

greater part of humanity, do seek to solve their common problems, Surely it need not be argued that particularly for them, and certainly for all of us, there would be immense value in a positive demonstration that so many different nations can work successfully together for their mutual benefit.

The situation today is very different to that of 1930 in many ways. We are all well aware of the rapidly increasing demands for wider zones of control over the living resources of the sea. In recent years claims have been made far beyond three, six, or twelve mile limits. In 1953 we recall that three states extended their territorial claims up to 200 miles for the purpose of exploiting the living resources of the sea adjacent to their coasts. I merely mention these facts for the purpose of drawing attention to a trend which cannot be ignored. I submit that there is plenty of evidence that many states are only postponing action until they see whether there will be agreement at this conference. If there is no agreement on the breadth of the territorial sea and contiguous zone, can there by any doubt that many more countries will soon make their own decisions?

There is no doubt that the establishment of a contiguous fishing zone of twelve miles would result in at least a temporary reduction in the catch of some of the fleets fishing in waters distant from their own home ports. However, we have found that among the nations fishing in Canadian waters the loss in most cases would not be serious, and for one country there would be no loss whatever. To the distinguished delegates of those states which are in this position, may I most respectfully submit that the question is not whether they are going to continue to fish within three miles of the coasts of other nations, but whether they are going to fish outside of a much larger zone established by international law or outside of a zone of any size which may be established by the unilateral action of any coastal state.

It may be said that it would not be legal for a state to take unilateral action which would greatly extend the sea area under its control. But what enforceable law will they be breaking, if we do not agree upon some law here? How will any nation fishing in distant waters prevent the application of the laws and regulations made by the coastal state, if we do not reach agreement? Certainly not by force. The days are gone when action of that kind would be considered seriously. If that assumption is correct, then the simple truth is that whatever the unilateral decision of any state may be, it will be very difficult for any other state to disregard claims that are asserted.

That brings us to another point. States which have already made claims to a wider zone than 12 miles may very naturally say to themselves, "What do we get out of this that can be put before our people as a definite achievement, if in fact we have accepted less than we already claim?". Surely the answer is that we will have all joined in creating a regime of law and that this in itself is of immense value and worth a great deal to all of us.