

introduced a proposal of its own for a 6-mile territorial sea with an additional fishing zone. The fishing zone in the United States proposal, however, was not exclusive because it granted so-called traditional rights in perpetuity in the 6-mile zone.

The United Kingdom had introduced earlier a 6-mile territorial sea proposal which was in reality a 3-mile territorial sea with an additional 3-mile fishing zone. The Canadian Delegation made every effort to accommodate these two important and friendly partners. As a matter of fact, it was very much because of our concern over the defence aspects so far as the United Kingdom and the United States were concerned that we originally introduced the proposal for a 3-mile territorial sea and 9-mile fishing zone instead of a straight 12-mile territorial sea.

It was very disappointing when first the United Kingdom and then the United States abandoned the 3-mile rule after we had made such efforts to accommodate them, and after this development the Canadian Delegation felt justified in converting its proposal into a 6-mile territorial sea with an additional 6-mile fishing zone, the form in which it received a majority in the committee vote, in an effort to reach general agreement. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis the central issue before the Conference was not whether there should be a fishing zone but whether it should be subject to existing traditional rights as proposed by the United States or whether it should be exclusive and without impediment as proposed by Canada.

It is quite evident that the Canadian proposal had a tremendous impact on the Conference. Without this concept there would have been no hope whatever of agreement because of the basic conflict between those states interested in coastal fishing rights and those interested in maintaining the maximum freedom of the high seas. This question remains unsettled for the moment, but it has not been forgotten and is still under very active international consideration. I might point out in this connection that the Conference adopted a resolution put forward by Cuba in these words:

--to request the General Assembly to study at its thirteenth session (1958) the advisability of convening a second international conference of plenipotentiaries for further consideration of the question left unsettled by the present conference.

It is felt in New York, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian Delegation will press for a second conference to be held at the earliest possible date to carry on the consideration of this question. I think it is safe to assume that any solution ultimately arrived at will incorporate the Canadian fishing zone concept in one form or another. At any rate, the Canadian position remains that the concept of an exclusive fishing zone should be adopted, and our efforts will be directed to this end. Agreement on a regime of law is very important to us,