

It introduces a provision with respect to dominion companies whereby in case a rectification of the register and transfer book is required to prevent fraud, a summary application may be made to the court by petition as in the province of Quebec, where an originating summons does not form a part of the procedure. In other provinces the usual procedure is by an originating summons or a notice of motion, and on that the judge can hear the application and state an issue to be tried summarily. A similar provision exists in some of the provincial acts, but in respect of the dominion act it has always been necessary heretofore to commence a substantive action in the ordinary course.

Mr. DUPRE: I move the amendment accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Sections 207 and 208 agreed to.

On the schedule.

Mr. CAHAN: At page 98, line 27 of form 1 of the schedule there should be a blank space before the word "shares."

Mr. DUPRE: I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Mr. BURY: A complaint has been made that, in the case of companies which have set up subsidiary companies, the shareholders of the main company are not given the information to which they are reasonably entitled as to the operations and financial position of the subsidiaries. One company in particular which has a number of subsidiary companies was mentioned to me. The subsidiary companies have lost considerable funds, and the shareholders of the original company, as I understand it, have not been able to get information as to the financial condition or operations of the subsidiary companies. Can the Secretary of State tell me whether there is any provision at all in this bill covering that?

Mr. CAHAN: There are provisions in the bill which require a very full disclosure with regard to subsidiary companies. Those sections now stand for further consideration. In the meantime I will bring them to the attention of the hon. gentleman in case he should wish to make any other suggestions.

Mr. JACOBS: Might I ask if the bill will be reprinted before it comes up for third reading?

Mr. CAHAN: I did not intend to reprint because every one of the suggested amendments will be found in the votes and proceedings of this morning.

Progress reported.

INQUIRIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 84, to amend the Inquiries Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Gobeil in the chair.

On section 1—Authority to confer powers upon.

Mr. CASGRAIN: May we ask the hon. minister who is in charge of this bill to give us an explanation? I see it contains only two clauses.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The explanation is very simple. We propose to add a new part, part 4, to the Inquiries Act. The purpose of it is to enable international commissions and tribunals to take the evidence of witnesses in Canada, subject to such limitations as the governor in council may impose. Part 1 of the present Inquiries Act provides for the issue of a royal commission to take evidence and conduct inquiries in Canada. It frequently happens that another nation issues a commission and desires to take the evidence of persons in Canada. There is no power at present to grant them that right, and so it is proposed by this bill that when the governor in council sees fit, and under such limitations as he may impose, this courtesy shall be extended to other nations which extend the like courtesy to Canada.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Does that mean that these commissions will examine witnesses and inquire into facts in Canada at the instance of other governments?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Has the minister any case in mind which brought to his attention the necessity for such a provision? Has there been any case where we did not have but wanted such a provision?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think I could suggest them. The bill is brought in at the instance of the Department of External Affairs as a matter of courtesy to nations that grant us the same privilege.

Mr. JACOBS: Does that apply to criminal as well as civil matters?