

limit; for recognition of a six-mile territorial sea and of the interests at the same time of states concerned with distant-water fishing; and for a six-mile territorial sea and a further six-mile exclusive fishing limit. There may be other formulae proposed for the solution of these two questions.

If the basic solutions advanced at the First Conference are analyzed, it will be seen that they had one fundamental point in common. The eight-power proposal for a three-to-twelve-mile territorial sea, the proposal of the Soviet Union, the United States and Canadian solutions all recognized, implicitly or explicitly, that a state may claim jurisdiction over fishing in a twelve-mile zone contiguous to its coastline. In fact, more than eighty nations voted for a twelve-mile fishing jurisdiction in one or other of the forms in which it was advanced in the various proposals put forward at the Conference.

This clearly demonstrates that, in spite of the failure of the First Conference to reach agreement on the territorial sea and on fishing limits, almost the entire international community did agree on one crucial matter: a coastal state has a right to a twelve-mile fishery jurisdiction. In view of this wide measure of agreement, there is good reason to hope that the next Conference may resolve the problems before it.

It is the Canadian view that the unqualified 'six plus six' formula will come closest to meeting the needs of all states, thus proving an acceptable compromise at the next Conference. The reasons for this may be seen from a comparison of the Canadian formula with other solutions.

The Canadian formula differs from the proposal for a three-to-twelve-mile territorial sea in that it grants to coastal states all the advantages which they would gain under a twelve-mile territorial sea without the disadvantages which would follow from extending the territorial sea to that limit. The Canadian solution differs from the United States six plus six formula put