Cove bridge. How can my honorable friend answer that? It showed that this government had obtained in the Mill Cove bridge a bridge certainly just as good, he claimed nothing more for it. The live load, the strength or the strain of it was just as great as in the bridge to which he referred in the province of Ontario, and it was obtained at $9.26 less than that company charged the municipality in Ontario to which he referred for a bridge five feet wider than the bridge which cost $9.26 per lineal foot more. (Bridge No. 1082.)

That was a riveted bridge of 80 feet and cost $2,341, the contract price, which would be at the rate of $29.26 per lineal foot. Honorable gentlemen who came after him speaking upon the other side of the question might say that was a heavier bridge, but that was not necessary, because this company might have material on hand, material rolled from the mill, upon which there had been little labor expended, which they would send to put into the bridge work; the shop labor was light and they could afford to sell at a much less price per pound than if built of sections such as were in the Lefebvre and Campbell bridges upon which from two to ten times the amount of labor had been expended in the construction of the bridge.

He intended to refer further to this statement of Mr. Roy, and would say with all confidence that honorable gentlemne had only to study this statement carefully in order to see that it proved beyond a doubt that in respect to many of the bridges which this company had built in Ontario they got a price ranging from six to seven cents per pound, and many of those were riveted bridges and of a cheaper character, the price of which was from one to one and a half cents less per pound than a pin bridge. He took for example bridge No. 1100, which was a riveted bridge costing 6.42 cents per pound, added one and a half cents to that and it made a fair selling price of 7.92 cents per pound. He wondered if his honorable friend were in Ontario and in the municipality to which this bridge was sold if he would have said that Mr. Roy's company had stolen out of that municipality. (Hear, hear.) That he had stolen a large amount and exacted from them double what the bridge was worth. To say they have charged a double price would be to reflect upon that company and charge them with exacting more than the bridge was worth; just as he said the charges made in that House reflected in the most serious way upon the character and integrity of such men as Mr. Ruddock and Mr. Peters and other gentlemen connected with the Record Foundry Company. The charges in effect were that these gentlemen had represented to the government that they were only making a fair and reasonable profit out of these bridges; in effect these gentlemen were said to have been stealing money out of the public chest and obtaining these prices under false representations; the effect of his honorable friend's charge was that in '93 when the Record Foundry Company was instructed to do this work by the day, keeping an accurate account of the cost of the metal and the shop labor and of the day's work and of the number of men employed and the time during which machinery was used, and adding only a fair and reasonable profit, the charge was in effect that the Record Foundry Company, upon whose board of directors were such men as Amos Ogden, one of the most prominent men in the county of Westmorland and a political opponent of the Hon. Mr. Emmerson, that he and others were parties to a false representation to this government; because unless the cost of those first three bridges was what they represented it to be, 6¾ cents, then they were guilty of gross misrepresentation and of perpetrating a fraud upon this government and the chief commissioner of public works, and he could not believe they would do anything of that kind, and when they said they kept an account of the cost of those three bridges and represented they actually cost 6¾ cents a pound, he could not believe but that statement was true and the chief commissioner had a perfect right to rely upon it as true, and he would not charge and did not think his honorable friend would charge the Hamilton Bridge Company, who had obtained from the municipality in the province of Ontario what would be a fair equivalent for 7.9 cents a pound for a pin bridge for No. 1100, a riveted bridge, he did not think his honorable friend would charge the company with exacting more than a fair price for the work.

Look at No. 1098, a pin bridge. My learned friend will see the price is 7.7 cents per pound; look at 1075 and he will find the price is $6.26 per hundred pounds; adding 1½ cents for an additional selling price of a pin bridge he will find it is $7.76 per hundred pounds, or nearly 7.8 cents per pound. Look at No. 974 in this statement of Mr. Roy; he will find it was a riveted bridge, the price $6.06 per 100 pounds; adding 1½ cents would make it upwards of 7½ cents per pound. No. 988 is a riveted bridge, the price $5.19 per hundred pounds; adding $1.50 makes it $6.69, or nearly 6 7-10 cents per pound. No. 964 is a riveted bridge, the cost $5.77; adding $1.50 makes it $7.27 per hundred pounds, or nearly 7¼ cents for a pin bridge per pound.

In the face of this statement of Mr. Roy, himself the manager of the Hamilton Bridge Company, which professes to turn out such cheap bridge work——

Mr. Laforest—He is not the manager.

Dr. Pugsley—Does not Mr. Roy swear he is the manager of the highway bridge department?

Mr. Laforest—He said he was the engineer.

Dr. Pugsley—He said he was the engineer and manager of the highway bridge department of that company, and more than that, he said he was the man who made the tender for all the various contracts his company obtained. He was the man upon whom the company relied to do the figuring, to estimate the fair price to charge and put in the tender on behalf of the company for the work; he was the man of all others who would know what would be a fair price to charge, the man who communicated with the New Brunswick government when they wanted lately to get in here to build our bridges, and yet I am able to show that in respect to those six bridges, and there are many others in the list to which attention might be called, and they were not dealing with governments with large public moneys at their back with comparatively poor municipalities in Ontario, they charged what would be an equivalent of from 6.7 to 7.9 cents per pound in respect to every one of those bridges to which I have called your attention.

The ground Mr. Pugsley took was those were reasonable and fair prices; he admitted if you took some of those bridges in which there was a great deal of weight and very little workmanship, which were built upon the design of the company, in respect to which there was no inspection, they could work in material which they might have left over from their railway bridges and could utilize that old material in accordance with plans and designs they themselves drew. He was free to admit in respect to some of those bridges the prices charged were lower, but if you took them all you would find on some of them they lost and in respect to others they did not make a living profit. He asked the honorable gentlemen to take those bridges in respect to which the company only claimed to have made what the company would be fairly entitled to make having reference to the capital invested, in respect to those bridges, some of which were built in '98, some in '99 the prices would run in respect to pin bridges all the way from 6.7 to 7.9 cents per pound. Then if those were fair charges he would ask what became of the statement of the honorable gentleman as made in various parts of this country and heralded through the press, that this government had been paying double, and more than double, current prices for highway bridges. Out of the mouths of their own witnesses their charge was disproved. It had been proved by their own witnesses how reasonable the prices paid by the government were; they were only reasonable and fair prices and such as this very company charged in respect to many of their own bridges and such as would yield a fair and living profit.

He had called attention to the fact Mr. Roy came here, as Mr. Johnson sought to come here, with a few selected contracts, and Mr. Roy had picked out four contracts for bridges built, and when were they built? Built in 1895, 1896 and 1897, in the years during which those bridges in respect to which the committee were making their investigation were built? No. They were bridges built in 1898; bridges in respect to which he supposed Mr. Roy discovered they had charged very low prices and thought they might make an impression on the committee. As he said last evening, it was extremely fortunate they were able to drag out of Mr. Roy this statement which spoke so eloquently in denunciation of the opinion Mr. Roy expressed as to what would be a fair price for the construction of these bridges. He had there the contract of what is called the the Hunter's Mill bridge, in Nova Scotia, and would be able to demonstrate from that contract that in order to yield a fair living profit, that between seven and eight cents per pound was the price which should have been charged in respect to that bridge, providing the ordinary workmanship went into it relative to the metal. In the first place, it was built on the design of the Hamilton Bridge Company themselves, not on a design or plan prepared by the engineer of the Nova Scotia government, because attached to the contract was the strain and material sheet of the Hamilton Bridge Company. Taking the specification it would be found it was not true as the honorable gentleman seemed to think that the government of Nova Scotia did not pay for the cost of paint put on after the erection. The company only put on a coat of paint at the works and after the bridge was erected the paint was put on by the Nova Scotia government at its own expense. (Applause). Further than that taking bridge No. 973, turning to the marvellous statement which, as he had said, was worthy of most careful study and a copy of which he hoped every honorable member would take home with him, he found the bridge referred to (No. 973), that the contract for that was let in September, 1898. It was to be finished on the 15th of November. It was a pin bridge with a span of 120 feet and the weight of the metal in the bridge was 30,136 lbs. He would like the honorable gentlemen to keep those figures in their minds, because he believed he could demonstrate to the satisfaction of the house that if in respect to that bridge you allowed a fair amount for shop labor and the same price for steel as was paid for the steel which went into the Lefevbre bridge, and allow for the erection of that bridge 1½ cents per pound, which Mr. Roy himself said would be a fair price to charge for the erection of the Lefebvre bridge, and allow a reasonable profit, he would show that if the conditions had been the same as those under which the Lefebvre bridge was constructed, allowing a fair and reasonable profit, the price would have been between seven and eight cents per pound. Surely after he had proved that, as he believed he would be able to prove it, it would be no argument in favor of the opposition to bring in a contract entered into with the Nova Scotia government under which they had built that bridge and upon which they made no money. Their total profit upon the bridge according to their own statement was only $6.58. Surely if he could show that allowing for a reasonable profit and a reasonable cost for erection, such as Mr. Roy says the Lefebvre bridge would cost, the price of the bridge was between 7 and 8 cents a pound, he thought he should be able to make a very strong point against the contention put forth by the honorable gentleman (Mr. Hazen). Taking the weight of that bridge as 30,136 lbs., the cost of steel $1.75 per 100 lbs., because that was the price which Mr. Peters swore the steel which went into the Lefebvre bridge cost, taking for the shop labor the same rate as was paid in respect to bridge No. 925, $2.32 per 100 lbs., and that was relying entirely upon figures given in Mr. Roy's own statement, it would make the shop labor $699.15. You would have the steel at $1.75 a 100 lbs., $527.92, the shop labor at the very rate put down in Mr. Roy's statement with respect to another bridge, $699.15, allowing for the lumber $150 considering it was a double floor, the under floor of spruce and the upper floor of birch, planed upon both sides, at $17.50 a thousand, the total $150 would be a reasonable price; allowing $100 for freight for that bridge from Hamilton to Nova Scotia, which would be less than 37 cents per hundred pounds which Mr. Roy said would be reasonable; then for painting the bridge after erection $150 which would be reasonable. The honorable gentleman would bear in mind he stated that under the contract the company did not have to do the painting after erection but the government and therefore it would be right to add $150 for painting. Then he allowed a profit of $400 and the honorable gentleman would see with respect to a bridge 120 feet long a profit of $400 was not excessive. If Mr. Roy's own statement were taken it would be found in respect to many of those bridges regarding which the heavier material was used and where there was less workmanship a profit of less than $400 was made; in respect to one there was a profit of $050, and others $500 and $600. Adding those figures together they would make $2,130.77, and that divided by the weight of the bridge, 30,136 pounds, would give a price of 7 cents per pound. He put it to the house as to whether or not that was not a fair calculation, taken from Mr. Roy's own figures. He was not taking then the figures of the Record Foundry Company, or the figures of Mr. Ruddock, but the figures which he found in the blue print as prices charged for shop labor in respect to other bridges, and taking the actual cost of the steel which went into the Lefebvre bridge. In the statement which he had made he did not even take the cost of erection as 1½ cents per pound, but only $193.99 which would be really only about 1-3 of a cent per pound and even taking those figures it would make the cost of that bridge just seven cents per pound; that applied to the Lefebvre bridge in respect to which Mr. Roy himself would not say but 1½ cents would be a fair price for erection, by reason of the great rush of the tide, the quicksand and the hard conditions which attend the erection of a bridge there; putting in 1½ cents per pound he was sure you would find the price of that bridge come up to wards of 8 cents per pound. (Hear, Hear). And that would only allow a fair and reasonable profit. Now in the face of this fact he would ask it candid or fair or right of the honorable gentleman, and just to the people of this country that he should put forward that a bridge built by this company in Nova Scotia out of which they made no profit as a fair criterion of the price at which this company could build bridges? And yet it was upon information like that Mr. Roy ventured to make the statement as to what the company should build those bridges for. He asked the honorable gentlemen to look at the shop labor put down for that bridge and consider whether the work in their judgment could be done for that, remembering it was a pin bridge, 120 feet long, and the shop labor put at $277.58; he asked if taking a bridge that long, weighing 30,000 pounds, it could be constructed, all the shop work done, for $277.58.

Mr. McKeown—What profit did he make?

Dr. Pugsley—He claims to have made a profit of $6.58.

Mr. Pugsley submitted that $277.58 would not begin to pay the shop labor upon it and could prove it by their own statements, because bridge No. 925 which only weighed 34,988 pounds, only 4,000 pounds more than this bridge weighed, cost $700.96 for shop labor as against $277.58 upon this bridge. Why were those figures given; was it because Mr. Roy was anxious to get into Nova Scotia he was deceiving his directors and making them believe he was making a profit of $6.58, at all events no less, and might continue to make those low tenders with the hope of getting into Nova Scotia; but it is incredible in respect to one bridge you have the shop labor where the weight is only 4,000 pounds lighter about one-third the cost of the labor in the heavier bridge. It proves one of two things—either the falisity of the statement or the mighty poor work which was done upon the bridge sent down to Nova Scotia. (Hear, hear.) It necessarily proved one or the other, and so he might go through that statement and show many other peculiarities. Mr. Roy made a great point of the fact that his company had constructed a beam bridge 23 feet long for which they had charged $150; but if we looked on a little further we would find his company constructed a beam bridge, No. 948—35 feet long, 66 feet wide—for $348, which seems a low price, but if we went down a little farther we would find his company constructed another beam bridge 38 feet long—only three feet longer than the last, of the same width, and got a price of $1,545 for it. (Hear, hear.) What was the explanation of that? One bridge, 35 feet long, 66 feet wide, a beam bridge, $348 for it; another beam bridge only three feet longer, exactly the same width and for that $1,545. My honorable friend from the county of Madawaska will no doubt deal with this subject before the debate is closed. Mr. Pugsley said that he trusted when he came to deal with it he would explain, if he could, how it was that this company which was so anxious to get into Nova Scotia and show us how cheap bridges could be built—how for one beam bridge of exactly the same width and only three feet longer they got from one municipality $1,545 and for the other beam bridge of exactly the same width and made up of the same material they got $348. He would like the honorable gentleman to grapple with that subject and explain to the satisfaction of the house and the country, if he could. For the beam bridge in respect to which they got $1,545 the price would be $41 per lineal foot.

Those were some of the mysteries connected with bridge building, so far as this company was concerned, and the very small price the company charged in respect to one beam bridge of $348 in order, as Mr. Roy swore, perhaps, to keep in the swim or get their feet in, which might explain how anxious they were to do that at the low price in order when they got the next opportunity to tender for a beam bridge they might get the higher price of $1,545. (Applause).

In respect to the steel which went into those bridges the honorable gentleman had spoken so often of the high price of metal and sought to explain that that might account for this higher price in 1899. Mr. Pugsley had gone carefully over the statement of the steel which had gone into all those bridges built by the Hamilton Bridge Company in 1898 and 1899 and the average was less per pound, taking all the bridges together in those years, than what the steel cost the Record Foundry Company for whet went into the Lefebvre and Campbell bridges. Taking the Hunter's Mill bridge built in Nova Scotia, the steel there cost $1.48 per hundred pounds, as against $1.75 per hundred pounds for the steel in the Campbell and Lefebvre bridges, a difference of 27 cents, being the additional cost of the steel which went into the Campbell and Lefebvre bridges; and so he might continue through the list. He would read from Mr. Roy's statement the total quantity of steel. The total estimated weight was 1,050,860 pounds and taking the total cost of the steel it would be found it was considerably less per hundred pounds than the steel which went into the bridges built by the Record Foundry Company, and the average price as much as 00 cents per hundred pounds less than what metal cost Mr. Ruddock, which went into the Mill Cove and Trueman Pond bridges. It would be in the vicinity of 60 cents per pound less than the metal which went into those two bridges constructed by Mr. Ruddock. There was another important thing you could see, taking the weight, and that was that this company was always careful—perhaps not every time, but upon the whole—careful that the weight of the metal which they put into the bridges was considerably less than that they allowed the municipalities to suppose they would put in; because on the whole the actual weight is very much less than the weight upon which they tendered and under the design and plan prepared by themselves. The total estimated weight is given at 1,050,860, and what do you suppose was the actual weight? Only 944,358, or a difference of 106,502 pounds. So we find the actual weight of this bridge was less by 106,502 pounds than the weight estimated by them according to their strain sheet and material sheet and which they represented to those municipalities would be put into the bridges. (Applause.)

That will explain, Mr. Speaker, how it is these companies when they can, build bridges according to their own design and strain sheet and material sheet, having no inspection or anybody to look after it on behalf of the municipalities they can roll the material lighter than the strain sheet requires and the material sheet or design requires and in that way save money.

Mr. Emmerson—Ten per cent.

Ten per cent. actual weight less than the estimated weight which they lead the municipalities to believe would be put into the bridges. Every time you look at this blue print you discover facts of the greatest consequence and upon which you could build up an argument against the contention of my honorable friend.

Mr. Pugsley, having referred to Mr. Roy's statement, said he would like to call attention briefly to some statements which the honorable gentleman had made in reference to what Mr. Johnson said that his company built bridges for in the province of Nova Scotia. Of course it was not necessary to call the attention of the House to the fact that in reading that statement his honorable friend had been departing from the record and endeavoring to prevent this House and ask the judgment of this House upon facts which were not before the committee, facts which have not been testified to, but which were mere statements of Mr. Johnson and might or might not be correct. His honorable friend said he had a statement from Mr. Johnson as to what the weight of the Sussex and Salisbury bridges was. With regard to that there was the statement of Mr. Arnold, who carefully inspected the Woodstock bridge at the works said he swore acting in the interests of the government he would not take the weight of any bridge building company as presented by the people whose duty it was to weigh the material, because he said he has known very often the weight given to be very different from the actual weight; and therefore he would require his honorable friend to be able to pledge his own word to the correctness of those statements before he would feel disposed to accept them himself or say the country or the House should accept them as correct. My honorable friend, Mr. Pugsley said, had chosen to read them to this House and asks them to take it as correct while he complains that the chief commissioner acted upon the estimated weight which was prepared by his responsible engineer upon whom rested the duty of ascertaining what those weights were. He would grant his honorable friend might have some warrant for making the statement to the House that these statements were correct, but as to that, on the other hand, he could say we have the estimates made up by Mr. Haines of what the weights were, given to the chief commissioner, when Mr. Haines would have no interest whatever to state differently from what they were, when he would know it would be his duty to state them correctly, because he was desired by his superior officer to state correctly, and Mr. Haines gives to the chief commissioner the weight of the Sussex bridge, 42,000 pounds; the Hampton, a little over 155,000 pounds, and Salisbury, a little over 69,000 pounds, and he would as soon take the disinterested statement of Mr. Haines, made at a time when he had no object and could by no possibility have any object in stating them differently from what they were; he would a great deal rather take the statement of Mr. Haines made under those circumstances than the statement of an interested man like Mr. Johnson, who had declined to act upon the request of the committee and bring before the committee the contracts which his company had made in the province of Ontario and give to them and to the House and to this country information which as a fair man, desirous of keeping nothing back and simply seeing the truth was disclosed to the committee and to the country, would have felt it his duty to present them, if animated by any such motive as that. He is an interested witness and one who had a motive to sustain the charges made by Mr. Hazen, and therefore he would rather take the estimate of a responsible engineer of the department than a statement made by Mr. Johnson under the circumstances mentioned and not under oath. In reference to Mr. Johson, as his honorable friend had chosen to make some statements as to what he could prove if he had an opportunity of doing so, he wished to repeat an observation he had made yesterday that even now Mr. Hazen does not choose to give any statement from Mr. Johnson as to what they built bridges for in Quebec and Ontario. He noticed how careful his honorable friend and Mr. Johnson were to confine their information to bridges in the province of Nova Scotia. Mr. Johnson showed an equal anxiety with Mr. Roy upon that subject and gave no information as to what they got for bridges in the home market where, as the committee said, and very properly, it would be reasonable to estimate fair and normal prices would be paid. Not one tittle of information was given with regard to them, but everything with regard to bridges built in the province of Nova Scotia. If he were to be allowed the same privilege as his honorable friend had chosen to take he would be able to show what, had Mr. Johnson been called as a witness, he had convinced himself he would be able to show in cross-examining him, that not only had his company been getting in the province of Ontario in many cases prices ranging all the way from six to eight cents per pound for highway bridges, but would have been able to show that even for railway bridges, with respect to which we know the cost is not more than one-half per pound what that of highway bridges is, he would have been able to show that on the 14th of September, 1899, the Dominion Bridge Company tendered for a railway bridge with only one coat of anti-corrosive paint on it, painted at the shop, the bridge to be delivered at Bedford, and the tender was 4.6 cents per pound; the tender of the Hamilton Bridge Company was 4.8 cents per pound, and also that the Dominion Bridge Company erected bridges in Nova Scotia last year under public competition, where we may estimate the lowest price which would give a living profit would be paid, and the Dominion Bridge Company got $4.88 per hundred pounds, or nearly 4.9 cents per pound. He would probably have been able to show that the Hamilton Bridge Company got five cents per pound for railway bridges built upon the Intercolonial railway, and if Mr. Johnson had been called to the stand he would have been able to show also that in the year 1893 his company built what is known as the St. John swing bridge, a bridge, he presumed, upon the Intercolonial railway, the total weight of which was 104,648 pounds. He built that bridge for Mr. McManus, or the company did, and the amount the Dominion Bridge Company received was $7,000, or at the rate of 6.2 2-3 cents per pound. (Applause).

It was no wonder that although Mr. Johnson might have had in contemplation that he would come here to give evidence before the committee that when he received the final subpoena to produce the railway contracts for work done by his firm during the last three years that he wrote Mr. Hazen and said: They have served me with a subpoena to produce the railway contracts; it is too much; my secretary won't let me bring them and therefore I won't be able to come. (Laughter and applause). He would also have been able to show by Mr. Johnson that the price today which railway companies expect to have to pay, from inquiries they have made of the Dominion Bridge Company and others, has gone up so that it is as much as seven cents per pound. On cross-examination of Mr. Johnson he would have shown all these facts, and it was true Mr. Johnson might reply, well steel has gone up a cent a pound since 1897. He would have been able to show Mr. Johnson, deducting a cent a pound, still you would have the price which your company was getting in 1897 for railway bridges as 3½ cents a pound, and then allowing what everybody now allows, admitting what by universal consent is now conceded as the fair average price of highway bridges would be double per pound what the fair and average price of railway bridges was, you would have seven cents per pound as a fair and reasonable price to get for highway bridges in 1897. (Applause).

In the face of overwhelming testimony it would be presented by these facts, and in the face of what my honorable friends must have known before they sent Mr. Johnson away from the committee without allowing him to give testimony, and in the face of what they must have learned before they prevented the committee from having the benefit of his testimony, I wonder how my honorable friend, knowing what he must know, that only fair and reasonable prices were paid for those bridges, that Mr. Ruddock and the Record Foundry Company only received a fair living profit out of the work which they did for the New Brunswick government, I can only express my amazement that my honorable friend, with all this knowledge he must have had and knowing as he must that his charges are without foundation, I can only express surprise that my honorable friend did not do himself the credit to rise in his place and say he had been deceived in making these charges and that he had in his mind that highway bridges should cost as much as railway bridges, and he had been informed by Mr. Archibald that railway bridges only cost 3½ cents per pound and highway bridges should have cost the same. I am surprised my honorable friend, having found he was deceived in those particulars and having got the information which he got from his own witnesses, Mr. Swain and Mr. Roy, after they had gone on the stand and subjected to the fair and reasonable cross-examination I was able to subject them to, that he had not done himself credit and arisen in his place and said he had been deceived, had made the charges unwittingly and had come to the conclusion that only fair and reasonable prices had been paid and that he was prepared to withdraw the charges and the country as well as this House would have said he had acted a manly and honorable part, and having been deceived and led to make false and unfair charges he was only doing that reasonable justice toward a political opponent which my honorable friend, the premier, has a right to expect from the leader of the opposition. He has not chosen to do so, but to proceed and not only to complete the investigation, but to stand up in this House and repeat the charges which he had made, and all we have to do is to say to my honorable friend that this House believes, as I am sure you will say it does believe when it comes to vote upon these resolutions, that Mr. Hazen was not mistaken and not only have the witnesses he himself called failed to prove the charges, but they and the witnesses called on behalf of Mr. Emmerson have failed to disprove them and have shown this House and the country that they are entirely without foundation. I thought, Mr. Speaker, I would deal for a little before passing away from Mr. Roy's statement with reference to some other bridges, but don't know that I need go into them in detail, but would call the attention of the House particularly to bridges No. 1075 and 1076, which are riveted bridges built by the Hamilton Bridge Company, and in respect to which the company neither found the lumber nor did they do any erecting. They simply furnished the bridge free on board the cars at their works. They paid the freight but they did not find the lumber and did not erect the bridges and if you take the price which they got for these bridges, adding only the small sum of $125 for the erection of it, and leaving out the lumber altogether, you will find the price 6.7 cents per pound for that bridge and that was a riveted bridge. Therefore if you add 1½ cents per pound as a fair selling price for a pin bridge as compared with a riveted bridge you will find 8.2 cents as the price of that bridge. (Applause).

I ask the honorable gentlemen not to make these vague statements with reference to what Mr. Roy's statements prove, but take the statement he has made in black and white in reference to those bridges and no matter how you analyze the figures I have given you can come to no other conclusion but that would be the price. Then honorable gentlemen may say that was in 1898 when steel was higher than in 1897. I have told you the steel that went into the Lefebvre bridge actually cost $1.75 per hundred pounds. What did the steel cost that went into this bridge? Mr. Roy's statement shows the cost of steel was $192.50, speaking now of the two spans, and the actual weight was 11,171 pounds; therefore the cost would be $1.72 per hundred pounds, or 3 cents per hundred pounds less than the cost of metal for the Lefebvre bridge. And yet, according to these gentlemen the Hamilton Bridge Company must have been getting double price for that bridge, the Hamilton Bridge Company must have been robbing the Northwest government when they charged them those prices for those two bridges, because, as I have said, if you had a reasonable price and only a very small allowance for the erection of $125 and then make the allowance between pin and riveted bridges you would have the price, without any lumber at all, 8.2 cents per pound. Take No. 974 at Willoughby, putting in shop labor as $78.82 and cost of erection as $39.13 and making the allowance for pin instead of riveted you would have the price, 6.1 cents, and yet the cost of the steel there, according to Mr. Roy, was $90.52; the actual weight was 5,612 pounds, the cost would be $1.62 per hundred pounds or 13 cents per hundred pounds less than the Lefebvre. Take No. 968, No. 965 and No. 966 and also No. 925 and you will find the price of steel in all those bridges was less than what it cost the Record Foundry than what went into the Lefebvre, and take the average cost of the steel all the way through in the years 1898 and 1899 and you will find it is several cents per pound less than the cost of steel in the Lefebvre bridge and about 60 cents per hundred pounds less than what Mr. Ruddock used in the Mill Cove and Trueman Pond bridges.

Let me deal for a few moments with the consideration of the circumstances under which the government adopted its policy of having these steel bridges erected in New Brunswick. My honorable friend says they did not adopt a wise policy; they should have gone to other people outside the province. I have to differ with my honorable friend. At that time the chief commissioner had those facts before him, had an estimate from his engineer as to the weight of the Hampton, Salisbury and Sussex bridges; taking the price paid for those bridges and the different articles put in he had the evidence that in respect to the Salisbury bridge the cost had been between five and six cents per pound, the Hampton bridge upwards of seven cents per pound, and he also had the advantage of the tenders of the Dominion Bridge Company and of Mr. Roy, now the chief engineer and general manager of the Hamilton Bridge Company, and then proprietor of the Central bridge works, that the tenders which they thought were fair and reasonable prices were much higher; the Dominion Bridge Company's tender being 7.3 cents per pound and Mr. Roy's about 8¾ cents per pound. It is true the Salisbury bridge had cost the government less, but what statement had he in reference to that—the statement of Mr. Jones, of the Dominion Bridge Company, that his company made no money out of the Salisbury bridge. They had lost money by it. He would know the company would not go on very long at prices at which they would lose money and therefore he had a right, looking at the tenders put in for those three bridges, to estimate that the cost would be somewhere between seven and eight cents per pound.

When the chief commissioner made arrangements for the construction of those first three bridges viz, the Cusack, Elgin and Douglastown, at the Record Foundry works, to be paid for at their actual cost, he was adopting what he (Pugsley) believed honorable members would agree was a proper course. He was desirous of having the work done within the province, and he knew that it was not practicable to have a proper inspection of these bridges if built in the upper provinces, except at a great expense, and that it was absolutely essential that such inspection should be had if we were going to get good bridges—having these things in mind the honorable chief commissioner took a reasonable mode of ascertaining at what price the work could be done in New Brunswick, and the result was that the actual cost for those three bridges was 6¾ cents per pound, delivered at the works at Moncton or on board the cars. Those three bridges are what the committee class as the first series of bridges. Shortly after there came up the question of building the Dingee, Grand Manan and Saunders Brook bridges. The honorable leader of the opposition picked out the Saunders Brook bridge, and he got Prof. Swain to testify before the committee that that bridge could have been built at a less price than was paid for it. Now the actual cost paid the Record Foundry Company for that bridge was $233.00. This was not a very large amount of talk about it, but why do they do it? They take these small bridges, which cost only a few hundred dollars at the outside, and they mix them in with the large bridges, such as the Campbell, Lefebvre, Blackville, Nepisiguit bridges, which were built at 6½ cents per pound, complete, erected, painted and ready for traffic, and in that way they sought to delude the people of the country into the belief that these higher prices were paid for the larger bridges. (Applause.) That was not the fair way to look at the matter. The size of the bridges ought to be taken into consideration and the total amounts paid, and then it could be ascertained whether the government had pursued a wise policy and whether the result had not been that by far the larger proportion of the work in connection with steel bridges had been done at the cheaper price at which it was claimed it was done. (Applause.) Those three bridges—the Grand Manan, Dingee and Saunders Brook—were taken as one order and the total cost of the three was $1,676. The Grand Manan bridge, being what is known as a scow bridge, was a very difficult one to build, and we have the evidence of Mr. Peters that if the company had taken the Grand Manan bridge alone the fair price would have been at least 10 cents per pound, and that statement was not contradicted. Mr. Peters recognized, as we all recognize, that if the Saunders Brook bridge had been taken by itself the price would fairly have been less than 6½ cents per pound; but these three bridges were all taken as one order and they have to be dealt with together in considering what would be a fair price, and when it is remembered that the Grand Manan bridge was built for less than what it would fairly cost, and admitting that the price paid for the Saunders Brook bridge was a little high, it will be seen that the government only paid a fair and reasonable price for the three. (Applause.) And it should also be recognized that the works had to be opened to construct those three small bridges which only aggregated a total cost of $1,676.

We next come to the two bridges built by Mr. Kitchen under contract with the government, viz., the Petitcodiac and Port Elgin bridges, and the honorable leader of the opposition complains of the course which the chief commissioner took in connection with those two bridges. The chief commissioner asked for tenders in the usual way, and while it is true that there was a tender of $2,000 for the substructure of the Petitcodiac bridge it is also true that there were tenders from experienced and prudent contractors for a much higher figure. It is not always wise to give a contract for bridge work or for any kind of work to the lowest tenderer, and it might well be that the chief commissioner and his engineer were of the opinion that the price named in the lowest tender was too low. He had a right to take into consideration all the tenders that were put in, with a view of enabling him to arrive at a conclusion as to a fair and reasonable price for the work. Mr. Kitchen tendered for both the sub and superstructure, and after considering all the tenders the chief commissioner was of the opinion that the price named in Mr. Kitchen's tender was a fair and reasonable one, and therefore the contract was awarded to him. The same remarks would apply to the Port Elgin bridge, also awarded to Mr. Kitchen. Now what course did Mr. Kitchen take? He was free to go where he pleased to get the steel superstructures for these bridges. As a shrewd business man and a contractor, although not engaged particularly in the construction of steel bridges, he would have a very good idea as to what was a fair and reasonable price to pay for steel work, and when he went to the Record Foundry Company and asked for their lowest price they quoted him 6½ cents per pound. Mr. Peters knew that Mr. Kitchen was free to go where he pleased; he knew that he would probably get figures from other bridge builders; he had no reason to believe that the Record Foundry Company would get the work at any unreasonable figure, and the fact that he quoted 6½ cents per pound as the lowest price at which they would build the bridges was strong confirmation of the statement that they made, that 6½ cents was a fair and reasonable price and that they would not do the work at that time for any less figure. (Applause.) The total price so far as the steel work was concerned for those two bridges was $4,040.

We now come to what is by far the largest of this series of bridges, viz., the Campbell, Lefebvre, Blackville, Nepisiguit and Tabor bridges, which were all constructed at a price of 6½ cents per pound, which price included the steel bridge, erected, painted, floored and completed and ready for traffic, the government only finding the flooring. Now in considering the result of the policy which the government has adopted if is right that we should notice this fact, that in respect to the amounts which the government has paid out for steel bridges since the inauguration of this policy, by far the larger amount has been paid for bridges built at the rate of 6½ cents per pound, completely erected and ready for traffic—certainly three-fourths of the amount has been paid for bridges constructed at that price. We have it in evidence that when the chief commissioner was ready to give the contracts for the five bridges which had just been named he said to the Record Foundry Company that in future any contract for steel bridges in the province would have to include the erection. The honorable leader of the opposition ridiculed the idea that the company should refuse to take contracts for erection, but their course was not unreasonable. The company was incorporated as a foundry and machine company, and not to build bridges, and if they had undertaken the erection of these bridges any stockholder would have had power to restrain them by injunction. That was the view the company took of it, and they refused to take the responsibility and risk involved in the erection of the bridges. The result was that Mr. A. R. Peters, the president of the company, being desirous that the work should go to his company, undertook the responsibility of the erection of the bridges. Did Mr. Emmerson show a disposition to give them any price they might ask? Not at all. He told them that although they had been getting 6½ cents per pound for bridges at the works, yet by reason of the thoroughly equipped plant which they had put in and the skill which they had acquired in the work, he thought that 6½ cents a pound should include the erection of the bridge, and he told them that if they did not choose to take that he would go elsewhere, as that in his judgment was a fair price to pay. They accepted his terms, and as a result all these larger bridges and the great bulk of the bridges which have been built since the inauguration of this policy have cost only 6½ cents per pound, completely erected and ready for traffic. The honorable gentleman has not endeavored to show that that is an unreasonable price. Mr. Peters came before the investigating committee with all the books and records of his company, and Mr. Hazen had an opportunity to show the committee from those books just what profits the Record Foundry Company were receiving, and whether they were getting an excessive price. But the honorable gentleman did not ask Mr. Peters to produce one single book of all the books and records which he had here. Mr. Peters swore that the Record Foundry Company had been carrying on their business for 20 years and had been making fair and reasonable profits. He swore that they had a standard upon which they proceeded in all their manufacturing business; that that standard had been agreed upon after conference by the leading manufacturers of the country, and that the carrying out of that standard is necessary to enable the company to pay a fair and reasonable dividend upon its capital. He showed to the committee the profits made in their ordinary business of manufacturing stoves and furnaces, and he stated that in estimating the price for the bridges built for the government they had adopted the very same standard as that used in connection with all the business they were carrying on, and figuring it out upon the same basis used in connection with the manufacture of furnaces Mr. Peters was able to show that in 1897, when the Campbell, Lefebvre, Blackville, Nepisiguit and Tabor bridges were built, instead of the company getting $5 per hundred pounds for these bridges they would have required to get $5.41 in order to pay the company the same profits as they were getting out of their ordinary business. That being true, and Dr. Stockton had not attempted to throw the slightest discredit upon the testimony of Mr. Peters in that particular, he (Pugsley) had no hesitation in saying that it was proved before the House, as it had been proved before the committee, and he felt sure it would be accepted by the country as true, that allowing ordinary and reasonable profits, such as the company received on its other business, the Record Foundry Company might fairly have charged $5.41 per hundred pounds instead of $5 per hundred pounds, which was the price they received in respect to the bridges built during and since the year 1897. (Applause.) That being so he felt the people of the country had no ground for complaint, because, as he had stated yesterday, he was satisfied that when the people come to the conclusion that only fair and reasonable prices were being paid for these bridges, they would say that they preferred that the work be done at home rather than abroad, where the bridges can be carefully inspected and where the work can be done by our own people, so that whatever money is expended or labor employed that money may be expended and that labor employed among and by our own people. (Applause.) That, he believed, was the feeling of the people of the province, so that when the honorable gentleman failed, as he confessedly has failed, to prove that the Record Foundry Company or Mr. Ruddock have made anything more than reasonable and fair profits, it seemed to him (Pugsley) that his case in that particular completely falls to the ground. (Applause.) The honorable gentleman has stated that Mr. Alfred A. Peters gets 6½ cents a pound for the work, and that he farms it out to the Record Foundry Company at 5 cents per pound. Does the honorable gentleman think that is a fair statement? Does he not know that the 1½ cents covers the freight, the cartage, the building of the false work, and all the risk and responsibility assumed by the man who erects the bridge; that it covers all the field work in connection with putting the bridge together and all the labor of every kind connected with its erection, as well as the painting of the bridge and the laying of the floor? (Applause.) Does he not know that it is a question whether 1½ cents per pound is a reasonable allowance for all the risk and responsibility and the expense connected with the work of erection. Upon that point Mr. Peters testified that 1½ cents did not in some cases allow him any profit at all. He stated that in respect to the Nepisiguit bridge he had lost money, and he stood to lose from $1,000 to $2,000 on the erection of the Kingston bridge, at which he was now engaged. Mr. Peters also said that he made a fair profit out of the erection of the Campbell and Lefebvre bridges. But let us see what Mr. Roy said upon this question. Mr. Roy swore that it would be worth 75 cents per hundred pounds to erect the Sussex bridge, and on cross-examination he admitted that to erect the Lefebvre bridge, which was a very difficult work, that it would be worth double as much as the Sussex bridge. That would be $1.50 per hundred pounds, or 1½ cents per pound, which was only the price which Mr. Peters received for the erection, freight and everything else connected with that part of the work. (Applause). Mr. Roy stated in his evidence that the cost of erection would vary according to the