

tary was right in front of him when that wrong information was given, and on that wrong information, and on it alone, the promotion was arranged. This shows there is need for either a resurrection or an insurrection or a revision. There needs to be something done in that department, and we look for the new minister to give a very serious, careful and watchful eye on the administration of that department over which he has been so unexpectedly called to preside.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has laid his suspicion on a wrong basis. I am in a position to affirm that there has been no contract given. I will give all the information possible ultimately, Mr. Keyes, when he wrote that letter, was misinformed or made a mistake.

Mr. HENDERSON. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct a statement which I have made. I had overlooked the fact—which I discovered on examining the estimates—that there was an appropriation last year to the extent of \$100,000. That will not do more than half complete the undertaking. The estimate is renewed I find this year. Whether it has been considered in committee or not is not a matter of moment, because the vote of last year is now in existence and can be utilized if the work is undertaken before the 1st of July. I make this statement because I wish to remove a wrong impression which I may have created; but at the same time that does not justify the department proceeding with this work without the consent of the head of this government or the department in question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course I have not had time to look at the papers, but I think also that tenders were advertised for, but the ex-Minister of the Interior would not issue the contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With regard to that, we certainly should have an explanation why the secretary of the department should have misled people who were proposing to tender and in the second place why he did not inform them that those advertisements had really been issued.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps I am wrong but my impression is that there were advertisements.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be very desirable to have a fence in the west as well as in the east—two fences built far apart, as probably one will never be satisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will keep to one just now at all events.

Mr. INGRAM. Not having been able to find the answer given by the First Minister to this question, I went carefully over 'Hansard' and could not find it. I think it very curious that the answer given on that occa-

sion should not have appeared in 'Hansard.' I desire to place on 'Hansard' the reply as given in the Toronto 'Globe' on May 2nd:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier informed the hon. gentleman that the question of erecting wire fences along the southern boundaries of the Northwest Territories is under consideration, but no tenders have yet been asked for nor contracts let.

That was the answer given on that occasion. The right hon. gentleman was asked to-day, and he was not able to give the answer, but he has since been informed by the department that contracts have not been let. What I want to know is: if that be true how does it come that Mr. Keyes, who represented the department on the 8th of April, states in his letter that the contracts have been let and signs his name to that effect. That is the statement he made in the letter read by the hon. member for Kent, and that letter was certainly an official one.

On the 20th of March this wire company wrote to the department and wanted certain information in connection with this contract. No reply was given until the 8th of April. Nineteen days afterwards, the secretary of the department, Mr. Keyes, writes to these gentlemen and tells them that the contract is let. Yet to-day we have the First Minister stating that the contract is not let. I think if ever there was a case of investigation, this is one. I notice in this correspondence, Mr. Speaker, that your name appears as the representative of that constituency, and probably it would be well if the Speaker would give some explanation with respect to the contract, or with respect to the correspondence that has taken place between the department and the fence wire company. There is something very extraordinary about it, and I presume that to-morrow when the papers are brought down, when the advertisement is exposed to the members of this House, and the tenders that have been called for, a copy of that document will be laid before the House so that hon. gentlemen on both sides will be in a position to judge of the merits of this case.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT. While fully agreeing in the criticism that has been made on this affair, I desire to draw attention to another phase of the question, namely, that where fencing is to be done between neighbours the ordinary common law of the land is that the neighbours who are interested are jointly responsible for the construction of the fence. This being an international fence, has any approach been made by this government towards the United States government asking them to pay their fair share of this fencing? It appears to me that is a proposition that ought to be entertained by the American government. They are interested in having the proper boundary line marked the same as we are. Has this government made any representations to the