SEMI-WEEKLY SUN, ST JOHN, N. B., MAY. 2, 1900

BRIDGE CHARGES es. If my hon, friend ever eaching he has either 'or-else entirely ignored it. n or else

Speech of Mr. Flemming M. P. P., for Carleton County.

The Views of an Intelligent, Successful and Progressive Business Man.

Who, After Carefully Examining the Svi dence, Finds That Every Item of Mr. Hazen's Argument was Established.

Mr. Speaker--In arising to address this house I do not propose to take very much time in discussing a subject which has already been so fully and ably discussed by those who have I receded me. The speakers supporting the government, and also those upon our side of the house, have gone very fully into this voluminous evidence, and therefore I shall not occupy much time in referring to it. I am all the more disuaded from this when I remember that the five speakers who have preceded me are all learned and able lawyers. I am not a lawyer, have had no legal training, analyzing evidence is not my fort, neither have I had the educational advantages which would enable me to go throug'i this evid-nce and present it intelligently to this house. Before going into the merits of the case as presented to the committee of inquiry, I wish to refer briefly to some statements made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Carvell.) When he began speaking last evening, he seemed to be in a very flery mood, and if the was somewhat eratic, he seemed to ba thoroughly in earnest. Today he is much calmer and milder, and probably has been listered to with as much attention and pleasure as when he was thumping his desk and waving his arms. The hon. member (Carvell) said last evening that by this morning the bridge charges would be dead and buried. We have no evidence that the hen, gentleman. after so abruptly breaking off his address last evening attended any burial ceremonies, or assisted at any interment, and after talking an hour and a half this afterroon, we do find that the br'dge charges, which were to have been lead and buried by this morning, are more alive than ever before. The hon. gentleman (Carvell) occupied the time of this house at considerable length, in reading extracts from the Daily Sun, a really excellent paper, published in the city of St. John. can ecsure the hon. gentleman and his friends supporting the government, that it would be considerably to their advantage to regularly read, and inwerdly digest, that excellent "journa" of the fireside." I do not propose to come here as a defender of the St. John Sun. That paper is well able to take care of itself, even if it chooses to pay any attention whatever to what my hon. friend may say about it. He, as I have said, read quite copionsly from the Sun's report from day to day of the evidence given at the bridge charges investigation, and he characterized those reports as misleading and untruthful. But I wish to remind the members of this house that the Sun of St. John, and other opposition papers which are entirely independent of the government, are quite as likely to give fair and truthful reports of that evidence as does the St. John Telegraph, and the Fredericton Herald and other subsidized cigans, which draw their thousands of dollars every year, and which must influence their judgment and action to some extent. My hon. friend (Carvell) has quoted from the Sun in the attempt to show that that paper has attacked Mr. Winslow, secretary of the board of works. He says that the Sun has tried to discredit Mr. Winslow, and to belittle him in the estimation of the recule of this province, and to throw reflections upor him as a capable and henest man. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen, neither can my brn. fitend produce, a single line either in the Sun or any other opposition reper that seeks to discre dit Mr. Winslew as a man, or to re flect in any way upon his character It is the system under which Mr.Wins low works which has been criticized. It is the system prevailing in the board of works department and for which Mr. Winslow is not responsible. and which system was largely reveal ed in Mr. Winslow's evidence, that has been discredited, and surely the newspapers and the members of this house have a right to attack and to criticise so vicicus a system. The hon, membe (Carvell) goes further and says if you want the acme of newspaper misrepre sentation, you must go to Woodstock I was surprised to hear him say that I do not reside at Woodstock, but I thought that we had good papers publighed there, and that the people of that town are disposed to deal fairly with all questions. We have a libera reper, a conservative paper, and an independent paper, and I am able to say that I believe they treat of public questions feerly. My hon, friend did not say the misrepresentation was confired to the tory party, and therein rerhaps is the saving clause of his statement. He spoke next of the election cam paign of 1899. That is a subject of considerable interest to myself. I had some little part in that campaign, and among the other things discussed the bridge charges of the hen. leader of the opposition had a very large part. I remember of it being distinctly stated that we in this province were getting our highway bridges built at six and a half cents per pound all compieted. But I do not remember baving heard the statement put forward by any supporters of the hon. leader of the opposition that bridges wer being built by the Hamilton Bridge company for 21-2 cents per pound. What I stated was this, that the Hamilton Bridge Co. were selling railway bridges at 21-2 cents per pound f. o. b. at Hamilton. My hon. colleague (Carvell) has a fertile imagination and a ready tongue, and it is very easy for him to make out a good story. He (Carvell) next took up Prof. Swain and Mir. Roy. I was, Mir. Speaker, taught in my boyhood that if I could say mothing good about a man's character to hesitate and even refuse to say

med a large part of his speech. He ridiculed Mr. Roy's personal appear-ance and made fun of his attitude. low, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Roy's evidence is a fit subject for dison in this house, but I submit also that Mr. Roy's personal appear-ance is not a proper subject to be dis-cussed in this house, and it is not edifying to hon. members and that such ridicule is not at all creditable to tiemen who indulge in it. This the gen ise is not at all concerned about the way in which Mr. Roy wears his glasses or whether he holds his head back or holds it down. The way in which he wears his glasses or holds his head does not in any way effect his evidence. If we were going to discuss that question it is my opinion that Mr. Roy is fully as good looking as my hon. friend who makes fun of his appearance, and I don't know that either of them have much to complain of in regard to their looks. The story which the hon. member told us as part of the conversation of two railway men at Fredericton Junction was not particularly edifying, nor the language at all choice nor worthy to form a part of this discussion. My hon. friend took occasion also to refer to Mr. Laforest's statement as to what the bridges of this province had cost, and what they should have cost. I Lsked my hon. friend why then he did not refute Mr. Laforest's statements if they were not correct, and I submit that that was a reasonable question to ask him. And how did he answer it? He went off into a fury and he hasn't answered it yet. He made certain statements in regard to bridges built by the Hamilton Bridge Co., but they were no answer to the contention of my honorable friend from Madawaska. He has in his speech this afternoon referred at some length to Phelps Johnson, who he admits would have been a very important witness.

Ne of Prof. Swain and Mr. 3tov

The honorable member for hings (Pugsley) and the government, too, knew that Mr. Johnson was an important witness and would have given evidence very material to support the charges made by the hon. leader of the opposition, and because they knew this, and because they did not want such evidence to go before the country and to be heard before the committee is why they took such desperate and unjustifiable means to prevent him from testifying. My hon, friend (Carvell) tries to excuse his own and the committee's conduct by saying, that Mr. Johnson was not allowed to give evidence because he had brought with him the contracts of only fifteen out of the eighteen bridges which his company had erected in the maritime provinces, and forsooth, because Mr. Johnson had not the contracts and could not sneak about three bridges they would not allow him to rive testimony about the fifteen of which he was competent and in every way prepared to speak. The attempt has been made, and is still being made, to aate the impressi Canadian concerns are building bridges inferior to those made by New Brunswick firms. If our friends who make such a statement believe it to be true, you would think, Mr. Speaker, that they would have been most deshous of getting all possible information about the bridges built in these provinces by Phelps Johnson's company. The fact that they took particular pains to prevent Mr. Johnson saying anything about bridges built by him in these provinces is pretty conclusive evidence that Mr. Johnson's testimony would not support their policy of belittling the upper Canadian bridge builders. My friend attempted to discredit Mr. Johnson's statement about the secretary of the Dominion Bridge Co. It has been shown conclusively that the secretary, being the custodian of the books and papers of the company. need not give them up at the will of the manager or president even but only on the order of the board of di-

the evidence bink, nor this house does not think ing. I heard the honorable member for Kings (Pugsiey) trying to get Mr. Seften to say that Hampton, Sussex and Salisbury bridges were I car struc-

He is a practical man, he knows poor work from good, and I believe he told carry it out. I believe, sir, in encourthe committee the truth. The honor-Hazen taken such means as that to consistent course which he has purcharges a yeer and a half ago, he has followed them persistently and consistently. He has pressed for a full investigations and he stands today before this house, and before the country fully vin licated, and stands higher today in the estimation of the people of this province than ever before. I wish to refer again, and briefly, to the election campaign of 1899. The premier now says that he did not state during that campaign that our bridges were being built for 61-2 cents per round, all completed. If the premier says that, the members of this house

et he rei den't know whether they wore rings the fact that Mr. Hazen was to press or not, but I do know that I would these charges and to have them thor-take their word just as quickly as if oughly investigated. If a full inquiry they had worn rings, and I do not was desired, why, I ask, that so much time was sp ent in ruling out evidence that a man's evidence under oath that would have been material. I do sould be discredited because he hap- not profess to know much about the ens to wear a diamond ring, or that laws of evidence. I do know that in his evidence should have greater pro- my opinion, and in the opinion of most minerce because he did not. I heard sensible men, that a legislative comcae of those practical bridge builders mittee appointed for the purpose of who was brought here to give evidence making a full investigation should on behalf of the premier, and I was have accepted all the information pospresent when Mr. Seften was testify- sible revelant to the question under consideration. One of the reasons advanced for

embarking and continuing in this new bridge building policy is that it would tures, that they were inferior to the encourage home industry. Premix r Lefebvre and Compbell bridges. The Emmerson says that he wanted the witness would not say so. He said work done in New Brunswick and by they were good bridges of their class, our own laborers. This is a good idea, and one worthy of support--if you do not have to pay too much money to

aging home industry, and I say give able member for Kings tried on three our own concerns the preference every different times and in as many differ- time if prices are equal or very nearly ent ways to induce Mr. Softon to say equal. I would be willing to support that the bringes built by the Record a policy that would give our own Foundry company were superior in manufacturers even a slightly larger vorkmanship to those built by the On- price than we would have to pay for tario firms, and would last fifty to similar work outside the province. But seventy-five years longer. But Mr. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker. Sefton would act; he could not give when it was that Premier Emmerson such evidence as that. He said that first found his new-born zeal for prothe Sussex, Hampton and Salisbury tection to home industry. It is not bridges were good bridges, and that many years since the promier, who they were all right for they work they was a prominent member of the liberal were intended to do, and all the ef- party, was, with the other leaders of forts of the able counsel for the pre- his party, advocating from one end mier could agt induce a practical wit- of this dominion to the other a policy ness like Mr. Sefton to say that the of sweeping away every vestige of bridges built by the Reverd Foundry protection to our home manufacturer. would last ff;y or seventy-five years Not only were they willing that Onlonger than the Sussex, Salisbury or tario and Quebec manufacturers Harryton bridges. My hon, colleague should be placed upon equal terms (Carvell) told this house a few mo- with our own concerns, but they wantments ago that he though that Mr. ed the manufacturers of the United Hazen should have intimated that he States to enjoy every advantage in had been deceived, that he had been our markets that our own concerns do. misled and should have withdrawn his. They would sweep away every bit of charges, and that he should have ano- protection to the home manufacturers logized to the committee and to the and throw open our markets to the house and had he done sy that he great firms of the New England would have coasidered Mr. Hazen the States, and give our local firms no hirgest man in the country. Had Mr. advantages whatever over those of The speakers for the government have this whole continent. Premier Emsecure the good opinion of my hon. merson was one of the loudest, and I ment out of Mr. Roy. I want to say coll-ague. I feel sure that it would am free to confess, an able advocate have been at the sacrifice of his own of that policy, which they called unself-respect. Mr. Hazen has won the restricted reciprocity, but it seems that admiration of this house and of the a great change has come over the whole country by the honorable and spirit of his dreams, and we wonder when this change could have taken such with respect to these bridge place. I think I know, sir. I think it are erected in this province. I wish to charges. Since he preferred these was about 1893. I remember that at take was about 1893. I remember that at take from the statement only some that time there was a gathering of figures about the pin bridges, which considerable importance, a gathering of the liberal party at the city of Ottawa. That gathering was assembled

to bury the old policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and Premier Emmerson was there and took part in the burial ceremony. I think it was there, Mr. Speaker, that he found his zeal for the protection of home industries. My hon. friend (Carvell) last night

discussed the Woodstock bridge, and I want to say a few words about that | Roy's blue print: bridge. I am fairly familiar with it, No. of have got to accept his word. I am and I think I can give this house a prepared, Mr. Speaker, to say that the few interesting facts concerning it. Bridge. That bridge, we are told by Chief En-907... 17,255 gineer Wetmore, weighed one million 921... 19,304 pounds. The contract price was \$42,-000, or 4.2 cents per pound. By a most ingenious process, my hon. friend (Carvell) brought the cost of that bridge up to nearly six cents a pound. He said the contractors lost \$5,000 on the job, and that they should have made \$5,000 profit. Then he added a lot more of things and got the price of that bridge nearly up to what we are baying the Record Foundry Company. But, Mr. Speaker, of the several tenders of that bridge none were above \$50,000, and even had the highest tender been accepted that would not have brought the cost of the bridge up to five cents a pound. I believe the Woodstock bridge is one of the best bridges in the country. I deny the statement of the hon. gentleman (Carvell) that the opposition had tried to belittle the Woodstock bridge. well remember when that bridge was opened, and the members of the government were there, and in their speeches they claimed that it was as fine a tridge, and as good a bridge as could be found in the whole dominion, and 1 am not disposed to deny. and never have denied, that statement. This I have said-and I repeat it in this house-that while the superstructure of that bridge is as good as can be built, and which cost this province a little more. than four cents per pound, that far too much money was caid for the substructure. After the government had entered into a contract for that bridge, they placed an inspector at the works, and inspectors at the site. They insisted upon having a first-class bridge, and I agree with them that they got it. The chief commissioner must have thought that he was paying too high a price, which cost his a little more than four cents a pound, and he went to work experimenting, and the experiment has proved a costly one to this province. I found fault with their experiment at the first. If they wanted to find out how cheap bridges could be built in this province, if they wanted to inaugurate a policy of manufacturing at home, why did they rot give all the manufacturing firms who might have been willing to build bridges, a chance to say what they would be prepared to do. I submit that it is only a business ractosition, and a reasonable proposition, that they should have gone to all New Brunswick firms who might be willing to undertake this work, and have escertained their prices. Instead of that, they went to only one concorn, the Record Foundry Co. of Mone ton. The first three bridges built by this concern were the Elgin. Cuisac and Douglastown, and they cost 63-4 cents per pound at the shop. All the other expenses of cartage. freight. lumber, painting, crection, etc., were extra. These three bridges cost when erected more than double the price of the Woodstock bridge, and here as where I claim that the chief commissicner was most neglectful in his duties to the province. He had the Petitcodiac experience of the Woodstock bridge, Port Elgin which he lamself says is as good a Saunders Brook bridge as is in the province, and he had made his experiment with the Record Foundry company with the result that the latter cost fully twice as much as the former, and I ask this house, and I ask the country, what

puts on his coat and hat, and starts off post haste for that town. He saw the mersger of the Kecord Foundry Co. and he told them that they were charging too high for the for the province, and we can well imsgine the indignation with which he reesoned with them and told them that they must come down in their prices As the result of this interview, what do we find, and what is the result of his demand? The result was the munificent reduction of one quarter of one cent per pound. This reduction upon the next three bridges erected the Sounders' Frook, Grand Manan and Dingee bridges, which weighed 25,790 hounds, saved to the province the mignificent sum of \$64.47. At the rates which the members of the government charge this country for travelling exrenses, it would have been far better for this province had the hon, chief oner remained at Fredericton and saved the country his travelling expenses on that trip and simply writ-ten a letter telling the Record computy to go ahead at the former price of 63-4 cents. I must confess. Mr. Speaker, that the impression has gone atroad throughout this province, and that I myself believed it to be ture. until within a short time, that the province was buying these bridges from the Record Foundry company. I find in the evidence taken before the committee, and which is there in the house that I was mistaken, and that that impression was entirely wrong. We are not buying these bridges from the Record Foundry Co., but from A. E. Peters, and that Mr. Haines acts for the province. And now I wish to discuss briefly

this blue print taken from Mr. Roy's statement. I am free to confess that I have not the legal training to get from this blue print the information that was extracted from it by my hon. friend from Kings (Pugsley). Dr. Pugsley-What particular bridge

is troubling you? Mr. Flemming-I am not troubled in the least. My hon. friend must feel that he hasn't earned his fee in this case, and so.is working this afternoon. claimed that they dragged this statethat if they had known the contents of that paper they would have left if in Mr. Roy's pocket. We have in this statement the records of pin bridges. riveted bridges, rolled beam bridges are the same as the Campbeli, Lefebvre and other bridges built by the Record Foundry Co. For the purpose of some comparisons which I wish to make. I shall not refer now to the riveted bridges, but only to the pin bridges. My learned friend from Kings has stated to this house that pin bridges are worth 11-2 cents per pound more than riveted bridges, and this is the statement which I now present to this house, taken from Mr.

Weight. Cost. \$ 625 00

870 00



ongs of Praise

Ottawa, Jan. 20, 1899 I have used SURPRISE SOAP since tarted house and find that it lasts longer and is better than other soap I have tried. J. Johnston.

Predericton, N.B., Dec. 15th, 1895. Having used SURPRISH SOAP for the past ten years, I find it the best soap that I have ever had in my house and would not use any other when I can get SURPRISE. Mrs. T. Henry Troup.

SURPRISE. MIN. T. mentry from, St. Thomas, Ont. I have to wash for three brothers that work on the railroad, and SURPRISE SOAP is the only soap to use. We tried every other kind of soap, and I tell every-body why our overalls have such a good color. Maudie Logan.

Can't get wife to use any other soap, ays SURPRISE is the best. Chas. C. Hughes; SURPRISE is a pure hard SOAP.

when the br.dges built in New Bruns. wick were constructed. But, sir, W. have a more striking comparison than even taking the bridges in groups, as I have just done. We find that in th Lefebvre bridge slone there were 237. 941 pounds of steel, for which this province paid \$17,502, while in the fifteen bridges of the Hamilton Bridge company, which I have just named, therwas 405,724 pounds of steel, for which they received \$17,542, or for the whole fifteen bridges, weighing nearly double as much as Lefebvre bridge, they got only \$41 more than was paid for Le febvre alone. I think, Mr. Speaker that the hon. members of this house and the people throughout the country must agree with me, and with the hon. leader of the opposition, that our chief commissioner has been paying two prices for the bridges built in this province.

Dr. Pugsley-What is the price per pound of No. 1691?

Mr. Flemming-I an not giving prices per pound of any single bridge. I'm taking 15 of the pin bridges of the best class (rected by the Hamilton Bridge Co. I Pgure up their total weight and the total cost-not the cost to the company, but the actual contract prices paid by the people who received the bridges and I find that for those 15 bridges, the average paid was 4.32 cents per pound. It will be noticed, and I want it to be notice I, that I have taken only pin bridges into this calculation in my statement of the Cntario bridges, while the statement

Dr. Pugsley-How did Johnson get the fifteen contracts he brought from his secretary?

Mr.F!emming .- You might have a lowd him to go on the witness stand, and let him tell you about these fifteen contracts, and then you could have questioned him about those other three. He would have told you.

As I previously said, I do not pro-Lose going very deeply into the details of this evidence, but I wish to appreach this matter reasonably and thoroughly, and to look at it as a business man, and to consider it from a bushess standpoint. If they are building bridges in Ontario at low prices, and if the builders in Ontario are willing to build our bridges at low prices, it appears to me, as a reasonable proposition, that we should allow them to do co. But we have ample evidence that the matter of low prices would not necessarily send this work out of our own province. In the adjoining province of Nova Scotia, the local bridge builders are able to do the work in competition with the Upper Canaoian concerns. Messrs. Stewart and MacNeil at New Glasgow build most all of the bridges for the Nova Scotia government, and they get the contracts for three bridges in open competition with the Ontario concerns. Mr. Roy

gives as his testimony that it is very rare that his company can build low encugh for a bridge to get a contract in Nova Scolia, or even to secure made business in Quebec in competition with the Dominion Bridge Co. on account of the latter teing in close proximity 'to where the bridges would be required. If these Ontario firms are willing to build bridges for our government upon our own plans and specifications and to build them at less price than what we are paying. I would like to have it stown me, and the people of this province, who are paying the money for these bridges, would like to know why we should ray higher, if not double, prices for work done for us. And, I am suppresing too that the bridges built by Ontario firms, even where they are ucc-ssful in getting contracts, would te as good in every respect as those for which we have been paying from seven to twelve cents a pound. The concrable gentleman who preceded me (Carvell) saw fit to refer to the fact that Mesers. Lockhart and Seften had

no diamond rings upon their fingers.

im, ression was sent out all over this province during the election campaign that cur New Brunswick bridges were being built and completed ready for traific at 61-C"cents a pound. I will wad to the house from the report of a speech made on nomination day by the hon. member from St. John who has a seat in the government. in which he (McKeown) said: "Now," said Mr. McKeown, "his in-

terview shows that the Upper Canadian 'leeway' manufacturers wanted three cents a pound for inferior bridges delivered f. o. b. at Montreal. The 61-2 and 71-2 cents a pound paid by our government for New Brunswick made bridges includes the full price of those bridges delivered at the streams they are to span, erected, floored, painted and complete, ready for public travel; in fact, forming a portion of the highway." L. P. D. Tilley attempted to contradict this, and Mr. McKeown, in answering him, read a statement made by Premier Emmerson at Moneton Briday: "The 61-2 cents which we have paid to our New Brunswick concerns includes the delivery of the bridges at the sites,

the erections, etc." That extract is from a report of my hon, friend's speech published in the St. John Telegraph, a paper which most of the hon. members opposite will accept as fair and accurate. Last year Mr. Hazen made these charges in the house, and steps were taken towards an enquiry, but, it being late in the session, a mutual arrangement was come to for the charges to stand over until this year. The government took every advantage of that, and it has been repeated over and over that Mr. Hazen had abandoned his charges. And here again I must refer for a moment to the election campaign in Carleton county in January last. The members of the government were in Carleton county in full force during the progress of that campaign, and they made the statement upon every platform in that county that Mr. Ha zen had found himself "in a hole." and that he realized that there was nothing in his charges and had abandoned them. They stated that those charges were dead. My opponent so stated on nomination day, and that the country would hear no more cf th em, and no person responded-(hear, hear)-to those statements more heartily than did my hon. colleague (Carvell). I would ask my hon. friend now, I would ask the members of the government who made those statements throughout Carleton county, if that was a fair campaign. They knew in making those statements that they were absolutely false, and that Mr. Hazen was sincere in making those charges, and that he intended at this session to have them fully investi-gated. The electors of Carleton county believed Mr. Hazen, and did not believe the members of the government. They took their statements for what they were worth, just as the people of the whole province will take those statements as soon as they have an opportunity to speak.

The report which has been presented to this house by the committee is a quite remarkable one, and I am afraid that there was considerable wear and tear upon the consciences of the honorable members who subscribed their names to it. The statement was made that we were to have as if that would make any difference the fullest possible investigation, and

1.420 00 926.. 51,504 . 2.550 00 929 19,600 807 00 930 14,450 609 00 937 46,309 1,400 00 1.617 00 953 28,900 1.060 00 967..... 24,300 1.075 00 973..... 30,160 1.285 00 1072..... 18.945 1.050 00 1098 7,011 540 00 1055... 29,335 1.285 00 1056 28,815 1.350 00 We find that the average cost per pound of these fifteen bridges is 4.32 cents. And these all are pin bridges. None of them are rolled beams, like Saunders' Brook, or cheap bridges None are riveted bridges, such as Trueman's Pond and Mill Cove. Dr. Pugsley-Do you include the cost f lumber in your figures? Mr. Flemming-In nine of the bridges which I have mentioned they are all complete, ready for traffic. In some of the others, according to the statement, the lumber and erection is not included. In 907 there is no lumstatement is as follows: ber; in Nos. 925 and 926 no lumber or erection; in 929 we have no particulars; 937 and 967, no lumber is included. All the rest are for bridges com-No. of plete. As all of these bridges in which Bridge. lumber is not mentioned there are 926 ... short spans, the lumber would have been a very small time, and would not 968 have increased the cost by more than 974 a small fraction of a cent per pound. 1069 think we have a very reasonable explanation from Mr. Roy himself as to 1075 and 76 11,171 why lumber and erection are not included in six of the fifteen bridges in 1098 this table. We have it in evidence that 1100 Mr. Brown, one of the witnesses who testified here, took the contract to erect one of these bridges at Hunter's Brook, N. S., and he also was to find the lumber. Consequently Mr. Roy would not put these items in the statement. But that makes no difference. The prices I have quoted here are the actual contract prices, the money really paid out by the people who bought these bridges. And we find that for fifteen bridges containing 405,724 pounds of metal there was paid \$17,543, an average price of 4.32 cents per pound. And now, let us see what was the average price per pound paid for the New Brunswick bridges, and we will find that it was nearly double that paid for the pin bridges in Ontario, and I'll include in my statement ber ? of the New Brunswick bridges those of the cheaper class as well as the higher priced pin bridges. complete. NEW ERUNSWICK BRIDGES. Bridge. Weight. Cost. Lefebvre 237.944 \$17,502 0 Campbell 155.715 11.480 1 cents ? Blackville .178.220 12.753 5 Dingee ... examined at this time by the hon. member for Kings. He spent hours and days in cross-examining the wit-12.586 1.176 17 Grand Maran 9.618 830 6 Mill Cove ... 13.050 1.280 00 ness before the committee, and his Trueman's Pend 29,880 2,590 4

43,300

28.230

3,497 0 other lawyer in Canada could have done, but I am not one of the wit-3,586 423 21 nesses, and I decline to be cross-712,159 \$56.807 10 examined. And if the hon, member for Kirgs will int get so excited while or an average price per pound of 7.95 I em presenting these facts and figcents, or 3.67 more per pound than the ures to the house, I will continue my fifteen pin bridges built by the Hamil-

friends say he did it better than any

4,474 90

excuse the chief commissioner can of-fer for continuing in that course. He and 1899, when the price of steel was argument. I know that my friends opposite do saw that he was paying too much for considerably higher than in the years not like to have these facts and figures

eferting to New Brunswick includes all the bidges fullt. While the hon. member for Kings has not, I think, stated outright that all the bridges in New Erunswick are the high class pin we, in New tridges, he certainly has sought to cents more create that impression, and he would bridges than like to think that Ontario has a cheappany received er class of bridges, and we have only sive bridges e the higher class. That is not so. We when steel have a cheap class of bridges too, althan it was though they really cost us the most ected in New money of any. The Saunders Brook bridges is the cheapest kind of highiron they put way bridge known, being merely three heavy rolled beams, and that bridge from Glouce speech, I am cost us nearly 12 cents a pound. And while I have shown that the fifteer pin allow him ment he nlea. bridges built by the Hamirton Bridge was saying. Co. cost the average price of 4.32 cents bridges built per pound. I do not wish to be unfait the administr to myself in this calculation. I do no ex-chief com wish to be unfair to the house or to more than th the country, and for that purpose bought at the selected from Mr. Roy's statement the ton Bridge co ten bridges for which they received the highest Inces, and the selection is ten most ex two years' taken from the whele list of bridges clude, and th built in 1898 and 1899, so as to make province must the comparison with the prices ; aid for our New Brunswick bridges as favorable as possible to the latter, this HAMILTON BRIDGE COMPANY'S BRIDGES Cost Weight \$2,550 926 51,594 965 and 966 %14,F41 840 42. 8.130 340 5.612 500 \$.520 1072..... 18,945 1,050 700 2.341 1082 39,375 540 7.011 850 13,232 178,041 \$10.13 Average price per pound, 5.68 cents We have, in this inquiry, confined ourselves to ten bridges, and to make what seems to me a fair comparison, have taken the ten highest price bridges from Mr. Roy's statement, and I find that his ten highest priced bridges weighed 178,041 pounds, for which his company received \$10,136, 01 an average price per pound of 5.68 cents, which is 2 3-10 cents less per pound than was paid in this province for the ten bridges to which this in-guiry was restricted. Dr. Pugsley-Does that include !um-Mr. Flemming-1066 and 1082 do not in-clude the lumber. All the rest ar Dr. Possley-Would not the cost per bound, taking the estimated weight. and the sectual cost of No. 1666 be 7 Mr. Flemming-I decline to be cross-

\$16,000 is a dir I do not feel attention of length. As I the legal train of evidence as might be place the people of to say this: acuman, nor see that doub in this provin the steel high ing the past is so plain th see it who w the truth. Th position has thoroughly su has vindicate house and be lieve that in (Mr. Hazen h under a great Believing, as ince was wr and more that highway bridg sibility of goir making those that, if given prove them. charges in them upon the pressed for a tion, and bet followed up th proved them. out a great of time and 1 hon. leader of day he stands before this co am satisfied brought out b placed before try, and whe Hazen's charge were only too will judge bet the opposition ioner. what their ver

Daniel McBe

Child

ON A S

gouche Co., is

Visconsin.

Mar. Young-

Mr. Flamm

