

TWO-PRICE BRIDGES.

Astonishing Evidence Last Night by Mr. Winslow.

Alfred Haines Given Money in Large Sums Without Orders or Certificates.

As Dr. Pugsley Wanted to Get off to Ottawa, the Enquiry was Adjourned.

FREDERICTON, March 22.—The bridge charges investigation was resumed this morning. The cross-examination of Mr. Roy was continued. He said, in reply to Dr. Pugsley, that a riveted bridge was somewhat less expensive to construct than a pin bridge. It would cost possibly from 1 cent to 11-2 cents per pound more. Dr. Pugsley then proceeded to examine the witness upon the contents of the private paper and statement which Mr. Roy was compelled to give yesterday. The bridges mentioned in the statement were tendered for at a rate varying from 4 to 5-2 cents per pound. These figures covered everything including erection and the bridge completed ready for traffic.

The price of one bridge built in the latter part of 1890 at the rate of 7-10 cents per pound. (See Mr. Roy's explanation in re-examination by Dr. Stockton.) The riveting machines operated by compressed air do much better work than can possibly be done by hand. They are used much as a labor saving machine as because of the fact that they do better work.

He had not communicated with any engineer regarding this case before coming to New Brunswick. He had communicated with P. S. Archibald. His communication had been only with Mr. Hazen. The 75 per cent. which he had mentioned in his evidence as the rate which he added to the cost of the labor in tendering upon a job was given him as the figure upon which to calculate by the accountant of the company. No additional charge was made in his estimates for managing expenses, rent, office expenses, etc., and he understood that the 75 per cent. mentioned covered all these items. He could not say whether the Hamilton Bridge Co. was making money and paying dividends. That was the company's private affair and not his business.

MR. ROY'S SINCERITY QUESTIONED.

Dr. Pugsley questioned the sincerity of Mr. Roy's statements and offers at what he would build a bridge in New Brunswick for. Mr. Roy replied that if, New Brunswick government wished to test the sincerity of his offers let them give the Hamilton Bridge Co. an opportunity to tender for the highway bridges which are built here, and they would quickly find out if they would not make contracts at the prices which he had mentioned. And they would satisfy every requirement of the plans and specifications of Mr. Wetmore, too.

RE-EXAMINED BY DR. STOCKTON.

Mr. Roy was re-examined by Dr. Stockton. Mr. Roy stated that the statement put in evidence was one compiled by him for private information. None of the bridges mentioned in the statement were as heavy nor of so long span as the Lefebvre or Campbell bridge. The relative cost per pound was greater in a lighter bridge than in a heavy one like the Lefebvre. Dr. Pugsley in cross-examination had assumed that the labor upon the material of the Lefebvre would not cost 11-2 cents per pound; this witness testified that it would be more than \$1.00 per 100 lbs. at the outside. The fair cost of erection for Lefebvre would be 55 cents per 100 lbs. There has been considerable fluctuation in the prices of steel since 1891 and up to the present. As far as his recollection goes, the prices of structural steel was higher in 1891 and 1892 than in 1896 and 1897. Prices were much higher in 1899 than during the two previous years.

Bridge No. 1,100 upon his statement, which Dr. Pugsley called attention to as having cost 7 cents per lb., was contracted for on September 18th, 1899, and the bridge had to be completed before that time. The shop was rushed with work at the time and the company was not particularly desirous of the contract. They, however, put in a tender at a high figure and were awarded the contract. The bridge was 89 feet span; weighing 13,232 pounds; the contract price was \$550. Upon a rush order like this—the company having only a fortnight in which to build the bridge, there would probably be a lot of night work, which was very expensive. This fully explained why the price of that bridge was higher than any of the others.

No. 826 was for a bridge of 2 spans 112 feet each, the bridge weighing 51,094 lbs., and being a pin and roller structure. The contract price was \$2,550, a rate of 5 cents per pound. This bridge was erected at Ocotas in the Northwest Territories, and had to be freighted 1,200 or 1,500 miles. The freight charged upon this bridge was \$822.63.

No. 868 was 63 feet span; 8,130 lbs. weight; contract price, \$425. This was another rush order.

No. 971 was 68 feet span; weight, 11,272 pounds; contract price, \$550, a rate of \$4.83 per 100 lb.

No. 972 was a 78 feet span; weight, 12,909; contract price, \$560—a rate of 5-10 cents per pound.

No. 1069, built in 1899 when metal was high in price, was 63 feet span; weight, 3,520 pounds; contract price, \$500—a rate of 5-10 cents per pound. This was a rush order, the contract being let on June 30 and the bridge was completed on August 1st. Steel and wages were both high in the fall of 1899.

No. 1098 was built late in 1899. It is a 40 ft. span; weight, 7,011 lbs.; contract price, \$540—a rate of 7-10 cents per pound. The price of lumber was unusually high in this bridge, it cost-

ing \$87. There were other exceptional circumstances connected with this bridge.

Dr. Pugsley in referring to the cost prices of these bridges had taken the estimated weights, whereas the actual weights were greater in almost every instance. These bridges were the ones picked out by Dr. Pugsley as appearing somewhat favorable to his side and somewhat near approaching Mr. Emmerson's price of 6-2 cents L. O. B. at Moncton. Mr. Roy's prices were for the bridges completed ready for traffic.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

This afternoon Dr. Stockton continued the examination of Mr. Roy. Dr. Stockton again referred to the statement put in evidence by Mr. Roy. Dr. Pugsley had referred to several of the bridges mentioned in that statement which seemed to be of a somewhat high price. Dr. Stockton wished to call attention to a few other bridges. Referring to No. 955, it was a 55 feet span; weight, 13,737 lbs.; contract price, \$540—a rate of \$3.94 per 100 lbs. This was built in June, 1898.

No. 943 was of 59 feet span; weight, 6,368 lbs.; contract price, \$284—a rate per 100 lbs. of \$4.54. No. 977 was 68 feet span; weight, 14,057 pounds; contract price, \$565—a rate of 4 cents per pound.

No. 1055 was 118 ft span; weight, 28,215 lbs.; contract price, \$1,360; per 100 lbs., \$4.83. This bridge was built in June, 1899. Steel was somewhat high this year.

Nos. 929 and 930 were 68 and 59 feet spans, pin connected structures. The cost of shop labor was \$1.79 per 100 pounds. Nos. 985 and 966 were riveted structures, 63 and 48 feet span. The cost of shop labor upon these was \$1.03 per 100 pounds.

The witness was further cross-examined by Dr. Pugsley upon some of the details of the technical questions attempted by all sorts of technical questions to confuse Mr. Roy, and by picking out particular bridges to make it appear that there were inconsistencies in his statement. Mr. Roy replied, in general, that there were exceptional circumstances in many cases which he could not now call to mind. The figures were there and spoke for themselves.

Mr. Shaw—You stated that you would be willing to build the Lefebvre bridge upon the same plans as is now stands for the sum of \$2,000—a rate of \$3.90 per 100 pounds. Was that only for the material or for the bridge all completed?

Mr. Roy—That was the price all completed, ready for traffic.

Mr. Shaw—And do you consider that your company would be making a fair profit at that price?

Mr. Roy—I certainly do. This concluded the examination of Mr. Roy. He had been upon the stand since Friday last. He thanked the committee for the courteous and extended to him and asked Dr. Pugsley to induce the government to give the Hamilton Bridge Co. an opportunity to tender for the next highway bridge they wanted built.

The great importance attached to Mr. Roy's evidence is shown by the desperate efforts and divers tactics employed by the government to break the force of it. Dr. Pugsley was continually prompted in his cross-examination by Hon. A. E. Wetmore, Premier, Secretary Tweedie, Premier Emmerson and A. E. Peters of the Record Foundry Co.; and Chief Engineer Wetmore, J. M. Rudebeck, a government two-price bridge builder; Hon. Mr. Ferris, F. Thompson, proprietor of the New Brunswick Foundry, and other so-called experts were frequently consulted with in conference together, and assisting Dr. Pugsley. The government stenographers were at the beck and call of Dr. Pugsley, and long tabulated statements were speedily produced, and type written copies of papers put in evidence were made at short notice and put in Dr. Pugsley's hands—and all for the one purpose of trying to make Mr. Roy contradict himself or to get him confused.

But Mr. Roy was not that kind of a witness. As he plainly told Dr. Pugsley, he did not come here to make out a special case; he was here to give the committee any information he could about bridge building. He never for a moment lost his self-possession, or was in the least rattled.

He left for home upon the train immediately after his examination was concluded. He was called again and his examination resumed. He said that there were no tenders or contracts for the Dinege bridge. Some of the accounts for this bridge were produced. They all were made out in the name of Alfred Haines. Mr. Haines' expenses in connection with this bridge were \$38, and no vouchers were produced for these, and Dr. Stockton asked for them, and Mr. Winslow promised to bring them down. An item of \$35 charged against the Dinege bridge appears in the public accounts of 1898. Dr. Stockton asked what this was for. Mr. Winslow produced a memorandum of a bill from R. T. Babbitt of Georgetown for that amount, the charge being for inspection of the bridge. This is in addition to Mr. Haines' charge of \$70 for inspecting this bridge. Mr. Winslow did not have the original bill of Mr. Babbitt, and showed considerable disinclination to search his office and find it. Dr. Stockton insisted, however, upon the original voucher being produced, and Mr. Winslow promised to try and find it.

According to the statements so far produced the superstructure of Dinege bridge cost \$1,178.17 for 12,586 lbs. weight—a rate of 9.36 cents per pound. The accounts for the Saunders Brook bridge were next produced. They showed the cost of the structure to have been \$428.41 for a bridge weighing 3,583 pounds—a rate of 11.8-10 cents per pound.

(This is the bridge which Mr. Roy said his company would build for \$175.) Prof. Swain stated in his evidence that he thought that \$150 would be a fair price for the bridge.

The accounts of the Grand Manan bridge next came under review. The weight of this bridge was at the rate of 8.63 cents per pound. In reply to questions, Mr. Winslow stated that Mr. Haines is paid as in-

spector \$4 per day and expenses for all the time he is employed. Going to the Lefebvre bridge Mr. Winslow stated that there were no tenders asked for for the erection of this bridge, nor was any written contract entered into. It was built by the Record Foundry Co. Mr. Winslow stated that he paid Mr. Haines the money for this bridge and he paid (he supposed) the Messrs. Peters.

Dr. Pugsley said that the Messrs. Peters charged 61-2 cents per pound for material and erection, but that this amount does not include cost of material for the flooring nor the painting.

Mr. Emmerson has made the statement that the Lefebvre bridge cost 61-2 cents per lb. complete, according to the statement made up by the committee the cost was considerably more than that. The statement is as follows:

Record Foundry Co.'s bill.—\$15,466 36 Painting..... 250 00 Flooring..... 689 56 Freight and loading..... 74 32 Plates..... 46 88 \$16,526 24 This is a rate of \$4.94 per 100 pounds; and this does not include inspection, \$159.83; A. E. Wetmore, \$57.95; not taking down the old superstructure, \$275.55 which would bring the cost of the bridge to \$18,729.07.

In Mr. Roy's evidence he stated that the Hamilton Bridge Co. would today erect the Lefebvre bridge all complete and ready for traffic and according to the plans and specifications of Mr. Wetmore, as against the \$18,729.07, 100 pounds actually paid by Mr. Emmerson for the bridge. And material and labor for bridge building are considerably higher now than they were in 1897, when the Lefebvre bridge was built.

FREDERICTON, N. B., March 22.—The committee met after 8 o'clock. Mr. Gibson being absent. Mr. Lafontaine called Phelps Johnson, manager of the Dominion Bridge Co., Montreal, to the stand. Mr. Johnson was examined by Mr. Roy, and Dr. Pugsley called all tenders and contracts of his bridge company for bridges from 1891 to 1895. Dr. Pugsley then objected to the witness being sworn, on the ground that the papers called for had not been produced to the committee, the chairman having sent a telegram to them yesterday afternoon.

Dr. Stockton protested that this was an unheard of procedure, and Mr. Hazen protested against this course as unknown to law. The chairman ruled that the committee would be governed by the strict rules of evidence, and refusal or neglect to produce papers did not render him incompetent to give evidence. It had not been shown that the witness had controlled the papers asked for, or had a fair opportunity of getting them, or even that he refused to produce them. No witness could be asked on going on the stand to say what he was going to do at a later stage of the case. Such a course neither he, the chairman nor any other lawyer had ever heard of.

Dr. Pugsley replied that his client would be injured if any other course was pursued. He claimed all contracts should be before the committee, and referred to the difficulty of getting Mr. Roy's statement. Secondary evidence of contracts could not be given if they were withheld, and his client powerless to protect himself. He led a right to protect himself and show what these companies charged before the present system was adopted.

The chairman ruled that he could allow witness to be sworn and would then examine him himself, and refused to hear Mr. Baxter upon this refusal until after the examination of Mr. Johnson, sworn, said to Mr. Carvell that he had got the telegram shortly before leaving Montreal and that there was not time to bring the papers required. He had all the Nova Scotia papers in his possession.

The chairman then ruled that papers from 1891 to 1895 must be produced before the witness' examination could proceed.

Mr. Hazen appealed from this decision. Mr. Baxter argued against the decision, showing the question had not arisen. The issue of subpoena did not make the papers material evidence. The charges were that Emmerson had given contracts in 1895, 1896 and 1897 for the erection of the bridge at prices higher than current market prices. The contracts made in 1891 had no bearing on the question of market price in these years, therefore it would be no evidence. The question could not be raised until after the direct examination of witnesses, when if papers were not produced secondary evidence could be given.

Dr. Stockton followed, asking if this was the full investigation promised. He told the chairman that he (Carvell) as a lawyer knew that there was not the slightest foundation in law for Pugsley's argument or the chairman's ruling. He reviewed the position in an eloquent speech, and warned the committee that if such measures were adopted by them and approved by the legislature, our free institutions would be prostituted and degenerate into a reproach, and responsible government become a farce. This was not a party or political question, but one of justice. To shut out one piece of evidence because another piece was not forthcoming was a proposition which could not stand in a court of justice.

Because Dr. Pugsley had a majority at his back he was able to deal with evidence as he saw fit, but he (Stockton) warned the committee that they would be a laughing stock before the legislature and the country. Dr. Pugsley had spoken of his client, but it was the country who paid him last year and not Emmerson. The people had to pay for delay and suppression of investigating into the administration of public work. If this was established as a precedent there was no possibility of inquiry into the future administration of public affairs.

Dr. Pugsley replied, appealing to the committee to sustain his view and the chairman's ruling, which was done by Fish, Legeve and Young against Hazen and Shaw.

FREDERICTON, March 22.—The bridge inquiry committee reassembled at 11.15 this morning. Dr. Stockton stated that Mr. Johnson, the witness who was ruled out last evening, stated to him that he has not the papers asked for under his control, but that he will return to Montreal and consult the directors of the company, and if they consent to inform the committee Tuesday or Wednesday next if he can or cannot produce the papers. Mr. Stockton stated to have Mr. Johnson put on the stand and examine him relative to the two bridges which the Dominion Bridge Co. built in this province, the Hampton and Sussex bridges, and about which Dr. Pugsley has already made some statements to the committee.

Dr. Pugsley objected to this, and the chairman stated that he would not allow Mr. Johnson to be put on the stand and to allow him to give evidence without appearing altogether from any papers or contracts.

THE BRIDGE BUILDER GIVES EVIDENCE. William Brown was called and examined by Mr. Baxter. He was called and examined by Mr. Baxter. He is a civil engineer and a member of the Canadian Institute of Civil Engineers. He was bridge inspector for the Nova Scotia government for eight years, 1883 to 1890. Since the latter year he has been erecting iron and steel bridges for the Dominion, Canadian Central and King Bridge companies, but met with an accident which prevented him from doing so. These were all highway bridges, and they were all built for the Nova Scotia government. He was also bridge inspector for the Dominion and Hamilton Bridge companies put on tenders and the received very high tenders during the past few years. The Dominion and Hamilton bridges are very high. They are underbid by local firms.

Mr. Brown stated that he had a knowledge of the Lefebvre bridge, derived from reading the public documents.

Dr. Pugsley asked what are those prices? Dr. Pugsley objected. Question ruled out by the chairman.

DR. PUGSLEY WON'T HALF TRY. Dr. Pugsley stated that it was impossible for him to get the bridge companies to send witnesses here to give testimony on behalf of Mr. Emmerson. Dr. Stockton called Dr. Pugsley to ask the Nova Scotia government to send its engineer, Mr. Carvell, to give evidence about the bridge building. There could be no doubt but that the witness would give the truth.

Mr. Hazen said that he had Mr. Murphy, the Nova Scotia government's engineer, subpoenaed to appear here, but that he could not obey.

Dr. Stockton pressed Dr. Pugsley to send a letter to the engineer of the Nova Scotia or to Mr. Murphy requesting the latter's presence here, but Dr. Pugsley would not do this.

In New Brunswick Mr. Brown stated that he was well acquainted with the bridges built in the Province of the same class as the Sussex and Salisbury structures. The witness had inspected the Blackville bridge and the Salisbury bridge in workmanship. The riveting in the end spans was very bad. The rivet heads are split, missing in many instances there is not enough stock in the rivets to form a head. He did not know where the rivets were inspected in both end spans. The centre span was a little better.

When asked upon the Blackville bridge would not be tolerated at all in Nova Scotia. The rails are angle iron and afford no support. The ends of the bridge do not come together by 3-4 of an inch, and in some instances are 1 inch apart.

THERE IS A TWIST IN THE TRUSS. There is a defect in the erection. The bridge had never been painted since erection, or if so the paint has all washed off. The rivets are rusted and the bridge to deteriorate very rapidly. It was a far inferior bridge to the Sussex and Salisbury structures.

Assuming that the weight of the Salisbury bridge was 75,134 pounds and that the contract price was \$2,740, the price per pound would be 3-10 cents.

Mr. Brown stated that he had had the shipping bills of the Salisbury and Sussex bridges, given to him, and that the bills were destroyed in the Digby fire about a year ago. A paper was put before the witness which he recognized as the specifications of the Salisbury bridge. Mr. Baxter asked for the plans of the Salisbury bridge and other papers which he had and put in evidence.

A set of plans were produced, some of which Mr. Brown said were the plans of the Salisbury bridge and others were not. Mr. Brown stated that his client, the Salisbury bridge, was \$320. This included the hauling from Salisbury station, building the bridge, painting, and erection. The average price for erection after the material is delivered at the site is 10 cents per lb. for the weight of the bridge when such exists. He erected the bridge in East Hants, Nova Scotia. The bridge weighed 100,000 pounds. He took the material at St. John, freighted it to the site, and received 50 cents per 100 pounds for it.

CANNOT FIND THE CONTRACT. At the request of Mr. Baxter, Dr. Pugsley sent to the board of works for the contract with the Dominion Bridge Co. for the Salisbury bridge. Mr. Brown said that the company's bill and other papers and that the contract could not be found.

Dr. Pugsley stated that the difficulties of erection were very great there, greater than they were at Moncton, where the Lefebvre bridge was built.

He contended the direct examination of this witness, and he was taken in hand by Dr. Pugsley, who had the assistance today of a new expert, Mr. Arnold, C. E., of New York. The witness was questioned as to alleged faulty construction of the Salisbury bridge. Mr. Brown had not seen the bridge since it was erected in 1892. He said that if it had not been carefully and properly erected and cared for it ought to require any extensive repairs now.

He erected the Hampton bridge, receiving \$1,600 for it, he thought. He thought that the bridge was perfectly constructed, though the workmanship was not quite as good as upon the Sussex and Salisbury bridge. He looked upon the latter as better bridges. He stated that the riveting and defective workmanship can be detected by inspection. He had no other bridges in New Brunswick since Mr. Emmerson began to give them to his friends without tender or competition and secured.

Dr. Pugsley urged the committee to take into consideration the fact that the bridge and personal inspection of the bridges erected by the government at Salisbury, Blackville and other points where the Lefebvre bridge was built.

At the request of Dr. Pugsley the committee adjourned until Wednesday evening next.

FREDERICTON, March 24.—The bridge inquiry was resumed at 8 p. m. Friday evening.

T. B. Winslow, secretary of the board of works, was again on the stand and further examined by Dr. Stockton.

Some of the accounts of the Lefebvre bridge which had not been produced when the accounts of this structure were last under review were produced by the witness. One of them was a bill of Ezra P. Hoar, \$350 for painting the Lefebvre bridge. Mr. Winslow stated that this job had been completed by Mr. Hoar without tender or competition. Dr. Stockton remarked

that he had known of Mr. Hoar as figuring in various capacities, but he said the first time he had heard of him as a painter.

(Mr. Hoar is an Albert county—Mr. Emmerson's county—man, who frequently figures prominently in petty politics. He is not a painter, and it is doubtful if he knows oxide of iron from burnt alumina or yellow ochre. But he gets the jobs to paint Mr. Emmerson's bridges, and gets them, too, at his own price and without tender.)

CAMPBELL BRIDGE TWO PRICED. The accounts of the Campbell bridge were taken up. Mr. Winslow stated that there was no call for tenders for this structure. There was no contract other than the plans and specifications. The bridge was built by the Record Foundry Co. in 1897. This bridge was 156,715 pounds in weight, and A. E. Peters' bill was \$10,121.47 and, like the Lefebvre, was charged to A. Haines. Mr. Winslow stated that he paid the money, \$10,121.47, to A. Haines in various amounts and at various times. He (Winslow) never paid any money to Mr. Peters, but he supposed Mr. Haines did.

An attempt was made to get at the cost of the Campbell bridge. Mr. Emmerson has made the statement over and over again that it cost \$10,121.47 a rate of 61-2 cents per pound all complete. Mr. Hazen and his counsel by diligent search of the auditor general's reports and picking out items, succeeded in here and there, and compelling Mr. Winslow to produce bills and admit payments, have ascertained that the cost of the Campbell bridge has already been brought up to 71-4 cents per pound, and there are more bills to be looked into.

Mr. Winslow stated in his evidence that there were very some outstanding bills against this bridge which have not been paid. Ezra P. Hoar figures in this bridge with a bill for painting, and the job was given him without tender or competition. Mr. Winslow seemed to know so little about the accounts and to keep them in such a haphazard way that it seemed a hopeless task to find out from him what accounts were properly chargeable to Campbell bridge. Upon Dr. Pugsley's request Mr. Winslow produced a full statement made up. Dr. Stockton consented to that, as it was useless to try and get along any further with Mr. Winslow.

ASTONISHING EVIDENCE. While Mr. Winslow was being examined last evening he made some most astounding and surprising revelations as to the absolutely reckless manner in which Chief Commissioner Emmerson conducted the business of his department, and paid out thousands of dollars of the people's money merely upon the verbal request of Alfred Haines, a government inspector and go-between for Mr. Emmerson and the Messrs. Peters of the Record Foundry Co.

A bill was produced for the Campbell bridge, Sept. 21st, 1897. Alfred Haines in account with A. E. Peters, \$15,715 lbs. steel superstructure at 61-2 cents, \$10,121.47.

Dr. Stockton—To whom was that money paid?

Mr. Winslow—To Alfred Haines.

Dr. Stockton—Did he pay Mr. Peters?

Mr. Winslow—I suppose so.

Dr. Stockton—When did Mr. Haines get "his money"?

Mr. Winslow—At various times, and in various sums!

Further questioning Dr. Stockton got from Mr. Winslow the following extraordinary statements: Mr. Haines would go to the board of works at various times. He would make a verbal request for whatever sum of money he wanted. He would not present any bills or accounts to Mr. Peters. He made no returns nor certificates to the department that the work had been performed, nor as to how the work upon the bridge or bridges progressed, nor a return or written statement of any kind from Mr. Peters, acting under Mr. Emmerson's instructions, gave Mr. Haines checks for \$1,000 or \$2,000 or \$3,000, or whatever he asked for, merely taking his receipt for money received on account. Some-times two or three bridges were under construction at the same time, and Mr. Haines apportioned the money between them. Mr. Winslow knew nothing whatever about the work, nor whether it had been performed at all. Sometimes after the bridge would be completed Mr. Haines would present Mr. Peters' bill for the superstructure.

THIS RECKLESS METHOD of transacting public business was pursued with respect to Lefebvre bridge, which cost \$17,519, and Campbell bridge, upon which it has already been stated that over \$11,000 has been paid. Mr. Emmerson admitted and stated to the committee the other day that this method prevailed with respect to Dinege bridge, which cost \$1,178.17. Grand Manan bridge, for which \$30,244 was paid, and Sussex bridge, which cost \$423.41, when \$175 would have been a big price for the structure.

As the inquiry proceeds it will probably be shown that all the bridge building was conducted in the same way.

The reason why it is so difficult, in fact almost impossible to ascertain how much has been paid out on account of any one bridge or public work is because of the loose methods and absence of system which prevails in the board of works, a department which spends \$300,000 per year in addition to the money spent on permanent bridge account.

Another evidence of the reckless expenditure in the board of works was afforded in connection with A. Haines' bill for expenses. Several of these have thus far been produced by much probing by Dr. Stockton. Mr. Winslow—who paid them—was unable to tell Dr. Stockton what these expenses were or when or how they were contracted. The accounts presented to the committee, one of which was for \$150, were undated. They were paid without question.

ANOTHER BUBBLE PRICKED. While Dr. Stockton was pressing Mr. Winslow for the original accounts of Mr. Haines and other expenses Dr. Pugsley stated to the committee that the structure was last under review were produced by the witness. One of them was a bill of Ezra P. Hoar, \$350 for painting the Lefebvre bridge. Mr. Winslow stated that this job had been completed by Mr. Hoar without tender or competition. Dr. Stockton remarked

that he had known of Mr. Hoar as figuring in various capacities, but he said the first time he had heard of him as a painter.

(Mr. Hoar is an Albert county—Mr. Emmerson's county—man, who frequently figures prominently in petty politics. He is not a painter, and it is doubtful if he knows oxide of iron from burnt alumina or yellow ochre. But he gets the jobs to paint Mr. Emmerson's bridges, and gets them, too, at his own price and without tender.)

CAMPBELL BRIDGE TWO PRICED. The accounts of the Campbell bridge were taken up. Mr. Winslow stated that there was no call for tenders for this structure. There was no contract other than the plans and specifications. The bridge was built by the Record Foundry Co. in 1897. This bridge was 156,715 pounds in weight, and A. E. Peters' bill was \$10,121.47 and, like the Lefebvre, was charged to A. Haines. Mr. Winslow stated that he paid the money, \$10,121.47, to A. Haines in various amounts and at various times. He (Winslow) never paid any money to Mr. Peters, but he supposed Mr. Haines did.

An attempt was made to get at the cost of the Campbell bridge. Mr. Emmerson has made the statement over and over again that it cost \$10,121.47 a rate of 61-2 cents per pound all complete. Mr. Hazen and his counsel by diligent search of the auditor general's reports and picking out items, succeeded in here and there, and compelling Mr. Winslow to produce bills and admit payments, have ascertained that the cost of the Campbell bridge has already been brought up to 71-4 cents per pound, and there are more bills to be looked into.

Mr. Winslow stated in his evidence that there were very some outstanding bills against this bridge which have not been paid. Ezra P. Hoar figures in this bridge with a bill for painting, and the job was given him without tender or competition. Mr. Winslow seemed to know so little about the accounts and to keep them in such a haphazard way that it seemed a hopeless task to find out from him what accounts were properly chargeable to Campbell bridge. Upon Dr. Pugsley's request Mr. Winslow produced a full statement made up. Dr. Stockton consented to that, as it was useless to try and get along any further with Mr. Winslow.

ASTONISHING EVIDENCE. While Mr. Winslow was being examined last evening he made some most astounding and surprising revelations as to the absolutely reckless manner in which Chief Commissioner Emmerson conducted the business of his department, and paid out thousands of dollars of the people's money merely upon the verbal request of Alfred Haines, a government inspector and go-between for Mr. Emmerson and the Messrs. Peters of the Record Foundry Co.

A bill was produced for the Campbell bridge, Sept. 21st, 1897. Alfred Haines in account with A. E. Peters, \$15,715 lbs. steel superstructure at 61-2 cents, \$10,121.47.

Dr. Stockton—To whom was that money paid?

Mr. Winslow—To Alfred Haines.

Dr. Stockton—Did he pay Mr. Peters?

Mr. Winslow—I suppose so.

Dr. Stockton—When did Mr. Haines get "his money"?

Mr. Winslow—At various times, and in various sums!

Further questioning Dr. Stockton got from Mr. Winslow the following extraordinary statements: Mr. Haines would go to the board of works at various times. He would make a verbal request for whatever sum of money he wanted. He would not present any bills or accounts to Mr. Peters. He made no returns nor certificates to the department that the work had been performed, nor as to how the work upon the bridge or bridges progressed, nor a return or written statement of any kind from Mr. Peters, acting under Mr. Emmerson's instructions, gave Mr. Haines checks for \$1,000 or \$2,000 or \$3,000, or whatever he asked for, merely taking his receipt for money received on account. Some-times two or three bridges were under construction at the same time, and Mr. Haines apportioned the money between them. Mr. Winslow knew nothing whatever about the work, nor whether it had been performed at all. Sometimes after the bridge would be completed Mr. Haines would present Mr. Peters' bill for the superstructure.

THIS RECKLESS METHOD of transacting public business was pursued with respect to Lefebvre bridge, which cost \$17,519, and Campbell bridge, upon which it has already been stated that over \$11,000 has been paid. Mr. Emmerson admitted and stated to the committee the other day that this method prevailed with respect to Dinege bridge, which cost \$1,178.17. Grand Manan bridge, for which \$30,244 was paid, and Sussex bridge, which cost \$423.41, when \$175 would have been a big price for the structure.

As the inquiry proceeds it will probably be shown that all the bridge building was conducted in the same way.

The reason why it is so difficult, in fact almost impossible to ascertain how much has been paid out on account of any one bridge or public work is because of the loose methods and absence of system which prevails in the board of works, a department which spends \$300,000 per year in addition to the money spent on permanent bridge account.

Another evidence of the reckless expenditure in the board of works was afforded in connection with A. Haines' bill for expenses. Several of these have thus far been produced by much probing by Dr. Stockton. Mr. Winslow—who paid them—was unable to tell Dr. Stockton what these expenses were or when or how they were contracted. The accounts presented to the committee, one of which was for \$150, were undated. They were paid without question.



His babyship will be wonderfully freshened up, and his whole little fat body will shine with health and cleanliness after his tub with the "Albert" Baby's Own Soap.