

Washington Law Review

Volume 30
Number 3 *Washington Legislation-1955*

8-1-1955

Washington Legislation-1955: Corporation Law

Harry M. Cross
University of Washington School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr>

Digital Part of the [Business Organizations Law Commons](#)
Commons

Network Recommended Citation

Harry M. Cross, Washington Legislation, *Washington Legislation-1955: Corporation Law*, 30 Wash. L. Rev. & St. B.J. 195 (1955).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol30/iss3/1>

This Washington Legislation is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at UW Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington Law Review by an authorized editor of UW Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact cnyberg@uw.edu.

WASHINGTON LAW REVIEW

AND

STATE BAR JOURNAL

VOLUME 30

AUGUST, 1955

NUMBER 3

WASHINGTON LEGISLATION - 1955

The following articles, the work of the faculty of the School of Law, constitute the first academic comment on the laws of 1955. For obvious reasons, these articles are not represented to the reader as a complete survey of the legislative session. Rather, they are merely a compilation of comments on Acts which the writers have found to be important, timely, or merely interesting.

CORPORATION LAW

Alien Ownership of Corporations. Article II, section 33 of the Washington Constitution was amended in November, 1954, by the deletion of the following language:

Every corporation, the majority of the capital stock of which is owned by aliens, shall be considered an alien for the purposes of this prohibition.

In Chapter 255, the legislature followed this change by inserting in the definition of "alien" in RCW 64.16.010, "nor does it include a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any state or territory thereof," but the legislature did not delete the proviso in the definition that such a corporation owned by another corporation was not an alien. The proviso now seems meaningless and if it is, its deletion would have been preferable.

HARRY M. CROSS