

14th July, 1876, having had no fuel since the 19th June, he wrote, stating that Captain Smith had arrived with a supply. On the 26th July, 1876, there was a letter from the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department at Halifax, to the Department at Ottawa, which ran as follows :—

“The water supply at the station is very uncertain. There are no streams or springs, and it can only be obtained in the spring of the year from the melting snow running down the cleft, and from what can be secured from the roof of the whistle house. The tank can be filled in the spring but cannot be replenished after that, except from the rain supply. I would strongly recommend the building of another tank alongside the first one, by which means a constant and sufficient supply of water can be maintained. When I was at the station there was only enough for about 100 hours sounding, and had the whistle been in operation during the foggy weather at the end of June and the first part of July, when the fuel was out, the water supply would have been exhausted before this date.”

In the Department, with respect to the administration of which the hon. Minister had challenged him to point out any want of diligence, it appeared by the reports of the officers, that the only reason why there was not enough water on the 26th July was because they had to stop the fog whistle during the most dangerous period of the year for want of fuel. It would be difficult to imagine a case of more culpable negligence in any Department. The reply sent by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the agent of the Department at Halifax was as follows :—

“Your report received in this matter. I am glad charges against the Engineer are unfounded. I don't feel inclined to authorize expenditure this season for the tank you recommend. What will be the probable cost ?”

The hon. Minister on the 5th August, 1876,—one year after the engineer had been asking for water—obtained an estimate which placed the cost of building the improvements at \$992, which was afterwards reduced to \$815. On the 8th of August, Mr. Johnston wrote to Mr. Short :

“I am in receipt of your letter of 1st inst., inclosing estimates and offers for building tank, coal-shed and wood-house at Cape D'Or. I sent these papers to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and he instructs me that these improvements will have to stand until next year, as there is no appropriation to meet expenditure.”

On 24th August Mr. Johnston wrote to the Minister :

“I have the honour to forward copy of letter from the engineer at Cape D'Or, stating that the supply of water there was exhausted. I did not advertise this whistle as stopped because, between the date and receipt of the letter, we had had very heavy rain, which will, I trust, both clear the fog and give us a supply of water.”

The Department had certainly shown unlimited faith in Providence. On the 19th August, Mr. Short wrote to the agent at Halifax, to the effect that the water had given out, and that the whistle was silent. Now, if any ships had gone ashore, under the circumstances every fair and just-minded man would consider the Government responsible for any loss of life and property that might occur. On the 19th December, 1876, Mr. W. M. Smith, the Inspector, wrote to the Department, stating that he proposed building an addition to the reservoir, so as to insure a supply of water, and they had a memorandum by Mr. Joseph Tomlinson to the effect that this would involve an expenditure of \$700. Without taking up any more time of the House, he submitted that, if there was any question which demanded careful consideration, it was the one to which he had referred.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he did not think it was right that, at this late moment, without giving him notice, his hon. friend should make such a violent attack. He thought the conduct of the hon. gentleman on this occasion was unworthy of him. If any hon. member examined the papers he would find they did not reflect on either himself or his Department. It was impossible to manage 400 lighthouses and 30 or 40 fog-whistles without occasionally some mistake happening; but he did not think that there was sufficient ground in this instance for the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) to make a personal attack. He did not object to any fair criticism of his Department, but the hon. gentleman rather overstepped the mark in this particular. Any one who read the papers would find evidence to exculpate both himself and the Department. The appropriation for this fog-whistle was made during the incumbency of his predecessor, and it was finished in the