

*Alliance Security & Investigation, Ltd.*

after very perceptive and close questioning by committee members, approval was given. This I am pleased to be able to report to the House today. I again apologize to my hon. friend for failing to observe what he correctly pointed out should have been the courtesy of making a few comments.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ALLIANCE SECURITY & INVESTIGATION, LTD.**

AN ACT RESPECTING ALLIANCE SECURITY & INVESTIGATION, LTD.

**Mr. J.-J. Blais (Nipissing)** moved that Bill S-26, an Act respecting Alliance Security & Investigation, Ltd., be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the sole purpose of this bill is to revive the charter or patent letters of the company known as Alliance Security & Investigation, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker, as indicated in the documents that were tabled, this bill was passed by the Senate where it was carefully studied, without controversy, on second reading and in committee. The company lost its patent letters because it failed to file the reports required by law.

The company was transferred to new owners in 1967, at which time the latter were not aware of the fact that the reports had not been filed in compliance with Canadian law. However, those reports were in fact filed with the Quebec authorities as stipulated by the law.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, there was no intention of refusing to supply the required details on the president, the board directors of the company, or its activities; it was merely a matter of not knowing exactly what should be done. Enquiries were made of the Minister for Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet) to find out what was required at which time details and information were supplied that were not accurate. Evidently, it is essential to reactivate that company to give effect to what happened since 1968.

I merely wish to point out to hon. members that the bill includes a provision under which the company must meet the requirements of the Canadian legislation and submit within the period provided by the legislation all the particulars which were not submitted up to then. I also wish to indicate that those particulars are available, have always been in the public domain, since they were filed with the Quebec authorities. We do not want to make trouble for the people who use those services nor for the shareholders of the company. I merely wish to say as a lawyer that this shows how essential it is when carrying out transactions to be aware of all statutory requirements with which one must comply. Obviously this was not done in the present case.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to support this noncontroversial bill and refer it to the committee.

[Mr. Abbott.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

● (1710)

[English]

MARRIAGE LAW EXEMPTION—RICHARD FRITZ AND  
MARIANNE STRASS

**Mr. Hugh Poulin (Ottawa Centre) (for Mr. Campbell)** moved that Bill C-1,001, to provide an exception from the general law relating to marriage in the case of Richard Fritz and Marianne Strass, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and Standing Orders.

He said: Madam Speaker, this is a most unusual bill. Probably this is the first time a bill like this has been presented to the Parliament of Canada. I shall be brief, having explained the matter to some members of the other parties. Very simply, the bill seeks an exception from the general law regarding the degrees of affinity within which two people may marry. The petitioner, Richard Fritz, wishes to marry his half niece, Marianne Strass.

The preamble to the bill, which will be proven in committee, sets out the pertinent facts showing the necessity for bringing the bill before parliament.

Prior to the framing of the British North America Act in 1867, the civil code of the province of Quebec of 1866 was in effect, and it contained the provision saying that a man may not marry his niece.

The next year the British North America Act gave legislative jurisdiction to the Parliament of Canada in the field of marriage and, to the provinces, legislative jurisdiction in the field of solemnization of marriage. However, the degrees of consanguinity are part of the law of marriage, rather than part of the law of solemnization of marriage, and therefore only the Parliament of Canada may properly legislate in this regard. The prohibition against marriage between uncle and niece contained in the code is therefore a matter of federal legislative jurisdiction. Because that prohibition was in the civil code in 1866, section 129 of the British North America Act keeps it in force until it is "repealed, abolished or altered" by the Parliament of Canada.

Since parliament has the power to repeal that aspect of the civil code, it has the power to pass a private bill permitting the petitioners to marry each other, notwithstanding the provisions of the code. I submit, also, that this is the only legislative body in this land which has power to pass this law.

Since the facts relating to the bill are contained in the bill and will need to be aired fully before the committee following second reading, I do not propose to go into any further detail.

I am speaking on this matter having been completely briefed by the hon. member for LaSalle-Énard-Côte Saint-Paul (Mr. Campbell). This man and woman, aged 32 and 25 respectively, have been seeking to marry one another for the past year, but only by presenting a private bill to the House of Commons can they hope to marry. I may say that all these things will be proven in the committee with proper documentation. They have seen their