

Mr. OLIVER. Two bands, those at York Factory and Fort Churchill, including about 300 Indians.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The minister stated the distance to be about 480 miles, so this would be about \$1 for every mile. Does the minister not think that an abnormal price to ask the people of Canada to pay a man who is already paid for his services?

Mr. OLIVER. No; if I had thought so I would not ask the House to vote the amount. I think it is fair remuneration and consideration for the services rendered and the time occupied.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, does it not seem ridiculous to you that a man who is employed by the year as an officer of a department of this government, the whole of whose time is paid for by the people of Canada, should be paid \$400 for a couple or three months' service given, not in his own time, but in the people's time? I absolutely object to this.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no way of overruling my hon. friend's objection, nor have I any way of persuading him differently from the way he takes. I can only reiterate what I have stated, that, in my judgment, while Mr. Semmens' time was engaged and paid for by the country, still he was not paid for such duties or responsibilities as were placed upon him in the negotiation of these adhesions. We thought it was in the interest of economy that we should employ Mr. Semmens and make him a comparatively small allowance for extra duty rather than to employ some other person who probably would not do the work so well, and whose employment would cost the country a great deal more. That is one side of the question. The other is that we do not think it would be fair to hire Mr. Semmens for \$2,200 a year to act as inspector for a certain number of Indian agencies, and then demand entirely different duties and responsibilities at his hands, and under circumstances entirely different from those which he had reason to expect would surround the duties which he was paid to discharge.

Mr. BRADBURY. The objection I made in the beginning, I think, holds good. It was emphasized by my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) who, probably, knows more about the Indians than I do. But I think it is wrong to have an official, to whom the country is paying a very large salary, and then give him this additional work, when that work might have been performed by somebody else. The hon. minister knows how many people we have connected with the branch of the Indian Department at Winnipeg. The inspectors there draw a total of about \$9,000, and some do nothing more than walk down to

the office and get their cheques—do not leave Winnipeg and have no office work. I do not think there is anything to justify the sending out of these men at an extra \$5 a day to perform duties that the country has already paid for. As to my hon. friend's (Mr. Campbell's) reference to my criticism of Mr. Semmens the other night, I hold that my criticism was justified, but that does not mean that I am going to carry it through my life and persecute or follow up this man. I have stated that his knowledge was sufficient to enable him to perform the work in connection with this extra work, and, that being so, I think he should have performed it as part of the duties of the position he holds. But I have nothing to take back of my criticism of the other night. There were extenuating circumstances, perhaps which I stated on that occasion. But nothing that I said would show that he is unfit for the duty he is said to have performed in this case. My objection is that he should not be paid a double salary.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I think the minister's explanation is plausible, but it does not explain. I did not understand the minister to answer the question asked a moment ago: Was Mr. Semmens engaged for 79 days in getting these adhesions to the treaty, or does that 79 days include the time going and coming? I understood the minister to say that, on his way to where he received these adhesions and on the way back, he performed his regular duties as inspector of the department. Then, certainly, that needs explaining. If he was the best qualified man to get these adhesions, I have no objection to make, but I think it is a fair criticism to say that Mr. Semmens should not be paid extra for the time engaged in making inspections on his way to obtain these adhesions and on his way back.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Semmens' inspectorate extends to Norway House. There are several bands in the inspectorate between Selkirk and Norway House, and on his way between Selkirk and Norway House, either going or coming, he made the necessary inspections. The 79 days mentioned in the estimate was the time occupied from Norway House to Churchill and return to Norway House, and does not include the time he spent in going to Norway House.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And no inspections were made after leaving Norway House?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there were none to make, but the territory had to be travelled over in order to reach York Factory and Churchill. We wish to pay him the allowance from the time he left Norway House until he returned to Norway House, that being the time when he was employed in securing these adhesions at York Factory