

rights in the wider territorial sea. With the territorial sea extended there would, moreover, be an additional area in which the right of innocent passage would be applicable, with the probable result of increased occasions for dispute.

It would seem that the security of a state might be better ensured by other methods under international law, rather than by the extension of territorial waters. Such measures are already provided for by the rights of self-defence, and of hot pursuit (approved in Article Twenty-Three of the Convention on the High Seas), and by laws which enable countries, in certain circumstances, to take action on the high seas to punish violations committed within their territorial seas. Naval demonstrations, moreover, can be more effectively dealt with under the United Nations Charter (Articles 2(4), 10 and others), rather than through an extension of the territorial sea.

The containment of local conflicts, the maintenance of collective security and the preservation of peace in the world through the United Nations would also be hindered by an increase in the extent of the territorial sea.

There are additional difficulties involved in extending the territorial sea beyond six miles. Unrestricted access by each country to all areas of the world by sea and air without transgressing foreign territory, neutral or not, is important for maintaining the easy flow of commerce. The flow of commerce is uninterrupted and unimpeded only because the high seas are free. An extension of the territorial sea beyond six miles would mean restricted access to hundreds of thousands of square miles of seas now available for the free use of every country in the world. It would also transfer to the territorial waters of various states twenty-two important connecting bodies of water in different parts of the world which are now high seas for the use of all countries.

The consequences might mean longer commercial runs, increased shipping costs, less revenue to the producer and higher