

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not see that the work done here is any different from the ordinary work of inspection of Indian reserves. I would agree that if you hired a man to work in an office, and wanted him to work outside at manual labour, there would be ground for my hon. friend's argument. But this is to all intents and purposes the same class of work.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a great difference between travelling by steamer on Lake Winnipeg to Norway House, which is the ultimate limit of the inspectorate over which Mr. Semmens presides, and taking a canoe from Norway House to Fort Churchill and York Factory, a distance of 300 or 400 miles through an absolutely untravellered country. When his Excellency, the Governor General made a trip last summer on this same route, under the most favourable conditions, the fact was heralded throughout the world as something extraordinary. Mr. Semmens goes over a great deal more ground under conditions not nearly as favourable, and my hon. friend says that it is entirely in his day's work. I do not think it is. When a man goes to negotiate an adhesion to a treaty, or for all practical purposes to make a treaty with Indians who have not hitherto been under a treaty, I submit that his duties and responsibilities are radically and entirely different and of a much higher class from those of ordinary inspection. It is only fair that that condition should be recognized, namely, the extraordinary difference in the means and mode of travel and the important difference in the duties of the two positions.

Mr. BRADBURY. I agree with the minister that there is some difference in the work; but when he says that the duties are more arduous or more dangerous, I must differ with him. In the territory Mr. Semmens inspects, he has to travel considerable distances in canoes just as he would if he were going to York Factory. A trip to York Factory is not so dangerous, it is simply a pleasure trip, thousands of men have gone down that river, and the trip from Norway House down the Nelson river along the chain of lakes is really a pleasure trip, especially in the case of a man, travelling as an inspector, and making the journey with a large staff in attendance—really travelling in state. I do not object to a man getting paid for his work, and Mr. Semmens is perhaps one of the likeliest officers to do it, but what I object to is that, in addition to his salary of \$2,200 a year, he should be allowed extra for this work. The department has two inspectors, Mr. Swinford and Mr. Semmens, who apparently are working over the same territory and within a short distance of each other. Each of them gets \$2,200 per year, and I think

Mr. OLIVER.

that if you take them from their regular work and give them any other work, they should not draw any extra salary. An employee of the government, drawing a yearly salary, should give his whole time to the country, and I do not approve of this system of allowing government employees to get these additional perquisites. There are other men in Manitoba just as competent as Mr. Semmens to do this work, and it would not have cost more to employ any one of them. At the same time I am not criticising Mr. Semmens in the slightest degree, because I think he is an experienced man and especially adapted for this work, but he should not be paid a double salary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In listening to what the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) has just said, I wondered if this was the same Rev. Mr. Semmens whom he criticised a night or two ago with regard to the St. Peter's reserve. To-day my hon. friend has painted him in glowing colours whereas, the other night he depicted him as a betrayer of the Indians. I cannot understand this blowing hot and cold.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This man Semmens is, to borrow a term from the Senate, a reformed preacher. He has given up his charge as a preacher of the gospel and has become a heeler, more or less, for the Liberal party in the west. I object to \$400 extra being paid to him in addition to his regular salary, for he is paid a regular salary to give up all his time to Canada. This trip he made from Winnipeg to Selkirk was made during the time for which he was paid by Canada; and as my hon. friend from Selkirk has said, nine times out of ten, it is a pleasure trip. There is no defensible reason why we should be asked to pay him extra money for this pleasure trip. I would like the minister to inform me what territory, treaty number 5 covers

Mr. OLIVER. It embraces the northern part of Manitoba and the adjacent part of the district of Keewatin. This adhesion to the treaty is for the purpose of covering by the treaty all that part of what was formerly the district of Keewatin, and is now proposed to be included in Manitoba.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does treaty number 5 extend from the northern boundary of Manitoba into the Northwest Territories? Does it go to Hudson Bay?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The adhesion to treaty number 5 taken by Mr. Semmens covers the country on each side of the Nelson as far as Hudson Bay, and westward runs to the boundary of Saskatchewan and northward to the 60th parallel.

Mr. CAMPBELL. On this \$400 trip of this reverend gentleman, how many adhesions were obtained to the treaty?