

to do and is showing himself the true guardian of provincial rights.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) to be under the impression that, in order to incorporate into the province of Manitoba some portion of the territory which is now comprised in the Northwest Territories, it would be necessary to have the consent of the legislatures of Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I said of Manitoba.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But not of Ontario or Quebec?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. The Act says that, if they are likely to be affected by it they must be consulted. Of course, we must leave something for the Prime Minister to judge for himself. If, in his judgment, Quebec and Ontario are likely to be affected, he is bound to consult those provinces. I think it is perfectly clear that it is not a matter that can be jumped at without full consideration. Though a man from Manitoba might say that this matter does not affect Quebec and Ontario, it is perfectly clear that the Prime Ministers of Ontario and Quebec do not think so, for the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) tells us that they have filed claims with this government to be considered in the division of this territory. Therefore, this important statute clearly comes into operation here and its terms must be complied with.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) has gone further, to deal with land policy. He finds fault with the government—and, consequently with all Conservative governments that have existed in this country up to the present time—because they borrowed their land policy from the United States. I do not think it makes much difference whence we get a policy, so long as it is a good policy. If any rule of life that we follow is a good one, it is not wise for us to cast aside or neglect it because it happens to be in use in the United States. I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House will say that the land policy of the United States has not been a success so far as immigration is concerned, or so far as development is concerned so far as attracting the people is concerned and their success after they have gone to the United States. I think we would be only too glad if we could get as many people into our country and as good a class as they are getting through the land policy they have. Now, it has been pointed out that the provinces would do better in the handling of these lands than the central government. That may be so, but one thing is certain—that in the United States, if we can copy them, they have not followed that policy.

The States have had nothing to do with the public domain except possibly in their

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE.

early history they were formed into states, exactly as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the other provinces when they came into the union. I think they held what lands they had then, except that some were passed over to the central government under certain arrangements; but any lands they had acquired after the United States had been formed under one government, were held by the central government and one policy prevailed in respect to the whole of them. I submit that it is in the interests of this country to have one policy and one management of the public domain, one system in respect to immigration, and one price for the lands, in order to avoid as much as possible a conflict of management between half a dozen different governments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With regard to the constitutional point with respect to which I took the liberty of interrupting my hon. friend a moment ago, I do not find in the statute these words to which he referred: 'Likely to be affected thereby.' I did not contradict my hon. friend, because I thought he would be exact in his quotation. It says:

The parliament of Canada may from time to time, with the consent of the legislature of any province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish or otherwise alter the limits of such province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said legislature, and may with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation of any province affected thereby.

Not 'likely to be affected thereby.'

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. That was close to it, but when we are dealing with the great west we do not pay attention to trifling things. The difference is certainly very slight, and it was hardly worth my hon. friend's while to bother with it. It is certainly clear that the intention of that statute was that any province to be affected by the change should be consulted, that there should be legislation upon the subject, and it is only by concurrent legislation on the part of each government that they can deal with it effectively. The question would not be settled if we were first to start out to deal with it effectively. The question would not be settled if we were first to start out to deal with it without the consent of the others, and without that consent being obtained according to the statute. Although I may not be correct according to the very letter of the law, I am certainly not so far wrong as to justify the member from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) in saying that we are violating the constitution and doing a whole lot of wrong things because we did not deal with this question the right way. Now I think those two points as to whether it is the duty of the government to deal with this question as a public policy for the whole country, or whether it is better to