound, and had the Grand Manan, Dingee and Saunders Brook bridges built at 6 1-2 cents f. o. b. at Moncton. ers. To justify this defense an attempt But these were built in a year when was made to show that Sussex, Hamp- the price of steel was considerably ton and Salisbury bridges were in- less than it was when the three first fenior to the Lefebvre, Campbell and named bridges were built, and at the others built by the Record Foundry prices prevailing when the Grand Ma-Co. Prof. Swain and Mr. Roy both nan and the two other bridges were built, the Record Foundry Co. really made a considerably larger profit in building them at 6 1-2 cents per pound than they did in getting 6 3-4 cents per pound for the Elgin, Cuisac and which they are intended than the Sus- Douglastown bridges. Before the next series of bridges were built, the hon. tures. Mr. Lockhart, an engineer and chief commissioner had the experia practical man brought here by the ence of the Woodstock bridge, which, government themselves, said in his as I have already shown this house evidence that, while Lefebvre and most conclusively from the evidence, Campbell were heavier than Sussex, cost only 4 cents per pound. I sub-Campbell were heavier than Sussex, cost only 4 cents per pound. I sub-Salisbury and Hampton, yet the latter mit, Mr. Speaker, that the chief commissioner, even though he had fallen into an error, and an error which is hardly excusable, but even though he had done this, after his experience with the Woodstock bridge, there was no excuse for his continuing upon this were required, and that while there expensive policy. The chief commissioner claims that he still thought other perts of Campbell bridge, yet that 6 1-2 cents per pound f. o. b. too he would not say that it was any bet- high a price to pay for the material ter than the Sussex or Hampton bridges, which both Mr. Sefton and Mr. Leckhart agreed would do the work must erect them, and he so told the Record company. This, of course, is fised to say, even though pressed to the practice of all other bridge builddo so by the bon. member for Kings, ing concerns. And now we have some that Lefebvre and Campbell bridges most extraordinary evidence. Mr. Emmerson went to 'A. E. Peters as presi-Salisbury or Hampton bridges. Mr. dent of the Record Foundry Co., and Arnold was introduced by the govern- told him that if his company was to ment as an expert in bridge building. build the bridges they must erect He (Hazen) supposed that the hon. them as well. Alfred Peters talked member for Restigouche (Mott) would the matter over with. his brother sneer at the New York expert engineer Joshua. They called no meeting of as he had done at Prof. Swain and the directors; they seemed to consult Mr. Roy as expert witnesses. How- no person else; but they decided that ever, we have his evidence. He trank- their company would not undertake ly stated that his examination of the the erection of steel bridges. And tricges in this province was only then a most peculiar arrangement was superficial, as he could spend but a entered into. Alfred Peters, as presisupernexal, as the could spend but a dent of the Record Foundry Co., re-

are facts taken from the evidence bethey set up? I have already shown that the defense that New Brunswick construction; and yet what sort of inbuilt bridges are better than those conone not supported by the evidence of dock's sworn testimony that he visited the competent witnesses who appeared considerably in excess of what the defense which the hon. ex-chief commissioner will set up is that this policy was inaugurated and carried on for the ercourregement of home industry and inspection as that is worthy of the for the purpose of keeping this work name. Mr. Arnold, the expert witfor our own people. I will be glad to ness, and very competent engineer, find my honerable friend among the called on behalf of the premier, deadvocates of protection for home industry. I will allow no one, sir, to outdo me in advocating protection of and cheours gement for home industries. I, the shops. We have not in this provand all the honorable members sup-

ince any of that special machinery for testing strains and strength of steel. parting me, ere, and have been, advocates of the national policy in our and it is only in the larger shops of Comadian affairs. My honorable friend, reputable bridge building concernsthat such tests are made. Take the the huncrable chief commissioner, has opposed and denounced that policy and evidence of Mr. Arnold, the governhas claimed that we should be free to ment's own witness, and what can webuy in the cheapest market and sell in conclude that Mr. Haines' inspection, the dearest. But there is nothing is worth? But far and beyond provwhatever in his defense and argument ing most conclusively that two prices that, if our bridge building were have been paid in this province for the bridges named in the charges prethrown open to cutside firms, our worknen would be deprived of this ferred in this house, the inquiry fore the investigating committee has labor. The Nova Scotia bridge building firms get work in open competition. disclosed a most astonishing state of It is most estonishing that Mr. Peters, affairs in the public works department of this province. I have no hesitation, as he told us in his evidence, has never put in a tender for bridges in Mr. Speaker, in saying that such a Nova Scotia, nor in fact has never state of affairs cannot be found even tried to get any bridge building work in the business of a small country other than that done for the New merchant, let alone the affairs of a Brunswäck government. In Nova province. It took days of weary in-Scotia the firms of Stewart and Mac- vestigation, as I have already point-Neil of New Glasgow are able to ed out, to find out the facts already underbid the Quebec and Ontario cited regarding the cost of these manufacturers, and it is only in very bridges, and up to the present hour rare cases that the upper province we have been unable to ascertain the concerns are able to secure a contract actual cost of one of these bridges-in Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia gets her Trueman's Pond. Such a state of afbridges built for one-half of what we fairs would not be allowed in a public pay, with the result that their men get works department of any other provtwo bridges to build for our one. But, ince of the dominion, or any state of what is there in this plea of Mr. Im- the union, and I am sure that the merson's that he is encouraging home business men of New Brunswick have industry? One would have supposed been astanished at the revelations from the great talk that has been made upon the oaths of the secretary made, and I confess that I myself im- of the board of works and of the agined that we were assisting to build hon. premier himself. The sooner that up a great industry at Moncton. Mr. the system now prevailing in the Peters, however, in his evidence says board of works department of this that his whole plant invested in bridge province is placed on a business basis building is valued at from \$10,000 to the better will it be for this province, \$12,000 and that they employ from 10 and were no other result accomplished to 35 men for three months of the year from the investigation held, this proupon bridge building. Mr. Ruddock vince would be well repaid by the says upon bis oath that he has change that must certainly be made from \$1,200 to \$1,400 invested in the system of keeping accounts in in bridge building plant, and that he the board of works department. employs upon an average eight men [Mr. Hazen here moved as an amat bridge building during the year. endment to the motion of the hon. And this is the extent of the great in- member for Restigouche (Mott) the minority report, seconded by Mr. dustry which we are paying enormous

prices to encourage and prosper. Is it Shaw, and already published in the desirable, I would ask this house, and Sun.] double and more than double for its bridge building work to one concern in very briefly to the assistance render-Moncton? Why, I ask, does not our ed me in this inquiry by the late short time upon each, as modeed was acht of the Record Foundry Co., re-the case with Prof. Swain and Mr. Broy. He said in his evidence that the workmanship upon the Sussex, Salis-bury and Hampton bridges was good, so, and he accordingly made a con-bury and Hampton bridges was good,

