

a company incorporated by provincial statute would necessarily have the same extensive capacity for acquiring extra-provincial rights and powers as a charter company is held to have; the rights and power and capacities of a company incorporated by statute being, as above mentioned, restricted to the terms of the statute under which it is incorporated. But as regards Ontario Companies: see now 6 Geo. 5, c. 35 (Ont.)

CANADA—LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY—INSURANCE—"REGULATION OF TRADE AND COMMERCE"—INSURANCE ACT 1910 (9 & 10 Edw. 7 c. 32, D.)—B.N.A. ACT, 1867 (30-31 VICT. c. 3) ss. 91 92 (13) (2) (25).

*Attorney-General of Canada v. Attorney-General of Alberta* (1916) A.C. 588. In this case the question at issue was whether ss. 4, 70 of the Dominion Insurance Act (9-10 Edw. 7, c. 32), were *intra vires* of the Dominion Parliament. Section 4 prohibits the doing of insurance business in any province of Canada without first obtaining a Dominion licence, and section 70 prescribes a penalty for breach of the provision of s. 4. The Dominion Government sought to uphold the legislation as being an enactment regulating trade and commerce, but the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lord Buckmaster, L.C., and Lords Haldane, Parker and Sumner) held that the sections in question were an invasion of Provincial rights respecting property and civil rights, and were *ultra vires*. A further question was propounded, viz., whether it would be competent for the Dominion Parliament to enact legislation prohibiting foreign insurance companies from doing business in all provinces or any province of Canada without a Dominion licence and their lordships held that under the B.N.A. Act s. 91 (2) (2s), it would be competent so to enact.

CANADA—LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY OF DOMINION AND PROVINCES—INCORPORATION OF COMPANIES—POWERS AND CAPACITIES OF COMPANIES—B.N.A. ACT 1867 (30-31 VICT. c. 3) ss. 91 92.

*Attorney-General for Ontario v. Attorney-General for Canada* (1916) A.C. 598. This is still another case dealing with the relative rights of the Dominion and Provincial legislatures in regard to the incorporation of companies. The case arises on questions submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada. Seven questions are propounded, but they are not answered categorically, but simply by reference to the previous decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the following cases: *Bonanza Creek Gold Mining Co. v. The King*; *Attorney-General for Canada*