

\$150 was too small a salary, and represented that the two lights were one-third of a mile apart, over a rough, rocky road, most difficult to traverse, and that he required occasional assistance to attend to both lights. That it was lonely was no reason, certainly; but the Department thought the claim a meritorious one.

MR. McCALLUM asked why a decrease in salary of \$35 had been made at Scotch Bonnet, an increase of \$25 at Port Stanley, and a decrease of \$133 at Lancaster Pier?

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said that the Port Stanley light was one of the most important on the north shore of Lake Erie. Port Stanley was the principal harbour on the north shore.

MR. McCALLUM said he knew that it was not the principle harbour there.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said that, under an Order-in-Council passed in 1870, before he came into office, the salaries of various lighthouse keepers in the Dominion were fixed; some were decreased on the appointment of new officers, and Scotch Bonnet came in the latter list. The appointment at Lancaster Pier was also a new one; hence the decrease.

MR. CAMPBELL said he wished to know why the lighthouse keeper at Bird Island, N.S., had been allowed to come on shore during winter, while Mr. McPhee, the manager of the Government institution at St. Paul's Island three years ago, had been turned out in the middle of winter, when he could not remove his family or effects from the Island. This man remained on shore all winter, and his wife and part of his family stayed alone on the Island, with a superintendent over their heads. His constituents had repeatedly asked him why the action of the Government was so arbitrary in the one case and so generous in the other, as in the case of Bird Island lighthouse, the keeper farmed out the work done for \$200, and pocketed the balance, making a political canvas at the same time. This lighthouse keeper had abandoned his post twelve months ago. He had moved for the papers relating to this

matter some time since, and he had just received them.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said that the lighthouse keeper on Bird Island was the brother of Hon. Mr. Ross, and having spoken to him (Sir Albert J. Smith) about this matter at Halifax, he had told Mr. Ross to make his application for leave of absence on the ground that his family was ill the winter before, and that he desired to live on the mainland in winter, in writing. Mr. Ross promised in his letter to provide an efficient person (Mr. Mackenzie) to take charge of the property during his absence, and to return to the post in the spring. If he did not return, of course he would have to resign the position. These were the facts, and he thought that the House would justify him in granting this leave of absence under the circumstances.

MR. STEPHENSON said that, as was well known, the lighthouse property at Rondeau was very valuable. The lighthouse keeper at this point had entire charge of two lighthouses, one of which was provided with a revolving light, and, nominally, he believed, this man had control of the harbour itself; but no person had actual charge of the harbour, into which large vessels went and lay during storms, to the great damage of piers, upon which a large sum had been expended. No one had authority to order the vessels to go into the harbour and anchor there, and the result was that these piers sustained very considerable damage. This lighthouse keeper received a salary of \$400 per annum; he lived several miles from any inhabited house; he did not have the advantage of any school or of any land to cultivate; and he had ten or twelve miles to go to market; in fact he was completely isolated. Last year the Government had been kind enough to give this official a boat, but it was only large enough for one man to use to go to market, to the post-office etc. He had the nominal and ought to have active control over these entire works. Moreover, he was compelled to remain at his post during the whole of the year, and, in addition, he had to take charge of these two

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH.