

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understand the position, I think the remarks of the Prime Minister do not alter my contention in the least. This was treated by the Department of the Interior as a boundary fence between the United States and Canada. Here is the correspondence that was read yesterday :

Replying to your letter of the 20th ultimo, in reference to the erection of a wire fence at the southern boundary of the Northwest Territories, I beg to state that the government has awarded the contract in this matter.

Now the clerk in the Department of the Interior writing that letter treats it as a boundary fence. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman the position I understand he is going to be in with regard to this fence. This fence, he says, is not going to be right on the boundary, he is going to leave a strip of no man's land, he is going to run a fence 800 miles long, 100 feet from the boundary. I suppose the hon. gentleman is taking the precaution to place this fence on the south side of the line, on the south side of the Canadian boundary, because if he places it on our side, he will run the risk of giving 100 feet of land along 800 miles in length to our neighbours to the south for all time to come. Everybody knows that when a piece of land is outfenced for some years, it becomes the property of the man whose land it adjoins outside the fence. The very first principles of fence building are to notify the neighbour that a line fence is about to be built, if it is not a line fence it is not a boundary fence. But what is the reason of this government building a fence 800 miles long for the benefit of private property?—Because that is practically what it amounts to.

If it is not an international fence, upon what system, or upon what line of public policy is this government intending to build that fence? There is no justification for the building of this fence at all. This fence is to all intents and purposes an international boundary line. As such it should be surveyed. If it is not surveyed you will either alienate a long strip of land, or else you run the danger of trespassing on your neighbours, and in either case you are in danger of stirring up trouble. It is a difficult matter to explain and you will incur a considerable amount of danger by establishing a boundary line of 800 miles between the United States and Canada. The very first step should be to notify the government of the United States, the proper authorities, that a boundary fence is about to be run. Whether they are going to take part of the cost or not it matters little, but by reason of the fact that the fence is built there it will become known as the international boundary line and as such it becomes a very important public work. If the hon. gentleman is not going to run it upon the exact boundary then he is throwing away a part of the territory of this country to the United States, because it will

be known as the boundary fence and ultimately that line may be claimed by our neighbours on the south. The government has not justified this work in any other way than as an enterprise for the protection of private property. It is supposed to be for the protection of the boundary line. If it is only to keep off cattle why should these gentlemen who own the land adjoining the boundary line have their fences built for nothing when all other farmers in the Northwest Territories have to build their own fencing? There is no system of reasoning by which it can be justified other than as an international boundary line, and I say that although the danger may appear small to hon. gentlemen opposite there is nevertheless the danger of international trouble. We know what boundary lines are. We had a question of this kind up in Alaska only recently and we know how quickly the country is aroused when it is asked to part with one foot of territory that it thinks belongs to it. The first principle of fence building is to establish the line correctly between the neighbours whose property is being divided, and this being upon the international boundary it becomes still more important to do this. Therefore, I trust that the right hon. First Minister will not treat this as a light matter. I think the very first thing that should be done is to notify our neighbours that this line is about to be established and let them become parties to the erection of this fence, because otherwise, you may have the fence torn down and be told that it is not on the line. I think the matter should be very carefully gone into before this imaginary line, as this fence will be, is placed between the United States and Canada.

Motion (Mr. Sproule) to adjourn, negatived.

APPOINTMENT OF MR. NIXON.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to some information which has just come into my hands. It never rains but it pours and this is one of the little showers after the larger one. What I want is to find out whether the information is correct or not. The information is that shortly after the government took power a gentleman by the name of Nixon, an ardent Liberal, a shoemaker, was appointed land agent in or near Macleod. He performed the duties of his office for some time and it is stated that moneys which ought to have reached their proper destination did not. Thereupon a celebrated and somewhat notorious gentleman from Manitoba by the name of Leech was sent to investigate and it turned out that there was a defalcation to the amount of \$600. My information then goes on to say that Mr. Nixon discreetly resigned before the investigation was brought to a completion and that the