

Mr. OLIVER. \$2,200.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What becomes of his duties as inspector when he is performing this special duty?

Mr. OLIVER. He is of course not able when he is securing adhesions to the treaty at York Factory, to inspect the reserves in the north-eastern part of Manitoba; but we considered that it was economy to employ his services and allow him extra pay for that work, instead of employing another commissioner who would have to receive full salary for the time he would be employed.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. During the time that he was so occupied, does the minister consider that his duties as inspector were neglected in any way?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then I do not see where the economy is, because if he was getting a salary of \$2,000 a year as inspector, he could have done this work for nothing.

Mr. OLIVER. A large number of his inspections are performed on his way to York Factory and Churchill or on his way back, so that while he was not inspecting during the time he was taking the adhesions to the treaty, there was a minimum loss of time from his inspection duties, and the work was done at a minimum cost.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Was not his salary under this clause running concurrently with his salary as inspector?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then I do not see where the economy comes in. If a man can perform these duties concurrently with his regular duties, either his regular duties do not give him enough to do or he should have performed these extra duties without extra remuneration.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter for the consideration of the House. The opinion of the department was that it was sound economy and better work to employ him in taking the adhesions, because he would have to travel a less distance and occupy less time away from his inspection duties than would have been occupied by another person; and besides, by reason of his long experience with the Indians, and their confidence in him, he was more likely to do good service for the department than a man who was a stranger to that line of business. We believe the public service gained more by the system we followed than it would have gained had we retained him in his inspection work exclusive-

ly, and engaged an outside commissioner to take the adhesions.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As I understand, when a man is employed by the government in this department, and is paid such a salary as this man receives, the department is entitled to the whole of his time; so that if you are paying him anything extra, you are paying him something that he is not entitled to. I make this complaint, not particularly in this case, but because I observe all through the estimates that it is getting to be a rule in all the departments that a man who gets a good round salary for his services, is paid various little extras. It is a bad precedent. When a man is expected to give his whole time to the service, and is paid liberally, if he is asked to do some other work, there should be either a deduction made from his salary, or he should do the other work without extra pay.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do these 79 days include the time that he was going to make the inspection? If he was inspecting during that time, he was not entitled to the \$5 a day, because he was getting a salary besides that.

Mr. OLIVER. I admit that there is fair ground for the argument of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but in the judgment of the department the circumstances in this case were of such an exceptional character that the best interests of the government and the interests of actual economy were better conserved by the course we pursued. When you engage a man and pay him for the whole of his time, you do not possibly pay him for the whole of his talent. You engage him to do work under certain conditions which are suitable and favourable, and he engages on the understanding that he will perform those duties under those suitable and favourable conditions. You ask that man to do something else, under conditions which are neither suitable nor favourable, conditions which put him in danger of his life from day to day, conditions which are entirely distinct from those of the duties which he is properly called on to perform. It is true, we could say to a public servant, you must either do whatever duty we see fit to assign to you or leave the service; but I do not think it would be fair, or that it would tend to good work in the public service, to do so. We engage a man to do a certain work; if we require him to do different work, under different circumstances and conditions, and with different responsibilities, I think it fair and right and reasonable that we should give some consideration to those circumstances.