

accordance with the laws of the province, but in compliance with the letter and spirit of the constitution.

Here I pause to point out that those were words that were used by a great convention assembled in Winnipeg, in dealing with that problem. I take it that the right hon. the Prime Minister, in order to expedite a settlement of this somewhat disputatious matter, as it has become through the action of the government itself, inserted those words, "in compliance with the letter and spirit of the constitution." I congratulate him upon his effort to secure unanimity with respect to a matter of that kind. The letter continues:

Following the transfer to Alberta of the natural resources, it is proposed to continue to pay to the province of Alberta the present annual subsidy in lieu of lands, of \$562,500, with the understanding, of course, that increases in the subsidy to the province as provided for pending the administration of the natural resources by the Dominion government, shall cease upon the transfer of the resources to the province.

As for the present reference to the courts of section 17 of the Alberta Act, the matter is before the judicial committee of the Privy Council, but Their Lordships have expressed the view what there should be an appellant party other than the Dominion government whose contentions were upheld by the unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada. We understand that your province does not wish to appear in the capacity of an appellant in this reference. We will consider further the advisability of our government taking steps with a view to having this appeal proceeded with, in order to secure a decision of the Privy Council in the matter.

It should be understood that these proposals now made to the province of Alberta have been very carefully considered by the Dominion government and are not subject to further modification by correspondence. It is our hope that the government of Alberta will see in this offer an indication of the sincere desire of the Dominion government to arrange an early settlement of this long-standing question.

Now I put to the house this question: Could any province be expected to accept those proposals in their entirety, if that province happened to be, for instance, Alberta, in view of the arrangement made with Manitoba? I happen to live in the province of Alberta, not in Manitoba. Here are the proposals for Manitoba: Why was Alberta treated in a different way? Why do you go back to 1870 and concede, so far as Manitoba is concerned, as we always have contended in the west, that these natural resources belong to the west, and that the crown in the right of the Dominion administered them only in trust for the new provinces that were to be—why concede that for Manitoba and say: We will go back to

1870 so far as Manitoba is concerned, and not say the same for Saskatchewan and Alberta? What is the answer to that? The answer would be, I suppose, that Alberta got a subsidy in lieu of lands. So did Manitoba. The swamp lands of Manitoba you will recall were turned over to that province. There is Manitoba, on the one hand, and there is Alberta on the other, being treated differently.

I speak now in my capacity as a member from the province of Alberta, and I deny the right of any government to come to a measure of settlement with Manitoba that is not accorded to the province in which I live, and which I have the honour to represent. I go further, and I now appeal to those hon. gentlemen opposite who are such pronounced autonomists, those gentlemen who deny the right of appeal to the Privy Council, and who say that the Supreme Court of Canada should settle all these matters. Why is your government now so anxious to go to the Privy Council on appeal from a judgment in its own favour—a judgment in its own favour, mark you? Where is the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland), who talked about the autonomous rights of Canada with respect to its courts? The judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada was a unanimous judgment in support of the federal government's contention as to the proper interpretation of section 17 of the act of 1905, and when my right hon. friend, who is not a lawyer, says that the matter is before the Privy Council, his language is not quite technically correct. The position is that the Dominion government made an application for leave to appeal to the Privy Council. It has not yet received that leave, and when the application for leave was made to the Privy Council, the presiding lord asked who was the appellant, and as they did not have any appellant except the Dominion government, which could not appeal from a judgment in its own favour, they have apparently been looking ever since for an appellant. I do suggest to my friends who are so strong for autonomy, and who argue so strongly for the finality of the judgments of the Supreme Court of Canada, that they should get busy with their government and ask them why they are going to appeal from a judgment in their own favour. It is for only one purpose—delay. We have a right, so far as Alberta is concerned, similar to the right conceded to Manitoba by this order in council, upon which legislation will undoubtedly be framed. Bear in mind this further fact, sir. This legislation passed by the provincial legislatures