J. C. 1914

JOHN DEERE PLOW COMPANY, LIMITED v. WHARTON.

must, like the expression, "Property and Civil Rights in the Province," in s. 92 receive a limited interpretation. But they think that the power to regulate trade and commerce at all events enables the Parliament of Canada to prescribe to what extent the powers of companies the objects of which extend to the entire Dominion should be exercisable, and what limitations should be placed on such powers. For if it be established that the Dominion Parliament can create such companies, then it becomes a question of general interest throughout the Dominion in what fashion they should be permitted to trade. Their Lordships are therefore of opinion that the Parliament of Canada had power to enact the sections relied on in this case in the Dominion Companies Act and the Interpretation Act. They do not desire to be understood as suggesting that because the status of a Dominion company enables it to trade in a province and thereby confers on it civil rights to some extent, the power to regulate trade and commerce can be exercised in such a way as to trench, in the case of such companies, on the exclusive jurisdiction of the provincial Legislatures over civil rights in general. No doubt this jurisdiction would conflict with that of the Province if civil rights were to be read as an expression of unlimited scope. But, as has already been pointed out, the expression must be construed consistently with various powers conferred by ss. 91 and 92, which restrict its literal scope. It is enough for present purposes to say that the Province cannot legislate so as to deprive a Dominion company of its status and powers. This does not mean that these powers can be exercised in contravention of the laws of the Province restricting the rights of the public in the Province generally. What it does mean is that the status and powers of a Dominion company as such cannot be destroyed by provincial legislation. This conclusion appears to their Lordships to be in full harmony with what was laid down by the Board in *Citizens Insurance Co.* v. *Parsons* (1), *Colonial Building and Investment Association* v. *Attorney-General for Quebec* (2), and *Bank of Toronto* v. *Lambe.* (3)

[1915] *A. C.* p. 341.

It follows from these premises that those provisions of the Companies Act of British Columbia which are relied on in the present case as compelling the appellant company to obtain a provincial licence of the kind about which the controversy has arisen, or to be registered in the Province as a condition of exercising its powers or of suing in the Courts, are inoperative for these purposes. The question is not one of enactment of laws affecting the general public in the Province and relating to civil rights, or taxation, or the

(1) 7 App. Cas. 96. (2) 9 App. Cas. 157.
(3) 12 App. Cas. 575.