

only about \$50. In any event, the value is represented in the one case by ten for one; in the other, by more than three times the issued price.

Hon. Mr. Lambert: I should like to cover one point made by the honourable leader of the opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), namely, that the subdivision of these shares will make them more valuable. He must realize—for the market has been full of such examples—that to subdivide a stock to make ten shares where there was one before, has, if anything, a depressing influence on its value rather than an enhancing one.

It does not seem to me fair, or even possible, to compare the organization which is represented in connection with this by the Inter-provincial Pipe Line Company with the ordinary run of exploration companies. I hold no particular brief from the Imperial Oil Company, but we all know the work that was done in the Province of Alberta before anything in the way of a producing well was obtained. At the time this pipeline company was incorporated, some three years ago, it was stated that the Imperial Oil Company had spent over \$80 million in explorations in Alberta before it had anything to show for the outlay. I believe the principle which has been stated here, of having the par value of the shares reduced to \$5 so that the public can buy them more readily than they could at the higher price, and to enable the company's own employees to share more generally in its profits, is a sound and good one. What is the alternative? It is, to let the State take charge of these explorations, organize companies, produce the oil and sell it. What is evident in the development of oil in this country, particularly in the Province of Alberta, is a fine measure of co-operation between the best sort of skilled enterprise and the state in relation to our natural resources. The more that idea can be encouraged and extended, the better, I suggest, for all concerned.

As to the value behind the present capital of the company, I am willing, if honourable senators so wish, to have the matter examined in committee. But I myself have no hesitation in suggesting that the proposition which is presented through this bill is a sound one.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. Lambert: Honourable senators, I move that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

The motion was agreed to.

COASTAL FISHERIES PROTECTION BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. A. B. Baird moved the second reading of Bill E, an Act to protect the coastal fisheries.

He said: Honourable senators, this bill is to revise the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1947, chapter 43. The main provisions of the Act were first enacted in 1868 in a measure entitled "The Foreign Fishing Vessels Act". The last amendment of the Act took place in 1913.

The principal purpose of the Act was to protect Canadian fisheries in territorial and inland waters from encroachment by foreign fishing vessels, and to regulate the conduct of foreign fishing vessels in our ports and territorial waters. But the last half century has brought about a significant change in the status of Canada within the Commonwealth, and this and the entry of Newfoundland into Confederation, and particularly the changed methods of fishing, involving the use of long-range fishing and processing boats, have rendered many of the provisions of the Act obsolete or at least not in harmony with the changed conditions.

The following is a brief summary of the defects in the existing Act which the bill aims to remedy.

The existing Act purports to exclude from our territorial waters foreign fishing vessels. There is, however, no definition in the Act of what constitutes a fishing vessel. It is doubtful if in its ordinary sense the term "fishing vessel" could be construed to include vessels hunting seals or taking marine plants in our territorial waters.

There is also serious doubt whether the present Act would exclude vessels that are not engaged directly in fishing, such as, for example, fish-processing vessels, or even mother ships which do not engage in direct fishing but store or transport fish caught by catching boats.

The Act only excludes fishing vessels which are "foreign or not navigated according to the laws of Great Britain or of Canada" and which are not permitted to come in by "any treaty or convention or any law of Great Britain or of Canada."

The bill would bring the Act into line with the present status of Canada within the Commonwealth, and all fishing vessels except Canadian fishing vessels would be prohibited from coming into our territorial or inland waters, unless permitted by any treaty or law of Canada. Under the existing Act the Governor in Council is authorized to allow United States fishing vessels to purchase bait and supplies, tranship catch, ship crews, etc.,