

suggested that it would be useful to have all submissions compiled respectively under the headings of the sections to which they relate. This work of compilation will take some time. There is a further suggestion that the compilation itself should also be printed.

Then there is a point concerning the French version of the bill. Of course, both the French text and the English text are original, but since the bill has been printed in English the French text becomes necessarily a version of it. There are certain difficulties connected with the translation. For instance, in section 2, the Interpretation section, "assignment" is defined in clause (b), but the French word for "assignment" is "cession", so the order in which this definition would appear in the French version is different. Similar translation difficulties arose when the Shipping Bill was before us, and at that time it was suggested that the order of the definitions in the French version should be the alphabetical order, but that each definition should be accompanied by a note indicating to the reader in what clause of the English version the definition was given. I shall need a motion authorizing that to be done, and I understand that otherwise the French text will not be considered as an original. Is that right, Mr. MacNeill?

Mr. J. F. MACNEILL, K.C., Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not quite correct. All that the translators want is a direction from this committee to put the definitions in alphabetical order in the French version, and it is also necessary for the committee to instruct me to put the French lettering at the end of the English letter. Then if paragraph (b) in English is (c) in French, the letter "(c)" will be put at the end of the English paragraph (b), and "(b)" will be put at the end of the French paragraph (c), to show in each case where to find the corresponding definition in the other version. That was done in the Shipping Act, at the direction of this committee, and all we need now is the same direction with respect to this bill.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I would move that the direction be given.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: There are no more detailed matters requiring our attention, so I will now call on Mr. R. C. Merriam.

Mr. R. C. MERRIAM, of Messrs. Gowling, MacTavish, Watt, Osborn & Henderson: Mr. Chairman, I am representing certain companies.

Hon. Mr. EULER: What companies?

Mr. MERRIAM: Certain companies in British Columbia, sir.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: I would like to know what companies they are.

Mr. MERRIAM: The companies I am representing are a group of B.C. industrial concerns, composed of the American Can Company Limited, the Vancouver Supply Company Limited, W. H. Malkin & Company, Limited, and Shell Oil Company of B.C., Limited.

The group of firms which I have just enumerated have considered carefully the proposed Bill N, and while they are in general agreement with the provisions therein contained they have instructed me to make certain representations to this committee with regard to four sections as now worded. The first of these is section 79 (3) (b), which provides that where the bankrupt is a corporation, any officer, director or employee thereof may not vote on the appointment of a trustee or inspector. Our submission is that this should be extended to cover the situation where the parent company of a bankrupt subsidiary or associate is a creditor of that bankrupt. I think the reason for the proposal will become apparent when you consider the following example. One of the subsidiary companies of a parent company goes into bankruptcy, and it transpires that either the parent company or an associated company is a large creditor. The