

their own off-shore areas. It is, however, quite natural that these states, bearing in mind the need of their expanding populations and their future requirements, should be looking to the living resources in the waters adjacent to their coasts as the source of an important and sometimes vital food supply. The Canadian proposal acknowledges the right of coastal states to achieve greater economic security and stability for their own people.

Unlike the United States proposal advanced at the 1958 Conference, the Canadian six-plus-six formula does not attempt to deal with the question of "traditional" fishing rights. In providing for an exclusive twelve-mile fishing zone, the Canadian solution contains, instead, an easily applied and uncomplicated formula capable of universal and uniform application. The Canadian formula does not attempt to deal with these questions because of the fact that fishing practices of states vary from area to area. Thus, the adoption of a new rule of international law, such as that envisaged in the Canadian proposal, may be expected to have implications for certain countries which it would not have for others. Consequently, the question of the recognition of "traditional" fishing rights or that of making allowances or adjustments for fishing operations now being carried on in the six-to-twelve-mile zone can more appropriately be dealt with through supplementary bilateral or multilateral agreements, rather than by attempts to mould the universal rule of law in such a way as to regulate or dispose of questions which are essentially particular and local in nature.

The desirability of dealing with these types of questions or difficulties on a bilateral or multilateral basis was clearly stated by Sir Pierson Dixon at the United Nations General Assembly when he pointed out that:

"We have repeatedly said that these are matters to be settled by negotiation and by the conclusion of agreements