

prices to the consumer. Further, increased shipping costs would ultimately have to be borne by the countries dependent upon sea-borne commerce for their economic existence or development. It is seen, therefore, that any extension of the territorial sea beyond six miles might be exceedingly costly.

It is the duty of a coastal state to administer and patrol effectively its territorial sea. An increased territorial sea would require larger governmental expenditures not only to administer and patrol, but to increase and to maintain navigational aids.

Any extension of the territorial sea beyond six miles would also interfere with the freedom of the air, in that, by reducing the total free area of the high seas, it would also reduce the free airspace above them. Since there is no rule of law recognizing the right of innocent passage through the airspace over the territorial sea of a state, it is clear that to extend the territorial sea to twelve miles would affect many areas of importance to international air navigation. In an age of ever-growing air travel, such a reduction of free air space and the denial of free access to areas important for international air navigation should be a matter of concern to all states.

In conclusion, in the Canadian view there are no specific advantages in securing a twelve-mile territorial sea which a coastal state would not acquire through the unqualified six-plus-six formula, together with existing international laws and conventions. By claiming a twelve-mile territorial sea limit, there would, however, be clear disadvantages for all coastal states in sea and aerial navigation, affecting both the security and commercial interests of all nations.

The Fisheries Question—Methods of Dealing with Problems in the Outer Six-Mile Zone

In addition to a six-mile territorial sea-limit, the Canadian proposal provides for an exclusive twelve-mile fishing zone, measured from the same baselines as those of the territorial sea.