

of the existence of exclusive fishing zones independent of, but contiguous to, the territorial sea. These zones would remain part of the high seas, thereby ensuring the maximum freedom of the oceans as desired by the maritime states. At the same time, the zones would, as far as fishing is concerned, be under the sole jurisdiction of the coastal states, thus permitting a control most of them had been anxious to obtain over fishing in their contiguous waters. At the 1958 Conference Canada incorporated this idea in its "six-plus-six" proposal, which would have provided for a six-mile territorial sea and a six-mile exclusive fishing zone.

Following the decision of the General Assembly to convene a second conference, Canada made a series of representations to some 60 countries on behalf of the Canadian "six-plus-six" proposal and prepared a pamphlet that was distributed to most nations of the world.<sup>1</sup> In this way, Canada helped to generate interest in the subject and tried to acquaint various countries not only with the terms of the only proposal that seemed likely to succeed but also with the chaotic conditions to which a failure of the conference could expose the world. Conversely, the Canadian thesis ran, the success of the 1960 Conference would do much to ensure the ratification of the Conventions adopted by the 1958 Conference, thus bringing about an orderly codification of rules governing navigation and exploitation of the seas.

#### The 1960 Conference

Early in the Conference the U.S.S.R., Mexico, Canada and the United States advanced major proposals. The Mexican and U.S.S.R. proposals were similar, in that both would have permitted states to set the breadth of their territorial seas at any distance from three to twelve miles; however, the Mexican formula provided an elaborate scheme for determining the extent of an exclusive fishing zone. As the Conference progressed, Mexico withdrew its proposal in favour of an Afro-Asian proposal known as the 18-Power Proposal, of which it became, along with Venezuela, a co-sponsor. Shortly before voting in committee, the U.S.S.R. also withdrew its proposal in favour of the 18-Power one, which, like its antecedents, was a three-to-twelve mile proposal without any significant element of compromise.

The United States proposal was similar to the Canadian one, in that both provided for a six-mile territorial sea and a further six-mile exclusive fishing zone. As at the First Conference, the main difference between the two proposals was that the United States' proposal allowed for the indefinite continuation of traditional fishing rights — a feature that earned it the support of most Western European states. The Canadian proposal, on the other hand, attracted other countries because it would have ended traditional fishing rights in the twelve-mile zone. As the Conference progressed, it became clear that some compromise of these two positions was necessary if a rule were to be adopted.

<sup>1</sup>This pamphlet was reprinted in "External Affairs" Vol. 12, No. 1, Jan. 60. P. 435.