Conservation has, of course, done much to maintain the productivity of the living resources of the high seas, and, as it has now received full expression in the Convention of High Seas Fishing adopted by the International Conference on the Law of the Sea, it will play an increasingly important role in ensuring that the living resources of the sea will not be exploited to the detriment of the coastal states or of the world community. But the conservation principle, while recognizing the special interests of coastal states in maintaining the productivity of the living resources in their adjacent seas, does not reserve a reasonable coastal belt for the use of fishermen of the coastal states, even though many of their communities may largely depend for their livelihood on the preservation of the fishing stock in the nearby seas. It is to achieve this purpose that the Canadian proposal provides for more adequate fisheries jurisdiction extending six miles beyond the territorial sea.

While some emphasis appears to have been placed in public discussions on the differences between the United States and Canadian proposals at the First Geneva Conference, these proposals have, in reality, a great deal in common. As distinct from other proposals, both aim, in the interest of the freedom of the seas and for general reasons of peace and security, at restricting the limit of the territorial sea to a maximum of six miles. Both also accept the concept of a separate contiguous fishing zone comprising a further six miles.

The only difference between the two proposals relates to "traditional" or "historic" fishing rights. These are rights claimed in the six-to-twelve-mile zone adjacent to certain states by countries whose fishermen have in the past carried on and who continue to carry on distant-water fishing operations in that zone.

The newer nations of the world do not and, in the nature of things, cannot possess "traditional" fishing rights in distant waters; nor do they very often possess as yet well-developed fisheries in 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