

MR. STEPHENSON said he generally received the explanations of his hon. friend the Minister of Marine with a degree of satisfaction, but in the present case he might express the belief that \$5,000 were required to remove the obstructions in these two rivers.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said that if the hon. gentleman called the attention of the Department to the existence of obstructions in either of these rivers, from floating lumber, he would cause an enquiry, and, if necessary, remove the obstructions.

Vote agreed to.

XIV. LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE.

127. Salaries and allowance of Lighthouse Keepers..... \$151,583 00

MR. LANGEVIN asked why the lighthouse keeper at Kamouraska had received an increase of \$50.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said it was because the light there was changed from a fixed to a revolving light, entailing more responsibility, time and care.

MR. LANGEVIN said the salary of the keeper at Metis had been reduced by \$20, and he presumed that was done because the light there was changed from a revolving to a fixed one.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said he did not think any actual reduction had been made, but he would enquire into the matter.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. LANGEVIN asked how long the keeper had been at Tadousac Range Light.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH: I think about three years.

MR. LANGEVIN said the man had been there for three years taking care of the two lights, which were a quarter of a mile distant from each other, for a salary of \$150, and now, all at

once, it was proposed to double his salary. His duty would not be more than during the past three years, and the only reason given for the increase appears to be that it was a lonely place, and that there was no garden to cultivate to render him less lonely. He might say that there were other lighthouse keepers who were as lonely, some whose lighthouses were situated in the middle of the St. Lawrence, three or four miles from shore. These had not had their salaries increased. He thought there should be a rule for these increases, and that they should not be allowed to be made in this discriminate fashion. Last year he pointed out the case of a lighthouse keeper, whose salary had been gradually increased, until it was \$350, simply because he had a friend at Court. It was the same in the present instance. They might have increased the man's salary by \$50, but there was an object in doubling it; it was doubled so that next year the man would not want an increase, and some other relation could receive an augmentation of his salary. At the lighthouse of Port Charles, a very important point between Montreal and Quebec, and where a large sum of money had been expended, the man only received \$150, and had to keep the lights from the middle of April to the 1st December. Why was not that man to receive \$300? He was quite as lonesome as the other. The Cap aux Oies lighthouse was as lonely a place as could be found on the Lower St. Lawrence; notwithstanding, the lighthouse keeper there had \$200 only. The fact that the man at Tadousac had been increased \$300 would have this effect: that all lighthouse keepers would be applying to be put on the same footing. He did not say that the man's work was not worth \$300; but, if so, the work of the other man was worth as much. He should like to ask if the Department had any explanation with regard to the increase.

SIR ALBERT J. SMITH said that, before he yielded to the solicitation of the keeper, he had an enquiry made, and Mr. Gregory visited the locality. He reported to the Department that