EXAM 6 – CANADA, FALL 2019

2. (1.5 points)

a. (0.75 point)

State the decision made by the Privy Council in Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons and describe the rationale behind this decision.

b. (0.75 point)

Identify three implications of the Privy Council's decision in *The Attorney-General for Canada v. The Attorney-General for Alberta*.

SAMPLE ANSWERS AND EXAMINER'S REPORT

QUESTION 2	
TOTAL POINT VALUE: 1.5	LEARNING OBJECTIVE(S): A1, A3
CANADI E ANICIA/EDC	

SAMPLE ANSWERS

Part a: 0.75 point

Sample

- The Ontario Fire Insurance Policy Act was deemed to be intra-vires
- All insurers are treated equally
- Trade is inter-provincial, not intra-provincial

Part b: 0.75 point

<u>Sample</u>

- Insurers incorporated in a single province have the capacity (not the right) to write in other provinces. They will need the other province's approval.
- Foreign insurer might have to be federally licensed even if operating in just one province
- Federally incorporated insurers have right and capacity to operate in all provinces

EXAMINER'S REPORT

Candidates were expected to understand the division of responsibility between federal and provincial/state regulators, the rationale of the decision made by the Privy Council and their implications.

Part a

Candidates were expected to understand the rationale behind Privy Council decision in Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons.

Common errors included:

- Mixing up intra-vires and ultra-vires
- Mixing up inter-provincial trade and intra-provincial trade
- Providing answers based on a case other than Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons

Part b

Candidates were expected to understand the implications of the Privy Council's decision in The Attorney-General for Canada v. The Attorney-General for Alberta case.

Common errors included:

- Stating foreign insurers must be (instead of may be required to be) federally incorporated to operate in any province or multiple provinces
- Providing answers based on an incorrect case