

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

in the Legislative Assembly, Saturday, April 7th, Chairman Carroll submitted the report from the committee appointed to investigate the bridge charges, also the evidence taken by the committee.

The evidence occupied 899 pages of type-written matter containing about 275,000 words.

way have to helped to sustain the bridge he would have been called on Mr. Hazen's behalf. It may well be, and the committee have a right to assume, that if Mr. Archibald's testimony would in any way have been sustained, Mr. Hazen would have been called on Mr. Hazen's behalf. It may well be, and the committee have a right to assume that after witnesses called in sup-

"For the Salsbury bridge the tenders were:

"Dominion Bridge Company, \$2600; Canadian Bridge Company, \$4,113.

"Mr. Emerson says that Mr. Hazen, who is, in fact, a criminal man, of the ability of a very high order, gave him the estimated weights of these bridges as follows, at the same time stating that from

"The committee deem proper in this connection to refer to the three bridges, namely, Mill Cove, Trueman's Pond and two spans of the Blackville bridge, built by Mr. Rudbeck, of Chatham, and in respect to the 16th day of April, 1884, it is made that the prices paid were excessive.

"The Mill Cove bridge, as originally contracted for, was a long structure; having

were referred the charges made by Mr. J. Douglas Hazen, a member for the county of Sunbury, against the Hon. Henry R. Emmerson, premier and attorney general, on the 12th day of March last past, and submitted on the 16th day of April, 1884, to the House of Assembly.

By unanimous consent this motion was made the order of the day for Monday,

that campaign and the object less which they held before the country was principally this, that in comparison with the cost of the railway bridges of the country the cost of the highway bridges built under the act of 1874 was excessive.

not only two but three and four times what was paid for those railway bridges, and presented to the people of the country some-

your examination of the bridge nor your examination of the specifications you tell how many pounds of beams were used in one span of that bridge? A.—I didn't make an estimate of the bridge and cannot tell.

Q.—Is that amount correct? A.—I would not be at all surprised if there were 10,000 pounds of beams in the bridge.

[illegible]

<p>John, Joshua Peters, Alfred E. Peters, John Stewart, Alfred Haines, Martin Murphy, Peter S. Archibald, A. G. Beck, with, Will Kitchen, W. R. Mackenzie, Phelps Johnson and William E. Brown. The names of the witnesses who were called and gave evidence on behalf of Mr. Haines will be found stated below.</p> <p>Alfred E. Peters and Mr. Haines</p>	<p>F. Swain, of Boston, Mr. R. Mattiey, Jr., engineer of the Hamilton Bridge Company, of Hamilton, Mr. T. B. Winslow, secretary of the public works department of Mr. William E. Brown, who had been engaged in erecting bridges for the Dominion Bridge Company and others, Mr. Willard Kitchen, a contractor, and Mr. A. E. Peters, president of the Record Foundry and Machine</p>	<p>Swain; Bridge Company, 6 4-10 cents per pound. "Dominion Bridge Company, 6 4-10 cents per pound. "Swain; Bridge Company, 6 4-10 cents per pound. "Canadian Bridge Company, 6 cents per pound. "Having this information and being dis-</p>	<p>one and in the public interest. The contract with Mr. Haddock being thereby necessarily broken by the department, an equitable arrangement was come to whereby he was paid \$1,200 for the cost of the truss which he had completely erected, and was allowed for the extra steel and other material on hand, which became the property of the government. Most of the metal</p>	<p>Frederick, April 9.—In the legislature today Mr. Motte made his motion: Resolved that this House do concur in the order of the special committee to whom a referred bill was sent on the 24th inst., and that a member for the county of St. Mary, against the Hon. Henry R. Emmerson, premier and attorney general, on the 12th day of March last past, and submitted on the 7th day of</p>	<p>in their essence are repeated in this legislature and the committee is freely granted by the House. No limits or qualifications are set upon the grant of that committee. It is further recommended according to the prayer of the petition, that it be, presented by the honorable gentleman.</p>	<p>to be paid, would not that cost at Montreal in 1897 \$20.04 per hundred pounds? A—I could not tell you.</p>
<p>Q—This is all before one dollar's worth of metal is put on it? A—I could not tell you anything about the prices of the metal at Montreal.</p>	<p>Q—You have no knowledge of what the freight would be? A—I have no knowledge</p>					

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

Did No Intend to Return. "Another important point emphasized by these witnesses is the fact that the workman-ship on some parts of the Campbell and Hamilton bridges was of a very poor quality. The cost would range from 19 to 12 times as much as on the Hamilton and Sumner bridges, while on the Campbell bridge it would be from two to three times greater.

[illegible]

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

Tenders Compared.

"Attention has been particularly called to the Hamilton, Sussex and Salisbury bridges, and as different New Canadian, F.W. Bell, and this I am well aware is true of any class of expert witnesses, the class called in to give evidence in this case, as the other—and I am speaking my own opinion—has not been paying much regard to the testimony of any of them—I am prepared to respect the opinion of a practical man of sound, good common sense, and judgment in preference to the opinion of a man who has been called in to give evidence."

[illegible][illegible]
