

don so far as they had a right to sue the Royal Bank in Alberta had a civil right in Alberta, and in like manner so far as the Attorney-General of Alberta had the right to press his action against the Royal Bank in Alberta, he had a civil right in Alberta.

Now, the British North America Act gave the provincial legislature of Alberta power as plenary and ample as the Imperial parliament itself, in the plenitude of its power, possessed and could bestow, to make laws in relation to civil rights in the province. It, therefore, had plenary power to take away the civil right of the lenders in London, so far as it was a right to sue for the debt in question in Alberta, and to give to the Attorney-General of Alberta a civil right to sue the Royal Bank for a like amount in Alberta, just as much as if the lenders in London had assigned their claim to him, except that the provincial legislature could not interfere with the civil right of the lenders in London to sue the Royal Bank for the money in Montreal. The lenders in London had a civil right to recover the debt in Montreal; they also had a civil right to recover the debt in Alberta. They could sue for it in either jurisdiction. The Legislature of Alberta, I would have thought, were it not for the judgment of the Privy Council, had power to destroy, or transfer, or control in any way, the latter right, although they could not affect the former. It is right to remember that we are dealing with plenary powers conferred by the Constitution upon the legislature of what is, or will grow to be, a great country, and not dealing with powers delegated by statute to the town council of Little Peddington.

I must say with all respect that the article of Mr. Labatt and the letter of G. S. H. seem to me to contain some very fine flowers of confused thinking. For example, Mr. Labatt says that I take the position "that the provincial legislatures have received plenary power to direct the provincial courts to recognize or refuse to recognize any description of civil rights." Maybe they have under their power over "the administration of justice in the province," but all I have contended for as to their power over "civil rights in the province," is that *if, and so far as* a civil right is a civil right in the province, the British North America Act has given the provincial legislature plenary power over it. Then Mr. Labatt seems to think that no one can have a civil right in a province unless he himself is domiciled in that province, for he says it is "almost too plain for argument that this clause" (meaning the clause of the British North America Act