

tration. Up to the present time no suggested amendment has been received from the department of the attorney general of any province of Canada, but this bill has been widely distributed and I have received from hon. gentlemen opposite and from leading lawyers all over the country various suggestions which we have considered very carefully. To the full extent that we are at present prepared to accept them a complete list will be printed in the votes and proceedings to-morrow.

Mr. BUTCHER: The other day the Secretary of State advised us that when we got into committee on this bill hon. members would be permitted to speak on the principle of the bill. Several hon. gentlemen who desire to speak on the principle are not here to-night. Would the Secretary of State grant us that same privilege at the next sitting of the committee?

Mr. CAHAN: Section 1 was reserved for the purpose of the discussion to which my hon. friend has referred. Now, having reserved that section, we can proceed until we encounter a section to which hon. gentlemen object or which they wish to have stand for further study.

Mr. DUPRE: There is one paragraph we intend to amend. I moved that section 3 be amended by striking out paragraph (n) and substituting therefor the following:

(n) Shareholder means every subscriber for or holder of a share in the capital stock of the company, and includes the personal representatives of a deceased shareholder, a subscriber to the memorandum of agreement and every other person who agrees with the company to become a shareholder.

Mr. CHEVRIER: I notice that in the votes and proceedings there are three pages of proposed amendments to this bill. Will the Secretary of State kindly say whether, when these amendments are translated, the cost of that translation will be added to the cost of the French version, and we will be told that the French version cost so much more than the English version, through the translation of these amendments.

Mr. DUPRE: This is out of order.

Mr. CHEVRIER: We are in committee; I have asked a question and I should like an answer.

Mr. CAHAN: In order to be as courteous as possible to the hon. gentleman I will simply say that the translation of this bill will follow the ordinary course.

Mr. CHEVRIER: The minister will not say that the French version cost more than the English version because of the extra cost of translating these amendments?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): I rule that these remarks are out of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): I understand that the amendment just moved by the Solicitor General is only a matter of redrafting?

Mr. CAHAN: When it was drafted formerly some words were inserted twice, and this is simply to make a clearer definition.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 4, 5 and 6 agreed to.

Section 7 stands.

On section 8—Conditions precedent to issuing of letters patent to be established.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In connection with subsection 4, I suggest some provision ought to be inserted in the act whereby before the Secretary of State may on his own initiative change the name of the company, some notice should be given to the applicants, and that a name other than that applied for should not be changed without such notice being given.

Mr. CAHAN: That matter is already governed by office regulations. After an application has been received for letters patent in which a proposed name is designated the Secretary of State, if there are objections, never proceeds to change a name without notice to the applicants and obtaining the consent of the applicants to the new name. As a matter of fact, we are under an international agreement to which all the leading nations are parties, and provision is made in the Unfair Competition Act that a name shall not be granted in Canada which might be confused with the name of any other company, foreign or domestic, which is doing business in Canada.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have no doubt that the Secretary of State is quite right in that what he states is the practice. I am thinking more particularly of the practice in other jurisdictions. It always struck me that there should be some provision in the statute which would compel the department of the Secretary of State to give notice to the applicants, and I can see no harm in inserting such provision.