

On section 4—Corporate name.

Mr. BENNETT: With respect to the question of the corporate name a very serious difficulty has arisen in this country of late, which I think should be investigated. A company made an application for a name. They were told that it conflicted with another company's name. They then proceeded to acquire the name of the other company by purchase. Then they came up here, and although arrangements had been made to spend a large sum of money in development in this country their application was refused and another company was given the name, which is at variance with the regulations. They then sent back the money to their shareholders, cancelled their plans and left the country. They contemplated the expenditure of a very large sum of money, and I think the matter is so serious that there should be some very clear explanation given. I refer to the Texas Oil Company of Canada. The minister knows about it, for these people saw him personally.

Mr. RINFRET: I recall the case, but first I might explain that the only change in this section is the use of the three letters "Ltd." instead of the full word "Limited." I do not suppose my hon. friend takes objection to that.

Mr. BENNETT: But this question comes up under this section.

Mr. RINFRET: With regard to the case of the Texas Oil Company I must say that although I recall meeting the representatives of that company and of a company with a similar name doing business in Canada, I would not care to discuss that specific case without having the file before me. Perhaps my hon. friend would agree that since the amendment proposed by this section is a very minor one we might pass it and some other opportunity may be found when I shall be pleased to give my hon. friend the explanation for the action of the department in regard to that case.

Mr. BENNETT: I have no desire that the matter should be discussed without the hon. gentleman having his papers, but I thought it might be sufficiently clear in his memory, because it is not of very long standing. This case has been the subject matter of complaint to me in very strong terms; I think it involves a question of far-reaching importance, certainly with relation to development in this country which will not now be carried on because of the action taken. There must be a very clear explanation given, because the regulations under the statute have been contravened by the action taken, and the people

wasted and lost a very substantial sum of money. The hon. gentleman knows the story. If he does not remember the case clearly enough to discuss it without his papers I am content to wait for another opportunity, but before this bill leaves the house I propose to have something to say about this case.

Mr. RINFRET: My hon. friend knows the conditions which exist at present. I should not like to see a bill containing general dispositions and amendments to the law, which have been agreed to by both parties in the Senate and by a committee of this house this year, delayed on account of a specific case which can be well discussed when we take up, for instance, the estimates of the department. I am quite willing to admit that the discretion which is left with the Secretary of State to decide the use of names places him in a very difficult position. An illustration is found in those American companies of long standing which come to Canada to obtain the right to a name in this country. Later on a Canadian company may be formed and desire to use a name which has a certain similarity to that of the American company. I do not desire to go fully into this matter to-night, as I cannot trust my memory. I do remember one company in Canada which applied for the use of a name similar to "Texas." The department took the stand that great care should be exercised before the use of that name was allowed to designate a product similar to the products manufactured by the Texas Oil Company of the United States.

I could not trust my memory to give the precise facts concerning this case, but I am sure that my hon. friend and the hon. members around him are anxious to see this bill go through the house. It is purely a departmental bill and has no political significance whatever. It was considered last year by a committee of the Senate and approved, and has been introduced this year practically in the same form in which it left the Senate. It has been examined and studied by the banking and commerce committee, and it was reported to the house with the common agreement of members representing all parties that we should leave aside any contentious matters concerning the Companies Act. It was agreed that we should put through these enactments which give statutory force to practices already followed by the department, and which have been asked for by the business men of the country. I am sure my hon. friend is desirous, as are some of the hon. members around him, to see these amendments pass the house and reach the Senate in time for consideration this