

ARBITRATION BETWEEN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
AND NOVA SCOTIA

held on the 28th day of November, A.D., 2001, at the Wu  
Conference Centre, Fredericton, New Brunswick, commencing  
at 9:30 a.m.

P. Lynch Enterprises  
Henneberry Reporting Service

ARBITRATION BETWEEN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR  
AND NOVA SCOTIA

held on the 28th day of November, A.D., 2001, at the Wu  
Conference Centre, Fredericton, New Brunswick, commencing  
at 9:30 a.m.

Tribunal:

Hon. Gerard V. LaForest, Chairman

Mr. Leonard Legault, Q.C.

Professor James Richard Crawford

Appearances:

L. Yves Fortier, Q.C.

Professor Phillip M. Saunders

Jean G. Bertrand

.....  
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fortier?

MR. FORTIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to  
you and to other members of the Tribunal. I was brought  
up in an age where we avocats, barristers, did not use  
slides, and as you will recall, I forewent the privilege  
of -- or the offer of using slides last Friday in my  
closing first round speech, and I have decided to do the

same this morning. I will not be using graphics.

I have a text which is being printed and will be handed to you at the conclusion of my remarks.

Now Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, Nova Scotia's rebuttal submissions in this second and last round of the hearing in phase two of the arbitration will, of necessity, cover a number of distinct, yet complementary topics arising from the speeches by counsel for Newfoundland and Labrador on Monday, as well as from the questions posed to Nova Scotia by the Tribunal during our submissions last week.

We, unlike Nova Scotia -- unlike Newfoundland, rather, intend to confine ourselves to a true rebuttal. We will not employ the Newfoundland tactic of using its last appearance before the Tribunal to unload arguments and material that have clearly been in its possession for some time, and more importantly, whose origin, accuracy and veracity is, in many instances, so dubious as to call into question its bona fides.

My colleagues and I who appear before you today on behalf of Nova Scotia, hope and trust the Tribunal will not consider our role to be simply to deliver uninterrupted monologues. We continue to invite and welcome challenging questions.

And unlike Newfoundland and Labrador, we will not have

recourse to arguments packaged in blandly pleasing terms, tempting rhetoric and the sort of false yet appealing syllogisms as might have been deployed by Milton's devil in Paradise Lost.

Newfoundland may cloak itself in the mantle of sober orthodoxy, yet its hands are far from clean and its dogma, its mantra, should be anathema to the members of the Tribunal.

No, Mr. Chairman, don't be a pioneer, just apply the law. Professor McRae pleaded soothingly on Monday of this week, "Don't be a pioneer, just apply the law." Professor McRae suggested that the law provides a simple and ready answer to the complex legal and factual issues that the Tribunal has been charged to resolve.

This, in my respectful submission, is nothing other than a plea for you to ignore what I called on Friday the most basic truths of this case, including the truth that you are confronted with facts that simply have never been considered before by an international tribunal, but which cannot for that reason be disregarded, as Newfoundland and Labrador proposes.

As well as the truth that the law does not contain ready-made solutions to maritime delimitation disputes, least of all a dispute of this nature. Of course it does not. To suggest that it does, no matter how very

reassuring the proposition, is to deny the very essence of the law that you are asked to apply. Newfoundland and Labrador's proposition is -- I say very respectfully, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, Newfoundland and Labrador's proposition is but an invitation to abdicate your very duty as arbitrators and to forego your mandate.

This arbitration, you were told by my friend, Professor McRae, on Monday, in the opening minutes of his presentation, is but, and I quote, "the culmination of a process that began with the adoption of the Atlantic Accord in 1985 and the Nova Scotia Accord in 1986...for the determination of the boundary between the provinces in respect of their offshore areas."

This is far from the truth, as even a casual reference to the Accords and their implementing Acts makes abundantly clear.

As you well know, under the Canada-Newfoundland Act, the process for determining the limits -- the process for determining the limits of what, for the sake of convenience, we refer to as "Newfoundland's offshore areas", was to be, and I quote, "by regulations made by the Governor in Council."

As you know, in the Canada-Nova Scotia Act, the limits of the Nova Scotia offshore area are defined with deliberate precision in Schedule I, including the boundary

between the offshore areas of the two provinces.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Mr. Fortier -- and that's the case, also, for the 1982 Accord?

MR. FORTIER: Yes, it is.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Can you explain to me why the '82 Accord was replaced by the '86 Accord?

MR. FORTIER: Why the '82 Accord was replaced by the '86 Accord. I'm not sure the -- yes, the negotiations continued between the province and the federal government and a better deal was struck with the arrival of a new government in 1984. Mr. Mulroney became Prime Minister in 1984 and it was one of his -- one of his election promises to the Atlantic -- to the Atlantic provinces that he would be prepared to enter into negotiations with the provinces to better the 1982 Act.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Because the '82 Accord has this most favoured province clause in there to which had earlier been suggested by Prime Minister Trudeau as a method of getting the individual provinces to come on board, as it were, individually.

MR. FORTIER: That is correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Was the '86 Accord sort of -- was that relevant to the negotiation of the '86 Accord or was it simply a change of policy at a different level?

MR. FORTIER: I'm instructed that it was relevant. Yes. So

it's a change of government. It's a better deal, in fact, after the 1984 federal election.

CHAIRMAN: In fact, did not the Conservatives, at least under Joe Clark, agree to grant it -- and I don't know what Mulroney did; I think for awhile he may have followed that policy, but when he came to government, thought that was a little difficult to take.

MR. FORTIER: You are absolutely right. In the short-lived Clark government of 1979, there was -- the Accords were on the agenda, definitely. Definitely. But the fact of the matter is whether in 1982 the '82 or '86 legislation, the definition of the limits of the Nova Scotia offshore area are defined with precision.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Do you see any differences that the mechanism for resolving boundary disputes is different as between '82 and '86?

MR. FORTIER: Yes, it is, but you have -- you have pronounced the key word -- for resolving a dispute if a dispute arises. But the boundary -- failing a dispute, the boundary is defined with precision and it delimits the offshore area of the two provinces. And as I said, it's only in the event that one of the two provinces raises a dispute regarding these limits, and only where as the provision, the clause in question Dr. Crawford has referred to -- only where other means have been tried and

failed -- in other words, negotiations -- that recourse to arbitration is to be had.

CHAIRMAN: But, in fact, it was known that there had been a dispute, at least since the Doody letter?

MR. FORTIER: We would take issue with that. I know that you allude in your Phase One Award to what appears to be the beginning of a dispute, but as I will try to demonstrate, if there was a dispute, there was -- there was an obligation which Newfoundland had to put in motion the process that was defined in the legislation, and they did not do it until -- in effect, until 1998. And that is one of the elements which I believe should weigh very heavily in your consideration of the facts.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: That's certainly true because my understanding of the chronology, and this is something Mr. McRae addressed the other day, obviously, you had the legislation in the mid-80s. The moratorium was still in force during that period and didn't expire until 1992.

MR. FORTIER: That is correct, between France and Canada.  
Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. So that the Newfoundland explanation for the delay was that they were in discussions with the federal government. The moratorium was there. There was uncertainty about what the boundary would be until after the Anglo-French Court of -- sorry,



the French-Canadian Court of Arbitration made its decision, and accordingly, there was no call for a resolution of any intraprovincial dispute until after that.

MR. FORTIER: But the boundary between -- as between the two provinces lived on in legislation.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: In legislation with Nova Scotia.

MR. FORTIER: In provincial and federal legislation.

Absolutely. So our point here is that Newfoundland and Labrador wishes to see yourselves as legislators -- in a sense, part of a process intended to enact a boundary as though for the first time, but I repeat this is simply not the case.

Newfoundland and Labrador hides behind this ruse so as to avoid the implications that flow from the fact that, Mr. Chairman, it waited nearly 40 years to raise a dispute clearly and formally. It wasn't until 1998 that Newfoundland and Labrador raised a dispute clearly and formally. It wasn't until 1998 that it stated a claim different -- a claim different than the line that it long considered to be a reasonable and equitable boundary between the offshore entitlements of the parties.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And in the 1982 Accord even, there is provision for the resolution of disputes. Although my reading of the Accord, there is some discrepancy between

the Accord and the legislation.

MR. FORTIER: Some.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I think that's probably irrelevant,  
because --

MR. FORTIER: In our view, it is irrelevant.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. But if you look at the Accord,  
it's clearly -- it says in the beginning of the boundary  
description, before the actual boundary description, in  
the annex, it says any boundary -- I can't remember what  
the word is...dispute, or whatever it is.

MR. FORTIER: The word "dispute" is used.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Can be resolved by the federal  
minister, after consultation with Nova Scotia.

MR. FORTIER: That is correct. That is correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So, wouldn't one infer from that that  
it was not the intention of the federal government to lay  
down a boundary that was beyond dispute? I mean, if you  
say any dispute about the following boundaries will be  
resolved in the following method, but these are the  
boundaries. You are, aren't you, implying that the  
boundaries are still, in some sense, capable of being  
disputed?

MR. FORTIER: But our point here is that the legislation  
uses the word "dispute" and the -- if there is a dispute  
about a line, that means that the party that disputes the

existing legislated line has another line to propose. And that is what was not done until 1998.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: For the record, the first appearance I have been able to find of the line is 1997. It was put in the -- and it was a formal letter.

MR. FORTIER: Yes, I will be coming to that.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Not in '98, but there was an earlier version of the line which seems the same in 1997.

MR. FORTIER: In 1997, it was as between the Federal Government and Newfoundland, Nova Scotia not being a party to that correspondence.

And contrary to Professor McRae's suggestion on Monday, the 1984 legislation implementing the '82 Agreement did not contain any provision for modifying the line. For modifying the line. It referred to a dispute, but there was no provision for modifying the line. And I believe that this is something that you should -- it's also something that should be borne in mind.

So, the -- as I think, if I may just complete this first facet of my presentation this morning, you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Tribunal, know by now that it is Newfoundland and Labrador which petitioned the Federal Government for this arbitration. It is Newfoundland and Labrador which challenges, now challenges the line that has been law since 1984, and in use de facto for almost 40

years. And it is Newfoundland and Labrador that seeks to undo a deal, to revise history, and to rewrite legislation.

Now, following my initial comments this morning, Mr. Chairman, Professor Saunders will address the Tribunal. He will consider what I call the load dumped on all of us by Newfoundland and Labrador this week. Its sheaf of lines to use terminology employed in Tunisia-Libya.

He will also respond to Professor Crawford's query regarding the line that Nova Scotia might have claimed had it not claimed the existing line. As well as your hypothesis, Professor Crawford, concerning a delimitation between two independent states in the position of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, but, quoting from the transcript of the 23rd of November, "with no prior agreement between them, taking into account the maritime boundary of St. Pierre and Miquelon."

Finally, Professor Saunders will address the Tribunal's wish to have depicted what Dr. Crawford has called "the coasts and areas that actually have an impact on the delimitation."

Following Professor Saunders, my partner and friend, Jean Bertrand, will re-visit, briefly, key facets of the conduct of the parties, in respect of which, in Nova Scotia's view, counsel for Newfoundland have attempted to

cloud the facts and confuse the Tribunal.

Finally, I will return to the podium to summarize the position of Nova Scotia and the nature of the relief which it seeks, and you will be happy to hear, to close Nova Scotia's case.

Before asking you to call on Professor Saunders, Mr. Chairman, there are two preliminary matters which remain to be addressed, unfortunately. They both stem from the statements of Newfoundland's counsel on Monday.

The first concerns the basis of title and the terrible, yet wholly imaginary, outcome forecast by Professor McRae and his colleagues, should your Tribunal accept to treat the dispute as it quite frankly is, as a dispute regarding negotiated and legislated offshore areas, rather than ab initio and ipso jure continental shelves.

Professor McRae, Mr. Willis' presentation on Monday, and the fact that I was left with the impression that their views were not being challenged by Members of the Tribunal makes it incumbent on me to return to the basics of the case for both parties, the basis of title.

My second preliminary matter concerns, we have alluded to it presently, concerns a recent history of the dispute. The recent history of the dispute, and the ostensibly comforting, yet equally illusory, description provided by

Newfoundland and Labrador's Agent regarding the manner in which the dispute in fact crystallised, and the steps which led to it being referred to binding arbitration by the Government of Canada.

Professor Crawford?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I just want to make an observation.

The fact that Members of the Tribunal don't ask questions about something that is profoundly equivocal, it may mean that we are satisfied by something, or it may mean we are so dissatisfied by it that we have nothing to say.

MR. FORTIER: There was a division of opinion between counsel for Nova Scotia on this point, Professor Crawford. But, of course, I recognize that it can be one or the other. Some arbitrators are more sphinx-like than others.

The basis of title. Last week in the course of my opening submissions, Mr. Legault stated that his understanding, that was earlier in the process, Mr. Legault stated that his understanding is that the basis of entitlement to all maritime zones over which a coastal state exercises jurisdiction is the state's sovereignty over its land territory. As well, we heard Mr. Willis earlier this week, affirm a similar proposition in response to a question from Mr. Legault.

It is of course true that the maritime entitlements traditionally recognized by international law derive from

sovereignty over the land, and that it is through the medium of a state's coastal geography that the maxim, "the land dominates the sea" is given practical application.

However, it would be incorrect to believe that, on its own, this constitutes a complete statement of the legal basis of maritime entitlement. The jurisprudence is abundantly clear on this point, as I will very briefly review.

The Chamber in a case which Mr. Legault knows well, the Chamber in the Gulf of Maine case, cautioned that although the concept of adjacency can be acknowledged to express the link between a state's sovereignty and its sovereign rights to adjacent submerged land, it should not be forgotten, I quote from paragraph 103, "It should not be forgotten, however, that legal title to certain maritime or submarine area is always and exclusively the effect of a legal operation. The same is true of the boundary of the extent of the title. That boundary results from a rule of law, and not from any intrinsic merit in the purely physical fact." Paragraph 103.

Now the legal basis and the extent of title to maritime areas is not the result of the purely physical fact of coastal geography, adjacency, or natural prolongation. Rather, title arises as a result of a legal operation that also encompasses other considerations as

well, such as the nature and the purpose of a state's right in relation to the zone.

For example, publicists have written extensively about the difference between the nature of a coastal state's title to the territorial sea and the nature of its rights in relation to the continental shelf.

With respect to the territorial sea, a coastal state exercises a three-dimensional sovereignty that extends not only to the waters, but also to the seabed and subsoil below and to the airspace above.

These rights extend over areas close to the coastal state's shores for purposes related to what? Related to the defence and security of the state, interests inherent in the old cannon shot rule. And lest the point be forgotten, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, I would ask you to bear in mind that a cannon fires in all directions, not only straight offshore, perpendicular to the coast, as it were.

On the other hand, a coastal state's rights over the continental shelf involved not sovereignty, but rather sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting the natural resources of the shelf.

Now the significance of this difference in the basis of title to the two zones, the territorial sea and the continental shelf, and its implications for the



delimitation process were clearly recognized by the Chamber in the Gulf of Maine case, when it declared, and I quote again, this time from paragraph 120: "The situation of the territorial sea and the contiguous zone, conceived as subject to the sovereignty of the coastal state, or subject to the exercise of customs controls and similar measures, intended to prevent violations of territorial sovereignty cannot be treated as an analogy to the continental shelf or fisheries zone."

And the Chamber went on to say in the same paragraph 120, "There is nothing here in the legal institution of a territorial sea and contiguous zone, there is nothing which is comparable with the reservation of the exclusive rights of exploitation of resources of a maritime area extending to 200 miles. There is, therefore, nothing which could justify the idea of an extension thereto of criteria and delimitation methods expressly contemplated for the narrow strip of sea defined for a quite different purpose."

In other words, this is back to basics, I appreciate, but it behooves me to go back to basics. In other words, notwithstanding that the legal institution of the territorial sea and of the continental shelf share a common origin in the coastal state sovereignty over the land, there exists significant differences even between

two such closely related juridical concepts as regards their respective bases of title. And these differences have very important implications for the delimitation process.

The differences between the legal basis of a coastal state's title to the continental shelf, and the basis of the parties' entitlement to the offshore areas to be delimited in this case, it goes without saying, I submit, is far greater. Both juridical concepts are related, to some degree, to the coastal geography of the so-called state that enjoys the entitlement. The provinces, as we know, would have no offshore area entitlements if their lands did not abut the sea. But unlike the continental shelf, the legal basis of the offshore area, and of the parties' entitlement to it, are negotiated, are given effect by legislation, and are confined to purposes that are incompatible with any notion of sovereignty or sovereign rights.

MR. LEGAULT: Mr. Fortier --

MR. FORTIER: Yes, Mr. Legault.

MR. LEGAULT: -- if I may, just very briefly. The differences, which you have described very accurately, between the legal nature of the territorial sea and the legal nature of the continental shelf, and again, as you are absolutely right to point out, delimitation is a legal

operation. But in that legal operation, those differences, don't they come into play in the determination of the relevant circumstances? I thought that was indeed the essence of Nova Scotia's pleading.

MR. FORTIER: You are absolutely right. But there is a process that begins with the basis, the identification of the basis of title. The process must begin. That is the benchmark of the operation that you have to carry out. You first have to inquire into the basis of title. Once you have inquired and identified the basis of title, you are able to look at the nature of the entitlements. That is the point, which I believe is made abundantly clear in the Gulf of Maine case.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: There isn't really a dispute here about the nature of the entitlements. I think my understanding was that Mr. McRae agreed with your analysis of the nature of the entitlements. The question is the geographical extent of the entitlements.

MR. FORTIER: Well the fundamental difference here is that -  
- as for Newfoundland and Labrador, this delimitation should be -- should proceed as if you were delimitating a continental shelf. And we say no. You have to look at the purpose for which the entitlements have been legislated. And the purpose, as we know, is a share in the administration and the benefits of the offshore area,

which is altogether different from the rights which accrue to the coastal state, which is claiming rights over the continental shelf ipso jure -- de facto ipso jure.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: There is a problem with that argument in that both the legislation itself, and also the Terms of Reference, but let's stick with the legislation. As you say, that's the dominant instrument. The legislation not merely spells out the purposes in the way you have described in the entitlements in terms of their character, it also says that we are to apply international law with such modifications as the circumstances require. The international law, the principles of maritime delimitation.

MR. FORTIER: Correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So that the legislature actually addressed its mind to this point in precisely in the context of these sorts of entitlement. It told us to apply --

MR. FORTIER: That is correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- a particular area of law. Now the question is whether your argument relates to the way in which the international law, principles of delimitation apply in this situation. That is to say, as Mr. Legault would put it, whether it's a relevant or special circumstance, as the case may be, or whether your argument

goes to the modifications to that part of the formula. Are you saying that the principles, themselves, operate differently in relation to these sorts of rights? Or are you saying because the provinces only have these sorts of rights, it's necessary to modify the international law principles?

MR. FORTIER: Definite -- not the latter, it's the former without any doubt at all. The whole process -- the whole operation begins with the legal basis of title. And to -- if one listens to, reads the Newfoundland argument, we see that there is a fundamental dispute, if I may use the word, between their definition of the legal basis of title and Nova Scotia's definition. And I have tried to demonstrate by reference to some passages in the Gulf of Maine case, that you have -- you, the adjudicator, have to look at the nature and the purpose of the title that the provinces have over the offshore area.

And here the purpose and the nature of the rights -- the nature of the rights of the provinces is a share in the, as I said, the administration and the benefits. It's not -- they are not rights which can in any be identified with those which a coastal right, a coastal state has over a continental shelf for purposes of a delimitation of a -- of a pure continental shelf. In the same way that the nature and purpose of the "territorial sea sovereignty" is

different from the nature and purpose of the continental shelf.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fortier --

MR. LEGAULT: Mr. Fortier -- oh, I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: -- you distinguished quite properly between the sovereign rights of the states, a complete right of sovereignty over the territorial waters and the contiguous zone, which is a system to protect the sovereignty of the state in its internal aspects. Now whereas both the continental shelf, using another perspective now, and the rights given to the provinces under these agreements are for the exploitation of resources of the sea, which is really not a complete analogy to me and leads to why the distinction is made there?

MR. FORTIER: There are no rights of exploitation to the resources of the sea which are granted to the provinces.

CHAIRMAN: Not as extensively, but --

MR. FORTIER: None whatsoever, I say respectfully.

CHAIRMAN: -- certainly in the end you share the administration of it.

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You share the profits of it.

MR. FORTIER: Yes. But you don't have any other rights to those resources, such as a state, such as Germany and Denmark and the Netherlands had in the continental shelf

off their coasts in the North Sea cases. With respect, there can be no -- there is no identify -- the rights are altogether different. Altogether fundamentally different.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Well they are not altogether different. But certainly they are different. I mean I think everyone would agree with that. But evidently Canada gets half the revenue.

MR. FORTIER: Well --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So it's foregone half the revenue, but it would have got that half of the revenue by reason of its inherent rights if the Accords legislation had never existed. So to that extent, there is overlap, to put it at its lowest, between the provisions of the Accords and the situation that would existed apart from them.

But the question that concerns me, I asked you this in the first round, and you gave an answer at least in one respect, but you said it wasn't a complete answer. The question was well bearing in mind that this is a negotiated provincial entitlement, does that mean that conducts during the negotiations is more important to delimitation of the offshore area, than it would be to delimitation of the continental shelf? To which your answer is, yes, but that's not the only difference. Okay. So I mean I understand that you say you have to draw a connection between the character of the entitlement, as a

negotiated entitlement, and the character of what is relevant circumstances for purposes of delimitation.

That's fine.

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Looking at the other aspects of the differences between continental shelf and offshore area, the question is what other implications are we to draw from those differences? Now maybe you are coming to this. But my difficulty is in seeing other cases. I mean, for example, the resources of the continental shelf include sedentary species, but it's not really suggested that the boundary should be any different because you are not getting sedentary species.

MR. FORTIER: Of course not. Of course not.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: No.

MR. FORTIER: Of course not, Professor Crawford.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: The extent of the area is the outer edge of the continental margin, which is in fact co-extensive with the rights of Canada to continental shelf.

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So there is an expressed link in the Oceans Act that way. So again, it doesn't seem that although I perfectly see that the extent of the margin raises implications for a delimitation process, I don't see that there is any difference between the implications



it would raise for this delimitation process, and the difference it will -- and the implications it would raise on a purely interstate basis.

MR. FORTIER: The way you phrase your question, I agree with you, as far as Article 76 of the Oceans Act is concerned, it only serves to determine the relevant area. It's not part of the law -- it's not a principle of law of maritime delimitation.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So what we have established so far is that because this is a negotiated entitlement, unlike continental shelf, therefore, conduct during negotiations and conduct more generally --

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- has a higher level of salience or relevance?

MR. FORTIER: Absolutely.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Okay. Follow you there.

MR. FORTIER: It all goes to the weight of that's the relevant circumstance, which conduct is.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. Fine.

MR. LEGAULT: Mr. Fortier, if I may, I don't want to add my cannon shot to the barrage you are undergoing --

MR. FORTIER: As long as you don't fire in one direction only, Mr. Legault.

MR. LEGAULT: Are you arguing that the differences in the

nature and purpose of the rights enjoyed in these various maritime zones change the legal basis of title over those zones?

MR. FORTIER: I am saying that in order to identify the basis of title, you have to look at the nature and the purpose of the zone in question. You have to look at the nature and the purpose. And the nature and purpose is found in the legislation. You have to look at the nature and purpose of the territorial sea. You have to look at the nature and purpose of the continental shelf. You have to look at the nature and purpose of the offshore areas in this case. That's what the Chamber said in the Gulf of Maine.

Let me remind you again of what I consider to be one of the most important passages. Legal title to certain maritime or submarine area, the offshore area, is always, and exclusively the effect of a legal operation.

So where do you find it? You find it in the legislation here. You find it in your Terms of Reference.

MR. LEGAULT: That wasn't quite the question I put to you but I thank you for your answer.

MR. FORTIER: Now when you talk about, as Article 3 of the Terms of Reference does, the principles of the law of maritime delimitation, what does it refer to? Dr. Crawford, you referred to it. It boils down to what? To

the fundamental norm. And the fundamental norm we certainly have never advocated that would be heresy. The fundamental norm, you know, does not -- I forgot what I was going to say. But the fundamental norm begins with the basis of title. That is the all important submission that we are making. And the basis of title to an offshore area is different than the basis of title to a territorial sea, or to a continental shelf, or to an EEZ or to a fisheries zone.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And the point I was trying to make, and I think we have probably reached at least a measure of agreement on this is, okay, we accept that the basis of title is different and it's then necessary to show how the particular difference relates to --

MR. FORTIER: Yes, sir.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- the application of the principles of international law. And we have seen one respect in which in your view it does relate and it would make -- at least arguably make a difference.

MR. FORTIER: Yes, sir. So the -- because you see, you must after you have identified the basis of title -- and as I say, the norm dictates to the adjudicator that the operation starts with a basis of title. After you have identified the title as a touch -- you know, you use it as -- I would say as the touch stone for every other aspect

of the delimitation operation. But you start with the basis of title. And in order to identify the basis of title, you must look to the nature and purpose of the area. What is the nature and purpose?

Now I have reached a point where I'm repeating myself, so I will move on.

Although it may be justifiable in a multi-purpose delimitation of a single maritime boundary encompassing the different zones -- encompassing different zones as in the Gulf of Maine case, although it may be justifiable to focus primarily on the common denominator of the different zones being delimited in conjunction, for example, on coastal geography and on considerations related to it, the situation is different, is entirely different where, as in the present case, the delimitation involves only one zone, the legal basis of which relates to particular and specific purposes.

This is implicit in the Chamber's comment on the natural criterion of delimitation related to the distribution of fisheries resources advocated by the United States.

In this regard the Chamber found -- and I quote -- "The fundamental fact remains that the criterion underlying the US line of 1976 was too much geared to one aspect of the present for problem for it to be capable of

being considered equitable in relation to the characteristics of the case. This criterion may have been justified for a delimitation concerning exclusive fishery zones alone, but less so for a single delimitation in whose purpose the continental shelf and especially the resources of its subsoil also play a most important part." So it's the identification of the circumstance. It's the weighing of the circumstance.

And I invite you to remember that, you know, Newfoundland both in its written pleadings, as well as in its oral submissions, actually denies that the basis of title affects in any way the weighing of relevant circumstances. And this is a fundamental difference between the positions of the two parties before your Tribunal.

The point is that in the present case, which concerns the delimitation of only one juridical zone, the offshore area as defined in the Acts, there is simply no need, and indeed it would be wholly inappropriate to restrict an analysis of the basis of title and the considerations which flow from it, to such a common denominator, as we hope we demonstrated in our written and oral submissions. And as I have just mentioned, the federal government would presumably not have conferred offshore area entitlements on the parties if they did not have any coastal geography,

of course. But geography is not the root of that entitlement. Geography is not the root of the entitlement.

There is nothing radical here, I submit. Nothing to conjure up the dragons produced by the imagination and the seductive rhetoric of Newfoundland and Labrador's Agent. You know, if we --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: If we look at the negotiations, of course, there was a serious proposal for pooling, which would have treated I think all of the east coast provinces on the same basis here irrespective of coastal geography.

MR. FORTIER: Yes. It came to that in the 70s, yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And that was rejected.

MR. FORTIER: That's right.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So one might say that that aspect of the negotiation supports the idea that the more coastline you have the more you may be liable to get.

MR. FORTIER: Well I suppose you could make the argument but I don't think that it would hold, respectfully.

CHAIRMAN: It certainly would be the case on the under the basis of the "agreement" which the provinces freely entered into.

MR. FORTIER: I'm sorry, Mr. --

CHAIRMAN: The "1964 Agreement".

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: There was a division based on geographical considerations.

MR. FORTIER: I -- we have never, never stated that geography was not a relevant circumstance. Of course it is a relevant circumstance. It's the weighing and the priority, if you wish, that you accord to geography versus conduct, for example, in this particular case. But, yes, geography is a relevant circumstance.

CHAIRMAN: But completely divorced from the continental shelf. Why should it be? They are all part of Canada.

MR. FORTIER: And the question?

CHAIRMAN: Why should there be a difference? They are all part of Canada, every province is.

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So why should we make a difference between them on the basis on geography? We don't for other federal powers.

MR. FORTIER: Well if you mean, Mr. Chairman, whether or not you should consider the geography of the area, my answer is yes. We have -- Nova Scotia has never taken the position that geography was not a factor. But my point at the moment is that in order -- you know, before you come to identifying -- if I may work backwards -- identifying the method after you have identified the relevant circumstances and after you have given its proper weight

to each one of the relevant circumstance, you have to go back to the identification of the basis of title. What is the nature and purpose of the area in question? And the nature and purpose is not the exploitation of the natural resources, because that is not a right which is conferred to either Newfoundland and Labrador or to Nova Scotia. It's strictly a participation in, a sharing of the administration and the benefits.

And, you know, to come back to Dr. Crawford's reference to what was envisioned at one time, the pooling connotes the idea of a division based on some kind of a formula. But that is not the case that we are dealing with, because -- like this is another one of the conditions that did not materialize. This was another aspect of the negotiation in the 1970s between the Atlantic Provinces and the federal government that came to naught.

As I was saying before I addressed the most recent questions of Members of the Tribunal, by no stretch of the imagination, no matter how fertile it may be, can it be said that geography in this case it has been described even by my friend Professor McRae as unique -- geography is not the root of the provinces' entitlement. And that is not radical. I submit that it doesn't conjure up the dragons produced by the imagination and the rhetoric of



Professor McRae to say that the basis of title to the offshore area should affect the selection of and the weight attached to the circumstances to be considered by the Tribunal and the equitable criteria to be applied is to do no more than reaffirm -- as I stated a moment ago, no more than reaffirm the fundamental norm of maritime delimitation.

And to say, Mr. Chairman, that the offshore area is not a continental shelf, is not the shocking heresy that Newfoundland describes. It is one of the simple basic truths of this case. We are not -- I repeat, we are not saying that geography is not relevant to the delimitation, but we are saying that geography is not the only -- not the only relevant consideration. And this is the only conclusion that is supported by the applicable law and true to the indisputable facts of this case.

MR. CRAWFORD: Of course, it is also true under

international law that geography is not the only basis.

MR. FORTIER: Yes, sir. Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So in this case there is actually concordance between the international law principles and the principles you would say flow from the character of the design. That is that geography is relevant but not the only relevant consideration.

MR. FORTIER: It's a question of weight. It's a question of

weight and I -- it affects the -- I have to go back to basics again. And if you go back to basics you have to go back to the basis of title. And the basis of title affects the weighing of the relevant circumstances. And this is denied by Newfoundland and Labrador, that the basis of title in this case in any way affects the weighing of the relevant circumstances. And that cannot be so.

So, yes, in the delimitation, as in this case, of a negotiated entitlement, conduct relating to the genesis of the entitlement and the determination of its limits or boundaries, will have more weight than it would in the delimitation of, for example, the continental shelf. And yes, in the delimitation of an entitlement that confers rights solely in relation to certain resources, circumstances relating to the location of those resources and the access to them, provided by various proposed lines, should have more weight than might otherwise be the case.

But no, the fact that the offshore area is not identifiable with a continental shelf does not mean that there is no law to apply. The frightful notion that there would be no law to apply if the offshore area is not treated as a continental shelf, and if the parties' entitlements are not treated as inherent continental shelf

rights, is entirely of Newfoundland's making.

The theme, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, if you don't follow us or you will be devoured by dragons, is not Nova Scotia's argument, it's Newfoundland's argument. It's an argument in terrorem, a device not without effect, but without any merit. And the Tribunal ought not to buy into it.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I take it these are marine dragons?

MR. FORTIER: They have to be.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR. FORTIER: They are marine dragons found in the offshore areas of the parties.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And they're not sedentary?

MR. FORTIER: That is correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Therefore they are irrelevant.

MR. FORTIER: The offshore areas to be delimited, yes, they are unprecedented as far as maritime entitlements go. And the legal basis of those areas and of the parties' entitlements will affect, as I said, the weight attached to the circumstances and the criteria considered by the Tribunal.

And as you begin your deliberations, I invite you to recall that both provinces which appear before this Tribunal, Mr. Chairman, they received rights relating to the seabed abutting their coasts. Just as in a different

context, one could argue, continuing on your, you know, this is Canada type of question, Mr. Chairman, western provinces receive rights over northern lands abutting their provinces, as they were then defined.

Geography does matter. We are, as we -- these are both Canadian provinces, but if there were no coastal geography, there would be no offshore area. That's a truism, of course. You know, we have never argued that the offshore area, as I said earlier, is an issue in this case, because the two provinces have coasts which abut on those area.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Could we argue that because this is a negotiated settlement within Canada which is a federation dedicated to principles of fiscal equalization, or at least a measure of fiscal equalization, therefore we should take into account relative resources of the provinces?

MR. FORTIER: I don't think I will enter that political --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I'm just looking for ways in which it might be different if they are offshore areas, and that seemed to me an important way, because if you were simply doing it on a geographical basis, obviously you could accentuate the inequalities. But if we imply a measure of fiscal equalization, we would actually improve things. So we should look at the relative resources, which we can't

do under international law.

MR. FORTIER: That's an interesting argument. While you're doing that, you might also consider how important in the context of the Canadian Federation, is the word of a -- of a Provincial Premier, you know, given to one of his colleagues.

So, you know, lest you be -- would you like to continue the discussion?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: The Chairman was just saying to me that this is true in general of provincial premiers, but not universally.

MR. FORTIER: Again, this is not an area that I'm going to -- there I would fear running into dragons.

So, you know, I almost feel as if -- Members of the Tribunal are extremely eminent, and very experienced adjudicators, jurists. I'm sure you will not shy away from the unique circumstances that present themselves in this case. That you won't shy away from discharging your responsibilities, your mandate under the Terms of Reference.

Because, to guide you in your task, you have the law. You have the international law of maritime delimitation which, of course, encompasses the all important fundamental norm. And the fundamental norm remains the same. The tools, the criteria, the techniques, the

methods developed by the jurisprudence remain the same, and they are available to your Tribunal, and you, of course, will have recourse to them.

You know, it would be difficult to count the number of times during the hearing that counsel for Newfoundland and Labrador charged that the delimitation proposed by Nova Scotia rests on its conception of the basis of title to the parties' offshore areas. It does. Of course it does.

But so, too, does Newfoundland's delimitation depend on its own conception of the basis of title. The difference between our case and that of Newfoundland and Labrador, is not that only one rests on a particular conception of the legal basis of the parties' entitlements. The difference, I submit, is that Nova Scotia builds its case on the true basis of title that is at issue in this case, while Newfoundland asks the Tribunal to assume, or imagine, or fictionalize a basis of title that does not exist, that the parties do not possess, that the Government of Canada and the Supreme Court of Canada have in fact, both expressly denied to Newfoundland, and that the Tribunal is neither required nor permitted to impute to the parties under the terms of its mandate.

So the choice to be made between these two competing approaches, the one based on the facts, and the other

based on fantasy is easy, there is no choice at all.

Under the international law of maritime delimitation, and according to the provisions of the Terms of Reference, the one factor that you must constantly bear in mind as you fulfil your mandate, to quote yet again the Court in Libya-Malta, "is the legal basis of the offshore areas to be delimited and of the parties' entitlements to those areas."

And what of the requirements to apply the facts as if the parties were states? Well, in your first Award, the first phase of this arbitration, you dealt with that requirement. You found that the Terms of Reference provide the flexibility required to apply rules of international law to facts that arise within Canada, by reference to Canadian law and politics, and to modify the applicable principles of international law, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, but not the facts of the dispute.

You have already ruled. You held that this rule applies equally to the second, and to the first phase of the arbitration. And the facts, yes, as Mr. Currie said last week, the facts are the facts.

I turn the page now, and I go from the basis of title to a brief review of the recent history of the dispute.

I have discussed up to now this morning the true nature of the exercise in which you are engaged, not the

neutral, quasi-legislative process of setting a boundary as though none existed, that Newfoundland describes. This is not what you are asked to do. But proceedings engaged as a direct result of a dispute raised by Newfoundland and Labrador concerning an existing de facto line.

In his comments this week, the Agent for Newfoundland and Labrador misstated the manner in which this dispute arose, and was referred to arbitration. And in so doing, since he may have misled the Members of the Tribunal, I believe that it is incumbent on me to review, very briefly, the record. It is clear, it is before your Tribunal.

All of the material that was adduced by the parties in phase one of the arbitration is relevant to this continuing arbitration. Almost none of it was referred to by Mr. McRae this week.

Briefly, it was in March of 1992, just before the Award in St. Pierre et Miquelon was handed down, that representatives of the two provinces met with the Federal Government to discuss the resumption of oil and gas activity that would occur after the Award. And I refer here to Newfoundland, at document number 109. There's an internal memorandum, the Newfoundland representative at this meeting, reported that in response to a comment from a federal official, that it will be necessary for Newfoundland and Nova Scotia to confirm their boundary,



Nova Scotia's Assistant Deputy Minister, quote, this is in the Newfoundland memorandum, that the Nova Scotia Deputy Minister "stated that Nova Scotia feels that the offshore boundary with Newfoundland is properly set out in the Nova Scotia Accord Legislation." This was in 1992.

In August of 1992, after the decision of the Tribunal of the international arbitral tribunal in the Canada-France dispute, August, Mr. Epp, the Federal Minister of Energy, who was referred to earlier, wrote to his provincial counterparts in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, and in his letter he proposed that representatives of the three governments immediately begin discussions regarding the determination of the offshore boundary. This was in August.

One month later, the Nova Scotia Minister replied by stating that Nova Scotia did not believe that a dispute existed, in virtue of which the dispute resolution provisions of the Accord Acts could be engaged. Nova Scotia said there is no dispute. But the offer of federal assistance was appreciated.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes, I don't have the letter with me.

What they said was, from recollection, they wouldn't describe it as a dispute. You might --

MR. FORTIER: It's Nova Scotia annex 3.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. So, it's not a letter which, as

it were, affirms that there is no disagreement whatever. What it says is that there may be something that requires discussion. It hasn't yet taken on the characteristics of a dispute, that's how I read that.

MR. FORTIER: Well we read that letter as a statement of position by Nova Scotia to the effect that there is no dispute. But if -- but the Nova Scotia Minister said, you know, we appreciate the offer of federal assistance. And two months later, in November of 1992, here this -- I'm referring to document number 112, Newfoundland document, phase one. The -- Nova Scotia's Assistant Deputy Minister of Natural Resources wrote to his vis-a-vis in Newfoundland, further to a meeting between them that had taken place a few weeks ago, to provide him with, and I quote document number 112, "background information relating to the 1964 boundary line that was agreed to by the two provinces."

So what did Newfoundland do? Nothing. Absolutely nothing occurred that we have been referred to. And the matter appears to have been dropped.

It was three years later in August of 1995, the Newfoundland Minister, three years later -- now I'm in Nova Scotia annex 5 -- annex 4, forgive me -- the Newfoundland Minister wrote to the Nova Scotia Minister to say that "The government of Newfoundland and Labrador

supports a process of negotiation to resolve the Newfoundland/Nova Scotia offshore boundary. Once our preparations are complete, I will be in contact with you." This was in, I repeat, August of 1995. Nothing further was heard from Newfoundland, at least not by Nova Scotia.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Of course, I mean the first point to make and it has to be acknowledged, that Nova Scotia has been entirely consistent in its position throughout --

MR. FORTIER: Since 1964.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Throughout that period. I've seen no evidence at all that indicates that there was any divergence of the Nova Scotian position. Those discussions in the 90s, there's a clear implication, even in 1992, that there is something to discuss. It's not very clear what it is, I admit that, that there's something to discuss and the process of --

MR. FORTIER: Well, this --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- negotiations that was referred to in 1995 was obviously a negotiation about something to do with the boundary. It wasn't simply the record of an agreement and a long lunch.

MR. FORTIER: Well, the -- but the Nova Scotia position as we see and as we will continue to see is that there is no -- there is an agreed boundary. The words are "The 1964 boundary line that was agreed by the two provinces."

That was the Nova Scotia position. And Newfoundland at that point did not engage. That is they did not raise the dispute to the level which the legislation had envisaged. They just said, well, you know, we are prepared to start a process of negotiation, and then silence, you know, for three years.

And -- well, it's one of the points that we are making, that in the fullness of time -- we came to August of 2001 and the first formal claim with a defined line which was explained came to be presented to Nova Scotia in the Newfoundland Memorial. The -- yes, my colleagues remind me that, you know -- yes, I mean the correspondence is certainly not limpid, but, you know, one could argue that rather than there being any disagreement over a boundary as such, over the boundary, that since some of the federal permits crossed the line and needed to be split, that was what was envisaged -- what was envisaged as a subject for discussion.

So you -- we come to November of 1997, and we have a representative of the federal government who wrote to Mr. Ryan in Halifax, stating that -- and I quote, "In view of the correspondence and subsequent discussions between Ministers Goodale and Furey, who were the federal and the Newfoundland Ministers of Energy, the Natural Resources Canadian Minister has decided to exercise his authority

under the Accord legislation with respect to negotiations involving the boundary issue." This is Nova Scotia Annex 5.

And attached to that letter was a copy of some earlier correspondence from Newfoundland to the federal government and a Newfoundland map, none of which Nova Scotia had ever seen.

Six weeks later, January, 1998, the federal Minister formally notified the provinces of his intentions to convene negotiations with a view to resolving this issue. And the Minister's letter noted that no meeting regarding the issue had taken place since the autumn of 1992. We're in 1998, six years later -- no negotiations were ever formally convened. Rather, it was at a meeting of representatives of the two provinces held at the Halifax Airport Inn on April 9, 1998. There were no minutes that we're aware of that were taken and no paper exchanged, but the Nova Scotia officials present heard from Newfoundland's legal counsel, now its Agent. They heard Newfoundland's view regarding how the existing line should have been drawn. And three months later -- yes, Dr. Crawford?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes, go ahead.

MR. FORTIER: This was in April. Three months later, in July, Nova Scotia received a letter from Newfoundland to

which was attached a map and a single page of explanatory note -- that's Nova Scotia Annex 7 -- regarding a proposed line. And the material provided in July of 1998 in no way explained the basis for Newfoundland's objection to the existing line. There was no mention of Newfoundland's basis for the objection to the existing line. And as you will recall, it was prefaced with the words that it was provided without prejudice to any position that Newfoundland and Labrador might take in the future on the location of the line.

So other than this information which I reviewed very briefly, from 1992 to 1998, no explanation of Newfoundland's reasons for disputing the existing boundary was ever presented to Nova Scotia before the arbitration commenced.

Now why do we -- why do I recall this evidence at this hour?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Can I just come back --

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: During the whole of this period, and, indeed -- well, I suppose if we take the moratorium, though it didn't cover the whole area as being significant, in the period from 1992 to 1997, the Accord structures on both sides would have been operating?

MR. FORTIER: Yes, sir.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: But we don't have any evidence that anything occurred in the context of those meetings -- Accord meetings -- which related in any way to the boundary or to resources along it.

MR. FORTIER: We do not -- we do not -- and I would venture the observation that if anything relevant to this adjudication, to this process, had surfaced during those discussions, that either one of the two provinces, of the parties, would have produced it.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: That seems a reasonable inference.

MR. FORTIER: Now why did I recall this evidence, albeit it briefly? Well, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, it is to put the lie to Newfoundland's attempt to lull the members of the Tribunal into the false belief that this arbitration is anything other than the result of Newfoundland's conscious decision in 1998 to invoke for the first time ever the dispute resolution provision of the Accord legislation.

It also highlights the truth, as remarked by the Tribunal itself, during last week's hearings, that no formal claim of any sort to any line -- no formal claim of any sort to any line other than the existing line was ever made by Newfoundland prior to August, 2001 when it produced its Memorial in phase two of this arbitration.

Now --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Well, I mean it's only a quibble, but it's quite clear that what was done in 1998 amounted to a claim, even though it was done without prejudice. In fact, precisely because it was done without prejudice. And as soon as you start saying "without prejudice", then you know, you're talking about --

MR. FORTIER: You know that it's -- you're not making a formal claim, and as the evidence discloses, I guess it took Newfoundland another three years to decide that it would push the line a little further west. You know, the formal claim which is before your Tribunal is the claim which rests on the line which we saw for the first time, which Nova Scotia saw in August of 2001.

Now I also referred briefly to this evidence to underscore, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, the degree to which the two phases of this arbitration are intimately intertwined. Your Tribunal has been established. You have been appointed to resolve a single dispute and to preside over a single arbitration. For good reason, the process was bifurcated, with the question of whether the line dividing the parties' offshore areas had been resolved by binding agreement treated in the first phase.

But the Tribunal's determination of that issue, which Nova Scotia has never, of course, called into question,



did not, as Newfoundland pretends now, render moot the issue of the parties' conduct.

The arguments made by the parties, the conclusions sought by them in the first phase of the arbitration may have been fully addressed in the Tribunal's Phase One Award, but not the evidence of their extensive negotiations, agreements and other conduct concerning a boundary between their respective offshore entitlement -- the very issue to be determined by the Tribunal here.

Throughout phase two, Newfoundland has attempted to mock Nova Scotia's case and has invited the Tribunal to do the same. It has referred to this -- Newfoundland's -- Nova Scotia's case has been referred to as a "rehash of phase one". Well, for its part, Nova Scotia does not consider that the Tribunal made a "hash" of phase one.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I hope we don't find either "hash" or "rehash" on our smorgasbord.

MR. FORTIER: Maybe on your curry.

MR. LEGAULT: French is your mother tongue.

MR. FORTIER: More significantly, Newfoundland and Labrador provides no response to the common sense proposition articulated by your Tribunal in your Award in the first phase that just because the parties' conduct does not reveal evidence of a binding agreement from the perspective of international law, their efforts to reach

agreement were necessarily without legal effect or consequence. In the words of your Tribunal, "The conduct of the parties may be relevant to delimitation in a variety of ways, while stopping short of a dispositive agreement. Such conduct thus remains relevant for the process of delimitation in the second phase of this arbitration."

Now we have never pretended that this passage from your first -- from your Award in phase one provides a complete answer to the analysis of the parties' conduct -- a complete answer to the analysis of the parties' conduct to be made in phase two, but it does provide, at the very least, a point of departure. It provides a benchmark.

And as Dean Russell pointed out last week, the test for the relevance of conduct in a delimitation is not the test for an estoppel, nor is it the test for whether the conduct resulted in the creation of a legally binding agreement. But this has not deterred Newfoundland and Labrador from accusing Nova Scotia of inviting the Tribunal "to undo its phase one decision" and righteously declaring that "it would be a mockery of this arbitration process", we heard on Monday, for the Tribunal to find that the existing line could be the basis of a delimitation "by virtue of the application of a standard less stringent than that of agreement."

Again, this language is deceptively simplistic. How would a non-binding agreement become a binding delimitation? Well in fact, Nova Scotia seeks no more, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, than that which the Tribunal, itself, suggested would be appropriate. That the parties' conduct, as reflected in the consensus reached by the Premiers in '64, reaffirmed by them in '72, and given practical effect in the conduct of successive government from '64 onward be seen for what it is, highly relevant to the process of delimitation.

And the decision, which has been referred to earlier in the Guinea-Guinea Bissau case is instructive.

Very briefly, the Court of Arbitration in that case found that an 1886 Convention between France and Portugal did not delimit a maritime boundary between the parties, but that the description of the first inshore segment of the boundary set out in the instrument was nonetheless, "a factor", it -- the Court should take into account, with a view to a delimitation tending to achieve an equitable result.

And in the 1986 article, the noted publicist, Allan Willis, described the situation in the following words, he said, referring to this passage in the Guinea-Guinea Bissau case, the 1986 treaty, although not applicable de jure, was treated as a relevant circumstance of decisive

important.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Another example I commend to you is the treatment of Eddystone Rock in the Anglo-French case.

MR. FORTIER: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely. So the possibility that this could be true also in our case is vigorously, indeed, emotionally, almost religiously denied by counsel for Newfoundland and Labrador, including my friend, Mr. Willis.

Small wonder then that Newfoundland and Labrador shun all together any reference to the Tribunal's injunction in the phase one Award regarding the relevance in phase two of the parties' conduct. In doing so, Newfoundland not only disavows the conduct of its political leaders and representatives of the past, it seems prepared to do so with respect to the declaration of its counsel in the first phase of the present proceeding. You remember the passages, which my friend, Mr. Bertrand referred to last week. Now when the Agent for Newfoundland and Labrador in March referred to the '64, '72 events, as a present indication of what their boundaries are going to be. The identification of the boundary lines, he said. The defined element of an agreement and so on. That the boundary lines that the provincial premiers themselves obviously considered equitable, could be dismissed out of hand by Newfoundland as being utterly irrelevant to the

present process, the goal of which is to ensure an equitable result, is truly astonishing.

More generally, that the conduct of the parties relating specifically to the creation, the definition and the division of their offshore areas should be, in its view, irrelevant to the delimitation of those same offshore areas is beyond belief. How is it possible that this could be so is a mystery that would baffle even the most experienced international lawyer. I fear that not even Frank and Joe Hardy of The Missing Compass Rose fame, could unravel this mystery.

However, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, any lingering doubts will, I assure you, be solved today. Commencing with the submissions of my friend and colleague, Professor Saunders, who will review the geographic context within which the delimitation will be effected. And unless you have any more questions for me, I ask you to invite Professor Saunders to the podium.

CHAIRMAN: I wonder, Mr. Fortier, if this might not be a good time for a break?

MR. FORTIER: Considering that my colleague does use graphics, I think it would be a good time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: 15 minutes?

MR. FORTIER: That's fine. Thank you.

(Short Recess)

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal. Good morning. I will be addressing again issues of geography, relevant coasts and areas, and briefly, the conflicting proposals of the parties.

A preliminary point I should mention that some of the figures in my package would be out of sequence, if you read the numbers at the bottom. But they ought to match the presentation on the screen, I hope.

If I may begin, Mr. Chairman, before my own main presentation, I would like to respond very briefly to something that was mentioned in the last session, which I had an opportunity to look at. This is a question that because geography is important to some extent in this case -- to some extent, not as important as Newfoundland would make it, not as heavily weighted, but still a factor -- it was suggested that we might expect then that longer coasts would get larger areas. And in general that is exactly what happens in the delimitation, or the general definition of the offshore areas.

So just to set the context, and not to relate this to the precise delimitation line, I do think we want to remember the Newfoundland offshore areas, we calculated with the present line is 1.5 million plus square kilometres. Nova Scotia's is 648,000. The area that Newfoundland requests with its new line, departing from

the existing line, constitutes over 25 percent of Nova Scotia's zone, and just over 10 percent will be added to its own.

It does set some of the context. And in fact the longer coasts do get most of the maritime area, which is ultimately as it should be. The question is how we segment and define those coasts for the microscopic purposes of the delimitation.

Now the submissions of Newfoundland on Monday gave us a great deal to think about over the last day and a half, and a great deal to respond to. We have seen new lines, new calculations of the relevant coasts and the relevant areas, all of which we must address. And we learned a few things. We learned that Newfoundland does not care whether the Nova Scotia coast is much longer, despite their earlier protestations to the contrary. That is good news and we will return to it later.

We now know that it never really mattered at all whether the Gulf of Maine was actually identical to the geography of this case in the inner sector. It's just an incidental issue now. We got a much better idea of just how many different versions of the immutable objective coastal geography Newfoundland had to try on before they came up with what they viewed as a winner. And we learned that the Gulf of Maine boundary was in its effect,

something called a mainland equidistance boundary. A fact concealed by the Chamber in their decision.

And finally, one last go through this, we learned that shipwrecks were relevant to maritime boundary delimitation, but only because they provide a rough and ready indicator of how far an island is from the coast for purposes of deciding whether to give that island effect. And I will confess, I missed the subtlety of that the first time around.

But there are also, of course, inevitably, things that were not addressed by the speakers. Some of these, not all, will be raised in my presentation today. Examples include the following, we did not hear why, if the geographic configuration of the inner sector in the Gulf of Maine was both different and irrelevant, as we have now heard, Newfoundland found it necessary to represent it as being essentially the same, to the extent of creating a pink non-coast at the back of the Cabot Strait.

We do not know yet when Newfoundland first tested the equidistance line, either in its inner sector, out to 46 north and found it wanting. We know it wasn't in the Memorial. But apparently it has been done. Or in the words of Mr. Colson, just why and how it was demonstrated that the Newfoundland line in the inner sector, as he put it, could beat equidistance. What exactly was it about



the result with the median line that resulted in this conclusion?

We heard no more of Newfoundland's supposed authority for the proposition that coasts face only in one precise direction for the purposes of establishing their relevance. Newfoundland presented one authority that might have supported them. If I could have the next. Thank you. Supported them in the notion that a coast with the slight coastal direction change that might be identified at Canso could lead to this consequence. And that was Tunisia-Libya. But Newfoundland offered no explanation for the crucial factual omissions from their account of that case. The failure to mention both the Tunisia-Italy boundary and the Libya-Malta situation, both of which must have affected the choice of coasts.

We never heard an explanation from Newfoundland of just what it is that overlapping maritime projections are meant to reflect, if it's not some measure of the overlapping legal entitlements. If it is a subset of that area, which it appears to be, they do not explain exactly by what criteria it is limited.

And finally, if quantitative proportionality is not a mandatory test of equity, a point made by Mr. Colson on Monday, and one with which we agree, and in fact we have made it before, and that it is difficult to apply it in

open seaward areas, why has Newfoundland relied upon it as the sole test of the equity of the result? And why in their Memorial were they sure of the opposite position? Where they said in the following passages, it was pointed out that it was accepted in the cases that a substantial disproportion between lengths of coasts and areas allocated would be a circumstance calling for correction, it is modified by substantial, but the following, in making such a proportionality calculation, the area allocated as a result of a delimitation has to be defined. That is Newfoundland's case. It isn't necessarily or doesn't have to be ours.

In any event, with the time available, I propose to address the remaining issues under the following heads. First, I would like to carry out a brief analysis of the new lines and the new justifications presented as examples only by Newfoundland. And a review of what we feel is left of their original proposal.

Second, I would like to deal -- rephrase that -- I have to deal with the vexatious question of relevant coasts and areas and proportionality, as dealt with by Newfoundland in a new form, and by Nova Scotia. And in response to questions raised by the Tribunal, and by Newfoundland, perhaps to try to and find some unification or unity in President Guillaume words.

And third, I want to deal with the question of nonencroachment, as well as cut-off and the connection to the baguette and the coast of southwest Newfoundland. On this point, I will attempt to deal with Professor Crawford's hypothetical about the impact of the notional three independent states with no history of conduct. Which I will say for the first, and not the last time, that we do not accept the premise of the hypothetical.

If I may begin, in a series of scenarios presented on Monday, scenarios which were not intended as proposals, of course, Professor McRae showed us something of the reasoning that went into the Newfoundland claim and we think exposed some of the difficulties in that fundamental approach.

As Newfoundland has it on this figure, all roads lead to Rome. And, of course, we have resisted the temptation of placing Rome on the Laurentian Sub-basin. Now let's have a very quick look at these options presented by Newfoundland on Monday, all of which demonstrate, in their view, the irresistible geographic attraction of the line that they have proposed.

First, we have scenario one, which they label the macro-geographic approach. I should note the titles do get better as they go along. Here in the inner sector, Newfoundland has dropped its reliance on the Connaigre

Head line, and substituted a line which runs from Cape Ray to the Burin Peninsula directly.

In fact, this line was used in the original Newfoundland offer, without prejudice, in 1998, and before Newfoundland discovered that there was a coast at Connaigre Head and developed the second bisector approach for the inner portion. Our reaction to that line then was the same as it is now. St. Pierre is part of the coastal direction, if we can live with that as a general proposition. But apart from that, this line is about as close as you can get to being 100 percent water and still touch coastal points. It's clear the justification of a bay closing line is not going to work here. It runs for quite some distance well seaward of the islands of any general direction of the coastline and utilizes the peninsula. Fair enough.

In the outer sector, we have a new general direction closing line -- directional line in Newfoundland running from Cape Ray to Burin -- across Burin and hitting Cape Race. And also a long line on the Nova Scotia side. And this is compared -- these coastal directions are compared, this time for Nova Scotia a one directional line only, which seems to have been possible contrary to Newfoundland's other assertions.

But why change the coastal direction in Newfoundland?

And why compare the combined inner and outer Newfoundland coasts to Nova Scotia's outer coast only? If we turn this around -- and this is an alternative, we are not suggesting this, there are flaws in this model too -- we have this model combining the Newfoundland coast, but applying it to the inner coast in Nova Scotia.

Now there is a method employed here to average out the coastal directions. Quite simply, the areas of water inside the line are by mathematical operation equal to the areas of land that stick out beyond it. It averages out the coastal direction on both sides to the same principle.

So we establish those coastal directions, which runs on our side by chance, as it turns out, down to Sable, if you extend the line. The bisector, shown here in red, amazingly enough approximates the 135 line, which is shown in black. All done with a recognizable sort of method.

So let's move on to scenario two from Professor McRae, what he calls the outer rings. The inner sector in this case is done on the same basis as the last one, and we still have the Burin to Cape Ray line, which is problematic. The outer, here on the right, has a perpendicular to the closing line, but without the further shift to the west, although part of the same effect has been achieved by changing the inner coastal direction to land at Burin, but pushes the line to the west in a

different way but not in the same way as was done with the 1998 -- with the 2001 line.

Now essentially this is the '98 proposal as far as we can tell, showing that the outer perpendicular, however, is on a azimuth that is also enbuttreassing this, the average of the two short outer coasts of Nova Scotia here, and Newfoundland here. This time they have changed the coasts, they are not using the longer coasts and they have changed the direction of it.

Given that this same justification is used for the current Newfoundland proposal, this outer coast average justification -- I will return to it later, if I may.

Scenario three. Scenario three, Newfoundland calls the broken wing. And this one is a little more confusing, but what they have done is compare the Nova Scotia outer coast from Canso to Scatarie with the coasts from Cape Ray to Burin here. I'm not sure -- we are not sure why, but to bisect that, and sure enough you once again end up with something like the same line.

Now for us, choosing the angles you need, you get the result that you want, but we can turn that on its head. If we can have the obvious next question that arises from this, why not try it the other way and use the inner Nova Scotia coast and the outer Newfoundland coast? And we get this red line running down beside the green line, which is

the 124.74 line. Perhaps we finally explained that 125 line on the 1964 map. No more meaningful, no more useful.

Here is scenario four, they call St. Paul's cake and ice-cream. And it shows the Nova Scotia coastal direction running to St. Paul, not something we rely on -- not something we need to rely on because we use what amounts to a median method in that area. This adds nothing of importance, but it makes the outer sector, in this scenario the bisector of the outer wings here and here. And of course to get the right angle this time, Newfoundland has tried out a third coastal direction for Nova Scotia, this time from Scatarie to Sambro.

And again, having chosen the angles they need, they get the result they expect.

But there is of course another option that never appears in Newfoundland's approaches, and we will call it scenario five. If, as Newfoundland has argued from time to time, this geography is similar to the Gulf of Maine, perhaps we should forget about both outer coasts for a moment, as they did in the Gulf of Maine, and use an option based on the inner coasts. This is an option, in fact, that I mentioned last week in argument.

Here we have a median line in the inner sector, justified of course on the basis of the opposite coast configuration. And here we have the bisector to the inner

coasts as currently defined by Newfoundland in their Maine proposal. Why? Because on the logic of the Gulf of Maine, the perpendicular was nothing more than the bisector of a straight coast at the back of the Gulf. Here the coasts are not straight, they are angular. And this is the bisector of the inner coasts.

There is the 64 line. This then on a Gulf of Maine reasoning, no stranger than that proposed by Newfoundland, is perhaps the claim we did not make but could have made, as referred to by Professor Crawford last week.

But in the end what do these scenarios and our critiques, as well, in our fairness, really demonstrate? What this shows first, I think, is the process of reasoning that went into the geographic construction of Newfoundland's real proposal. That is that supposedly objective immutable facts of geography are subject to a virtually unlimited range of changing definitions and characterizations as the argument might require.

This is an approach that is in fact at the heart of the subjective use of geography. And it's the kind of exercise that I think most people would admit we have seen before the International Court in many cases. It is this unpredictable, uncertain use of geography as a component of equitable principles that gives resonance to the desire of President Guillaume and others for some degree of



certainty in the manner in which geography is used.

And President Guillaume remember, was not complaining about the uncertainty of conduct, which can be referred to in historical record, nor of resource location in Jan Mayen.

If I can return to Professor McRae's opening analogy when he said that all roads lead to Rome. What he was forgetting is that the reason all roads led to Rome was simply because that was where they started. And if they didn't start there when they were built, that's where they were headed. The builders had an objective in mind and in every one of its scenarios, so did Newfoundland.

So where does that leave us with Newfoundland's actual proposed line, the final result of its process of trial and error. Our criticism of the Newfoundland approach, particularly as related to their reliance on the Gulf of Maine, were addressed on Friday, and these still stand. I propose to recap these only in brief and to move on to the responses that came from Newfoundland on Monday.

By way of review then. We pointed out the following difficulties with the approach of Newfoundland to the use of methods from the Gulf of Maine. And it was the methods, remember, that they adopted, not the equitable criterion that was applied in that case. First, the basic geography of the inner sector is entirely different, and

it was that geography that made the method appropriate.

The rectilinear formation of the Gulf, which the Chamber called an essential requirement for the use of the perpendicular, the transition from adjacency to opposition that justified the second line, the presence of inner coasts that defined the delimitation area and no outer coasts that were relevant, especially given the triangle established by the parties as the terminal area, none of these are present here.

I will come back to the responses of Newfoundland in a moment.

Second, a related point. There is no backing coast that provides the parallel to the closing line. The closing line Newfoundland presents has no parallel at all.

Third, the perpendicular line drawn in the Gulf of Maine paralleled the parties' earlier claims, not here of course. Fourth, the length of the line, the presence of the triangle, prevented the kinds of distortions that result here with a line of almost 700 kilometres from the closing and no limit as to where it might land.

And finally, the Chamber in the Gulf of Maine kept an eye on what its line did with respect to ensuring reasonable resource access for the parties. And that included the speculative prospective oil and gas areas. And we know, of course, that was not a concern of

Newfoundland's in drawing this line.

And how was this responded to on Monday? Professor McRae minimized our concerns about the lack of similarities, geographic similarities with the Gulf of Maine. In particular, the geographic configuration of the area.

We find this to be at least puzzling in a case that depends entirely on geography, geographic differences from one case to another make no difference to the outcome? Professor McRae extended this view even to the question of the rectangular formation of the Gulf in these words, when one gets beyond the issue of rectangular configurations, the boundaries in the corner and the Bay of Fundy, there are several lessons from the Gulf of Maine. But with respect, you don't get beyond the rectangular formation that easily, not for methods, the use of the methods at least.

The Chamber saw it as an essential requirement for its choice of methods, particularly the perpendicular. And yes, there are other lessons to be drawn. But in the first round of orals, the lessons that Newfoundland drew from the Gulf of Maine were entirely based on the methods that could be applied, not on anything else. So having dropped the first line of lessons, what does Newfoundland now take from the Gulf of Maine?

Professor McRae noted that the Chamber recognized that when emerging from a closed into an open area, methods need to change. And they did say that effectively for the delimitation they were confronted with. They stated no general rule. More important, they never said that two methods could not result in a line that was effectively unidirectional as it emerged from the inner area because theirs was very close to that, as the line developed by the parties in this case was. And indeed, as is the line developed by Newfoundland. But more on that later.

Next we heard that coastal length is important and that's a lesson from the Gulf of Maine, and yes, from other cases as well. But not necessarily definitive. And it was used in the context of an inner sector division that assumed by its method an equal division of areas. So the maritime part of a comparison of coast to area was, in the Chamber's view, already taken care of by the method, not so in the way the method is applied here with the inter sector coasts, as we have shown.

What else? Professor McRae told us that the Chamber in the Gulf of Maine recognized that the boundary inside must be effected with a view to the outside. And of course they said this, as already noted. But they said it in a case where there were only inner coasts to consider and the outer area was severely constrained by the prior

agreement of the parties.

They said nothing about the kind of manipulation we find here affecting vast areas of seaward extension. And furthermore, one of the things they kept in mind as they projected into the outer area explicitly were the resources at stake, which Newfoundland says this Tribunal must deny.

Finally, Professor McRae suggested that the Gulf of Maine held, and I quote from page 751 of the orals, "The coastal geography of the exit point that must govern the line..." -- "That it is the coastal geography of the exit point that must govern the line as it leaves the inner area and as it moves to the transition to the outer area." But really, as we saw in Mr. Colson's very thorough presentation of last week, it was the geography of the area leading up to the exit point, that, in many ways, governed not the points themselves, or two points, as chosen by Newfoundland.

And, in fact, it was the geography of the area at large, the backing coast and parallel, the rectangular formation, that made possible the use of the closing line in the first place, all of which I have noted is not the case here.

These may be lessons from the Gulf of Maine that Professor McRae has cited, but they are not lessons to be

applied by rote. And in any event, they are not lessons, at least not the same lessons, that Newfoundland applied in the first round of orals where it focused almost entirely on a simple transference of the methods from Gulf of Maine, methods which we have shown were so dependent on the specific facts of the case, which, in the end, is the real lesson of the Gulf of Maine. The criteria and the methods which must be derived from those criteria have to be determined in the factual context that you are operating in.

There was one other issue emphasized by Newfoundland on Monday that I would like to address, and it did appear in the Memorial, as well. This is the fact that if you take Newfoundland's designated coastal wings, the outer coasts, and bisect the angles, as they call it, you end up with the same azimuth as their perpendicular. Now we have already had an inside view to the kinds of trial and error that are possible behind Newfoundland's various scenarios, and this may be another example, but there are bigger problems.

First, if Newfoundland is now relying on the bisector of an angle created by the coastal -- by the outer coasts to create the perpendicular and not just the -- not the closing line at all or not just the closing line, it's going in a direction that's contrary to that stated in the

Gulf of Maine and Tunisia-Libya and in Guinea-Guinea Bissau, all of which recognize the need for a fairly substantial stretch of straight coast to apply a perpendicular.

As to the use of a bisector -- not a perpendicular, but a bisector in a situation of adjacency for angular coasts separated across a body of water, that's essentially unsupported in the Newfoundland case. We're not aware of a case in which it's been done. The closest might be the inner portion of the Gulf of Maine, but the coasts actually became adjacent because of the land terminus, although the boundary didn't start there.

And in any event, it all leads to the same problems as those identified by Mr. Willis in 1986, where he points out the difficulty that leads to the need to take a macro-geographical perspective, and sometimes, he said, on a continental scale.

To give an example, a perpendicular out to 50 miles from the coast may look right if it is backed by a straight coastline of approximately the same length, but a perpendicular out to the 200-mile limit would normally require the establishment of a general coastal direction of a far greater length.

And here, of course, we are talking about a line that goes out 696 kilometres -- whatever that is in nautical

miles.

Furthermore, it must be noted that the use of two points, or even a short segment of outer coast on either side, effectively results in a line that is equidistant to those two points, as shown here, or the immediately surrounding coastal front, which is very short. And the Tribunal will recall that Newfoundland has identified in its Memorial the distorting effect of equidistance simply applied when there are long lines to run seaward, including, for example, the fact that incidental points can distort the line further out.

But the situation is not improved when one simply chooses the controlling points and then draws what is effectively an equidistance line between those two. It's no better than the general method -- just has the advantage of choice.

In the end, all of Professor McRae's scenarios, and, indeed, we think the entire construction of Newfoundland's line highlights nothing so much as the subjectivity, the uncertainty behind President Guillaume's concerns about the use of geography in equitable delimitation.

If I could turn briefly to the role of equidistance, its appropriateness or inappropriateness, its possible use in this delimitation, I would note that Newfoundland, after opening with Mr. Colson saying that we were making



innuendos beyond our knowledge, that we wanted an equidistance line, spent a good part of the past week telling the Tribunal in none too subtle fashion not to apply this, while showing you versions of equidistance with no effect for Sable Island. I'll have more to say on the practical impact of equidistance in a hypothetical situation later. But for Newfoundland, of course, the only issue with respect to equidistance is that of islands. For now, because it has not really been rebutted, I would reiterate what I said last week. Islands are not the only issue here. I did not, of course, say what Professor McRae suggested I did; that the Newfoundland peninsulas are, I quote, "a mere image of Sable". What I did say was that the impact of peninsulas cannot be ignored. When the outer basepoints of Newfoundland from Burin out are controlled, they are all controlled on a few peninsulas, and indeed, the St. Marys basepoint falls on St. Marys Caves to rocks offshore, but within the territorial sea.

Now this impact of the peninsulas is simply enhanced by the added effect, as I said last week, of the east-west orientation of Newfoundland compared to the southwest to northeast orientation of Nova Scotia. The tip of Nova Scotia essentially points at the middle of Newfoundland, leaving clearly the outer coast of Newfoundland in an

advantageous position with respect to equidistance.

That's the general structure of the region, not just one island.

But what of President Guillaume's comments respecting a possible presumptive effect for an equidistance line in a delimitation such as this, subject to modification for special circumstances?

The history in the cases was thoroughly addressed by Mr. Colson on Monday, and I do not propose to repeat that ground. Mr. Fortier may return to some of it later, depending -- what I would add, and I have to say this, is really my humble opinion is that President Guillaume is both right and wrong. Yes, it does appear that in cases like Jan Mayen and Libya-Malta, and for all their protestations, the Court was close to granting some sort of presumptive effect to the median line, but those cases were explicit, still, in stating that the opposite relationship of the coasts was a factor in making the median line appropriate. I think that's an important limitation.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: That's certainly true for Jan Mayen, which was, of course, an opposite case. What he said was that -- and there are lots of other would say that in the opposite situation you would normally start from the equidistance line unless there are good reasons --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Yes, that's right.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- very good reasons not to. I don't think anyone really has any doubt that it's a sort of a presumption in opposite coasts unless there are good -- unless there are very good reasons, but what he said was that the use in Qatar-Bahrain, in the outer area in Qatar-Bahrain --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- was really the extension of it. That's, perhaps, the most interesting thing that he did say.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I stress, of course, that -- I mean I drew your attention to it simply because I had read it and I didn't want you not to know that, as it were.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Well, it's going to be important later. I'm assuming that this Tribunal you constructed has read it, as well.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: The point is this, that he's not speaking in judicial capacity and it's not --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- it's not holy writ. It's simply a view -- an informed view because he was in the cases, but nonetheless, a view of what's going on.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Absolutely. I agree completely, and

perhaps I can take off from that point, that I think in their heart of hearts, the presumptive effect that an opposition situation, whether they say it or not, seems to be what is happening.

But with all respect to the President of the Court, and maybe I can turn to the Qatar-Bahrain situation -- I think that it is premature to expand his idea into situations of what I might call "broad adjacency". And in that situation, it was quite constrained. The outer portion was very short, and still, one would argue, almost within a zone of opposition. I think perhaps he is, if not on a frolic of his own, at least ahead of the race, to some extent, on the adjacency situation.

In other cases, however, and this is perhaps the other aspect of where this comes in -- it's noted by Mr. Colson, "It would appear that tribunals, even in adjacency situations, have been in some situations, not always, at least comparing the line they have developed to equidistance." That's a different issue, although, and again, he's quite correct -- as Mr. Colson pointed out, no real certainty is found as to how they have gone about dealing with it once they have made the comparison.

This was explicit in the Gulf of Maine, where there was comparison of the orientation of the chosen line to what had been the equidistance proposal. But we would

just say, and this is in passing, that this line that was presented by Newfoundland as the mainland equidistant line, presumably submitted as part of the fall back campaign for no-effect equidistance, was based on three basepoints on each side, one of them, ironically, in the middle of an island, seven miles offshore, as far as we can calculate it -- Grand Desert Island, and not even on the coast, and indeed, the first two appear to have been chosen because the midpoint between them falls on the line, which is not exactly how we would go about calculating an equidistance line, but this is a byplay.

The real issue is the application of the concept in Gulf of Maine, and yes, they did consider it. I don't think they applied it.

The real issue, the broader issue, and President Guillaume's concerns, can be brought in some ways to this case. In this respect, I note two things.

First, out to 46 north, we apply a line that is a simplified median line. Most of the area is, on the definition of either party, within the area of coastal opposition, and we feel it's sustainable to 46 north, in any event, if not a little further. So we fulfil Guillaume's dream out to this point. Newfoundland has offered nothing of consequence within this area to suggest a modification.

Second, in the Jan Mayen case to which President Guillaume referred approvingly, the line was adjusted to deal with resource location and access. We do not --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And distance of coasts.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: And distance and coastal length.

Absolutely. The point I'm making is that although there is some conflict within Guillaume's comments because he refers elsewhere to special circumstances as primarily geographical, at the same time he refers approvingly to Jan Mayen, and it used the fishery resource location as one of the special circumstances, and he certainly doesn't deny conduct, either. In our case, with respect to conduct, we apply it quite strongly. With respect to resource location, we don't apply it to ask for a shift in the line, but rather a check on the line to find that our lines comes out just fine.

But in any event, the point that I draw from this is that President Guillaume must not have seen his search for certainty and unification as excluding in any way consideration such as resource location as a reason for departing from equidistance, even if you take it to his lengths in the adjacent areas.

But as I said, I think that in situations of long seaward adjacency, he is perhaps ahead of the rest of the Court.

For these cases, these other long seaward cases, I think the best view was that essentially stated by Mr. Colson. The Courts will look at the equidistance line, if only as in the Gulf of Maine, to check the orientation. It's possible this was a factor in Tunisia-Libya, as well, in the outer sector, with the dog leg. But this would, of course, come together with consideration of other factors, such as conduct and resources.

So here we see the existing line and the equidistance line are essentially in parallel, quite closely so in parts. And we know that the strong history of conduct is important, and we would argue that resource location and proportionality both support a movement from equidistance to the line proposed by Nova Scotia. So, although we may not agree with the requirement to do it in the outer area, we are blessed in that we could if we had to.

Let me turn to relevant coasts and proportionality. To begin with, our fundamental position, and I don't need to argue it in detail, remains unchanged. The proper approach is to take account of the overlapping entitlements. And in the present case, because this is an offshore area, that means not the traditional approaches to continental shelf outer limits, but the criteria of Article 76 represented here, a technical representation that has never been rebutted by Newfoundland.

So I would emphasize first that our position remains unchanged. But I also note that the Tribunal had a number of remaining questions on this issue. And, I note further, that Professor McRae has now introduced a number of alternative visions of the relevant coasts, and the relevant areas, which I will address in a moment. These require a response.

Before considering those issues, I propose to deal very briefly with a couple of preliminary points. First, I would remind the Tribunal again that it was Newfoundland that relied entirely upon the quantitative proportionality test as its sole measure of the equity of the result. If the Tribunal believes that proportionality is difficult to quantify, or even to apply in a meaningful way in these circumstances, then Newfoundland is left with nothing to fall back on.

Newfoundland has never really defended their vision of how proportionality should be measured as a partial zone cropped by arbitrary limits. It has focused its attack on Nova Scotia's use of the legal definition of the seaward limits.

Second, and briefly, I submit to the Tribunal that whatever particular limits, especially lateral limits, it might place on the relevant area, they must nonetheless be linked, even if not perfectly, to the concept of



overlapping legal entitlements.

On Monday, both Mr. Willis and Mr. Colson referred to the Jan Mayen case. Mr. Willis referred to the fact that the Court had identified different areas as they did, and as was shown in our diagrams, including the overlapping 200 nautical mile entitlements. And then said the following.

"But when it came to the actual delimitation method..." at paragraph 89, and following, "...the focus was on the actual area of overlapping claims, which it divided into three sectors by joining up the turning points on the median line, and the 200 mile claim, the Danish 200 mile claim."

Quite true, except for one thing. Mr. Willis missed an intervening step. In paragraph 64, not paragraph 89, the Court began to first consider the prima facie value of the median line. And it described it as, and I quote, "equidistant also from the two 200 mile limits." And as a line which may, quote, "prima facie be regarded as effecting an equitable division of the overlapping area."

It went on in the subsequent paragraphs to modify the area, to account for the special circumstances of the case which have already been referred to. But the starting point of their inquiry was the division of the full overlapping entitlements by the median line, which was

prima facie an equitable division in the case.

And the practical application of the area referred to in paragraph 59 is, though briefly, found in paragraph 69.

But they didn't use it in the end. They did move to a different method. And I don't want to replay this debate. We have been fully heard on the issue. Newfoundland added nothing new, other than what I have just referred to on the subject.

What was new, however, was the introduction by Newfoundland of new conceptions of how it might constitute a relevant area, and relevant coasts. And we must respond to these, as well as to the Tribunal's remaining questions from last week.

You will recall Newfoundland's relevant area extended here to the continental margin, the inverted cone that it represents highlights the fundamental problem of Newfoundland's use of perpendiculars from localized coastal directions to determine relevant areas far out to sea. Because the narrowing of the zone, as you move seaward, cannot be taken even as a reasonable reflection of the original broader coastal front. Even on Newfoundland's own theory.

In fact, the continental margin, because of the geometry, is longer than the coasts. If anything, the relevant maritime area should be broader as we move

seaward, if all areas are to be counted, which is what Newfoundland wants to avoid.

Now, as I said, Newfoundland presented a number of new versions of the relevant area, some with 200 mile zones, some with the continental margin. These are found, figures 119 to 124, of Newfoundland's orals.

We briefly reviewed these, and are unsure of some of them. For example, in these two figures, 120 and 122, we find that Nova Scotia turns out to have the same calculated maritime area in both figures, despite the fact that the outer margin is included in one and not the other, which is an impossibility. And on our arithmetic, the total maritime area in percentages on figure 122, adds up to 102.6 percent of the relevant area.

Similarly, some figures are restricted to 200, some are shown in an outer edge version, and it seems to bounce back and forth.

But in the end there is one key point that emerges. Only one of these figures introduced by Newfoundland attributes any maritime area to the coasts of Newfoundland past the perpendicular drop from Cape Race in the east. And that is figure 126, shown here.

It uses what is stated to be the 350 nautical mile arcs, we think it's an approximation of those, not accurate. But this is the one figure that begins to show

some disproportion in favour of Newfoundland, even on Newfoundland's description of its own coasts as including all of the areas behind St. Pierre.

Now Professor McRae, page 861 of the transcripts, mentioned this test, but said it did not affect the proportionality results. It does affect the proportionality results, in fact.

And of course, the 350 nautical mile limit, contrary to what Mr. Willis may or may not have said, is not the outer limit, the outer edge of the continental margin. So this figure, by going to 350, begins to show the problem, the proportion starts to reverse, but it doesn't solve it, because it stops at 350. We're left with the same difficulty.

The problem is the one we identified in this figure, which we all enjoyed so much last time around, so I am going to use it again. But there is a point to it this time.

It points out the problem, even if we accept, for purposes of argument only, that the relevant coast is defined first in isolation, you are still left with the further question, how do you then attribute maritime area to that coast for the purposes of comparison or relevant area, if you wish to take that step? Especially where, as here, a key coastal point is on the end of a coast with

substantial maritime area adjacent to it, as here? How does that get allocated?

Simple radial projection? Frontal projection? A mixture? What is the option? Because it has to be decided.

How much of the area should be credited to the coasts, as it were, fairly reflects what maritime area is really being allocated to that coast, which is what proportionality is all about. Because the perpendicular is used on the end of a coast rather than in the middle, substantial maritime areas go unaccounted for, and no comparison of like to like is possible.

So, given Newfoundland's suggestions, new suggestions, as to possible relevant coasts for Nova Scotia, which it made in oral argument on Monday, and again, not in any means sacrificing our main argument, this is for the sake of argument only, how can these limited coasts and areas be defined while still respecting the extent of entitlement to the outer margin, which ties back to the definition of the offshore area?

Here we have 200 nautical mile arc from Newfoundland, one of the methods suggested on Monday for limiting the extent of these areas by Newfoundland. This arc, although it actually comes from up here, can be extended to define a point to the Newfoundland coast. Two hundred has no

magic, it's one option.

If that point, however, is related to Sable nearby, we see that there is a certain logic, that things may not go past Sable. We're playing, in a sense, Newfoundland's own game here. But a little more, we hope, logically.

This arc defines a point on the coast which gives us these results and coasts. Now on the Newfoundland side, we run from Cape Ray to Race. But consistent with the reasoning in Canada-France, and with Newfoundland's not being able to project through land, but allowing them to project through water, including other territorial waters, we limit the coast at Connaigre Head. The rest of the area behind is taken up by the boundary with St. Pierre.

So how do we define the direction seaward from Cape Race? Well, one option. This figure shows the total arc on a radial projection to stop at 200, but it would continue out in the same way. The total arc controlled by that one coastal point. That is, this is the arc beyond which other points start to control on either side of Cape Race.

But, to allow even more for the influence on that maritime area from the north, to be cautious, we bisect that area. Bisect the arc. Cut it in half. Creating this directional line from Cape Race to the outer edge of the margin.

Now, we do not agree with this limitation. We don't think it's necessary. We think our definition of Article 76 entitlements is sufficient. But it does restrict the area, while giving at least some weight to the notion of how the entitlement must be determined in this case.

On the Nova Scotia side, if we assume that Sable forms a natural blocking point, and that there's at least some reason to say that between Sable and its own coast, home coast, the areas are more directly within Nova Scotia's projection from both sides, as it were, then it's appropriate to join the mainland point to the island.

From Sable to the margin, and again, this is not the line we would choose, took Newfoundland's method. The line from Sable Island to the margin is drawn perpendicular to the general direction of the mainland coasts. Which in a mid-coastal point might reflect the method of arcs as well, because the next point immediately takes over. What are we left with? We have these coastal lengths on both sides. And finally, we have the existing line and their respective areas accorded to the parties set out in this figure.

The result of this approach, building on Newfoundland's suggestion of a 200-mile arc, and its new willingness to accept an area to the outer edge of the margin, is a result that is roughly proportional,

certainly to the degree that would be acceptable when measuring such a large area.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Mr. Saunders, I'm sure you don't know this figure but just on the hypothesis, if you do, what would you do if you joined Lamaline Shag Rock and Connaigre Head?

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: You would add 77 nautical miles and whatever that is in kilometres. It affects the proportion slightly but on the scale of operation with the offshore areas there would be a disproportion in favor of Nova Scotia, but in that we are looking for a significant disproportion, we don't feel that it affects it significantly. We could provide those numbers though, if you wish.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Surely the disproportion would be in favor of Newfoundland, if you are --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: That's what I meant, yes. Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: But it wouldn't -- what you are saying --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: I meant in favor of Nova Scotia in the sense of allocation.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. Okay, fine. It wouldn't be -- it still wouldn't be significant looking at in some global sense?

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Not in the kind of macro sense that has



been talked about here.

Now in the end, even on this approach, merged as it is with one of the options presented by Newfoundland for the selection of Nova Scotia's areas, and with even a partial inclusion of the large areas generated by the south coast of Newfoundland off to the east, the result with the existing line is equitable to the extent the proportionality is even required as a test in these circumstances. Recalling, of course, that Nova Scotia relies as well on the relationship of good faith conduct to the line and the factor of access to resources in determining the equitableness of the result.

If I may turn now to nonencroachment and cut-off. Last week I suggested that while it should be considered particularly as a factor in assessing the equitableness of a result, the general principle of nonencroachment was generally of limited utility in an operational sense in choosing a line. Its companion piece cut-off can have a more direct application, I would submit. And I would like to turn to that in a moment.

And I noted that where parties are in a situation of adjacency and they share the same shelf, as here by agreement of the parties, equitable principles derived from non prolongation, which includes nonencroachment as a category, would not be of direct application in the

selection of the line. A position supported, we would argue, by Tunisia-Libya and to some extent Guinea-Guinea Bissau.

Now Professor McRae and Professor -- and Mr. Willis -- I am starting to call him Professor Willis, since -- I don't know if that's a compliment or not. But the writing is professorial.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. It seems the more he gets cited as an authority the more difficult it is.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: My mother always said no one is perfect, but that worried me. She was usually referring to me, but that's -- Professor McRae and Mr. Willis both returned to this point and they argued for a continued usefulness for both nonencroachment and cut-off in a practical, not the general sense, that is as a choice of method.

And Mr. Willis noted that the method was alive and kicking, and that its use to, as he put it, to control the method of delimitation had been -- and I quote -- "decisive in a number of significant cases". Furthermore, that it had not been restricted to areas relatively close to the coast.

In support, he raised the North Seas, St. Pierre, Guineau-Guinea Bissau. But of course the North Seas is where we started, that was the point. We indicated that

later developments changed the situation. In St. Pierre, as Professor McRae pointed out last week, was decided on its peculiar facts and has not been taken, as far as we know, to stand for much of anything as a general proposition about nonencroachment far from a coast. It's a very odd case.

And Guinea-Guinea Bissau on the other hand, was a case of true potential cut-off, enclavement, to which I will return in a moment, because I think it's a related but a different issue. It says nothing in what Mr. Willis said to reverse the general position that we stated about the limited usefulness of moving directly from a statement of nonencroachment, in general, to the choice of a line in particular. And that's what they do in the west especially, by excluding any Nova Scotia presence at all west of the -- sorry, east of the baguette on the basis of this principle alone. Our view, based on the cases after North Seas, is the principle -- we didn't say it was dead, but if the horse they are flogging isn't dead, it's at least not feeling well at this point. And I think that we can say it hasn't been used in the context that's suggested, direct choice of a line from such a generalized principle, except in very special circumstances.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And it would be very rare that a principle such as cut-off would dictate a line. The

question is whether its use as a basis of criticising a line?

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Yes, I agree. And that's how Nova Scotia suggests it be used. Newfoundland on the other hand does actually use it at least in excluding Nova Scotia from the east as a direct method, in a sense, and proposes it to some extent as a very direct basis for choice of method, if not the precise direction of the line to the west as well.

But what was notable on Monday, and I think perhaps in response to questions including -- I think twice Mr. Legault raised the question of the difference between nonencroachment and cut-off -- was the degree to which Newfoundland switched emphasis from simple nonencroachment east of the baguette well out to sea, to the issue of what it calls the cut-off in the west. And I think we need to address this squarely.

There are some fundamental difficulties with the way Newfoundland perceives the cut-off in this area, in our view, partly connected to the fact that these are provinces and they have an entire zone and Newfoundland has access to the rest of it, but more specifically. In the North Seas the impact of the equidistance line on Germany was that it would have no further seaward projection in the region. On the other side of the other

zones that were involved, there was no further German continental shelf, that was it. Similarly, the potential enclavement -- and this is where we come to real cut-off in Guinea-Guineau Bissau, meant to further projection seaward could be a fundamentally inequitable result requiring drastic responses.

Here in this case, there are two important differences. First of all, Newfoundland has other coasts in the immediate vicinity that do project seaward in an unobstructed manner with no impinging third party presence and in fact a huge entitlement. Indeed, on Newfoundland's theory, remember, the entire south coast is one unit. The unit represented by the south coast in Newfoundland's view, certainly seems to have plenty of room to project seaward. There is no cut-off if you take it as a unit, on Newfoundland's argument.

What Newfoundland is really arguing is this, every segment of a coast must be free from cut-off regardless of its location, although of course, that does not seem to apply to Cape Breton here, the inner coast of Cape Breton. And also we would note that Nova Scotia's protection from cut-off, 277 kilometres on this arrow and 398 kilometres on this arrow, is substantially less if we allow any weight for proximity in any way at all.

More fundamental though is this notion that every

piece of a coast is entitled to a full projection seaward. And Newfoundland has not really supported that segmentation idea by reference to any cases at all.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I mean, I think that's a slight over statement of Newfoundland's position. Their position is that you have got to consider every segment of a coast and minimize the cut-off to the extent possible.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: At times they say that in the statement but in the effect what they insist upon is the ability to project seaward down this line. So the method in fact reflects I think -- I would argue a more absolute approach to it.

Now if I can return to this question actually. This assumption -- we will change the assumption here -- relates to the fact that Newfoundland's argument on cut-off depends entirely on the presence of the baguette. Without it it would be apparent that Newfoundland -- the south west coast of Newfoundland does project seaward, albeit at an angle, well to the south east. Indeed, using this assumption, this figure shows an angular seaward projection maintaining the breadth of the coasts without cut-off to the edge of the continental margin using the existing boundary.

It assumes projection through the water of the baguette, not through the land mass of St. Pierre, to be

consistent. And both parties have agreed that projection through another territory's water for these purposes is possible. We heard this again from Mr. Colson on Monday with reference to the Channel Island situation. But of course, Newfoundland's entire assumption about the role of its eastern coast to the west is based on this as well.

So what it comes down to is this, unless we can accept that projection, coastal projection can only be in one absolute direction, and you must ignore everything to the side, a position which I think Newfoundland I think has abandoned, then there is no reason to restrict our consideration of the seaward entitlements of Newfoundland's south coast to one direction and one direction only, that simply predetermines the answer to the question. If you only run their coast down to the south, yes, it looks like there is a cut-off, if you assume the baguette is impermeable.

In fact, in our argument, the St. Pierre zone is a Godsend for Newfoundland in this arbitration. Without it, they would have no visual possibility of arguing the cut-off as they have. With it, and for the sacrifice of less than 10,000 square kilometres of the EEZ portion of the St. Pierre boundary, Newfoundland can create the illusion of a cut-off to the detriment of Nova Scotia. A cut-off that just doesn't exist.

The delimitation of this area has to be considered as a whole, as here. When that is done it's clear that the kinds of inequitable effects of a real cut-off, a North Seas cut-off, a Guinea cut-off with no further projection seaward for the state involved, simply do not occur with respect to Newfoundland, both because they can project from the west and because there is in effect a projection down the line.

Mr. Chairman, the question of nonencroachment and the impact of the baguette gives rise to one further issue. On Friday Professor Crawford asked me a hypothetical question involving a situation, which if I got it right, St. Pierre, Newfoundland and Nova Scotia were all states bound by the Canada-France Court of Arbitration in which there was no boundary established by the conduct of the parties, if that's a fair statement of the hypothetical.

The question, as I understood it, was how a boundary might be drawn under international law in such circumstances. I, naturally, equivocated to some degree and denied the basis of the hypothetical. And, of course, we still do. We cannot tell how the Court would have drawn that boundary had Nova Scotia been a separate state, because they didn't have to consider it. And in any event, I did not provide the actual boundary, which I could not have done without technical help.



But on Monday, Professor McRae returned to this issue of a boundary drawn tabula rasa, or almost rasa, because we still have St. Pierre. He indicated that we had avoided, as he put it, any invitation by the Tribunal to indicate how it would delimit this area. In his words, if it had to apply principles of international law.

Well, of course, we have said how it should be drawn according to international law, in our view, but his point was more specific. The invitation to draw a new boundary on those terms was that proposed by Professor Crawford in his hypothetical. So to provide Professor McRae with the answer he felt was lacking, but still fully denying yet again the premises of the hypothetical, I will suggest how that imaginary boundary might have been drawn.

Here is the area in question. The green line is no longer the existing boundary. But I have assumed that Nova Scotia would at least have a claim line, if this is within the terms of the hypothetical, and oddly enough, it turned out to be the same.

I also show the equidistance boundary. But from the tri-junction point down to around 46 north, as we have shown, the line so modestly claimed by Nova Scotia in this hypothetical Tribunal, is effectively a simplified median line. So it deserves some priority. And this new Court of Arbitration, having attended President Guillaume's

speech, will give it just that. And it gives us a first segment as shown here.

How do you move into the next sector, is hypothetical states? The baguette does seem to provide a natural transition point, and a short straight extension of the inner line provides a boundary as far as that point. Similar to the extension in Tunisia-Libya, up to the point of transition.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I am sorry --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: They are calculated equidistance points, the yellow ones. And the first ones are the points on the current boundary.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: From the tri-junction, as I said, we move on --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: You are not drawing any equidistance points from St. Pierre and Miquelon?

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: No.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Or in --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: These would be from Burin Peninsula, yes. Now --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Part of the problem here, and this is why it's such an unusual situation, in all the third party cases that have occurred so far, you haven't -- well, with the exception, I suppose, Iceland and Jan Mayen, because

that was a conceded, but it was off to one side --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- and didn't really present the problem. Here we have the point of an intervening third state, with a boundary binding on both existing states, and therefore --

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: That's right.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- no third state problem. Just the problem how to draw the line. And that's never happened before.

PROFESSOR SAUNDERS: No. But I would suggest though, Professor Crawford, that it will. I can think of circumstances in the Caribbean, with some of the sequential island states, and the leeward and windward islands where precisely that problem may emerge. Particularly, where France has been a little more ambitious in some of their boundary negotiations, where there is going to be some kind of crossing over. So it isn't purely hypothetical.

In any event, if we can move to the next sector. Here we are. If the baguette provides a natural transition point, because of the binding boundary, the short straight extension of the inner line provides a boundary as far as that point on the eastern edge of the baguette. Similar to the extension in Tunisia-Libya up to a convenient point

of transition. And obviously this is short hand. And a point on another country's boundary, which is not a problem, as we heard from Mr. Colson on Monday. What next? Well, we are supposedly bound by Canada-France, which did refer to the projection of the south coast of Newfoundland.

On the other hand, even if these were states, it was equivocal on the relationship of Nova Scotia to St. Pierre, and silent on the relationship of Nova Scotia to Newfoundland. And the permit and political practice of these parties has, of course, been assumed away. Just as Newfoundland has done in this arbitration.

Now balancing all these considerations, as the Courts always do, it seems appropriate to reflect a chain situation by an angular alteration, as was done in the outer segment of Tunisia-Libya. But where? In the spirit of practicality that infuses boundary law, this can be readily accomplished by joining the last point at the edge of the baguette to the next segment of the equidistance line to the south, as shown here in red. This gives some scope for Nova Scotia's relationship to the outer maritime area, even on this hypothetical. And yet, and this was an area not addressed by the Court of Arbitration, particularly beyond 200, but it preserves Newfoundland's interest closer to shore and reflects the changed coastal

direction affected by what we assume is a binding boundary. And that, given this hypothesis, is how it might be done according to international law. But without any account being taken of the conduct of the parties, or resource location, or any of the nongeographic factors.

But, of course, this is not the reality that we are faced with. This is close to our boundary, but it isn't our boundary. Mr. Colson referred to the unique political geography of the region. And that means that we are dealing with these provinces, this federation and this history. And it means that the St. Pierre boundary was decided on a different plane. One where the rights and interests of Nova Scotia were simply not in issue. And in this real world, the extensive conduct of the parties represented here on this diagram, fully addressed by Mr. Bertrand last week, and again in a moment, or perhaps this afternoon, this conduct must be a highly relevant circumstance in the drawing of an equitable boundary. And so it is for Nova Scotia. But recall it is just that point that Newfoundland vehemently denies. And that is why we are having the argument we are over such an arcane issue as the basis of offshore title. It's really about the relevant circumstances.

But I am not going to review the Newfoundland claim again. I have shown on Friday and today, I believe, that

it is one artifice built upon another. It's disconnected from the law, from the historical facts, and even from the geography upon which Newfoundland places such reliance.

But there is one last overriding point on both boundaries that I wish to mention before I turn over the podium, and that relates to one fundamental critique of the line that Newfoundland offers. The line that the parties developed, that is.

Newfoundland claims that in a two-zone configuration - this is drawn from the Gulf of Maine, of course -- a single straight line is, "almost certain to deliver an unacceptable result." Elsewhere, however, it describes its own line in the following terms, the bearings of the second and third segments are so similar it says that, "there could be no objection to a simplified delimitation consisting of a single straight line extending seaward from the intersection of the first and second segments." And their line in fact runs that way, effectively from very close to Point 2017.

And Newfoundland justifies this apparent contradiction by saying that its outer line is defined on a different principle from the inner line. So it doesn't matter that it is in fact the same line, a straight line running to the margin just like the one proposed by Nova Scotia.

With respect, this is a degree of abstract formalism

that is divorced from the real world character of boundaries. Both parties in this case have suggested azimuth lines to deal with a long outer segment. And both are chosen lines. The only difference is that Newfoundland's was chosen by one party from among the creative options it had before it in preparation for this litigation. A sampling of which we saw on Monday.

The Nova Scotia proposal was chosen by both parties in the course of their political and administrative dealings and that existed in practice long before Newfoundland ever contemplated the initiation of this dispute.

And if there are no further questions on that, I thank you for your patience, and would seek guidance on whether we break at this point or call on Mr. Bertrand? Perhaps it might be most convenient, since I don't think Mr. Bertrand is going to take the whole afternoon, if we broke for lunch now, if that's acceptable, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN: Break for lunch then. What time?

MR. FORTIER: If it was convenient, could we adjourn until 1:15, Mr. Chairman. We will finish comfortably before 4:00 o'clock.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: You can get out to the airport in that time.

MR. FORTIER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: 1:15 then.

MR. FORTIER: Thank you.

(Recess - 12:00 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.)

MR. BERTRAND: Thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal. This afternoon, as you may suspect, I would like to deal with conduct generally. And more particularly with the permit practice of the parties.

However, before I do so, I would like to come back briefly on the issue of resources, only to respond to a characterization made by Mr. McRae, with respect to what Nova Scotia wants the Tribunal to do with the resources.

At page 880 of the transcript, Mr. McRae said, "Now, Mr. Chairman, the law of maritime boundary delimitation has recognized that the location of resources is a factor that can be taken into account in determining a line, or checking the equity result." And so he does admit, or concede the point, that the equity of the resulting line can be checked having regard to the access to the resources at stake, and the location of these resources.

However, a little further down the same page he says, "To determine the location of a boundary on the basis of where one side says resources may possibly be located in the future would be to be guided by speculation and not by law." And then he refers to the fact that maybe in two or five years from now, we may find that the sub-basin is actually dry, and it would be a shame to have delimited



the boundary on the basis of resources that prove not to be there.

I would just like to draw your attention to what the Chamber did in the Gulf of Maine, and how it took into account resources, even though these were only identified as potential resources. And that no actual exploration or exploitation had occurred.

And this is a reference I gave earlier last Friday, it is the Gulf of Maine decision, at paragraph -- at page 340, paragraph 232. And there is also, I believe, an earlier reference where the word "potential" is actually used. I believe it's at paragraph 217, but I'll check within the next couple of minutes and confirm it to you.

The -- before I delve into the permit issue, I would also like to say that I made good on my promise to provide you with a revised figure 33. You will remember that this is the figure that shows all of the wells with the boundary proposed by Newfoundland. And I must point out that Mr. Colson was quicker than I was on this issue. He had already provided his figure 108, and I understand that the line and the information we are showing do not diverge from that shown on his depiction at figure 108.

Now, turning finally to the permit issuance, the permit practice of the parties. A lot was said about permits by counsel for Newfoundland, and we believe that

it is important to correct false impressions that may have been conveyed by certain comments made, or inaccuracies of other comments. And also to give some context to other arguments presented to you by counsel for Newfoundland.

I propose to deal with six separate items under the permit practice, and the first is the number of permits that were issued.

Newfoundland has invited the Tribunal to disregard conduct relating to permit issuance, and in particular its own conduct, in part on the limited number of permits issued.

On the Nova Scotia side, several permits were issued along the existing boundaries. And we have to refer only to permits issued to Mobil, to Texaco, a little further up the Cabot Strait, to Amoco along the boundary with Quebec, and there are others even with PEI, Hudson's Bay, Shaw, I believe. Chevron, Murphy Oil, and so on. And that is figure 17 from our collection of figures.

On the Newfoundland side, the attention has been focused primarily on two permits: the Mobil and the Katy permits.

However, this conveys a wrong impression that the permit issuance behaviour of the parties comprised only a few episodes, insufficient in numbers to support a true practice.

In fact, Newfoundland has issued several exploration permits apart from the Katy or Mobil permits. And you have there showing on the slide Newfoundland's Counter-Memorial figure number 10, which accounts for at least nine permits. Or nine permittees, rather. There may be subject to more than one permit in each instance.

The Newfoundland permits to Katy and Mobil, in addition, were themselves renewed in 1972, you'll remember. Katy was renewed as a Class "B" permit with no drilling rights, whereas Mobil was renewed as a Class "A" permit with full drilling rights.

Turning now to figure 18, the reason why the attention was focused on the Newfoundland side of the boundary exclusively on the Mobil and the Katy permits is obviously that those permits are the ones issued by Newfoundland along the existing boundaries, including the de facto boundary between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

The reason why no more than two permits have been issued by Newfoundland alongside the line is simply that these two permits, Mobil and Katy, occupy all of the Laurentian Sub-basin area situated on the Newfoundland side along the 135 degree boundary line. There is hardly any room left to issue other permits.

And we invite the Tribunal to bear in mind, as well, that these permits issued by Newfoundland were issued in

response to industry requests, and not the reverse. The fact that Newfoundland has not issued more permits is not indicative of an intent by Newfoundland to limit the number of permits issued, or to curtail its permit practice in any fashion.

I said that Class "A" permits meant with full drilling rights, what I meant to say was full drilling rights and production rights. That is the ability to extract petroleum as a result of the drilling activities.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Mr. Bertrand?

MR. BERTRAND: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: How many permits were in force on your side of the line when the 1982 Accord came into force?

MR. BERTRAND: When the 1982 Accord, I don't have the information with me. I don't know that we have it. It is true, and we do not dispute Mr. Colson's -- or rather Mr. Willis', I believe, analysis of the situation. But a lot of the permits were surrendered by the companies. But that a number of them remained in force until 1982, when the Accord -- rather 1984, when the legislation implementing the Accord was enacted. How many exactly were still in force at the time, had not been surrendered, I don't have the information with me. But we have to remember that Nova Scotia issued, over that period, and I will come back to it, between '65 and '72, more than 400

different permits. So we are not talking about a few permits.

Obviously a lot of them had nothing to do with the area adjoining the boundary. But nevertheless, the point is that the permit practice is not based on sparse evidence.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Everyone has been talking about the period in the sixties and early seventies, why -- is it the case that the issuing of new permits as distinct from possibly the renewal, or continuation of permits, ceased in the early seventies, and if so, why?

MR. BERTRAND: That's what we can gather from the evidence. On the Nova Scotia side, if we can go back to figure R-3, we can see then the -- there is hardly any room left to issue permits. That may be one reason why.

The other reason is also, I believe, simply a business reason. At the time, the attraction was more towards Sable, and more towards the area where Hibernia is located, which is to the southeast of Newfoundland. However, as well, there was a moratorium that kicked in in 1967. But we'll see later that the moratorium did not prevent parties from issuing permits, and did not prevent certain activities from taking place.

So I think a combination of these factors may explain why these permits were mostly issued before, or around

1970. A bit before, as of 1965, and then in the first few years in the seventies.

If we could go now to my second point, which is the Katy permit, at R-7, that's correct. Our contention, as you may recall, is that the Katy permit is consistent with the de facto boundary using the 135 degree azimuth.

Now Mr. Willis submitted at page 785 of Monday's transcript, November 26, that, and I quote, "the western edge of the Katy permit was not in the vicinity of the 135 degree line." He indicated that according to their measurement, he said "ours", "ours" meaning Newfoundland, the distance between the western edge of the Katy permit, and the 135 degree line at the northern limit here, was 10.1 nautical miles, and that the distance between the western edge of the Katy permit and the 135 degree azimuth at the southern limit, was 39 nautical miles.

This again, assumes that the permit was drawn on a conic map, and that its western limit was drawn without reference to the existing boundary, the 135 degree azimuth, and not as an extension of the line formed by turning points 2016 and 2017, as I have explained to you last Friday.

In other words, what it assumes is that the drafter of the Katy permit intended to show, if we could go back to the previous slide, to show the western edge of the permit

here on the map, as a curved line and not as a straight line, on a normal map, being a Mercator map.

So he intended to show a permit that, if you were to look at it on a normal map, a Mercator map, you would see in effect, a long curved line, because he drew a straight line on a conic projection. And as Professor Saunders explained with a lot of ability in the first round, and several slides, on a conic projection, an azimuth of 135 degree line will, when transposed on a Mercator, actually gradually shift azimuth and be perceived as a curved line.

Again, let us remember, if we can go to the previous one -- oh, that's fine, yes -- let us remember that the Katy map does not provide any coordinates. Does not provide any methodology. It just provides a line on a map.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Who did the colouring in?

MR. BERTRAND: If we could go back to 7, it leads into my next -- this is an excerpt from the Katy map. So this obviously is not shown on the Katy map. We will see it a little later. So there is no point. So it's just a line drawn on a grid, which is a conic projection, and whether it's Newfoundland's technical person, Mr. Gray, or us, we have to figure out what is there simply by trying to measure where the line is, as opposed to following a methodology, which is purported to be replicated or

depicted on a map.

Going back to R-9, please. We invite the Tribunal not to lose sight of the demonstration given by Professor Saunders during the first phase of this hearing. And as he indicated then, this figure, which is figure A-7, on which from the Katy map, we have added point A, B, C, D and E. Point E being turning point 2016. Point C being turning point 2017. And point D being the point used by the drafter of the Mobil permit to draw a line between the southern edge of the Mobil permit to this point. And it matches the 135 degree line.

The purpose of this drawing is to show that the western edge of the Katy permit matches an extension of the line joining turning point 2016 with turning point 2017. Very close to the point D identified in the Mobil permit. And that azimuth is 136 degrees and some dust. So very close to the 135 degree that we say is the de facto boundary.

Now actually the azimuth of the extension line at turning point 2016 is 136 degrees, 13 minutes, 1 second and 45th hundreds. While the azimuth of the northeast extension of the western edge of the Katy permit is 136 degrees, 25 minutes. So a difference -- I will repeat. If you extend a straight line from turning points 2016 to 2017, you continue that, the azimuth is 136, 13 degrees.



If you extend the western edge of the Katy permit on the same path, the azimuth is 136 degrees, 25 minutes. So a difference of 12 minutes basically. And different of let's say 13 minutes, means that a depiction on this type of map, using this scale, would be hardly noticeable. It would be less than one-tenth of one millimetre. So the room for error is great. And we talk about one degree, we talk about several kilometres.

Again, the difference between the western edge, which is 136 degrees, 25 minutes, and the actual 135 degree boundary still means a difference of approximately one millimetre on this map. Again, something like a pencil mark. And so when you are looking at this map without any clue as to how it was drafted, it's very easy, even for the original drafter, to have misplaced the permit from the place he really wanted to show it on the map.

R-10, please. Now this is not a mere coincidence, especially in view of the fact that in the northern section of the Katy permit, which we talked about last Friday, the depiction conforms with the Quebec-Newfoundland boundary segment of the line in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, despite the very irregular path followed by the boundary on this location. So I invited you to draw the conclusion that manifestly the drawer meant to comply with the boundary. Not only there, but also there.

However, obviously a difference of a pencil line at the beginning of the course of a line that will extend over 300 miles, and which creates a gap hardly noticeable at the northern end, will eventually create a gap that will go increasing as you go down the length of the permit. And this is the reason why, according to Newfoundland's measurements, the gap between the western edge of the Katy permit and the 135 degree azimuth is 1.7 nautical miles as opposed to 10 nautical miles, according to Newfoundland at the northern edge, and 12 nautical miles as opposed to 39 nautical miles calculated by Newfoundland.

This length here, the whole length of the western edge of the Katy permit, is 263 nautical miles long. So the minute you are off just a bit, albeit by a pencil mark, you project that over such a long distance that you create an area of divergence that makes or attempts to make it appear as though the permit does not match the azimuth of 135 degrees.

I would like to turn now to my third subject, which is the Mobil permit. At page 845 of the November 26th transcript of Mr. Colson's argument, he indicated that Mobil, of course, received a federal permit that extended beyond the degree -- 135 degree line on both sides of that line. He then said Mobil took out provincial permits from

both Newfoundland and Nova Scotia to cover the federal permit. This conveys, again, the impression that the provincial permit regime was a duplicate of the federal permit issuance. And we contend that this is inaccurate.

First, as we have indicated last Friday, annex 150 clearly demonstrates -- can we go back to 150 -- clearly demonstrates that there existed more acreage under provincial permits than there existed under federal permits. And this has not been disputed, obviously, from what we heard last Monday.

Secondly --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Excuse me, Mr. Bertrand. The Mobil permit in the precise vicinity of the line was not also a federal permit.

MR. BERTRAND: I will come to that.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Okay.

MR. BERTRAND: I will show you that the shape of the federal permit does not match the joined shapes of the provincial permits. And I mean -- may I say that it proves little. But it proves a point that this is not simply a carbon copy of what the federal was doing. And I have yet more examples of that. I think that all of that to say that the permit practice of the provinces stood on its own.

So a comparison of figure 17, which is the issuance of permits by Nova Scotia, and figure 108, referred to by Mr.

Colson, shows clearly that there is no duplication between the practice of Nova Scotia and the permits issued by the federal government. And we just have to see for example on the Nova Scotia front, the Mobil permit versus the Gulf permit, or the Amoco permit here versus nothing, or the Hudson's Bay permit -- Hudson's Bay Oil versus nothing. And others that I could go into in this area not along the boundaries.

On the federal front, as you noticed, Professor Crawford, we have the Texaco permit. There is no Nova Scotia equivalent to the Texaco permit.

Turning now to the similar comparison with Newfoundland, by comparing figure 10 filed with their first phase Counter-Memorial, with the same figure 108 used by Mr. Colson, we see that the Katy permit, which is number 8 here, does not have any correspondence at the federal level. We see also that Katy does not have any correspondence with the Gulf permit. Is in conflict actually with the Gulf permit issued by the federal government.

CHAIRMAN: So what you are saying is that there were areas where company A had a federal permit, and unrelated company B had a provincial permit?

MR. BERTRAND: I am saying that among other things, yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And how could that operate? I am sorry

I am used to the arcane Australian constitution. In the Australian constitution, the state permit in that case would be invalid. Even if the state had the jurisdiction.

MR. BERTRAND: I don't think that the solution is that easy in the Canadian context. However, I will concede, as I said earlier, that it is our understanding that all of the drilling that occurred in this area occurred under the auspices of permits that were held from the provincial authorities as well as a permit from the federal authorities. Whether these permits were actually the same is not necessarily true; however, for that particular area where the well was drilled, it was a permit held by -- from the federal government and from the provincial government concerned.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Did these permits purport to be exclusive?

MR. BERTRAND: Some of them, yes. Others, no. For example, in Newfoundland the Class A permits were -- turned out to be -- the interim Class A permits turned out to be exclusive; the Class B were non-exclusive with no drilling rights. The seismic permits issued by Newfoundland were non-exclusive and that's a point I'll get to, that there was a lot of overlap, and we see from this map that there's a lot of overlap.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And you didn't have seismic permits at

all? You just waived --

MR. BERTRAND: Correct. In the harbour at Halifax.

Harbour. Correct.

We now have slide 16 to make the point that, furthermore, the statement of Mr. Colson is plainly wrong. The Nova Scotia and Newfoundland permits issued to Mobil in 1967 are not a duplicate of the federal permit issued to Mobil. This is apparent from a comparison of these two maps. For example, if we look at the map on the left, which is -- which was used in Mr. Saunders' phase one presentation, the yellow permit or the permit depicted in yellow is the Nova Scotia portion of the Mobil permit which abuts the line and which has an equivalent of -- on the Newfoundland side, the permit on the Newfoundland side is depicted in orange. Obviously, if you take this joint shape or the shape formed jointly by these two permits, you cannot replicate the shape on the federal permit depiction as seen in Figure 108. The Newfoundland portion --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I mean there is no doubt that there was a federal permit granted to Mobil that, as it were, transcended the line, if I can use --

MR. BERTRAND: Definitely. And not only to Mobil; to Texaco, as well. Obviously, when the government -- the federal government issued permits back in 1968 or '67, it

did not bother with the line. It just issued permits along the grids provided for by its permit grids. There was no diagonal division of the permits.

But the point is that, obviously, there's no -- it's not a replicate of the federal permit. Provincial permits are distinct from the federal permit, albeit there may be some overlap and the holders may be the same in several instances. It is not an automatic recipe.

Also, Mr. Colson's statement there on Monday serves to implicitly buttress Newfoundland's claim that its Mobil permit was issued to match the Nova Scotia permit issued to Mobil and that not much should be read into that, meaning that Newfoundland simply copied blindly what Nova Scotia had done.

As I explained to the Tribunal last Friday -- if I can have the next slide, please? The permit of Newfoundland issued to Mobil was described by using a point which is Point A on this figure, which has the same coordinates as the southeastern corner of the equivalent permit issued on the Nova Scotia side, but does not refer to the Nova Scotia permit. And so they drew a line between this Point A and a point which they described by coordinates shown here as Point D, a point which happens to be on a straight line between turnings points 2016 and turning points 2017.

If it had been drawn to match the Nova Scotia permit,

why did the draftsmen of the Newfoundland permit not use the coordinates of the Point B here? It would have been so easy. It was known then. Nova Scotia permit to Mobil had been issued a few months earlier and the permit grid was known, the coordinates was known. Why did they not use the second point to draw the line and say that this is the northern edge of the -- northern corner of the Newfoundland Mobil permit?

If that what -- if that's what they had in mind, then it would have been very easy to do, and since they didn't do that, but rather referred to a point which is somewhere between -- along the line between turning points 2016 and 2017, we submit to you that it's more likely that the permit of Newfoundland was drawn by reference to a line dividing the two provinces' offshore areas.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Drawn by whom? I mean presumably, Mobil came along and said, we want a permit from A to B, or --

MR. BERTRAND: Remember, Newfoundland said that the issuance of permits is a conscious exercise of assertion of jurisdiction. They said that time and again.

Obviously, the request for permit is submitted by the company with a drawing. The province doesn't have to say yes, and presumably, they know what they're doing when they issue the permits. I don't think it changes much,



the situation. The industry obviously knew that there was a boundary; they referred to it. Newfoundland saw the drawing, said, okay, we'll do it in this fashion. So it just goes to show that the argument to say that we didn't pay much attention -- Newfoundland didn't pay much attention because we just duplicated the matching Mobil permit on the Nova Scotia side doesn't hold water.

This insinuation relating to the blanketing of provincial permits by federal permits is a close cousin to the statements made by Newfoundland at paragraph 118 of its phase two Counter-Memorial.

In the first sentence of this paragraph, Newfoundland contended that it was federal permits that counted for private companies, as is illustrated by what industry itself was saying and seeing in leading journals at the time. And for this, they refer us to supplementary authorities number 3. Well, if we look at supplementary authorities number 3, we see that it is, in fact, a speech delivered by one D.G. Crosby. I'm sure you'll remember Mr. Crosby of the federal government, from the Department of Natural Resources. It was a speech delivered on behalf of Minister Donald Macdonald because he couldn't make it to the meeting where the speech was to be delivered. It was delivered on April 24th, 1973 at an East Coast Symposium of an American Association of Petroleum

Geologists held in Atlantic City.

So the first thing we have to say in respect of that -- this is not what industry is saying. It is what the federal government was saying. Second, it is not surprising having said that, to see that an official of the federal government speaking on behalf of his Minister is referring only to federal permits, especially at a time where there is still a provincial-federal dispute over the ownership of mineral rights in the offshore, and especially after the outcome of the BC reference.

In the second and third sentences of the same paragraph 118, Newfoundland states, "Figure 7 shows maps of the Canada east coast offshore published in the annual bulletins of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists in 1970 and 1971. They show the area blanketed with federal permits. There is no reference to provincial claims or to provincial permits." And then, again, the reader is referred to a footnote where he is then sent back to supplementary authorities number 4 and 5.

Now figure 7 is a reproduction of a map found in each of the articles referred to in that footnote, being supplementary authorities number 4 and 5. Those are not articles of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, as figure 7 would have you or the reader believe. The depiction here indicates "Eastern Canada

offshore holdings 1969, as depicted by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists." This is simply an article -- and we will get to -- in a moment to who is the author of that article -- an article published in a journal of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists.

Now they are articles co-authored by one R.D. Howie, a geologist of the Geological Survey of Canada. So again, it is not surprising to find, we submit, in these articles references to Canadian permits only.

I would like to turn to my fourth -- yes?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Did the provincial officials write about the area in terms of provincial permits in the Association of --

MR. BERTRAND: I don't know that they did.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: We haven't been referred to any articles where they did.

MR. BERTRAND: Correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Perhaps they have better things to do than write articles.

MR. BERTRAND: I will not go there.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Well, if somebody wrote an article today, had it forced back on them three times. It's a good rule not to write articles if you want to be an authority.

MR. BERTRAND: I would like to move to my fourth topic under "Permit Issuance", which is the permit practice of the parties and the moratorium. Now Mr. Colson, on Monday, again, made two separate comments regarding the moratorium which resulted from the Canada-France dispute.

First, at page 845 of last Monday's transcript, he indicated that because of the existence of the moratorium, "it seems that no seismic activities were conducted in the moratorium block." Now I understand that Mr. Colson was not there when I made my presentation last Friday, and I notice that he is not here today, so he won't hear the explanation -- my repetition of the explanation I gave last Friday. But we can see from a blow-up of figure 16, which is the Nova Scotia grid map for permits, first the Tribunal will recall that I referred to paragraph 242 of Canada's Memorial in the Canada-France dispute, which shows clearly -- it's annex 201 -- which shows clearly that seismic work as opposed to drilling was not prohibited in the moratorium area.

And I would like to draw Mr. Colson's attention, who I'm sure will read the transcript, to information contained in annexes 178 to 180, especially in 178, which shows that Mobil disclosed its intention to do seismic work in respect of permits 209. 209 being -- abutting the boundary. 210, I thought I had seen it. Skip 210. 218,

along the boundary. 222, also along the boundary, and 224. All of which are close to the boundary line.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: What was that document?

MR. BERTRAND: Annex 178. A report filed by Mobil informing the government of its intention in terms of work.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: The government of?

MR. BERTRAND: Nova Scotia. In terms of work to be conducted. Second --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And this was seismic work?

MR. BERTRAND: Correct.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I thought you said they didn't need permission for seismic work?

MR. BERTRAND: Correct. However, under the Nova Scotia permit system, a company could, because it was under the permit system, oblige to expend certain sums of money. Once it had the permit it could qualify certain of the expenses incurred to do seismic work as a valid expense towards expenses under the permit, the exploration permit.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And your response to the grouping point is that this seismic work was precisely located in these?

MR. BERTRAND: It was a number of permits, including these along the boundaries, our specific reference to these permits.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: As well as a number of others?

MR. BERTRAND: In other letters, yes. But there is a

specific reference to these permits.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: My understanding is that the moratorium was on drilling?

MR. BERTRAND: Correct. I will get to that in a minute actually. Now the second point I wanted to make in respect of Mr. Colson's argument on Monday is that at page 847, of the same day's transcript, in answer to a question of Professor Crawford, he admitted not knowing why the Texaco permit had been issued by the federal government in 1972 in the moratorium area after it had come into being in 1967. He as well speculated as to the reasons why the federal government had decided to issue one nevertheless. Maybe by way of retaliation to what France may have done.

I don't know the answer to that question, Professor Crawford, but what I know is that the reality of the moratorium is that it did not prevent Newfoundland from issuing permits in this area. Permits were indeed issued in the moratorium area by Newfoundland, including the Katy permit and subsequently the renewal of the Mobil and the Katy permits in 1972. All three permits were issued while the moratorium was in force. And were issued for areas covered by the moratorium, as can be clearly seen from a comparison of figure 108 with our figure 18.

Also seismic permits were issued in the moratorium area by Newfoundland to Texaco and Pacific Petroleum. We

see them as Texaco being number 6 and number -- I believe it's number 7 here, Pacific Petroleum. Apparently at the time, Newfoundland did not believe that seismic activities were prohibited in the moratorium area.

Now coming back to your comment or a question earlier, Professor Crawford, this morning on the reasons invoked by Mr. McRae in his argument Monday to explain the inaction of Newfoundland in the late 80s and early 90s, I would like to point out that certainly Newfoundland was not prevented from issuing permits along the boundary outside the moratorium. Although the moratorium may have hampered its willingness or eagerness to resolve the issue of the boundary, it was not prevented from issuing permits in this area or further down.

Drilling was not prevented outside this area, as we know. I think a more plausible explanation for Newfoundland's inaction was that first Newfoundland was preparing its case for the reference. Secondly, when it lost, it then sought to negotiate a better deal. Thirdly, industry -- as I explained or alluded to earlier, industry at the time was not showing any interest for the area because the sweet spot of the Laurentian Sub basin is right in the middle of the moratorium. The focus at the time was then Sable Island, here, and Hibernia.

Fourth, Newfoundland was waiting to play his hand at

the most opportune time. That explains why Newfoundland didn't do -- didn't protest, didn't do much in those years.

While I'm on the issue of lack of protest or acquiescence, with a small "a", by Newfoundland, I would like to respond to the description of events relating to the 1982 Accord and 1984 implementing legislation made by Mr. Willis at page 789 of the transcript on Monday.

Actually, I believe I can show that it is more an overview from a satellite in orbit around the earth than it is a description of events, as several important details were omitted.

At page 789, Mr. Willis said -- and I quote -- "now a final point about the political relations between the parties is that Mr. Bertrand in Nova Scotia's written pleadings refer to the failure of Newfoundland and Labrador to protest the 1982 Canada-Nova Scotia Agreement and the 1984 Canada-Nova Scotia legislation."

He then continued. "But, Mr. Chairman, the Agreement itself provided all the assurance Newfoundland and Labrador could have sought. The boundary schedule included the caveat -- quote -- provided that if there is a dispute as to these boundaries with any neighboring jurisdiction, the federal government may redraw the boundaries after consultation with all the parties



concerned".

This he said was the conduct -- this was the context in which the 1984 legislation was enacted and perceived. And of course very shortly thereafter it was overtaken by events. The Atlantic Accord with Newfoundland and Labrador was concluded, as was the second Nova Scotia Accord, both anticipating this dispute and this arbitration as though they were waiting for the proper moment to launch this dispute.

I submit that a few comments are in order. First, the most important one, is that the 1984 implementing legislation did not contain any reference to a possible dispute, to a possible dispute resolution mechanism or to even the possibility of the minister having the ability to redraw the boundaries in the event of a dispute.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I notice that it does refer back of course to the Accord?

MR. BERTRAND: It does refer back to the Accord.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: And the Accord contains --

MR. BERTRAND: Correct. It implements the Accord but it does not reproduce that portion of the Accord contained in the Annex which contains the out that Newfoundland is telling us today it found so reassuring at the time.

And that's very clear. So this is in stark contrast with the 1982 Accord. And we can say, I submit, that the

context in which the 1984 implementing legislation was adopted cannot be said to have referred to a dispute resolution mechanism.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I put that discrepancy rather elliptically to your leader this morning and he said he didn't think it was significant, but --

MR. FORTIER: I defer to my colleague.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Well I'm not trying to drive any further wedges between you, but --

MR. BERTRAND: Also the --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: But seriously, do we have any -- it is a curious discrepancy and certainly when you compare it with the situation later on where there is clear concordance. Is there any reason?

MR. BERTRAND: We don't know. We just take notice of the fact that it's there. Why did they not protest then? Obviously a new government had come into power, the Mulroney government. There were talks of a secret deal having been done with Newfoundland assuring them that they would get a fair shake, if I may say so. That may explain why they didn't feel the urge to come forward and protest. But the facts are the facts, as Mr. Mr. Fortier said.

So the conclusion of the Canada -- the last aspect of that is that the conclusion of the Canada-Newfoundland Accord only came in 1985. And the conclusion that a

subsequent Canada-Nova Scotia Accord containing the dispute resolution provision now enforce only occurred in 1986. This is a span of two years. I guess this casts new light on Mr. Willis' broad brush depiction of events summarized by him as follows -- and I quote -- "And of course very shortly thereafter, it" -- referring to the 1984 legislation -- "was overtaken by events". Well events that took two years really to materialize. And yet Newfoundland remained silent. And we are submitting that nothing can excuse Newfoundland's inaction.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Nova Scotia was arguably in a better legal position vis-a-vis the boundary under the first legislation than it is under the second legislation. There doesn't seem to have been any --

MR. BERTRAND: Do I need to comment on that?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Well, no.

MR. BERTRAND: I'm sorry.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I mean --

MR. BERTRAND: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- just looking at it from the outside --

MR. BERTRAND: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- I'm not a Canadian lawyer, but I would have thought that they had a better argument under the --

MR. BERTRAND: Without a dispute resolution provision.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes. They don't seem to have minded, as it were, about the change. Perhaps provincial silence is a more general phenomenon.

MR. BERTRAND: Correct. We don't know -- seriously, I don't know and I don't think that we know what the answer is to that.

The fifth topic is seismic permits. In the comments made -- or the comment made, rather, earlier in respect of the Mobil permit that Newfoundland contends that permit issuance is a conscious exercise of assertion of jurisdiction, leads me also to respond to Mr. Willis' statement found at page 786 of Monday's transcript. And it reads, I quote, "And Mr. Chairman in this light, there is only one important fact about the 1973 to 1976 Newfoundland and Labrador permits. They were issued under provincial legislation that only authorized the issuance of permits of whatever sort for areas in the province. They disclose a conviction by the province that the areas they cover are in the province and not in another province."

Now I promise I will spare you with the recount of Newfoundland's oversight as illustrated by the -- as we have seen last Friday, granting of a permit encompassing a large square area, but specifying that the area

effectively covered by the permit is limited to that found within Newfoundland's territory. And as we have seen, that's document number 50 of Newfoundland's supplemental document. Or the granting of a permit encompassing a large square area when the permit requested was for a linear area along a parallel. But I will remind you of Texaco's permits, as issued by Newfoundland in the Cabot Strait area, and that's permit number 6 here, which by encompassing an area comprising St. Paul Island can hardly be said to be a conscious assertion of jurisdiction over the area covered by the permit.

More importantly, the seismic permits conveyed no interest in the offshore, as mentioned to you last Friday during my presentation, and as Newfoundland itself pointed out in its White Paper of 1977, at pages 38 and 39. In most countries -- we can read there -- companies carry on the seismic surveys prior to even making an application for the right to drill and produce. A number of companies may conduct separate seismic surveys over the same area. And of course, only one company is awarded the right to drill and produce.

Thus in most countries, the carrying out of seismic surveys is considered to be a normal part of the process of determining whether a company is interested in an area and is not considered to entitle the company to any

special rights in the area in question. This will also be the position of this government. That's in the White Paper. Continuing on 39, this amendment of 1974, the amendment to the legislation, which made it a requirement to obtain a permit before conducting seismic, was aimed at regulating pre-drilling seismic surveys and obtaining the information generated therefrom. Pursuant to the amended Act, any company wishing to conduct seismic operations on Newfoundland's continental margin, must first present a general program description to the Department of Mines and Energy.

After review, an interim permit is issued subject to the usual conditions. So I think that puts the last nail in the coffin of the seismic permits on the side of Newfoundland. Especially they are used to assert an encroachment over the de facto line that existed between the parties.

The sixth topic, Mr. Chairman, is the termination of permits. Mr. Willis, affirmed on Monday, November 26th, at page 785, again, of the transcript that -- and I quote -- "It is on record in this case that any surviving Nova Scotia permits were terminated by 1984 legislation implementing the 1982 Canada-Nova Scotia Agreement. With respect to the Newfoundland and Labrador permits, the Katy and Mobil permits, these were terminated at the latest by

coming into force of the 1977 regulations."

Well we disagree with Mr. Willis' assertion regarding the treatment reserved to Newfoundland permits. First, Mr. Willis' confidence regarding the Newfoundland permits is somewhat surprising given the content of annex 213, which are letters from Newfoundland's Deputy Agent, Debbie Paquette, responding to queries first from the Tribunal back in March of this year, and subsequently from Nova Scotia later this September, regarding the date of termination or surrender of the Katy and Mobil permits. On both occasions, Newfoundland indicated that it was not able to determine a date of expiry, termination or surrender for these permits.

Second, both the Katy and Mobil original permits found under annex 80, provided that the holder shall be entitled to have a permit issued under regulations to be adopted. So let me be clear. The older of the interim Katy and Mobil permits, as it was issued back in 1967 and '71, was entitled on the face of the permit to obtain a new permit on the same terms under the new permit regime, when the regulations would be adopted and would come into force.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Which was when?

MR. BERTRAND: Eventually. It took awhile. It was only 1977. The 1977 Newfoundland --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: But we don't have any evidence --

MR. BERTRAND: -- petroleum regulations --

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: We don't have any evidence that new permits were in fact issued then?

MR. BERTRAND: We do not. But that's where I'm going, obviously. Both permits -- we know that both permits were renewed in 1972. Except that in the case of Katy, it was renewed as a class "B" permit, that is with no drilling rights. Both permits were in force at the time of the coming into force of the 1977 petroleum regulations. And there are indications that at the very least -- I'm sorry, the Mobil permit could have survived the coming into force of these regulations. The coming into being of the new regime.

Now it is interesting to note that the Petro-Canada report released at the end of 1979, which is found at annex 150, contains a map where the Mobil permit still appears. Newfoundland has not supplied any evidence to the contrary, and it is difficult for Nova Scotia -- it is difficult for Nova Scotia to adduce evidence in this regard, because the permits of Newfoundland are still kept today confidential. They can only be accessed through proper requests to access to information under the relevant access to information legislation.

So to say the least, Mr. Colson's statement -- rather Mr. Willis' statement is over-reaching, to state firmly



and unequivocally that all permits of Newfoundland were terminated, with the coming into force of the 1977 regulations is a statement that we say is unsupported by the evidence and is inconsistent with certain indications in the record.

Further, Mr. Willis' invitation to the Tribunal, found at page 786 of Monday's transcript, to conclude that the permits issued by the provinces have no relevance because they were ultra vires of the provinces from the outset is really grasping at straws. Whether or not the permits turned out to be ultra vires in the end is irrelevant. What matters is that the province believed that they were valid at the time of issuance. That the province acted in a consistent manner with that belief, and that the provincial permits respected a de facto boundary delimiting the provinces' respective offshore areas.

Finally, the permit episode of this case is certainly comparable in length with the period of time over which the old concessions were granted before a protest was raised in the Tunisia-Libya case. Over 400 permits were issued by Nova Scotia between 1965 and 1972. Newfoundland began issuing permits in 1963, with the gist of them being issued in 1965. As we saw, the Mobil and Katy permits were renewed by Newfoundland as late as in 1972.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I'm sorry to come back to this, but

what I want to know is why -- well you say you don't know what Newfoundland and Labrador was doing, that may be a fair comment. But let's just talk about Nova Scotia. Why did Nova Scotia issue no new permits after 1972, if that's the case?

MR. BERTRAND: As I said, I believe that the area was pretty much permitted out. Fully permitted.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: It was permitted -- I mean, one can look at these permits in prospective areas, as I have been doing in the Gulf of Guinea. And you see changes in the permits over time, when they become more and more ragged as different bits are relinquished and so on. In many cases, the permits have a requirement for relinquishment after a certain period for some --

MR. BERTRAND: If no activity is conducted.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- or even if there is activity, there can be systems of division of the permits. After a period of time, you have to relinquish half of it anyway. So which explains why these things come to assume very bizarre shapes. So in the ordinary situation of a prospective field with a permitting practice going over a period of, you know, a considerable number of years, you do expect changes. You don't expect to sort of stop.

MR. BERTRAND: Correct. Well, I am instructed that Nova Scotia did issue permits after 1972, albeit, not along the

boundary line that we are concerned with. How long after 1972 did it continue to issue permits? I don't have the information as of now. But before Mr. Fortier concludes the case today, if I have additional information, I will pass it along to him in this regard. I can only surmise that the area was pretty much permitted out, the effect of the moratorium -- there is an impact, there is no doubt, because, obviously permit issuance is a reaction to industry request. And industry was not interested in spending a lot of money since the sweet spot in this area, the primary objective is in the middle of the moratorium. And thirdly, as a bi-product, the interest of industry was more focused around Sable Island and Hibernia. When I say Hibernia, I mean in this area.

So over 400 permits were issued by Nova Scotia, yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: One final question on this. The reason is not the perceived industry -- an industry perception that the provincial campaign for offshore mineral rights in their own right had failed by the early 70s? I mean if one wanted to put a date on it, it would be '72, '73, when Mr. Trudeau said, you have got to be joking. I mean he didn't actually say that in those words, but he was pretty clear. I mean did that have any effect on whether companies applied for permits any longer?

MR. BERTRAND: I do not know. What I think we can assume is

that as a reasonable business person, if there are regulations that are in place, even though you may believe that they are invalid, until they are declared so by the Courts, you will comply with them and you won't take any chance.

So 400 permits were issued by Nova Scotia between '65 and '72. Newfoundland began issuing permits in 1963, with the gist of them being issued in '65. As we saw, Mobil and Katy were renewed in '72.

Now Mr. Colson tried at pages 836 and 837, and subsequently at pages 840 to 841 to distinguish -- of the transcript of Monday -- to distinguish the case at hand with the factual situation reviewed in Tunisia-Libya, drawing the Tribunal's attention to the fact that there were protests in this case only with respect to areas concerned with overlapping concessions.

He underscored that no protests were raised in Tunisia-Libya about the concession limits, and the activities therein, south of 33 degrees 55 minutes latitude north and 12 degrees east, until 1976.

With respect, what Nova Scotia sees there is a distinction without a difference.

In Tunisia-Libya, the first protest for the area south of latitude 33 degrees 55 minutes north first occurred in 1976. That is eight years after the oil concessions were

granted. In our case, the Tribunal ruled in phase one that the first hint or sign of a disagreement came in October, 1972, with Minister Doody's letter, that is more than seven years after the first permits were issued.

Mr. Willis conceded that the common front collapsed probably in 1973, and that would put the period of the first protest, or real sign of disagreement eight years after the permits were issued.

But by then, a de facto line had already taken form, and been accepted by both parties in the present case over the entire length and course of the line now sought by Nova Scotia. That is to the edge of the continental margin.

Furthermore, even accepting Mr. Doody's letter at face value, only the portion seaward of point 2017 was questioned. In fact, we believe that the context and content of the letter of Minister Doody indicate that he raised only an objection to the 125 degree depiction of the boundary seaward of turning point 2017, and that he was in fact, seeking a little wiggle room, so that the boundary in the outer segment would accommodate the Katy permit which his province had issued less than a year earlier.

We have demonstrated, I hope, that the Katy permit is consistent with the de facto boundary, and as such, we

look at the Doody letter as an attempt by Newfoundland to make sure that the boundary in the outer segment would espouse the 135 degree azimuth in the end.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: The handwriting on the graphic you were just showing --

MR. BERTRAND: Yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: -- it was figure 78. That's Mr. Doody's, is it?

MR. BERTRAND: I believe it is, yes.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: It says "Get lats and longs of..." what points?

MR. BERTRAND: Of turning points, I think. I'm not sure.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: It doesn't look like turning --

MR. BERTRAND: I have known that answer once, a long time ago, in this file.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I'm glad that your memory is not all that much better than mine.

MR. BERTRAND: Maybe we can find it out before we are over. I have known this at one point.

Now, turning to the next figure, which is the depiction of the combined permit practice of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and this is based on figure 28.

Mr. Drymer, Deputy Agent for Nova Scotia, informs me that it's "junction points", and with your permission, I will lend you his magnifying glass.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: No, no, it's okay.

MR. BERTRAND: And this figure, slide 29, is based on figure 28, which has already been used in our material. And we say, "In the end, the permit practice of the parties amply demonstrate the existence of a de facto line over the most part of the length of the boundary now sought by Nova Scotia." And moreover, the de facto boundary line, which has stemmed from the parties' permit issuance, bears no relationship whatsoever with the boundary now being proposed by Newfoundland, and which is now showing in red on the same figure.

Now, having said that, I would like to change topics, and deal with conduct in a more general sense. And it will lead me to make a few comments in response to arguments made by Mr. Willis last Monday.

First, at pages 776 and 777, Mr. Willis said "So the context in the quid pro quo, the objective in those years was, as I said, the big prize of ownership and jurisdiction and nothing less. And alluding to a point we have just been discussing, Nova Scotia has returned to its theme, and the 1964 proposed lines were to be the lines for all purposes. Nova Scotia cobbles together a pastiche of references to administrative arrangements to shore up this all purpose argument. There is..." he says, "...however, no evidence that Newfoundland and Labrador

ever bought into this."

This last statement of Mr. Willis, as I was reminded by a reference made by the Chairman last Thursday to Minister Otto Lang's letter, which letter is also discussed at paragraph 5.14 of the phase one Award, appears to be incorrect.

Second and more importantly, the conduct of the parties should not be found relevant -- irrelevant here, according to Mr. Willis, because the conduct does not relate to the basis of title. That's at page 770 and 771. To use his words, there is a "missing link" between the conduct on the one hand, and the Accords and the implementing legislation which forms the basis of title on the other hand. We disagree, obviously.

We would submit, with all due respect, that Mr. Willis attempted to rely on his credibility with this Tribunal, and to take some liberties with the state of international law, for there is no requirement in the law to have such a link present.

The conduct of the parties is either relevant or it is not. In this case, for the reasons I alluded to in my presentations last Thursday and Friday, all aspects of the conduct of the parties, consensus or agreement, if you will, with a small "a", permit practice or other subsequent conduct of the parties, as well as acquiescence



with a small "a", or tacit confirmation by Newfoundland, are all highly relevant to the Tribunal's mandate in this second phase.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Now Mr. Bertrand, I would agree with you, but as a -- I think I pointed out to Mr. Fortier, and again, I'm not trying to do this again, but if you say that what was created by the Accords, which is of course, well after the practice on which you essentially rely, if you say that what was created by the Accords was something entirely new and different, then surely there is a problem of connecting them. It's the same problem that the Court infer impliedly had in Qatar-Bahrain, when they were referred back to the pearling practice of Qatar-Bahrain in the twenties. And they said, well this stopped a long time ago, and it has got nothing to do with, in effect, it's got nothing to do with the continental shelf.

Now what Mr. Willis may have been trying to say, and I don't recall exactly what he was trying to say, but he may have been trying to say, is you can't connect up practice relating to a provincial claim to offshore areas of pertinent provinces with the subsequent grant of what, in your leader's submission, is quite different entity, a quite distinct entity.

MR. BERTRAND: Well, obviously our submission to that is that the basis of title is to be found in the Accords, and

the implementing legislation. However, the subject matter of these Accords and implementing legislation is closely related to the subject matter of the conduct that we have been describing to you in these proceedings. And hence, its relevance.

Now in fact, because of their particular characteristics, which I described at great length both Thursday and Friday last, talked about high degree of mutuality, we talked about referring to an earlier agreement, we talked about the concordant practice, and so on and so forth. These aspects of the conduct of the parties should play a decisive role in the Tribunal's choice of equitable criteria, and method of delimitation.

There exists no rule preventing the Tribunal from looking at, and considering the whole of the conduct of the parties, as Mr. Willis seems to have hinted. The Tribunal must have regard to all relevant circumstances.

In the present case, the conduct of the parties spans over a period of over 30 years from the late 1950s, when discussions between the provinces on the question of offshore entitlements began, to the mid 1980s, when each of Nova Scotia's and Newfoundland's Accords with the federal government was implemented in federal and provincial legislation.

The de facto line can be in law, and is in fact, the

result of a combination of various types of conduct, and the Tribunal must have regard to all of them. In the end, the Tribunal may rely on all of them to effect a delimitation along the line Nova Scotia is now seeking.

And these conclude my remarks this afternoon. Unless you have additional questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal.

CHAIRMAN: Yes, I wonder --

MR. BERTRAND: Was wondering -- you were wondering?

CHAIRMAN: Have you concluded your --

MR. BERTRAND: Yes, I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN: I was just wondering if we might take a short break now? Would you -- because your time is important, you might give me a notion how long we should break?

MR. FORTIER: I -- thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not be more than -- absent questions, I will not be more than half an hour in closing. So this would be an appropriate time to call a break.

CHAIRMAN: Yes. Fifteen minutes.

(Short recess)

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fortier?

MR. FORTIER: Merci, Monsieur President. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, before I start my final and concluding remarks, if I may address three or four matters of housekeeping or follow up questions, which don't really

fit into my péroraison.

One, last week the Tribunal expressed an interest in seeing the written pleadings of the parties in the Canada-France arbitration, and my friends and I have agreed that we would make available to the Registrar the Canadian pleadings. As far as the French pleadings are concerned, I'm informed that they are locked up in a vault somewhere in the Quai D'Orsay in Paris and not available, regrettably.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Mr. Fortier, in fact, it turns out the technical expert has a copy of the Canadian pleadings.

MR. FORTIER: Oh, really?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Yes.

MR. FORTIER: It is available?

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: So I think -- I think we are all right from that point of view. I was hoping I might get a copy of the French pleadings, but --

MR. FORTIER: Well, there is one member of the Nova Scotia team who has a copy of the pleadings, of course -- Monsieur François Mathys, but he is under a professional obligation not to -- and I haven't seen them. No, no, I'm sorry. That is not true. What am I saying? Of course, Mr. McRae and I have seen them. I don't remember them, is what I mean.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: I can -- I can relate to that. I think

we're okay.

MR. FORTIER: Okay. Now there was -- at the start of his address to the Tribunal this afternoon, Mr. Bertrand was searching for a reference in the Gulf of Maine Award, the Gulf of Maine decision to potential resources of the subsoil which the Chamber said was one of the principal stake in the proceedings, and that is to be found at paragraph 232. "This bank", that's referring to Georges Bank, "is a real subject of the dispute between the United States and Canada in the present case, the principal stake in the proceedings, from the viewpoint of the potential resources of the subsoil."

Another question that was put to Mr. Bertrand with respect to the date when the Nova Scotia Mobil permits may have ceased being the -- being used, in effect annex 178 in the Nova Scotia pleadings, written pleadings, demonstrate that the Nova Scotia Mobil permits were still being worked in 1974, including drilling. And I would point out that Mr. Colson himself on Monday, referring to page 850 of the transcript, mentioned that "Certain wells in Mobil's permit areas were only spudded, opened in 1975 and 1976." That's at page 850 of the transcript.

And finally, a question put to Mr. Bertrand when Professor Crawford was trying to drive a wedge between him and your humble servant -- I would point out that in

consultation with Mr. Bertrand, that it is -- reference being to the missing link, the alleged missing link, that the Accords did not represent a clean break with the past; that legal title originates in the Accords, but the Accords were the culmination, of course, of a long period of negotiations and other conduct which can trace its origin back to 1958.

So with these matters out of the way, I now begin my last intervention on behalf of the Province of Nova Scotia in this important arbitration. And I don't think it would be inappropriate for me to say a few words -- very few words about the -- what Mr. -- Professor McRae earlier this week referred to as the development and the evolution of the law of maritime boundary delimitation. I've entitled my remarks "the long march of the law of maritime delimitation".

Yes, Newfoundland's entire case is premised on its view of this evolution. It is based on the theory that the history of maritime delimitation decisions since the North Sea Cases may be viewed as a straight line progression of attempts to restrict the factors that may be taken into consideration by the adjudicator, and that this historical development has culminated in the reduction of relevant factors to one set, geographical.

But if -- as Members of the Tribunal know, if there is

one subject in respect of which the International Court has plainly acknowledged an about face, or I would say a volte-face, it is on this question of natural prolongation, and despite this volte-face, Newfoundland and Labrador continues to cling to this hour -- continues to cling to and to rely on as the foundation of its case the principle of natural prolongation, as it was enunciated in the North Sea Cases.

On Monday, for example, counsel for Newfoundland and Labrador reproduced for us paragraph 43 of the Court's decision in the North Sea Cases. And in quoting from Article 76 of the 1982 Law of the Sea, he selectively referred only to those portions which, read out of context and in isolation from the rest, could be construed as representing complete continuity with the North Sea cases.

Now as it has done since the beginning of this arbitration, Newfoundland and Labrador has studiously ignored the significance and the terms of Article 76 in its entirety, which clearly reflect those developments at UNCLOS III that marked a departure from the historical concept of natural prolongation as traditionally understood.

The recognized difficulty with the older concept, the depasser concept of natural prolongation, was that while it provided an apt description of the link between the

sovereignty of a coastal state over its land territory and its sovereign rights of the continental shelf, it provided no practical basis on which to define the shelf between neighbouring states or to determine the seaward limit of the shelf.

So if Newfoundland wished to build its case on natural prolongation and on criteria drawn from it, then at the very least it should have taken due account of the evolution of the concept, as reflected both in the jurisprudence and in Article 76 of the 1982 Convention.

The need to have proper regard to these developments in the process of delimitation -- this will be the only reference that I will submit to the Court at this point -- it was recognized by the Court in Libya-Malta when it said, "It follows that, for juridical and practical reasons, the distance criterion must now apply to the continental shelf as well as to the exclusive economic zone. The concepts of natural prolongation and distance are therefore not opposed, but complementary, and both remain essential elements in the juridical concept of the continental shelf."

Now in this case, Libya-Malta, the Court was not concerned with delimitation of the broad shelf, as we remember, given the location of and relatively short distance between the two states concerned. But in this



case, however, the implications of the statement by the Court are clear. Article 76 must be looked at as a whole as a basis for the definition of the seaward limits of the parties' offshore areas as defined in the Acts.

Now as both Professor Saunders and I pointed out last week and as I explained in some -- and as is explained in some detail in Appendix B, much referred to Appendix B of our Phase Two Memorial, the criteria and methods defined in Article 76 depend not only on geography, but also on geology, geomorphology and distance. And although those criteria are complex, the present delimitation clearly requires your Tribunal to look beyond 200 nautical miles to the outer edge of the margin.

The key to the delimitation cannot be found in an outmoded conception of natural prolongation, nor on criteria drawn from it, such as no cut-off or nonencroachment, as I believe Professor Saunders has demonstrated. Nor is the answer to be found in geography alone. Ultimately, Mr. Chairman, members of the Tribunal, the jurisprudence does not support Newfoundland and Labrador's theory of the evolution of the law, nor does it support the practical implications sought by Newfoundland, principally, the exclusion or at least the significant demotion, of non-geographic factors in what it has called the proper hierarchy of relevant circumstances. Relevant

circumstances of a non-geographic nature can and should be considered in any maritime delimitation. And in the present case, such circumstances may assume the pride and place -- the pride of place typically reserved for coastal geography and the delimitation of geographically generated zones.

The law of maritime delimitation has developed and changed slowly over time; however, just as the light from a fading star reaches the earth only long after the star has been extinguished, it may be another millennium before the light of this evolution dawns on Newfoundland, whose case is founded on a prehistoric version of the law of maritime delimitation that continues to radiate although its source is long dead.

The reason for what can be described as the incremental evolution of this branch of the law, and indeed the explanation for the many inconsistencies in the case, is fundamental. At the heart of the law of maritime delimitation, Mr. Chairman, is the need to strike a balance between the requirement to define rules, which are capable of being applied to all situations of like character, and so provide a legal basis to the delimitation exercise, but which are at the same time able to take cognisance of the unique circumstances of each individual case, so as to ensure that the results are

equitable.

As Professor Prosper Weil writes, "Here more than elsewhere, it is hard to keep one's balance between the Scylla of the blind automatism of the general and the Charybdis of the irreducibly unique, and the risk of falling to one or other of them is considerable."

The law dictates that the equitableness of the result is the predominant concern. The consequence is that, as in modern resource management, fisheries is a prime example, a precautionary approach is mandated in maritime delimitation. And if the adjudicator, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, is to err as he or she strives to carry out his or her responsibilities, he or she must make every effort to do so on the side of equity.

Last Thursday, in the course of Nova Scotia's first round submissions, Professor Crawford drew the parties' attention to a speech recently delivered to the Sixth Committee of the U.N. General Assembly by His Excellency Judge Gilbert Guillaume, President of the ICJ. We have heard from Professor Saunders this morning, the Nova Scotia reaction to that speech.

Perhaps the most useful light in which to view President Guillaume's comments are as an expression of his personal aspirations for the law of maritime delimitation, rather than as proof positive of any consensus amongst the

members of the Court, as reflected in the cases. As Professor Crawford suggested this morning, those comments do not necessarily constitute holy writ. And I doubt that even my distinguished friend, President Guillaume, would disagree with that statement.

As regard his conclusion that, "by means of developments in the Court's case law, the law of maritime delimitation has reached a new level of unity and certainty, while conserving the necessary flexibility, one can only wait and see whether his views are borne out in subsequent developments." And I'm certain I'm not alone in sharing his hope for certainty in the law, but not at the expense of equity.

In the present case, I doubt strongly that even President Guillaume would consider that the cause of certainty would be advanced by disregarding 40 years of history during which Newfoundland and Labrador adhered to the existing line and never formally articulated any other offshore claim.

In any event, the development of the law continues. Evolution is then an inexorable process. Your decision in this arbitration will doubtless, not only reflect, but also help to shape that process.

As George Bernard Shaw remarked, with his usual insight, "all great truths begin as blasphemies." The

wisdom of this observation resonates here, a case in which three very eminent arbitrators are asked to do their duty, fulfil their mandate, and apply the law, to facts in a context that has been called unprecedented. And where doing so has all but been condemned by Newfoundland and Labrador with the feigned piety that it can muster as heresy.

In his closing arguments this week, my friend, the Agent for Newfoundland and Labrador, Professor McRae, sought to cast himself as a modern-day Odysseus, to use his own metaphor, lashing himself to the mast, as it were, so as to resist the siren call that would lure less heroic mortals to their doom. But whereas a classical hero looked to his own destiny, Newfoundland's Agent is more concerned about the fate of the Members of the Tribunal. For it is to you that he has issued the invitation to chain yourselves to his ship. Resist the siren call to be a pioneer, he intoned. Resist the siren call to embrace new concepts. The sub-text is not subtle. You are invited to stick your heads in the sand.

In particular, you are invited to ignore the specific facts of this case, for the reason that they are unprecedented. And, yes, almost certainly unique in the annals of internal relations and jurisprudence. You are invited to eschew rules of law which, though they are

manifestly applicable, may never yet have been applied in any decision in any reported case. And lest such coaxing proves insufficient on its own, a little negative reinforcement is called in aid.

Newfoundland and Labrador invites you, "to resist the siren call to invert the law of relevant circumstances, or to apportion instead of delimit. Resist the invitation to reverse the result of your decision in phase one, or to undermine those decisions on maritime boundary delimitation affecting Canada."

Indeed, you were told, "if you draw a line that is contrary to what was done in these cases, or a line whose placement indicates that the approach or reasoning of these cases was wrong," -- well, let's be frank, Professor McRae meant a line that does not both mirror the geographic considerations of the Court in Canada-France, and mimic the methods used by the Chamber in the Canada-U.S. case. That is if you dare to be bold, as to differ from those decisions in any way, then your determination will have, "drastic implications of casting doubt on the very delimitations that those case effected." Those are his words. They are not mine. This is heavy stuff indeed. And we thought that Professor Saunders was the emotional one.

As you ponder the invitations and the calls to

resistance issued by Newfoundland and Labrador, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Tribunal, to bear in mind, coolly and reasonably, the nature and the true bearing of the vessel to which it asks you to tie yourselves. Ask yourselves whether a proverbial doom actually awaits you if you do not adhere to the confined, blinkered approach to the delimitation that Newfoundland and Labrador has charted. And consider the real impact of your decision in this matter, and the harm that would be done if, with the sweep of a pen, the Tribunal were to decree that 40 years of history meant nothing.

This is a watershed moment in the history of Atlantic Canada. Your decision in this case will define both the past and the future of the region. And indeed will resonate far beyond. It will determine whether 40 years of good faith dealings have any meaning or whether they can be written off as though nothing of any significance took place throughout the period 1958 to the present.

And it will determine whether the next stage of the history of this region is to have any link to the past, determine how and where offshore development will proceed in the future, and determine how two Canadian provinces, doing business together, as they do every day, should henceforth conduct themselves.

Of course, as we have written, as we have said,

Newfoundland and Labrador has absolutely nothing to lose in this Arbitration. It never has. If the current, legislated line is maintained, Newfoundland and Labrador will find itself with the same equitable boundary it agreed to and applied long ago. It will find itself with the same equitable boundary that has allowed it, and will continue to allow it to develop to great profit and without any obstruction or competing claims thrown out by Nova Scotia, or any hesitation on the part of the federal government, the resources located in its offshore area.

This is the worst that Newfoundland can expect from your decision.

But if only a fraction of the areas on Nova Scotia's side of the line that Newfoundland now claims are awarded to it, it will have gained significantly. As an oil and gas man might say, the prospectivity is enormous. Over the years, Newfoundland's claims, I use the word loosely, since no formal claim was made between 1964 and August 2001, over the years, Newfoundland's claim have only become more ambitious.

The illustration on the screen depicts the existing boundary as compared with the line shown on Mr. Doody's 1972 map, the line published in Newfoundland's 1977 Petroleum Regulations, the without prejudice line shown to Nova Scotia in 1998. And finally, the line currently



claimed to be equitable by Newfoundland.

It's a good thing that Nova Scotia pressed for a speedy resolution of the dispute. The record suggests that had it not done so, Newfoundland's claim would have been even more excessive than it is.

PROFESSOR CRAWFORD: Perhaps a claim to Sable Island as well as St. Paul Island.

MR. FORTIER: At least. Why not throw in Cape Breton too. Nova Scotia's situation, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, is vastly different. We are aware that no party to an adjudicated delimitation has ever, to our knowledge, been awarded the line that it claimed.

In all respects Newfoundland and Labrador certainly appears to have anticipated that this Tribunal will not award it the line that it has claimed, it has thrown out an excessive claim. An obviously excessive claim. A demonstratively excessive claim. With the apparent aim solely of convincing the Tribunal to award it something. Anything more favourable than the existing boundary.

As I have said, Nova Scotia is in a vastly different situation than Newfoundland. The boundary that it proposes, and that it asks the Tribunal to find constitutes an equitable delimitation, is itself the product of a compromise. Accepted many years ago as a fair and honourable solution after several years of

negotiations. The record is replete with these negotiations.

Nova Scotia could have claimed a line that did not reflect the compromise that it agreed to in 1964, and has lived with ever since. But it did not. It would have been dishonourable, at the very least, for it to disavow the compromise reached with all of its provincial neighbours. At most, it would have been highly disruptive for it to do so.

And ask yourselves, Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Tribunal, how would Newfoundland, and how would you, have reacted had Nova Scotia come before this Tribunal to ask for a boundary other than the one which it has consistently, openly and reasonably held to be an expression of what both parties considered equitable for almost 40 years. A boundary other than the one implemented in all of its pertinent laws and regulations. A boundary other than the one shown on its maps. A boundary other than the one which it pleaded was resolved by agreement in the first phase of this arbitration.

There can be no surprise that Nova Scotia has no other line to propose to the Tribunal. There can be no surprise that in this, the delimitation phase of the arbitration, initiated by Newfoundland and Labrador, it proposes the line.

The fact that the boundary proposed by Nova Scotia is itself a compromise, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, cannot be ignored. The boundary already takes into account the competing claims of the parties, as these reviewed by them prior to Newfoundland's initiation of the dispute. What Newfoundland and Labrador seeks is in fact a second kick at the can.

Taking the line not as the compromise that it truly reflects, but as what Newfoundland and Labrador might call a point of departure, Newfoundland asks the Tribunal to fix a line that will represent yet a further and with respect, a wholly unwarranted compromise.

As I've mentioned in my introductory remarks last week, Newfoundland and Labrador's obvious course in this arbitration is to claim a boundary so extreme, that no matter how the difference between that line and the existing boundary is divided, most or all of the area of primary interest, the Laurentian Sub-basin, falls to Newfoundland.

I've called Newfoundland's game "split the difference". Another expression also comes to mind, Mr. Chairman, "Heads, Newfoundland wins; tails, Nova Scotia loses".

The point is that this situation arises precisely because of the unique circumstances of this case.

Circumstances which, although Newfoundland and Labrador ignores them, Nova Scotia will not, lest its good faith be called into question by every other government with which it enjoys relations.

In its written and oral submissions in phase two of the arbitration, Nova Scotia has set out a reasoned coherent case, demonstrating that for a variety of reasons, taking into account a variety of considerations and criteria, the appropriate delimitation to be effected in this instance is for the Tribunal to apply the boundary that the parties themselves developed by agreement and other conduct.

That boundary is the clearest expression of what the parties sheltered from the stormy emotional atmosphere of the hearing room, considered to be equitable. It faithfully reflects the geographic and other circumstances relevant to this case. And it represents a demonstrably equitable result.

Nova Scotia's efforts have been directed to advancing not an excessive claim, concocted for the purpose of litigation, but a balanced, sound and equitable result, one that is grounded in the legal and factual context in which this case occurs, and that encourages the Tribunal to consider all of the circumstances of this unique dispute, and give each of them the weight to which they

are entitled.

On Friday last week, the Tribunal will recall that I spoke of ten basic truths of this case. I'm not going to repeat them at this late hour, but I invite you, very respectfully, to keep them in mind as you deliberate.

We have to return -- you have to return to the basics. You have to separate fact from fiction. You have to focus on the facts of this case, and on all of the undeniably relevant circumstances, including geography, including the true legal basis of that which is to be delimited; namely the offshore areas as defined in the Acts.

Since it is by this standard that every other consideration must be measured and weighed, including the location of the only resources that give any meaning whatsoever to the highly restricted rights comprising the parties' offshore entitlements, including the public declarations by both governments that the location of those resources, in the immediate vicinity of the existing boundary, constitutes the true reason for this dispute.

And including the line that the parties themselves once accepted as equitable. The line that can be clearly seen on your screen at the moment, by reference to the parties permit conduct alone. A line that two governments have enshrined in legislation, and a line that by any measure effects an equitable delimitation of the parties'

offshore area entitlements under the principles of international law governing maritime delimitation.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, I remind you of the statement of Premier Moore's in June of 1972. The Premier of Newfoundland at the time. When he rose, not just anywhere, he rose in the famed Newfoundland House of Assembly, to proclaim, and you will recall, that the governments of the five eastern provinces have agreed to the delineation and description of the offshore boundaries between each of these five provinces.

Almost 30 years later, in the first phase of the present arbitration, Newfoundland and Labrador convinced the Tribunal that no binding agreement arose with respect to this boundary.

It won. And we respect that decision.

Nova Scotia is confident that Newfoundland and Labrador will not win again. We're confident that the Tribunal will attribute to the words and deeds of Newfoundland's leaders, including the unambiguous statement of Premier Moore's, to which I have referred, quote, "The legal effect, or consequence, that they are due in the context of the second phase of the present delimitation."

Nova Scotia's aim throughout this case, Mr. Chairman, has been to furnish the Tribunal with all of the evidence

that it requires. Evidence regarding all of the relevant circumstances, as well as in this phase of the arbitration, all of the appropriate criteria and methods of delimitation. Evidence regarding the equities at issue. The correctness of our proposed line. And the fallaciousness of Newfoundland's skewed delimitation. In short, all of the evidence that the Tribunal will require when it commences the task of drawing the boundary that it has been asked to determine in all of its wisdom.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Tribunal, because the time has come to close, I would like to quote Nova Scotia's Premier Stanfield, from his address to the conference of Atlantic Premiers held in Fredericton, New Brunswick, on September 22nd, 1959. Premier Stanfield, in Fredericton, 41 years ago, said "I wish to thank the Chairman for the warm welcome that he has extended to us. I can say with all sincerity that it is a real pleasure for us to have this opportunity to meet in this old city of Fredericton. It is a delightful city to visit, and the pleasure of such a visit is enhanced by the welcome that has been extended by all the people of this city. The circle has been completed..." he said, in 1959, "...and we're now back at the place where the first conference of the Atlantic Premiers was held on July 9, 1956."

It is most appropriate, Mr. Chairman, Members of the

Tribunal, that we've returned to Fredericton for this hearing. That we've returned to the place where the first conference of Atlantic Premiers was held, at which the issue of provincial entitlements to the offshore and the boundaries between those entitlements, was first discussed amongst the premiers.

That extract from Premier Stanfield's speech can be found in Nova Scotia's Annex 9, at page one.

It is appropriate that it should be here in Fredericton. That Nova Scotia asked the Tribunal to delimit the line dividing the offshore areas of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador in a manner that is consistent with what the parties themselves determined at a conference of Atlantic premiers held in 1964, and as reflected in their subsequent conduct was an equitable division of their respective claims.

Mr. Chairman, it remains only for me to reaffirm all of the arguments made in Nova Scotia's written and oral submissions in this arbitration. And to reiterate our submission, that applying the principles of law governing maritime boundary delimitation and consistent with the Terms of Reference, the line dividing the respective offshore areas of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador is the line defined by the co-ordinates set out in part 7, paragraph 16 of the phase two Memorial of Nova



Scotia.

It has been for me and my colleagues an honour and a privilege to represent the Province of Nova Scotia in this arbitration. I on behalf of -- on my own behalf and on behalf of all of my colleagues, I would like to thank the members of the Tribunal for their challenging attention to the presentations which my colleagues and I have made in both phases of this arbitration. I would like to thank the Tribunal's expert, whose task now begins, I guess. I would like to thank the Registrar. I would like to thank the reporter and all members of her team. And I would like to thank, on our side of the room, all of those people, many anonymous, who have contributed to the presentation by advocates, by counsel in the course of the last two weeks. I refer to the men and women of Cabana-Seguin. I refer to my friend, Mr. Galo Carrera, technical advisor. I refer to Mr. David Raymond, technical advisor. I refer to Professor Prosper Weil, and François Mathys who have been special advisors to the team. I refer to Brian Cuthbertson who has been the historic researcher. And I refer, of course, to Madame Helene Gladue, who is refereed to amongst our team as "the boss" of the Nova Scotia team.

But last and not least, I would like to thank the deputy agent and counsel, Mr. Drymer, Stephen Drymer, the author of many of my own remarks in the course of the last

two phases, and without whose contribution, the advocates on behalf of Nova Scotia could not even have begun to do justice to Nova Scotia's case. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Tribunal.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Fortier. I would like to thank all of you for the assistance and congratulate you on the conviction, the clarity and the eloquence with which you presented your case. The Tribunal now has the difficult task of taking this into account. We have in mind the prescient of the last time, when we produced it about the time the Terms of Reference told us to. This is a far more difficult case, but we will attempt to do the same this time to stay very close to the time limits.

And I would like to thank all of you for the assistance you have given us, and wish you a good rest of the day and happy flight for those of you who are taking it. Thank you.

MR. MCRAE: Mr. Chairman, really on behalf of Newfoundland and Labrador, I would like to echo Mr. Fortier's words in thanking both you, the Tribunal, Mr. Gray, the technical expert, the Registrar, and the court reporter and the people who have provided the sound throughout this hearing. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. McRae. Now to the work.

(Adjourned)

Certified to be a true transcript of the proceedings of this  
Arbitration as recorded by me, to the best of my ability.

*Samuel Lynes*  
Reporter

A				
ab 905:16	accord 897:12,12	1009:11 1018:6	affected 949:16	1038:11 1054:21
abandoned 987:12	898:4,7,7,8,9,17	1020:10 1031:23	993:2	1056:12 1058:14
abdicate 897:6	898:23,24 901:24	1051:7	affecting 961:4	agreements 914:12
ability 986:10	901:26 902:2,7	add 917:22 966:12	1050:11	941:8
1000:9 1003:8	923:7 933:6,19	980:8	affects 921:13 926:2	ahead 937:24
1021:15 1062:24	937:2 938:24	added 947:3 965:22	926:5,7 980:9,13	968:13 970:25
able 903:5 911:12	939:4,19 1000:14	974:7 1004:7	affirm 906:23	aid 1050:5
978:11 1027:13	1000:15,21,22	addition 999:9	affirmed 1026:20	aim 1053:18
1046:24	1020:8 1021:6,8	additional 1031:5	affirms 934:2	1058:25
about 900:25	1021:18,19,20,21	1039:7	after 899:3 900:26	aimed 1026:6
902:19,26 906:9	1021:22,26	address 904:6,19	901:4 902:14	airport 937:17
908:4 911:15	1022:26 1023:2	947:14 950:15	919:22,24 923:25	995:23
918:23 935:20	accorded 979:21	962:13 972:7	923:26 932:21	airspace 908:11
940:7 947:11	according 931:4	984:18 1039:25	933:7 964:26	albeit 939:12
948:26 951:6	989:9 993:4	1041:4 1059:13	983:18 1014:11	986:20 1006:16
952:11 955:20	1002:11 1006:7	addressed 900:17	1018:11 1020:26	1011:7 1030:26
957:4 959:4 961:3	1006:10 1036:10	905:9 912:17	1026:13 1030:5	alive 982:18
963:25 964:21	accordingly 901:3	924:19 941:6	1030:15,18,26	Allan 943:22
968:22 969:11	Accords 897:16	948:12 957:18	1031:2 1032:26	alleged 1042:3
977:10 981:2	899:10 915:12,14	966:9 992:24	1033:5,9 1037:9	allocated 950:8,11
983:6,12 987:6	1036:13 1037:8	993:16	1046:10 1053:26	977:3,9
993:23 997:25	1037:10,26	addressing 946:3	afternoon 993:18	allocation 980:22
1001:2,8 1005:8,9	1038:3,23 1042:4	adds 955:8 975:14	995:17 996:5	allow 978:22 985:24
1005:20 1015:14	1042:5,6	adduce 1028:20	1039:6 1041:4	1052:8
1020:15 1024:4	account 904:17	adduced 932:13	again 909:4 910:25	allowed 1052:7
1024:16 1030:4	928:17 943:19	adhere 1051:7	916:23 918:15	allowing 978:11
1032:19 1038:9	949:14 971:21	adhered 1048:18	926:3 929:13	allude 900:7
1038:10,11	973:23 993:5	adjacency 907:12	931:6 943:2 946:3	alluded 905:23
1042:13 1043:3	996:15 997:6	907:24 958:5	954:19 955:14	1019:21 1036:22
1049:16 1062:6	1044:9 1055:5	963:7 968:9,14,17	968:21 972:11	alluding 1035:20
above 908:11	1056:9 1062:5	970:25 981:23	976:18 977:16	almost 903:26
absent 1039:17	accounts 999:5	adjacent 907:14	979:13 987:4	929:15 932:15
absolute 986:12	accrue 912:2	963:12 970:23	989:14 993:17,26	944:7 958:20
987:10	accuracy 895:18	977:2	1002:18 1003:12	962:4 968:11
absolutely 899:9	accurate 975:26	adjoining 1001:5	1005:10,13	989:3 994:12
901:10 910:26	accurately 910:23	adjourn 995:20	1007:3 1012:22	1049:24 1054:17
911:6 917:17	accusing 942:20	Adjourned 1062:21	1014:18 1015:9	1058:12
934:19 944:5,5	achieve 943:20	adjudicated	1016:5 1026:21	alone 921:5 983:18
967:26 970:7	achieved 953:25	1053:12	1037:7,7 1058:18	1045:20 1048:12
1052:2	acknowledged	adjudication 939:8	age 894:23	1057:24
abstract 994:26	907:12 935:8	adjudicator 913:16	agenda 899:11	along 939:5 951:25
abundantly 897:17	1043:3	919:23 1042:23	agent 906:2 922:7	998:14,16 999:17
907:8 911:13	acquiescence	1047:12	932:7 937:20	999:23 1008:8
abut 910:14 928:11	1020:6 1036:26	adjudicators 929:17	944:19 1027:7	1011:3 1012:13
abuts 1010:14	acreage 1007:8	adjusted 970:3	1034:24 1049:10	1012:18 1017:2,2
abutting 927:26	across 952:20 963:8	administration	1049:15 1061:25	1017:23 1019:11
928:4 1016:25	Act 897:18,24	911:26 913:21	ago 925:6 934:15	1025:7 1030:26
accentuate 928:24	898:16 916:23	914:21 924:9	1034:16 1037:16	1031:6 1039:5
accept 905:14	917:6 1026:9	administrative	1052:6 1053:25	alongside 999:20
919:13 951:9	acted 1029:14	995:10 1035:24	1059:16	already 931:19
976:20 979:25	activities 1000:10	admit 935:16	agree 899:5 915:7	960:18,24 962:18
987:8	1001:24 1016:9	956:22 996:16	917:5 949:25	973:24 997:21
acceptable 980:2	1019:4 1032:20	admitted 1018:9	967:26 971:16	1033:10 1035:4
995:18	activity 932:21	adopted 957:24	979:2 984:4	1055:4
accepted 950:6	1030:16,17	1022:3 1027:17	1037:5	alteration 992:16
1033:11 1053:25	Acts 897:16 921:19	1027:22	agreed 911:17	alternative 953:4
1057:22	933:19 1045:5	adoption 897:11	934:17 935:25,26	972:6
accepting 1033:15	1057:12	advanced 1048:17	987:2 1040:5	although 901:25
access 926:18	actual 902:9 957:14	advancing 1056:20	1052:6 1054:5	907:12 916:24
958:24 970:4	973:9,11 988:25	advantage 964:17	1058:9	920:8,11 943:25
981:12 984:23	997:7 1005:11	advantageous 966:2	agreement 903:15	953:24 963:13
996:18 1028:23	actually 904:21	advisor 1061:18,18	904:16 919:13	968:20 970:7
1028:24	912:16 921:12	advisors 1061:20	922:22,25 935:22	971:15 977:24
accessed 1028:22	925:21 928:25	advocated 919:3	940:23 941:25	985:20 1019:12
accommodate	947:20 963:12	920:21	942:2,6,19,26	1045:11 1046:14
1033:22	977:25 984:6	advocates 1061:15	943:3 944:23	1056:2
accomplished	986:14 996:26	1062:1	961:2 981:24	altogether 912:2
992:19	997:12 1003:10	affect 925:3 927:20	1020:18,20	915:4,4,5
	1004 20 1008:20	976:6,7	1026:24 1036:24	always 907:17

- 918:17 968:18  
 982:11 992:15  
 amazingly 953:16  
 ambitious 991:18  
 1052:21  
 amended 1026:8  
 amendment 1026:4  
 1026:5  
 American 1013:26  
 1014:15,24  
 1015:2,6  
 Amoco 998:16  
 1008:6  
 among 995:6  
 1008:25  
 amongst 1047:26  
 1060:7 1061:23  
 amounted 940:3  
 amounts 955:7  
 amply 1035:5  
 analogy 909:9  
 914:14 957:7  
 analysis 911:17  
 921:21 942:11,12  
 950:16 1000:18  
 anathema 896:8  
 angle 955:11 962:23  
 986:20  
 angles 954:21  
 955:14 962:16  
 Anglo-French  
 900:26 944:4  
 angular 956:6 963:7  
 986:21 992:16  
 annals 1049:25  
 annex 902:10  
 933:25 934:24,24  
 937:3 938:3  
 1007:6 1016:18  
 1017:5 1021:23  
 1027:6,16  
 1028:17 1041:16  
 1060:9  
 annexes 1016:23  
 annual 1014:14  
 anonymous 1061:14  
 another 903:2  
 914:11 924:14,15  
 940:10 944:3  
 955:16 959:10  
 962:20 987:3  
 992:3 994:2  
 1024:21 1041:14  
 1046:11 1055:22  
 answer 896:14  
 915:17,18,24  
 918:22 923:20  
 942:11,12 987:15  
 989:13 1018:8,15  
 1024:7 1034:15  
 1045:19  
 anticipated 1053:15  
 anticipating 1021:8  
 anyone 967:4  
 anything 939:3,7,16  
 959:24 974:25  
 983:5 1053:20  
 anyway 1030:19  
 anywhere 1058:7
- apart 915:15 952:11  
 999:3  
 apparent 986:18  
 994:21 1010:9  
 1053:18  
 apparently 948:23  
 1019:3  
 appealing 896:3  
 appear 895:21  
 927:24 962:13  
 966:14 968:17  
 969:9 1006:19  
 appearance 895:16  
 903:4  
 Appearances  
 894:15  
 appears 900:7  
 934:21 949:21  
 955:17 1028:18  
 1036:7 1053:15  
 Appendix 1045:8,8  
 applicable 925:16  
 931:17 943:25  
 1050:2  
 application 907:4  
 919:17 942:25  
 969:13 974:3  
 981:20,26  
 1025:18  
 applied 925:5  
 957:25 959:24  
 960:19 962:2,3  
 964:10 969:15  
 1031:25 1046:22  
 1050:2 1052:6  
 applies 931:20  
 apply 896:10,12  
 897:3 912:11,19  
 912:24 926:23,24  
 931:10,14 949:26  
 963:4 965:5  
 969:19 970:14,15  
 972:15 985:21  
 989:7 1044:17  
 1049:4 1056:11  
 applying 953:7  
 1060:21  
 appointed 940:19  
 apportion 1050:8  
 appreciate 909:21  
 934:9  
 appreciated 933:21  
 approach 951:15,24  
 952:7 956:20  
 957:16,22 971:21  
 979:23 981:3  
 986:12 1047:11  
 1050:14 1051:8  
 approaches 930:26  
 955:17 971:23  
 appropriate 943:6  
 958:2 966:20  
 979:12 992:15  
 1039:18 1056:10  
 1059:4,26  
 1060:10  
 appropriateness  
 964:24  
 approvingly 970 3
- 970:10  
 approximately  
 963:21 1005:12  
 approximates  
 953:16  
 approximation  
 975:25  
 April 937:17,25  
 1013:25  
 apt 1043:26  
 arbitral 933:8  
 arbitrary 972:20  
 arbitration 894:3  
 895:7 897:8 900:3  
 901:2 903:24  
 906:4 931:12,21  
 932:9,14,15  
 938:15 939:16,25  
 940:17,20 941:5  
 942:8,22 943:14  
 987:20 988:15  
 989:26 992:13,24  
 1021:9 1040:5  
 1042:11 1043:18  
 1048:23 1052:3  
 1054:21,24  
 1055:16 1056:7  
 1058:13 1059:4  
 1060:20 1061:5,9  
 1062:24  
 arbitrators 897:7  
 906:15 1049:3  
 arc 977:22,24 978:7  
 978:16,18,19,24  
 979:24  
 arcane 993:22  
 1009:2  
 arcs 975:25 979:18  
 arguably 919:20  
 1023:12  
 argue 928:2,13  
 936:14 968:11  
 971:13,20 982:3  
 986:12  
 argued 928:9  
 955:18 982:14  
 arguing 917:26  
 985:18 987:21  
 argument 912:5,22  
 912:26 913:11  
 922:19 927:5,5,6  
 929:3 955:23  
 956:19 976:21  
 977:16,17,18  
 985:17 986:16  
 987:19 993:22  
 1006:23 1013:5  
 1018:7 1019:8  
 1023:25 1035:25  
 arguments 895:16  
 896:2 941:4 998:5  
 1035:16 1049:9  
 1060:19  
 arise 931:15  
 arises 899:20  
 907:25 954:23  
 1055:25  
 arising 895:9  
 arithmetic 975:13
- arose 932:9 1058:14  
 around 948:10  
 953:4 976:17  
 989:22 1001:26  
 1020:11 1031:14  
 arrangements  
 1035:24  
 arrival 898:11  
 arrow 985:23,24  
 article 917:6 918:23  
 943:22 971:25  
 979:3 1015:4,5,5  
 1015:23 1043:13  
 1043:19 1044:11  
 1045:3,10  
 articles 1014:22,24  
 1015:8,10,18,21  
 1015:25  
 articulated 941:23  
 1048:19  
 artifice 994:2  
 asked 897:3 915:16  
 932:4 988:12  
 1049:3 1059:10  
 1060:11  
 asking 905:7  
 asks 930:17 1051:5  
 1053:23 1055:11  
 aspect 919:26  
 920:26 922:16  
 924:16 968:16  
 1022:24  
 aspects 914:10  
 916:6 1036:23  
 1038:12  
 aspirations 1047:25  
 Assembly 1047:19  
 1058:8  
 assert 1026:16  
 assertion 1012:21  
 1024:12 1025:11  
 1027:3  
 assertions 952:25  
 assessing 981:16  
 assistance 933:21  
 934:9 1062:4,11  
 Assistant 933:2  
 934:12  
 Association 1013:26  
 1014:15,24  
 1015:3,6,15  
 assume 930:18  
 979:7 987:18  
 993:2 1030:20  
 1031:26 1046:4  
 assumed 960:16  
 989:17 992:12  
 assumes 986:25  
 1002:18,24  
 assuming 967:18  
 assumption 986:15  
 986:15,21 987:6  
 assurance 1020:21  
 assure 945:14  
 assuring 1022:20  
 astonishing 945:3  
 Atlantic 897:11  
 898:14,14 924:17  
 1014:2 1021:6
- 1051:13 1059:14  
 1059:25 1060:4  
 1060:15  
 atmosphere  
 1056:15  
 attached 925:4  
 927:20 937:5  
 938:2  
 attack 972:20  
 attempt 939:14  
 951:5 1034:2  
 1062:8  
 attempted 904:26  
 941:11 1036:17  
 attempts 1006:18  
 1042:22  
 attended 989:26  
 attention 967:15  
 997:4 998:20  
 999:13 1013:6,7  
 1016:21 1032:15  
 1047:18 1061:7  
 attraction 951:21  
 1001:18  
 attribute 976:23  
 1058:19  
 attributes 975:21  
 August 933:7,9,15  
 934:22 935:5  
 936:9 939:24  
 940:14 1052:19  
 auspices 1009:9  
 Australian 1009:2,3  
 author 1015:5  
 1061:26  
 authorities 1009:10  
 1009:11 1013:18  
 1013:19 1014:20  
 1014:23  
 authority 936:26  
 949:4,7 982:10  
 1015:26  
 authorized 1024:18  
 automatic 1011:9  
 automatism 1047:5  
 autumn 937:13  
 available 930:3  
 950:14 1040:6,9  
 1040:15  
 average 953:8 954:7  
 954:12  
 averages 953:11  
 avocats 894:23  
 avoid 901:16 975:3  
 avoided 989:5  
 awaits 1051:7  
 award 900:7 931:11  
 932:18,21 941:7  
 941:23 942:10  
 944:12 1036:6  
 1041:5 1053:16  
 1053:19  
 awarded 1025:21  
 1052:15 1053:13  
 aware 937:18  
 963:10 1053:11  
 away 929:17,19  
 992:12  
 awhile 899:6

- 1027:24  
 azimuth 954:6  
 962:17 995:4  
 1002:7,16,21  
 1003:9,11  
 1004:17,20,22,26  
 1005:3 1006:9,19  
 1034:4  
 A-7 1004:6  
 A.D 894:7  
 a.m 894:9
- 
- B**
- B 999:10 1004:7  
 1008:24 1009:21  
 1012:3,18 1028:8  
 1045:8,8  
 back 909:21,22  
 924:3,10 926:2,3  
 926:4 938:19  
 948:19 956:5  
 958:11 969:4  
 972:17 975:18  
 977:20 996:8  
 1000:26 1001:14  
 1002:25 1003:18  
 1004:3 1007:7  
 1010:26 1014:20  
 1015:24 1019:6  
 1021:17,19  
 1027:9,19  
 1029:26 1037:14  
 1042:8 1059:24  
 backed 963:20  
 background 934:16  
 backing 958:13  
 961:21  
 backwards 923:24  
 baffle 945:9  
 baguette 951:4  
 983:17 984:16  
 986:17,26 987:18  
 988:11 990:5  
 991:22,25 992:20  
 Bahrain 967:8  
 balance 1046:21  
 1047:4  
 balanced 1056:22  
 balancing 992:14  
 bank 1041:9,10  
 barrage 917:23  
 barristers 894:23  
 based 923:2 924:12  
 930:26 931:2  
 955:22 959:23  
 969:5 983:18  
 987:7 1001:6  
 1034:23 1035:3  
 1042:19  
 basepoint 965:19  
 basepoints 965:16  
 969:6  
 bases 910:3  
 basic 896:18 925:11  
 957:25 1057:4  
 basically 1005:4  
 basics 905:21  
 909:21,22 926:3,3  
 1057:7
- basin 1019:23  
 bay 952:14 959:14  
 998:17 1008:7,7  
 BC 1014:11  
 bear 908:17 931:5  
 999:25 1051:4  
 bearing 915:19  
 1051:5  
 bearings 994:14  
 bears 1035:9  
 beat 948:26  
 became 898:12  
 963:12  
 become 943:3  
 1030:12 1052:21  
 before 895:16,21  
 896:20 902:9  
 905:7 921:15  
 923:23 924:19  
 927:24 932:12,17  
 938:15 940:12  
 946:10 947:24  
 949:26 952:5  
 956:23 972:9  
 991:11 994:6  
 995:7,11,21 996:8  
 997:15 1001:26  
 1002:2 1026:6  
 1029:20 1031:4  
 1034:19 1039:24  
 1046:11 1054:13  
 began 897:11  
 973:17 1029:23  
 1032:8 1038:22  
 begin 911:8 927:23  
 933:13 946:10  
 951:10 971:19  
 1042:9 1048:26  
 beginning 900:8  
 902:8 1006:3  
 1043:17  
 begins 911:7 913:10  
 919:5 975:26  
 976:12 1061:10  
 begun 1062:2  
 behalf 895:22  
 1013:22 1014:7  
 1042:10 1061:5,5  
 1061:6 1062:2,14  
 behaviour 998:24  
 behind 901:15  
 962:19 964:21  
 976:4 978:14  
 behooves 909:22  
 being 895:3 902:22  
 903:11 905:20  
 906:4 920:13  
 921:2 936:15  
 938:23 944:26  
 948:18 952:12  
 977:9 978:11  
 993:5 1003:3  
 1004:8,8,9  
 1014:22 1016:25  
 1018:11 1019:2  
 1028:13 1029:23  
 1032:9 1035:10  
 1041:16,16,19  
 1042:3 1046:22
- belief 939:15 945:8  
 1029:15  
 believe 900:13  
 903:18 907:5  
 911:13 932:11  
 933:17 993:26  
 997:11,13,26  
 998:18 1000:18  
 1001:17 1014:26  
 1019:2,4 1020:10  
 1030:7 1032:3  
 1033:17 1034:10  
 1045:18  
 believed 1029:13  
 believes 972:14  
 below 908:11  
 benchmark 911:9  
 942:14  
 benefits 911:26  
 913:21 924:9  
 Bernard 1048:25  
 beside 954:26  
 best 971:3 1062:24  
 better 898:11,16  
 899:2 947:22  
 951:25 964:16  
 1015:20 1019:20  
 1023:12,25  
 1034:18  
 beyond 902:18  
 945:8 953:11  
 959:13,16 965:2  
 978:19 992:25  
 1006:25 1045:13  
 1051:16  
 bifurcated 940:21  
 big 1035:19  
 bigger 962:20  
 binding 906:4  
 940:23 941:25  
 942:18 943:3  
 991:6,23 993:2  
 1058:14  
 bisect 954:19  
 962:16 978:23,24  
 bisector 952:7  
 953:15 955:10,26  
 956:5,7 962:22  
 963:6,7  
 Bissau 943:13,25  
 963:3 982:4,25  
 983:8 985:5  
 bit 1002:2 1006:16  
 bits 1030:13  
 bizarre 1030:21  
 bi-product 1031:13  
 black 953:17  
 blandly 896:2  
 blanketed 1014:16  
 blanketing 1013:9  
 blasphemies  
 1048:26  
 blessed 971:17  
 blind 1047:5  
 blindly 1011:14  
 blinkered 1051:8  
 block 1016:10  
 blocking 979:8  
 blow-up 1016:14
- board 898:20  
 body 963:8  
 boils 918:26  
 bold 1050:19  
 bona 895:20  
 borne 903:19  
 1048:11  
 boss 1061:23  
 both 905:9,22  
 910:10 912:6  
 914:10 921:11  
 927:24 928:7  
 930:21 938:25  
 948:16 949:14,15  
 953:12 955:20  
 966:14 971:14  
 973:3 975:11  
 979:11,20 982:13  
 982:15 987:2  
 988:7 991:6 994:5  
 995:3,4,9 1006:25  
 1007:2 1021:8  
 1027:12,15  
 1028:6,6,9  
 1033:11 1038:8  
 1044:10,20  
 1045:6 1050:16  
 1051:14 1054:16  
 1057:18 1061:9  
 1062:16  
 bother 1011:2  
 bottom 946:8  
 bought 1036:2  
 bounce 975:17  
 bound 988:15 992:5  
 boundaries 902:19  
 902:21,22 926:13  
 944:21 959:14  
 994:6 995:3  
 998:14 999:17  
 1008:9 1017:23  
 1020:24,26  
 1021:16 1058:10  
 1060:6  
 branch 1046:17  
 breadth 986:22  
 break 945:21  
 995:15,19  
 1039:14,15,19  
 1042:4  
 Breton 985:21,21  
 1053:9  
 Brian 1061:20  
 brief 931:24 950:16  
 957:19  
 briefly 904:24 907:8  
 910:22 932:11,17  
 938:13 939:13  
 940:15 943:14  
 946:5,11 964:23  
 972:10,23 974:4  
 975:8 996:9  
 broad 968:9 1023:5  
 1044:24  
 broader 969:16  
 974:22,26  
 broke 995:17  
 broken 954:15  
 brought 894:22
- 969:17  
 Brunswick 894:8  
 1059:15  
 brush 1023:5  
 build 1044:7  
 builders 957:12  
 building 979:23  
 builds 930:16  
 built 957:11 994:2  
 bulletins 1014:15  
 Burin 952:3,20,20  
 953:21,26 954:18  
 965:17 990:21  
 business 1001:17  
 1032:2 1051:24  
 butress 1011:11  
 buy 927:7  
 byplay 969:12
- 
- C**
- C 1004:7,8  
 Cabana 1061:16  
 Cabot 948:19  
 998:16 1025:8  
 cake 955:4  
 calculate 969:8  
 calculated 946:23  
 975:11 990:11  
 1006:12  
 calculating 969:12  
 calculation 950:10  
 calculations 947:13  
 call 895:19 901:3  
 904:7 905:7 955:4  
 955:17 962:16  
 968:9 982:6  
 995:15 1039:19  
 1049:13,18,19  
 1050:7 1055:10  
 called 896:17  
 904:21 940:26  
 948:2 958:4  
 1045:25 1049:5  
 1050:5 1055:21  
 1056:4  
 calling 950:8  
 calls 953:19 954:14  
 984:17 1050:26  
 came 899:7 922:13  
 924:17 936:9,11  
 947:25 957:20  
 973:9 1000:14  
 1012:18 1022:26  
 1033:3  
 campaign 969:5  
 1031:19  
 Canada 900:20  
 906:5 915:7  
 916:20 923:11,14  
 928:3,14 930:20  
 930:21 931:15  
 933:8 1014:14,26  
 1015:9 1022:24  
 1040:4 1041:11  
 1050:11,18  
 1051:14  
 Canada's 1016:17  
 Canada-France  
 978:10 988:15

- 992:5 1016:6,17  
1050:17  
Canada-Newfoun...  
897:18 1022:25  
Canada-Nova  
897:24 1020:18  
1020:19 1023:2  
1026:24  
Canadian 928:7  
929:5 931:16  
936:26 1009:6  
1015:11 1023:24  
1040:6,12  
1051:23  
cannon 908:15,17  
917:23  
Canso 949:11  
954:17  
capable 902:22  
920:26 1046:22  
capacity 967:21  
Cape 952:2,20,20  
953:21 954:17  
975:22 978:9,15  
978:20,25 985:21  
985:21 1053:9  
carbon 1007:21  
care 947:15 960:18  
Caribbean 991:14  
Carrera 1061:17  
carry 911:9 950:16  
1025:17 1047:14  
carrying 1025:23  
cases 915:2 916:10  
950:6 956:23  
960:14 966:9,14  
966:17 967:24  
968:15 971:2,2  
982:21 983:18  
986:4 990:25  
1030:14 1042:21  
1043:9,12,16  
1048:2 1050:13  
1050:15  
cast 1049:11  
casting 1050:21  
casts 1023:4  
casual 897:15  
category 981:26  
cause 1048:16  
cautioned 907:11  
cautious 978:23  
caveat 1020:23  
Caves 965:19  
ceased 1001:11  
1041:16  
Centre 894:8  
certain 907:16  
918:16 926:16  
978:4 994:12  
998:3 1001:24  
1017:16,17  
1029:5 1030:15  
1041:21 1048:12  
certainly 900:15  
914:20 915:6  
919:3 922:21  
936:14 966:22  
970:12 980:2
- 985:15 1019:10  
1022:13 1029:18  
1049:24 1053:14  
certainty 957:2  
968:22 970:20  
1048:10,13,17  
Certified 1062:23  
chain 992:15  
1049:18  
challenged 905:20  
challenges 903:25  
903:25  
challenging 895:25  
1061:7  
Chamber 907:10,11  
909:3,11 918:13  
920:23 948:3  
958:4,22 959:19  
960:2,21 997:5  
1041:7 1050:18  
Chamber's 920:19  
960:18  
chance 953:14  
1032:6  
change 898:25  
899:2 918:3  
949:10 952:26  
960:4 986:15  
1024:4 1035:13  
changed 954:8,10  
983:2 992:26  
1046:9  
changes 1012:26  
1030:11,24  
changing 953:25  
956:18  
Channel 987:5  
character 912:10  
915:26 916:2  
925:23 995:2  
1046:23  
characteristics  
921:3 934:4  
1038:8  
characterization  
996:10  
characterizations  
956:19  
charged 896:15  
930:7  
charted 1051:9  
Charybdis 1047:6  
check 970:16 971:5  
997:13  
checked 996:18  
checking 996:16  
Chevron 998:18  
choice 930:25 931:2  
949:16 959:20  
964:17 982:16  
983:14,23 984:9  
1038:14  
choose 979:14  
chooses 964:14  
choosing 954:21  
981:19  
chosen 955:14  
961:19 968:25  
969:10 995:5,6,9
- chronology 900:16  
circle 1059:23  
circumstance  
912:26 917:20  
921:8,9 923:5,6,9  
924:2 943:26  
950:8 993:19  
circumstances  
911:4 912:12  
916:3 921:14  
923:26 925:4  
926:5,8,17 927:21  
929:18 966:8  
970:9,12 972:16  
973:23 981:10  
983:24 988:20  
991:14 993:24  
1038:18 1045:26  
1046:2,4,25  
1050:7 1055:26  
1056:2,17,25  
1057:10 1059:3  
cited 961:26 982:9  
city 1014:2 1059:19  
1059:20,22  
claim 901:20,21  
936:10 939:22,22  
940:4,9,12,12  
951:13 956:10  
973:13,14 989:18  
993:25 1011:11  
1037:21 1048:20  
1052:19,20  
1053:5,7,17,17,18  
1055:16 1056:21  
claimed 904:11,12  
989:23 1053:2,13  
1053:16 1054:4  
claiming 912:3  
claims 958:17  
973:11 994:10  
1014:18 1052:9  
1052:15,18  
1055:5 1060:17  
clarity 1062:4  
Clark 899:5,10  
class 999:10,11  
1000:7 1009:19  
1009:20,21  
1028:8  
classical 1049:14  
clause 898:18  
899:25  
clean 896:7 1042:4  
clear 897:17 907:8  
911:13 932:12  
935:14,16 940:3  
952:13 988:3  
1021:25 1022:14  
1027:18 1031:24  
1045:3  
clearest 1056:14  
clearly 895:17  
901:18,19 902:8  
909:2 965:26  
1007:7,7 1008:2  
1016:18,18  
1018:23 1043:20  
1045:12 1057:22
- cling 1043:6,7  
cloak 896:6  
close 905:5 908:12  
952:12 960:9  
966:16 982:22  
993:8 994:20  
1004:16,18  
1013:10 1017:3  
1059:12 1062:9  
closed 960:3  
closely 910:2 971:11  
1038:3  
closer 992:26  
closest 963:10  
closing 894:26  
952:14,19 953:23  
958:14,15,21  
961:22 962:25,25  
1039:18 1049:9  
1059:11  
cloud 905:2  
clue 1005:15  
co 916:19  
coast 908:19 922:11  
947:16 948:7  
949:9 951:4 952:6  
953:3,6,7 954:12  
954:17,25,25  
955:25 956:5  
958:13 960:17  
961:21 963:4,20  
964:4 965:26  
969:9 976:21,24  
976:26 977:9,11  
977:26 978:7,13  
979:9,10 981:6  
982:23 983:6  
985:13,14,19,21  
986:2,7,19 987:7  
987:14,16 992:6  
1013:25 1014:14  
coastal 906:20  
907:3,24 908:5,8  
908:12,20 909:6  
909:25 910:6,11  
912:3 913:23,23  
920:14 921:26  
922:12 928:7  
947:24 949:10  
952:9,13,22,26  
953:9,12,13,25  
955:5,12 960:12  
961:11,12 962:15  
962:23 963:23  
964:7 969:21  
970:6 974:19,22  
976:26 978:19  
979:19 987:9  
992:26 1044:2  
1046:5  
coastline 922:17  
952:16 963:21  
coasts 904:21 915:2  
927:26 928:11  
946:4,17 947:6,8  
947:13 949:5,16  
950:7,22 953:3  
954:7,9,9,17  
955:20,22 956:2,6
- 956:7 958:7,8  
960:20,25 962:16  
962:23 963:8,12  
966:19 967:5  
970:5 971:18  
972:6 974:12,25  
975:21 976:3  
977:7,15,18 978:8  
979:17 985:9  
986:22  
coaxing 1050:3  
cobble 1035:23  
coffin 1026:15  
cognisance 1046:25  
coherent 1056:8  
coincidence  
1005:18  
collapsed 1033:6  
colleague 945:16,22  
1022:8  
colleagues 895:21  
905:13 929:7  
936:12 1061:3,6,8  
collection 998:19  
colouring 1003:17  
Colson 948:24  
949:24 964:26  
966:10 968:16,21  
971:4 973:3 987:4  
992:4 993:9  
997:20 1008:2,16  
1010:6 1016:4,10  
1032:11 1041:20  
Colson's 961:15  
1000:17 1006:23  
1011:10 1016:21  
1018:7 1028:25  
combination  
1001:25 1039:2  
combined 953:2  
1034:22  
combining 953:6  
come 898:20 911:3  
923:23 924:10  
936:20 938:19  
958:11 971:8  
985:4 996:8  
1000:26 1007:16  
1018:11 1022:18  
1022:22 1027:22  
1029:26 1030:20  
1054:13 1059:12  
comes 968:16  
970:17 977:25  
987:8 1055:22  
comfortably 995:21  
comforting 905:26  
coming 903:7 916:9  
1019:6 1027:2  
1028:10,12,13  
1029:3  
commenced 938:16  
commences 1059:9  
commencing 894:8  
945:15  
commend 944:3  
comment 920:19  
932:24 1019:6  
1023:16 1024:10

- 1030:4  
 comments 904:5  
 932:7 966:5 970:8  
 998:3,4 1016:5  
 1021:11 1024:9  
 1035:15 1047:24  
 1048:3  
 Committee 1047:19  
 common 909:25  
 920:12 921:22  
 941:22 1033:6  
 companies 1000:19  
 1013:15 1025:17  
 1025:19 1031:25  
 companion 981:19  
 company 1008:23  
 1008:24 1012:24  
 1017:15 1025:21  
 1025:25,26  
 1026:9  
 comparable 909:14  
 1029:19  
 compare 953:2  
 954:16 1022:13  
 compared 952:22  
 952:22 965:23  
 1052:23  
 comparing 968:19  
 1008:14  
 comparison 960:17  
 968:23,25 976:24  
 977:13 1007:25  
 1008:13 1010:9  
 1018:24  
 Compass 945:11  
 competing 930:25  
 1052:9 1055:5  
 complaining 957:3  
 complementary  
 895:9 1044:20  
 complete 903:20  
 907:6 914:7,14  
 915:18 935:4  
 942:11,12  
 1043:16  
 completed 1059:23  
 completely 923:10  
 967:26  
 complex 896:14  
 1045:12  
 compliment 982:7  
 comply 1005:25  
 1032:5  
 component 956:24  
 comprised 998:24  
 comprising 1025:10  
 1057:16  
 compromise  
 1053:25 1054:5,8  
 1055:3,9,13  
 concealed 948:3  
 concede 996:17  
 1009:6  
 conceded 991:2  
 1033:6  
 conceived 909:5  
 concept 907:12  
 969:13 972:26  
 1043:22,24,25
- 1044:10,21  
 conception 930:8,11  
 930:14 1045:16  
 conceptions 974:11  
 concepts 910:2,10  
 1044:19 1049:20  
 concern 958:26  
 1047:9  
 concerned 917:6  
 1009:15 1021:2  
 1031:2 1032:17  
 1040:7 1044:24  
 1044:26 1049:16  
 concerning 904:13  
 921:4 932:6 941:8  
 concerns 905:11,23  
 905:24 915:16  
 921:17 959:4  
 964:21 969:17  
 concession 1032:19  
 concessions 1029:20  
 1032:17,26  
 conclude 1029:8  
 1039:6  
 concluded 1021:7  
 1039:11  
 concludes 1031:4  
 concluding 1039:25  
 conclusion 895:4  
 925:16 949:3  
 1005:25 1022:24  
 1022:25,26  
 1048:7  
 conclusions 941:4  
 concocted 1056:21  
 concordance 925:22  
 1022:15  
 concordant 1038:11  
 condemned 1049:6  
 conditions 924:15  
 1026:14  
 conducted 1016:9  
 1017:9 1030:16  
 conducting 1026:6  
 conducts 915:21  
 cone 974:16  
 conference 894:8  
 1059:14,24  
 1060:4,15  
 conferred 921:25  
 924:6  
 confers 926:15  
 confess 948:9  
 confidence 1027:5  
 confident 1058:17  
 1058:18  
 confidential  
 1028:22  
 configuration  
 948.15 955:26  
 959:6 994:10  
 configurations  
 959:13  
 confine 895:14  
 confined 910:18  
 1051:7  
 confirm 932:26  
 997:14  
 confirmation
- 1037:2  
 conflict 970:8  
 1008:19  
 conflicting 946:5  
 conforms 1005:21  
 confronted 896:19  
 960:5  
 confuse 905:2  
 confusing 954:15  
 congratulate 1062:4  
 conic 1002:19  
 1003:7,9,22  
 conjunction 920:13  
 conjure 922:6  
 924:25  
 Connaigre 951:26  
 952:7 978:13  
 980:7  
 connect 1037:20  
 connected 984:21  
 connecting 1037:12  
 connection 915:26  
 951:3  
 connotes 924:12  
 conscious 939:17  
 1012:21 1024:12  
 1025:11  
 consensus 943:7  
 1036:24 1047:26  
 consequence 942:3  
 949:11 969:25  
 1047:9 1058:22  
 Conservatives  
 899:4  
 conserving 1048:10  
 consider 895:23  
 904:7 918:15  
 923:20 929:4  
 941:16 960:25  
 969:14 973:17  
 986:7 988:24  
 1048:16 1051:9  
 1056:25  
 considerable  
 1030:23 1047:7  
 consideration  
 900:14 925:15,25  
 970:21 971:8  
 987:13 1042:23  
 1057:14  
 considerations  
 907:26 920:14  
 921:21 923:3  
 992:14 1050:17  
 1056:9  
 considered 896:20  
 901:22 921:2  
 925:4 927:21  
 944 25 981:15  
 988:2 1025:24,26  
 1046:3 1054:16  
 1056:16  
 considering 945:22  
 972:9 1038:16  
 consistent 935:9  
 978:9 987:2  
 1002:6 1029:15  
 1033:26 1060:14  
 1060:22
- consistently  
 1054:15  
 consisting 994:17  
 constantly 931:5  
 constitute 974:11  
 1048:4  
 constitutes 907:6  
 947:2 1053:24  
 1057:20  
 constitution 1009:2  
 1009:3  
 constrained 960:26  
 968:10  
 constructed 967:18  
 construction 956:15  
 964:19  
 construed 1043:15  
 consultation 902:14  
 1020:26 1042:2  
 contact 935:4  
 contain 896:23  
 903:15 1021:13  
 contained 1016:23  
 1021:22  
 containing 1023:2  
 contains 1021:20,23  
 1028:17  
 contemplated  
 909:18 995:12  
 contend 1007:5  
 contended 1013:14  
 contends 1024:11  
 content 1027:6  
 1033:18  
 contention 1002:5  
 context 912:18  
 928:2 929:5 939:3  
 945:17 946:21  
 947:5 960:15  
 962:10 983:22  
 998:4 1009:6  
 1021:3 1022:2  
 1033:17 1035:18  
 1043:14 1049:5  
 1056:23 1058:23  
 contiguous 909:5,13  
 914:8  
 continental 905:16  
 908:7,21,26  
 909:10,24 910:7  
 910:15,25 911:23  
 912:4 913:24,25  
 914:2,11,26  
 915:23 916:7,11  
 916:19,20 917:12  
 918:11 919:9  
 921:6 923:10  
 925:10 926:14,22  
 926:25,26 963:18  
 971:24 974:16,24  
 975:6 976:11  
 985:3 986:23  
 1026:10 1033:13  
 1037:17 1044:3  
 1044:18,22  
 continuation  
 1001:11  
 continue 895:24  
 929:9 935:24
- 978:18 1004:26  
 1031:3 1052:8  
 continued 898:10  
 982:14 1020:20  
 continues 1043:6,6  
 1046:14 1048:21  
 continuing 928:2  
 932:15 1026:4  
 continuity 1043:16  
 contradiction  
 994:21  
 contrary 903:13  
 947:17 952:24  
 962:26 976:9  
 1028:19 1050:13  
 contrast 1021:25  
 contributed  
 1061:14  
 contribution 1062:1  
 control 978:20  
 982:19  
 controlled 965:17  
 965:18 978:18  
 controlling 964:14  
 controls 909:7  
 convene 937:11  
 convened 937:15  
 convenience 897:21  
 convenient 991:26  
 995:16,20  
 Convention 943:15  
 1044:11  
 conveyed 998:3  
 1025:13  
 conveys 998:23  
 1007:3  
 conviction 1024:20  
 1062:4  
 convinced 1058:13  
 convincing 1053:19  
 coolly 1051:4  
 coordinates  
 1003:14 1011:19  
 1011:23 1012:3,6  
 copied 1011:14  
 copy 937:5 1007:22  
 1040:12,17,20  
 corner 959:14  
 1011:20 1012:8  
 correct 898:22  
 900:20 902:15,15  
 912:15,20 927:15  
 968:21 998:2  
 1002:5 1010:3,4  
 1015:19 1017:11  
 1017:14 1018:5  
 1021:21 1024:6  
 1030:25  
 correction 950:8  
 correctness 1059:6  
 correspondence  
 903:12 936:13,23  
 937:6 1008:17,19  
 Council 897:23  
 counsel 895:9  
 904:26 905:10  
 906:13 930:6  
 937:20 944:8,16  
 997:26 998:5



- 1043:10 1061:15  
1061:25  
count 930:5  
counted 975:2  
1013:14  
Counter 999:4  
counterparts  
933:11  
Counter-Memorial  
1008:15 1013:12  
countries 1025:17  
1025:23  
country's 992:3  
couple 972:10  
997:14  
court 900:26 901:2  
930:21 931:6  
943:14,19 956:23  
966:16 968:6  
970:26 973:5,17  
988:15,22 989:25  
992:24 1037:12  
1043:2 1044:14  
1044:15,23  
1045:3 1048:2  
1050:17 1062:17  
Courts 971:4  
992:14 1032:5  
Court's 1043:11  
1048:8  
cousin 1013:10  
cover 895:8 938:23  
1007:2 1024:21  
covered 1018:23  
1025:2,12  
co-authored 1015:8  
co-ordinates  
1060:25  
Crawford's 904:10  
924:10 951:6  
create 962:24  
987:24 1006:5,17  
created 962:23  
1037:8,10  
creates 1006:4  
creating 948:18  
978:24  
creation 942:18  
945:5  
creative 995:7  
credibility 1036:17  
credited 977:7  
criteria 909:18  
925:5 927:21  
929:26 949:22  
962:8,9 971:24  
1038:14 1044:8  
1045:9,12,17  
1056:10 1059:4  
criterion 920:20,24  
921 3 957:25  
1044:17  
criticising 984:2  
criticism 957:16  
critique 994:7  
critiques 956:13  
cropped 972:20  
Crosby 1013:20,21  
crossed 936:17  
crossing 991:19  
crucial 949:13  
crystallised 906:3  
culminated 1042:24  
culmination 897:10  
1042:6  
curious 1022:13  
current 954:12  
990:13 1052:3  
currently 956:2  
1052:26  
Currie 931:21  
curry 941:19  
curtail 1000:5  
curved 1003:2,6,11  
customs 909:7  
cut 978:24 986:16  
987:21  
Cuthbertson  
1061:21  
cut-off 951:3 981:14  
981:19 982:15  
983:9,26 984:14  
984:17,20 985:4  
985:16,19,23  
986:8,23 987:17  
987:25,25 988:4,5  
988:5 1045:17
- D**
- D 1004:7,9,16  
1011:24  
Danish 973:14  
dare 1050:19  
date 1027:10,13  
1031:21 1041:15  
David 1061:18  
dawns 1046:12  
day 894:7 900:17  
947:11 1051:24  
1062:12  
day's 1018:8  
de 903:26 912:4  
932:6 943:25  
999:17 1002:7  
1004:18 1026:17  
1029:16 1033:10  
1033:26 1035:6,8  
1038:26  
dead 983:19,20  
1046:15  
deal 898:11 899:2  
904:3 947:11,12  
950:20,21 951:2,5  
970:4 972:9 995:4  
996:6 998:6  
1019:20 1022:19  
1035:14  
dealing 924:13  
968:23 993:11  
dealings 995:10  
1051:17  
dealt 931:12 950:22  
Dean 942:15  
debate 974:6  
Debbie 1027:7  
deceptively 943:2  
decide 940:10  
decided 894:26  
936:26 977:6  
983:3 993:13  
1018:13  
deciding 948:8  
decision 901:3  
933:7 939:17  
942:21 943:12  
948:3 997:10  
1041:6 1043:12  
1048:22 1050:3,9  
1051:10,14  
1052:13 1058:16  
decisions 1042:20  
1050:10,20  
decisive 943:26  
982:21 1038:13  
declaration 944:16  
declarations  
1057:18  
declared 909:3  
1032:4  
declaring 942:22  
decree 1051:12  
dedicated 928:15  
deeds 1058:19  
defence 908:14  
defended 972:18  
defer 1022:8  
define 947:8 977:25  
978:15 1044:4  
1046:21 1051:14  
defined 897:25  
899:14,21 900:11  
909:19 921:19  
928:5 936:10  
944:23 950:11  
956:2 958:7  
976:22 977:19  
994:22 1045:5,9  
1057:12 1060:25  
defines 978:7  
Definite 913:8  
definitely 899:11,11  
1010:24  
definition 899:13  
913:13,14 945:5  
946:20 969:21  
972:21 977:21  
979:3 1045:4  
definitions 956:18  
definitive 960:14  
degree 910:11  
940:17 956:26  
980:2 984:14  
988:20 994:26  
999:23 1002:7,11  
1002:14,16,20  
1003:10 1004:12  
1004:18 1005:8  
1005:11 1006:9  
1006:25,25  
1033:19 1034:4  
1038:9  
degrees 1004:17,21  
1004:24,26  
1005:3,11  
1006:20 1032:20  
1032:21,25  
delay 900:23  
deliberate 897:26  
1057:6  
deliberations  
927:23  
delightful 1059:20  
delimit 943:16  
989:6 1050:8  
1060:12  
delimited 910:9  
delimitating 911:22  
delimitations  
1050:22  
delimited 920:13  
927:17 931:8  
996:26 1057:11  
delimiting 1029:17  
delimits 899:21  
delineation 1058:10  
deliver 895:23  
994:12  
delivered 1013:20  
1013:22,24,25  
1047:18  
delve 997:15  
demonstrably  
1056:18  
demonstrate 900:9  
913:15 951:20  
956:13 1035:6  
1041:18  
demonstrated  
921:23 948:24  
1033:25 1045:19  
demonstrates  
1007:7,8  
demonstrating  
1056:8  
demonstration  
1004:4  
demonstratively  
1053:18  
demotion 1045:25  
denied 926:6 930:21  
944:7 988:21  
denies 921:12  
993:21  
Denmark 914:26  
denominator  
920:12 921:22  
deny 897:2 961:8  
970:13  
denying 989:13  
departing 946:26  
970:22  
Department  
1013:21 1026:11  
departure 942:14  
1043:21 1055:11  
depasser 1043:25  
depend 930:10  
1045:10  
dependent 962:6  
depending 966:12  
depends 959:9  
986:17  
depicted 904:20  
1004:2 1010:12  
1010:16 1015:2  
depiction 997:23  
1005:5,21  
1010:19 1014:26  
1023:5 1033:19  
1034:22  
depicts 1052:22  
deployed 896:4  
deputy 933:2,3  
934:12 1027:7  
1034:24 1061:25  
derive 906:26  
derived 962:9  
981:24  
describe 933:24  
described 910:23  
912:10 924:22  
943:23 973:18  
1011:18,23  
1038:8 1046:16  
describes 925:11  
932:3 994:13  
describing 1038:5  
description 902:9,9  
905:26 943:17  
976:3 1020:7,12  
1026:11 1043:26  
1058:10  
Desert 969:8  
deserves 989:25  
design 925:24  
designated 962:15  
desire 956:25  
despite 947:16  
975:11 1005:23  
1043:5  
destiny 1049:15  
detail 971:20  
1045:8  
details 1020:13  
determination  
897:13 911:4  
926:12 933:14  
940:25 1050:20  
determine 917:7  
974:19 996:21  
1027:13 1044:5  
1051:16,20,22,23  
1059:10  
determined 941:10  
962:10 979:6  
1060:14  
determining 897:19  
897:20 981:13  
996:15 1025:25  
deterred 942:19  
detriment 987:25  
develop 1052:8  
developed 930:2  
952:7 960:9,11  
968:19 994:9  
1046:8 1056:12  
development  
1042:14,24  
1048:21 1051:22  
developments 983:2  
1043:20 1044:12  
1048:8,12  
device 927:6  
devil 896:4  
devoured 927:4

- diagonal 1011:4  
 diagram 993:16  
 diagrams 973:6  
 dictate 983:26  
 dictates 919:23  
 1047:8  
 differ 1050:19  
 difference 908:5,24  
 910:3 911:20  
 915:24 916:26  
 917:3 919:15,20  
 921:14 923:13,16  
 930:12,15 959:10  
 984:13 995:5  
 1004:24 1005:4  
 1005:10,12  
 1006:2 1032:23  
 1055:17,22  
 differences 899:15  
 909:26 910:6,23  
 911:3 916:7,9  
 917:26 959:9  
 985:9  
 different 898:25  
 899:16 901:21,21  
 909:19 912:2  
 914:2 915:4,4,5,6  
 916:13 919:8,14  
 920:10,10,12,15  
 920:15 927:26  
 928:21 947:23  
 948:16 954:2  
 957:26 968:20  
 973:5 974:6  
 983:11 993:13  
 994:22 1001:2  
 1005:4 1030:13  
 1037:11,23  
 1053:11,21  
 differently 913:4  
 difficult 899:8  
 930:5 949:26  
 972:14 982:10  
 1028:19,20  
 1062:5,8  
 difficulties 951:14  
 957:22 984:19  
 difficulty 916:10  
 963:16 976:15  
 1043:24  
 direct 932:5 981:20  
 981:26 983:23  
 984:7,8  
 directed 1056:20  
 direction 917:24  
 949:6,10 952:10  
 952:16,18,26  
 953:12,25 954:10  
 955:5,12 962:26  
 963:23 978:15  
 979:16 984:9  
 987:10,14,15  
 993:2  
 directional 952:19  
 952:23 978:25  
 directions 908:18  
 952:22 953:9,13  
 974:19  
 directly 952:3  
 979:10 983:13  
 disagree 1027:3  
 1036:15 1048:6  
 disagreement 934:2  
 936:15 1033:3,8  
 disavow 1054:7  
 disavows 944:14  
 discharging 929:19  
 disclose 1024:20  
 disclosed 1016:24  
 discloses 940:9  
 disconnected 994:2  
 discovered 952:6  
 discrepancy 901:26  
 1022:5,13  
 discuss 932:20  
 935:15,17  
 discussed 931:25  
 1036:6 1060:6  
 discussing 1035:21  
 discussion 929:9  
 934:4 936:19  
 discussions 900:24  
 933:13 935:14  
 936:23 939:9  
 1038:21  
 dishonourable  
 1054:7  
 dismissed 944:25  
 dispositive 942:5  
 disproportion 950:7  
 976:2 980:11,13  
 980:16  
 disputed 902:23  
 1007:10  
 disputes 896:24  
 899:16 901:25  
 902:26  
 disputing 938:14  
 disregard 998:9  
 disregarded 896:21  
 disregarding  
 1048:17  
 disruptive 1054:9  
 dissatisfied 906:11  
 distance 952:15  
 970:5,6 1002:13  
 1002:15 1006:17  
 1044:17,19,26  
 1045:11  
 distinct 895:8  
 1001:10 1011:7  
 1037:24  
 distinction 914:15  
 1032:23  
 distinguish 1032:12  
 1032:13  
 distinguished 914:6  
 1048:5 1051:3  
 1054:11  
 distort 964:12  
 distorting 964:9  
 distortions 958:19  
 distribution 920:21  
 diverge 997:22  
 divergence 935:13  
 1006:18  
 divided 973:12  
 1055:18  
 dividing 940:22  
 1012:16 1060:12  
 1060:23  
 division 906:12  
 923:2 924:12  
 945:6 960:15,16  
 973:21,25 974:2  
 1011:4 1030:18  
 1060:17  
 divorced 923:10  
 995:2  
 document 932:22  
 934:11,11,16  
 1017:4 1025:4,5  
 dog 971:7  
 dogma 896:7  
 doing 928:23 929:4  
 932:9 944:13  
 1007:22 1012:25  
 1030:3,11 1049:6  
 1051:24  
 dominant 912:8  
 dominates 907:4  
 Donald 1013:23  
 done 903:3 940:3,4  
 940:5 948:23  
 953:17,20 954:2  
 954:16 963:10  
 988:3,26 992:13  
 992:16 993:4  
 1011:15 1018:14  
 1022:20 1043:17  
 1050:13 1051:11  
 1053:5  
 Doody 900:5  
 1033:18 1034:2  
 Doody's 1033:4,15  
 1034:9 1052:23  
 doom 1049:14  
 1051:6  
 doubt 913:9 967:4  
 1010:21 1031:8  
 1048:4,15  
 1050:21  
 doubtless 1048:23  
 doubts 945:14  
 down 902:18 918:26  
 932:18 953:14  
 954:26 986:11  
 987:8,16 988:9  
 989:22 996:20  
 1006:6 1019:15  
 Dr 899:25 904:20  
 918:25 924:10  
 937:22  
 drafted 1005:15  
 drafter 1002:24  
 1004:10 1005:16  
 draftsmen 1012:2  
 dragons 922:6  
 924:26 927:4,9,12  
 929:14  
 drastic 985:7  
 1050:21  
 draw 915:25 916:8  
 970:18 989:10  
 991:10 997:4  
 1004:10 1005:24  
 1012:7 1016:23  
 1050:12  
 drawer 1005:25  
 drawing 959:2  
 990:17 993:19  
 1004:13 1012:24  
 1013:4 1032:15  
 1059:9  
 drawn 937:22  
 958:16 959:21  
 979:15 988:19,23  
 989:3,8,15 994:11  
 1002:18,19  
 1003:22 1011:26  
 1012:15,17  
 1044:8 1045:17  
 draws 964:14  
 dream 969:24  
 drew 959:22 967:15  
 1003:6 1011:22  
 1047:17  
 drill 1025:19,22  
 drilled 1009:13  
 drilling 999:11,12  
 1000:7,8,10  
 1009:8,21  
 1016:19 1018:4  
 1019:16 1028:8  
 1041:19  
 drive 1022:9  
 1041:25  
 drop 975:22  
 dropped 934:21  
 951:26 959:25  
 dry 996:26  
 Drymer 1034:24  
 1061:25,25  
 dubious 895:19  
 due 1036:16 1044:9  
 1058:23  
 dumped 904:7  
 duplicate 1007:4  
 1010:8  
 duplicated 1013:7  
 duplication 1008:2  
 during 895:11  
 900:19 915:21  
 917:12 930:6  
 938:21 939:8,21  
 1004:5 1025:15  
 1048:18  
 dust 1004:17  
 duty 897:7 1049:3  
 D'Orsal 1040:9  
 D.G 1013:20  
 E  
 E 1004:8,8  
 each 924:2 969:6  
 999:7 1014:21  
 1038:22 1046:25  
 1056:26 1058:11  
 eagerness 1019:13  
 earlier 898:18 903:8  
 906:18,23 928:10  
 933:10 937:5  
 943:12 947:17  
 958:17 997:9,12  
 1009:7 1012:5  
 1019:6,21  
 1024:10 1033:24  
 1038:10 1042:13  
 early 1001:9,12  
 1019:9 1031:20  
 earth 1020:11  
 1046:10  
 easily 959:17  
 east 922:11 975:22  
 981:7 983:17  
 984:7,16 986:20  
 1013:25 1014:14  
 1032:21  
 eastern 987:7  
 991:25 1014:26  
 1058:9  
 east-west 965:22  
 easy 931:2 1005:15  
 1009:5 1012:4,11  
 echo 1062:15  
 economic 1044:18  
 Eddystone 944:4  
 edge 916:19 975:17  
 976:11 978:25  
 979:25 986:23  
 991:25 992:19  
 1002:10,13,16,26  
 1004:11,14,23  
 1005:2,10 1006:9  
 1006:11,14  
 1012:8 1033:13  
 1045:14  
 EEZ 919:9 987:23  
 effect 900:12 907:18  
 910:17 918:18  
 927:6 934:7 942:2  
 943:9 947:26  
 948:8 953:24  
 964:9 965:6,22  
 966:6,17 968:3  
 986:10 988:8  
 1003:6 1031:7,24  
 1037:16 1039:4  
 1041:16 1058:22  
 effected 945:18  
 960:23 1050:22  
 1056:10  
 effecting 973:21  
 effectively 960:4,7  
 964:5,15 989:24  
 994:19 1025:2  
 effects 988:4  
 1057:26  
 effort 1047:15  
 efforts 941:26  
 1056:20  
 eight 1032:26  
 1033:8  
 either 924:7 939:9  
 941:17 948:21  
 964:4 969:21  
 970:13 978:20  
 1036:21  
 election 898:13  
 899:3  
 element 944:23  
 elements 900:13  
 1044:21  
 elliptically 1022:6  
 eloquence 1062:4

- elsewhere 970:9  
 994:13 1047:4  
 embrace 1049:19  
 emerge 991:16  
 emerged 960:8  
 emerges 975:19  
 emerging 960:3  
 eminent 929:16  
 1049:3  
 emotional 1050:25  
 1056:15  
 emotionally 944:7  
 emphasis 984:15  
 emphasize 972:2  
 emphasized 962:12  
 employ 895:15  
 employed 904:9  
 953:8  
 enact 901:12  
 enacted 1000:22  
 1021:4  
 enbuttreasing 954:6  
 enclavement 983:9  
 985:4  
 encompasses  
 907:26 929:24  
 encompassing  
 920:9,10 1024:25  
 1025:5,10  
 encourages 1056:24  
 encroachment  
 1026:17  
 end 914:20 954:19  
 956:12 962:7,16  
 964:18 974:5  
 975:19 976:26  
 977:11 981:3  
 1006:5 1028:16  
 1029:12 1034:4  
 1035:5 1039:3  
 Energy 933:10  
 936:25 1026:12  
 enforce 1023:3  
 engage 936:3  
 engaged 931:26  
 932:4 933:19  
 enhanced 965:21  
 1059:21  
 enjoyed 918:2  
 976:17  
 enjoys 910:12  
 1056:5  
 enormous 1052:17  
 enough 952:17  
 953:16 954:19  
 989:19  
 enshrined 1057:25  
 ensure 945:2  
 1046:26  
 ensuring 958:23  
 enter 898:15 928:19  
 entered 922:23  
 entire 964:19  
 984:22 985:13  
 987:6 1033:12  
 1042:18  
 entirely 920:15  
 927:2 935:9  
 957:26 959:9,23
- 962:5 972:12  
 986:17 1037:11  
 entirety 1043:20  
 entitle 1025:26  
 entitled 986:2  
 1027:16,20  
 1042:16 1057:2  
 entitlement 906:20  
 907:7 910:8,12,16  
 912:18 915:20,26  
 916:2 917:11  
 922:3,4 924:24  
 926:11,12,15  
 941:9 977:20  
 979:6 985:12  
 entitlements 901:23  
 906:25 910:14  
 911:12,16,18,19  
 911:24 912:10  
 921:25 926:26  
 927:18,20 930:15  
 931:8 949:20  
 971:22 973:2,7,26  
 979:4 987:13  
 1038:22 1057:17  
 1058:2 1060:5,6  
 entity 1037:23,24  
 enunciated 1043:9  
 envisaged 936:4,18  
 936:18  
 envisioned 924:11  
 episode 1029:18  
 episodes 998:25  
 Epp 933:9  
 equal 953:10 960:16  
 equalization 928:15  
 928:16,25  
 equally 905:26  
 931:20  
 equidistance 948:2  
 948:21,26 964:9  
 964:15,23 965:3,5  
 965:7,9 966:2,6  
 966:26 968:20,26  
 969:5,12 970:22  
 971:4,10,14  
 984:24 989:21  
 990:11,17 992:20  
 equidistant 964:5  
 969:3 973:19  
 equitable 901:22  
 921:2 925:5  
 943:20 944:25  
 945:3 956:25  
 957:24 964:22  
 973:21 974:2  
 981:8,24 993:19  
 1038:14 1047:2  
 1052:5,7 1053:2  
 1053:24 1054:16  
 1056:16,19,22  
 1057:22,26  
 1060:16  
 equitableness  
 981:13,16 1047:8  
 equities 1059:5  
 equity 949:24 950:3  
 972:13 996:16,17  
 1047:15 1048:14
- equivalent 1008:12  
 1010:14 1011:20  
 equivocal 906:9  
 992:9  
 equivocated 988:20  
 err 1047:13  
 error 957:16 962:18  
 1005:8  
 eschew 1049:26  
 especially 921:6  
 958:8 972:24  
 976:25 983:16  
 1005:19 1014:8  
 1014:11 1016:23  
 1026:16  
 espouse 1034:4  
 essence 897:2 911:5  
 essential 958:4  
 959:19 1044:21  
 essentially 948:18  
 954:4 963:9  
 965:25 971:3,11  
 1037:9  
 establish 953:13  
 established 917:10  
 940:19 958:9  
 988:16  
 establishing 949:6  
 establishment  
 963:23  
 estoppel 942:17  
 et 932:18  
 even 897:15 901:24  
 909:26 924:23  
 935:14 940:4  
 945:9,11 959:11  
 964:4 968:17  
 969:8 970:22  
 972:15,26 974:21  
 974:22 976:2,20  
 978:22 981:3,5,9  
 992:8,23 994:3  
 997:6 998:17  
 1005:15 1009:4  
 1021:15 1025:18  
 1030:17 1032:3  
 1033:15 1048:5  
 1048:15 1053:6  
 1062:2  
 event 899:23 950:14  
 962:2 963:14  
 969:23 970:18  
 988:25 991:21  
 1021:16 1048:21  
 events 944:20  
 1020:7,12 1021:6  
 1023:5,8,9  
 eventually 1006:5  
 1027:24  
 ever 937:7,14  
 938:15 939:18,23  
 995:11 1036:2  
 1053:12 1054:6  
 every 919:26 923:14  
 957:13 985:18,26  
 986:7 1047:15  
 1051:24 1056:4  
 1057:13  
 everyone 915:6
- 1001:8  
 everything 987:10  
 evidence 935:12  
 938:17 939:2,12  
 940:9,15 941:7,25  
 1001:7,13  
 1027:26 1028:3  
 1028:18,20  
 1029:5 1035:26  
 1058:26 1059:2,5  
 1059:8  
 evidently 915:7  
 evolution 1042:14  
 1042:19 1044:10  
 1045:22 1046:12  
 1046:17 1048:22  
 exactly 946:18  
 948:26 949:21  
 969:11 1000:22  
 1037:19  
 example 908:4  
 916:11 920:13  
 923:8 926:14  
 944:3 962:20  
 963:19 964:11  
 975:9 1008:4  
 1009:18 1010:10  
 1043:10 1047:11  
 examples 948:13  
 950:17 1007:23  
 Excellency 1047:19  
 except 973:15  
 983:24 1028:7  
 exception 990:26  
 excerpt 1003:19  
 excessive 1053:6,17  
 1053:17,18  
 1056:21  
 exchanged 937:18  
 excluding 970:20  
 983:16 984:6  
 exclusion 1045:24  
 exclusive 909:14  
 921:4 1009:17,21  
 1044:18  
 exclusively 907:17  
 918:18 999:15  
 excuse 1007:13  
 1023:11  
 exercise 909:7  
 931:26 936:26  
 956:22 1012:21  
 1024:12 1046:24  
 exercises 906:21  
 908:9  
 exist 930:19 987:26  
 existed 915:13,15  
 932:3 933:18  
 995:11 1007:8,9  
 1026:17  
 existence 1016:8  
 1035:6  
 existing 903:2  
 904:12 932:6  
 937:21 938:6,7,14  
 939:23 942:24  
 947:2 971:10  
 979:20 981:8  
 986:24 989:17
- 991:6 998:14  
 999:17 1002:20  
 1048:19 1052:22  
 1053:20 1055:18  
 1057:19  
 exists 909:26  
 1038:15  
 exit 961:11,12,17  
 expand 968:8  
 expect 946:17  
 955:15 1030:24  
 1030:24 1052:12  
 expend 1017:16  
 expense 1017:18  
 1048:14  
 expenses 1017:18  
 1017:19  
 experienced 929:16  
 945:10  
 expert 1040:12  
 1061:10 1062:17  
 expire 900:19  
 expiry 1027:13  
 explain 898:6  
 949:21 1001:25  
 1019:8 1022:21  
 explained 936:11  
 938:5 955:2  
 1002:22 1003:8  
 1011:16 1019:21  
 1045:7,7  
 explains 1020:2  
 1030:20  
 explanation 900:23  
 938:13 949:13,17  
 1016:13,13  
 1019:17 1046:18  
 explanatory 938:2  
 explicit 966:18  
 968:24  
 explicitly 961:6  
 exploitation 909:15  
 914:13,16 924:5  
 997:8  
 exploiting 908:23  
 exploration 997:7  
 999:2 1017:19  
 exploring 908:22  
 exposed 951:14  
 express 907:13  
 expressed 916:22  
 1040:3  
 expression 1047:24  
 1054:16 1055:22  
 1056:14  
 expressly 909:18  
 930:21  
 extend 908:12  
 953:15 1004:25  
 1005:2 1006:3  
 extended 959:11  
 974:15 977:25  
 1006:24 1059:17  
 1059:22  
 extending 909:16  
 994:17  
 extends 908:9  
 extension 909:17  
 961:4 967:10

990:6,8 991:24,26  
1002:21 1004:14  
1004:20,23  
extensive 916:20  
941:7 993:15  
extensively 908:4  
914:18  
extent 907:19,22  
911:19 915:13  
916:18,24 946:14  
946:15 948:18  
968:14 977:19,24  
981:8 982:3 984:8  
986:8  
extinguished  
1046:11  
extract 1000:9  
1060:8  
extreme 1055:16  
extremely 929:16  
eye 958:23

## F

face 949:5 1027:20  
1033:15 1043:3  
faced 993:8  
facet 903:21  
facets 904:24  
facie 973:17,20  
974:2  
facto 903:26 912:4  
932:6 999:17  
1002:7 1004:19  
1026:17 1029:16  
1033:10,26  
1035:6,8 1038:26  
factor 923:22 931:5  
943:19 946:16  
966:19 971:6  
981:12,16 996:14  
factors 971:8 993:6  
1001:25 1042:22  
1042:25 1045:25  
facts 896:19 900:14  
905:2 925:17  
930:26 931:10,15  
931:18,21,22,22  
956:17 962:7  
983:4 994:3  
1022:23,23  
1049:4,23 1057:9  
factual 896:14  
949:13 962:10  
1032:14 1056:23  
fading 1046:10  
failed 900:2  
1031:20  
failing 899:20  
failure 949:14  
1020:17  
fair 952:17 988:17  
1022:21 1030:4  
1053:26  
fairly 963:3 977:8  
fairness 956:13  
faith 981:11  
1051:17 1056:3  
faithfully 1056:17  
fall 969:4 972:17

fallaciousness  
1059:7  
falling 1047:7  
falls 965:19 969:10  
1055:19  
false 896:3 939:15  
998:2  
fame 945:11  
famed 1058:7  
fantasy 931:2  
far 896:7 897:15  
910:10 917:6,10  
927:18 948:7  
954:4 963:24  
969:7 974:19  
983:4,6 990:7,25  
991:24 1040:7  
1051:16 1062:7  
fashion 965:4  
1000:6 1013:4  
fate 1049:16  
favor 980:11,17,21  
favour 976:2  
favourable 1053:20  
favoured 898:18  
fear 929:14 945:10  
federation 928:14  
929:5 993:11  
feel 929:15 950:18  
969:22 980:13  
1022:22  
feeling 983:21  
feels 933:4  
feigned 1049:7  
felt 989:13  
fertile 924:21  
few 934:15 947:14  
965:18 998:25  
1001:2 1002:2  
1012:5 1021:11  
1035:15 1042:12  
1042:12  
fiction 1057:8  
fictionalize 930:18  
fides 895:20  
field 1030:22  
Fifteen 1039:20  
fifth 1024:9  
figure 951:16  
975:14,23,26  
976:12,16 978:16  
979:22 980:5  
986:21 997:17,18  
997:21,23 998:19  
999:5,13 1001:14  
1003:24 1004:6,6  
1007:25,26  
1008:14,15  
1010:19 1011:19  
1014:13,21,25  
1016:14 1018:24  
1018:24 1034:8  
1034:21,23  
1035:3,3,12  
figures 946:7 975:7  
975:9,11,16,20  
998:19  
file 1034:16  
filed 1008 14

1017:5  
final 957:15  
1020:15 1031:17  
1039:24  
finally 904:19 905:3  
948:4 949:23  
955:2 958:22  
961:9 979:20  
997:24 1029:18  
1041:24 1052:26  
find 903:5 918:19  
918:19,20 941:17  
942:23 950:25  
959:8 961:4  
970:16 975:10  
996:25 1015:10  
1034:19 1052:5,6  
1053:23  
fine 916:4 917:21  
945:25 970:17  
980:23 1003:13  
finish 995:21  
fire 917:24  
fires 908:17  
firmly 1028:26  
fiscal 928:15,16,25  
fisheries 909:10  
919:10 920:21  
1047:10  
fishery 921:4  
970:11  
fit 1040:2  
five 955:18 996:25  
1058:9,11  
fix 1055:12  
flaws 953:5  
flexibility 931:14  
1048:10  
flight 1062:12  
flogging 983:20  
flow 901:16 921:22  
925:23  
focus 920:12 973:10  
1019:24 1057:8  
focused 962:4  
972:20 998:21  
999:14 1031:14  
follow 917:18 927:4  
1039:26  
followed 899:6  
1005:23  
following 902:19,20  
904:5,23 943:23  
948:14 950:5,9,15  
957:21 973:8,10  
994:14 1003:25  
follows 1023:6  
1044:16  
footnote 1014:19,22  
force 900:19  
1000:13,14,20,23  
1018:22 1027:2  
1027:22 1028:9  
1028:10,12  
1029:3  
forced 1015:24  
forecast 905:12  
forego 897:7  
forgone 915:10

forewent 894:24  
forget 955:20  
forgetting 957:9  
forgive 934:24  
forgot 919:4  
forgotten 907:15,16  
908:16  
form 950:23  
1033:10  
formal 903:6  
936:10 939:22,22  
940:9,12 1052:19  
formalism 994:26  
formally 901:18,20  
937:10,15  
1048:19  
formation 958:3  
959:12,16 961:22  
formed 1002:21  
1010:17  
former 913:8  
forms 979:7  
1036:14  
formula 913:2  
924:13  
forth 975:18  
1038:12  
Fortier's 1062:15  
forward 1022:22  
found 918:9 920:23  
927:12 931:13  
943:15 948:17,22  
968:22 974:4  
975:6 1014:21  
1021:24 1024:14  
1025:2 1027:15  
1028:16 1029:7  
1036:9 1037:26  
1041:8 1045:15  
1045:19 1060:9  
foundation 1043:7  
founded 1046:13  
four 955:4 1039:25  
fourth 958:18  
1015:12 1016:2  
1019:26  
fraction 1052:14  
France 900:20  
933:9 943:15  
991:17 1018:14  
1040:5  
frank 945:11  
1050:15  
frankly 905:14  
François 1040:21  
1061:19  
Fredericton 894:8  
1059:14,16,20  
1060:2,11  
free 985:19  
freely 922:22  
French 941:20  
1040:7,18  
French-Canadian  
901:2  
Friday 894:25  
896:17 957:18  
988:12 993:26  
997 9 1002:23

1005:21 1007:6  
1011:16 1016:11  
1016:14 1024:25  
1025:14 1036:23  
1038:9 1057:3  
friend 897:8 904:23  
924:23 944:9,18  
945:15 1048:5  
1049:9 1061:17  
friends 1040:5  
frightful 926:23  
frolic 968:13  
front 964:7 974:22  
1008:5,10 1033:6  
Frontal 977:4  
fulfil 931:6 969:23  
1049:4  
full 973:25 986:2  
999:12 1000:7,8  
fullness 936:9  
fully 941:6 974:7  
989:13 993:16  
1030:8  
fundamental  
911:20 913:12  
919:2,2,4,5  
920:24 921:14  
925:7 929:25,25  
951:14 971:19  
974:17 984:19  
985:26 994:7  
1046:19  
fundamentally  
915:4 985:6  
Fundy 959:14  
Furey 936:24  
furnish 1058:26  
further 934:14  
935:5 940:11  
953:23 964:12  
969:23 972:5  
976:23 984:25  
985:2,5 988:5,11  
995:13 996:20  
998:15 1019:15  
1022:10 1029:7  
1055:12  
furthermore 961:5  
964:3 982:21  
1010:6 1033:15  
future 938:10  
996:23 1051:15  
1051:23

## G

G 894:18  
gained 1052:16  
Galo 1061:17  
game 978:6 1055:21  
gap 1006:4,5,8  
gas 932:20 958:25  
1052:17  
gather 1001:13  
gave 915:17 947:10  
997:9 1016:13  
geared 920:25  
general 929:11  
946:18,19 952:10  
952:16,18 960:6

- 963:23 964:16  
966:3 979:16  
981:17 982:16  
983:5,12,14  
1024:5 1026:11  
1035:14 1047:5  
1047:19  
generalized 983:23  
generally 917:13  
945:4 981:18  
996:6  
generated 981:6  
1026:8 1046:6  
genesis 926:11  
geographic 945:17  
948:15 951:21  
956:15 959:5,6,9  
1050:17 1056:17  
geographical  
911:18 923:2  
928:23 963:17  
970:10 1042:25  
geographically  
1046:6  
geography 907:3,24  
910:11 920:14  
921:26 922:2,3,12  
923:5,7,9,17,20  
923:22 924:22,23  
925:13,14,19,24  
928:6,8 946:4,14  
947:21,24 955:19  
956:17,21,24  
957:2,26 958:2  
959:9 961:11,12  
961:16,20 964:22  
993:10 994:4  
1045:10,19  
1046:6 1057:10  
Geological 1015:9  
geologist 1015:9  
Geologists 1014:2  
1014:16,25  
1015:3,7  
geology 1045:11  
geometry 974:25  
geomorphology  
1045:11  
George 1048:25  
Georges 1041:9  
Gerard 894:12  
German 985:2  
Germany 914:25  
984:25  
gets 915:7 959:13  
982:9  
getting 898:20  
916:14  
Gilbert 1047:20  
gist 1029:23 1032:9  
give 948:8 963:19  
990:2 998:4  
1039:15 1056:26  
1057:15  
given 907:4 910:17  
914:12 923:26  
929:6 943:9  
954:11 958:8  
977:14 993:3
- 1004:4 1027:6  
1044:25 1062:11  
gives 956:25 978:7  
988:11 990:2  
992:21  
giving 979:5  
glad 1034:17  
Gladue 1061:22  
glass 1034:26  
global 980:24  
go 909:22 924:2  
926:2,3,3 927:18  
931:23 937:24  
948:4 951:25  
969:11 977:12  
978:4 1001:14  
1002:4,25  
1003:12,18  
1006:6,6 1007:7  
1008:8 1015:22  
goal 945:2  
Godsend 987:20  
goes 910:9 913:2  
917:19 963:26  
1013:5  
going 919:5 929:13  
944:21 952:14  
962:26 967:17,25  
976:12,18 991:19  
993:25 995:17  
1004:3 1028:5  
1030:22 1057:4  
gone 968:22  
good 894:21 940:21  
945:21,23 946:3  
947:17 965:3  
966:26 967:3,5,6  
981:11 997:16  
1015:25 1051:17  
1053:3 1056:3  
1062:11  
Goodale 936:24  
govern 961:11,13  
governed 961:18  
governing 1058:3  
1060:21  
government 898:10  
898:12 899:2,7,10  
900:24 902:17  
903:11,24 906:5  
921:24 924:17  
930:20 932:20  
934:26 936:21  
937:6 943:10  
1008:4,21  
1009:14,15  
1010:25,26  
1013:21 1014:5,7  
1017:6,7 1018:10  
1018:13 1020:25  
1022:18,19  
1026:3 1038:24  
1052:11 1056:4  
governments  
933:13 1057:18  
1057:24 1058:9  
Governor 897:23  
gradually 1003:11  
Grand 969:8
- grant 899:5 1037:22  
granted 914:17  
1010:22 1029:20  
1033:2  
granting 966:16  
1024:25 1025:5  
graphic 1034:5  
graphics 895:2  
945:23  
grasping 1029:11  
Gray 1003:23  
1062:16  
great 947:11,12  
1005:8 1038:8  
1048:26 1052:8  
greater 910:10  
963:24  
green 954:26  
989:16  
grid 1003:22 1012:5  
1016:15  
grids 1011:3,3  
ground 966:11  
grounded 1056:23  
grouping 1017:20  
guess 940:9 1023:4  
1061:10  
guidance 995:14  
guide 929:22  
guided 996:23  
Guillaume 950:26  
956:26 957:3  
966:13 970:3,19  
1047:20 1048:5  
1048:16  
Guillaume's 964:21  
966:5 969:17,24  
970:8 989:26  
1047:24  
Guinea 988:5  
1030:11  
Guineau-Guinea  
982:25  
Guinea-Guinea  
943:13,24 963:2  
982:3 983:8  
Guinea-Guineau  
985:5  
Gulf 907:11 909:3  
911:14 913:15  
918:13 920:11  
947:20,26 948:15  
955:19,21 956:3,5  
956:8 957:17,23  
958:3,16,22 959:5  
959:12,15,23,26  
960:13,22 961:9  
961:25 962:5,8  
963:2,11 968:24  
969:14 971:5  
994:11 997:5,10  
1005:22 1008:5  
1008:19,20  
1030:11 1041:5,6
- Halifax 936:22  
937:16 1010:3  
hampered 1019:12  
hand 908:20 944:26  
983:8 984:6 992:2  
992:8 1019:26  
1032:13 1036:13  
1036:15  
handed 895:4  
932:18  
hands 896:7  
handwriting 1034:5  
happened 991:10  
happening 968:5  
happens 946:19  
1011:24  
happy 905:5  
1062:12  
harbour 1010:3,4  
hard 1047:4  
hardly 999:23  
1001:15 1005:6  
1006:4 1025:10  
Hardy 945:11  
harm 1051:10  
hash 941:16,17  
having 955:14  
959:24 989:26  
993:22 996:18  
1014:6 1021:15  
1022:20 1035:13  
head 952:2,7 954:22  
978:13 980:7  
headed 957:12  
heads 950:15  
1049:21 1055:23  
hear 905:5 948:14  
1016:12  
heard 906:22 935:6  
937:19,20 942:23  
948:17 949:4,17  
960:12 974:7  
987:4 992:4  
1007:11 1047:21  
hearing 895:7 930:6  
1004:5 1056:16  
1060:3 1062:19  
hearings 939:21  
heart 956:20 968:3  
1046:19  
hearts 968:3  
heavily 900:14  
946:16  
heavy 1050:23  
held 894:7 931:19  
937:16 961:10  
1009:9,13 1014:2  
1054:15 1059:14  
1059:25 1060:4  
1060:15  
Helene 1061:22  
help 988:26 1048:24  
hence 1038:5  
henceforth 1051:25  
her 1047:14  
1061:12  
heresy 919:3 925:10  
1049:8  
hero 1049:14
- heroic 1049:13  
hesitation 1052:10  
Hibernia 1001:19  
1019:25 1031:14  
1031:15  
hides 901:15  
hierarchy 1045:26  
high 1038:9  
higher 917:15  
highlights 939:20  
964:20 974:17  
highly 943:10  
993:18 1037:3  
1054:9 1057:16  
him 934:15 982:6  
1023:6 1031:6  
1041:25  
himself 1041:20  
1049:11,12  
hint 1033:3  
hinted 1038:17  
historic 1061:21  
historical 957:5  
994:3 1042:24  
1043:21  
history 904:3  
905:24,25 931:24  
951:7 966:9  
971:12 993:12  
1042:20 1048:18  
1051:12,13,21  
hitting 952:20  
hold 922:20 1013:8  
holder 1027:16  
holders 1011:8  
holdings 1015:2  
holy 967:23 1048:4  
home 979:9  
Hon 894:12  
honour 1061:3  
honourable 1053:26  
hope 895:22 921:23  
941:17 946:9  
978:6 1033:25  
1048:13  
hoping 1040:17  
horse 983:20  
hour 938:18  
1039:18 1043:6  
1057:5  
House 1058:7  
housekeeping  
1039:26  
Howie 1015:8  
Hudson's 998:17  
1008:7,7  
huge 985:12  
humble 966:13  
1041:26  
hundred 977:26  
hundreds 1004:22  
hypothesis 904:13  
980:5 993:3  
hypothetical 951:6  
951:9 965:7  
988:12,17,21  
989:12,14,19,24  
990:4 991:20  
992:23

## H

half 915:7,10,11  
947:11 978:24  
1030:19 1039:18

- Iceland 990:26  
 ice-cream 955:5  
 ICJ 1047:20  
 idea 909:17 922:17  
   924:12 947:22  
   968:8 986:4  
 identical 947:20  
 identifiable 926:22  
 identification 911:7  
   921:8 924:3  
   944:22  
 identified 911:11  
   913:22 919:22,25  
   923:25 949:11  
   963:15 964:8  
   973:5 976:16  
   997:6 1004:16  
 identify 915:3 918:5  
   920:3  
 identifying 923:24  
   923:24  
 ignore 896:17  
   987:10 1049:22  
 ignored 965:16  
   1043:19 1055:4  
 ignores 1056:3  
 III 1043:21  
 illusion 987:24  
 illusory 905:26  
 illustrated 1013:15  
   1024:24  
 illustration 1052:22  
 image 965:14  
 imaginary 905:12  
   989:15  
 imagination 922:6  
   924:21,26  
 imagine 930:18  
 immediate 985:10  
   1057:19  
 immediately 933:13  
   964:6 979:18  
 immutable 947:23  
   956:17  
 impact 904:21  
   951:6 965:7,15,21  
   984:24 988:11  
   1031:8 1051:9  
 impermeable  
   987:18  
 impinging 985:11  
 implemented  
   1038:24 1054:18  
 implementing  
   897:16 903:14  
   1000:22 1020:8  
   1021:12 1022:2  
   1026:24 1036:14  
   1038:2,3  
 implements  
   1021:21  
 implication 935:14  
 implications 901:16  
   908:26 910:4  
   916:8,25,26 917:3  
   1045:2,23  
   1050:21  
 implicit 920:19  
   1018:18 1046:18  
   1050:12,24  
   1051:15  
 independent 904:14  
   951:7  
 indicate 989:6  
   1033:18  
 indicated 982:26  
   989:4 1002:11  
   1004:6 1006:23  
   1007:6 1016:8  
   1027:12  
 indicates 935:12  
   1014:26 1050:14  
 indication 944:21  
 indications 1028:11  
   1029:5  
 indicative 1000:4  
 indicator 948:7  
 indisputable 925:17  
 individual 988:20  
   1046:26  
 individually 898:21  
 industry 1000:2  
   1013:2,15 1014:4  
   1019:21,21  
   1031:10,10,13,18  
   1031:18  
 inequalities 928:24  
 inequitable 985:6  
   988:4  
 inevitably 948:11  
 inexorable 1048:22  
 infer 902:16  
   1037:13  
 inference 939:11  
 influence 978:22  
 information 934:16  
   938:12 997:22  
   1000:16,24  
   1016:22 1026:8  
   1028:23,24  
   1031:4,5  
 informed 967:24  
   1040:8  
 informing 1017:5  
 informs 1034:24  
 infuses 992:18  
 inherent 908:16  
   915:12 926:26  
 initial 904:5  
 initiated 1054:25  
 initiation 995:12  
   1055:6  
 initio 905:16  
 injunction 944:11  
 Inn 937:17  
 inner 947:21 948:15  
   948:21,25 951:25  
   952:8 953:2,7,19  
   953:25 954:24  
   955:22,24,26  
   956:7 957:26  
   958:6 960:8,15,25  
   961:13 963:11  
   985:21 990:7  
   991:24 994:23  
 innuendos 965:2  
 inquire 911:10  
 inquired 911:11  
 inquiry 973:25  
 inshore 943:17  
 inside 953:10  
   960:22 962:18  
 insight 1048:26  
 insinuation 1013:9  
 insist 986:10  
 instance 999:7  
   1056:11  
 instances 895:19  
   1011:9  
 instead 1050:8  
 institution 909:12  
   909:23  
 instructed 898:26  
   1030:25  
 instructive 943:13  
 instrument 912:8  
   943:18  
 insufficient 998:25  
   1050:4  
 intend 895:14  
 intended 901:12  
   909:8 951:11  
   1002:25 1003:4  
 intent 1000:4  
 intention 902:17  
   1016:24 1017:6  
 intentions 937:10  
 inter 960:20  
 interest 992:26  
   1019:22 1025:14  
   1031:13 1040:3  
   1055:19  
 interested 1025:25  
   1031:10  
 interesting 929:3  
   967:11 1028:15  
 interests 908:14  
   993:14  
 interim 1009:20  
   1026:13 1027:18  
 internal 914:10  
   932:23 1049:25  
 international  
   896:20 906:26  
   912:11,13,23  
   913:6 919:18  
   925:19,22 929:2  
   929:23 931:3,15  
   931:17 933:8  
   941:26 945:10  
   956:23 988:19  
   989:7,9 993:4  
   1036 18 1043:2  
   1058:3  
 intersection 994:18  
 interstate 917:4  
 intertwined 940:18  
 intervening 973:16  
   991:5  
 intervention  
   1042:10  
 intimately 940:18  
 intoned 1049:19  
 intraprovincial  
   901:4  
 intrinsic 907:20  
 introduced 972:5  
   975:20  
 introduction 974:10  
 introductory  
   1055:14  
 invalid 1009:4  
   1032:4  
 invert 1050:7  
 inverted 974:16  
 invitation 897:6  
   989:5,10 1029:7  
   1049:17 1050:8  
 invitations 1050:26  
 invite 895:24  
   921:10 927:23  
   945:19 999:25  
   1004:3 1057:5  
 invited 941:12  
   998:9 1005:24  
   1049:21,22,26  
 invites 1050:6  
 inviting 942:20  
 invoke 939:17  
 invoked 1019:7  
 involved 908:21  
   985:2 988:6  
 involves 920:16  
 involving 937:3  
   988:13  
 ipso 905:16 912:4,4  
 ironically 969:6  
 irreducibly 1047:6  
 irregular 1005:23  
 irrelevant 902:4,6  
   927:16 944:26  
   945:7 948:16  
   1029:12 1036:9  
 irresistible 951:21  
 irrespective 922:12  
 island 948:7,8 965:6  
   966:4 969:7,8  
   979:12,15 987:5  
   991:15 1019:25  
   1025:10 1031:14  
   1053:7,8  
 islands 952:15  
   965:10,12 991:16  
 isolation 976:22  
   1043:15  
 issuance 997:24  
   998:10,24 1007:5  
   1007:25 1012:20  
   1016:3 1024:12  
   1024:18 1029:14  
   1031:9 1035:9  
 issue 900:6 928:10  
   930:17 937:3,11  
   937:13 940:25  
   941:3,10 947:22  
   959:13 962:12  
   965:9,12 968:20  
   969:13,16,16  
   972:4 974:7  
   983:11 984:16  
   988:11 989:2  
   993:14,23 996:9  
   997:15,20 999:24  
   1001:16 1012:26  
   1018:13 1019:13



- 1020:5 1030:5,26  
1031:3 1059:6  
1060:5  
issued 998:8,12,13  
998:15 999:2,16  
999:20,26,26  
1000:3,5,25  
1001:26 1008:3  
1008:20 1009:22  
1010:7,8,26  
1011:2,12,12,18  
1011:20 1012:5  
1018:10,18,21,22  
1018:25 1024:17  
1025:8 1026:13  
1027:17,19  
1028:4 1029:9,22  
1029:24 1031:16  
1032:7,9 1033:5,9  
1033:23 1049:17  
1051:2  
issues 896:14 946:4  
950:15 972:9  
issuing 1001:10,23  
1018:18 1019:11  
1019:14 1029:23  
1032:8  
items 998:6
- 
- J**
- James 894:14  
Jan 957:5 966:15,22  
970:2,11 973:4  
990:26  
January 937:9  
Jean 894:18 904:24  
Joe 899:5 945:11  
join 979:12  
joined 980:6  
1007:19  
joining 973:12  
992:19 1004:15  
joint 1010:16  
jointly 1010:17  
joking 1031:22  
journal 1015:6  
journals 1013:16  
Judge 1047:20  
judicial 967:21  
July 937:26 938:4  
1059:25  
junction 1034:25  
June 1058:5  
jure 905:16 912:4,4  
943:26  
juridical 910:2,10  
921:18 1044:16  
1044:21  
jurisdiction 906:21  
1009:4 1012:22  
1020:25 1024:13  
1025:11 1035:20  
jurisprudence  
907:7 930:2  
1044:11 1045:21  
1049:25  
jurists 929:17  
just 896:10,12  
903:20 906:7
- 910:22 921:24  
927:26 928:20  
929:10 932:17  
936:5 938:19  
941:24 946:21  
947:3,21,22  
948:24 949:18  
962:24,25 964:16  
966:3 969:2  
970:17 974:8  
980:5 987:26  
990:2 991:9  
992:12 993:20  
994:25 997:4  
1003:15,21  
1006:16 1008:4  
1010:2 1011:2  
1013:5,7 1022:16  
1023:21 1030:4  
1034:6 1035:21  
1039:13 1046:9  
1058:7  
justice 1062:2  
justifiable 920:8,11  
justification 952:13  
954:11,13  
justifications  
950:17  
justified 921:4  
955:25 958:6  
justifies 994:21  
justify 909:17
- 
- K**
- Katy 998:21 999:3  
999:8,10,15,21  
1002:5,6,10,13,16  
1002:25 1003:14  
1003:19,20  
1004:7,14,23  
1005:2,20 1006:9  
1006:15 1008:16  
1008:18 1018:19  
1018:21 1026:25  
1027:11,15,18  
1028:7 1029:24  
1032:10 1033:22  
1033:25  
keep 1047:4 1057:6  
kept 958:22 961:5  
1028:21  
key 899:19 904:24  
975:19 976:26  
1045:15  
kick 1055:8  
kicked 1001:21  
kicking 982:19  
kilometres 946:25  
958:20 963:26  
980:9 985:23,23  
987:23 1005:9  
kind 924:12 956:21  
961:3 980:26  
991:19  
kinds 958:19 962:18  
988:4  
knew 1013:2  
knowing 1018:9  
knowledge 965:2
- 1053:12  
known 900:4  
1012:4,6,6  
1034:15,20  
knows 907:10
- 
- L**
- L 894:16  
label 951:23  
Labrador's 897:4,6  
906:2 922:7  
1045:22 1055:15  
lack 959:4 1020:5  
lacking 989:13  
LaForest 894:12  
Lamaline 980:6  
land 906:22 907:2,4  
907:14 909:26  
953:11,26 958:21  
963:12 978:11  
986:26 1044:2  
lands 910:14 928:4  
language 943:2  
Lang's 1036:5  
large 961:21 980:3  
981:6 1024:26  
1025:6  
larger 946:18  
lashing 1049:12  
late 1019:9 1029:25  
1038:20 1057:5  
later 933:16 934:10  
934:22,23 937:9  
937:14,22,25  
947:18 954:13  
960:11 965:8  
966:11 967:17  
983:2 1001:22  
1003:21 1022:14  
1027:10 1058:12  
lateral 972:24  
latest 1026:26  
latitude 1032:21,25  
lats 1034:11  
latter 913:8  
launch 1021:10  
Laurentian 951:18  
999:22 1019:23  
1055:19  
Lawrence 1005:23  
laws 1054:18  
lawyer 945:10  
1023:24  
lay 902:17  
lead 949:11 951:16  
957:8 1035:15  
leader 1022:6  
leaders 944:14  
1058:20  
leader's 1037:23  
leading 961:17  
1013:16  
leads 914:14 963:14  
963:16 1003:18  
1024:13  
learned 947:14,15  
947:25 948:4  
least 896:25 899:4  
900:5 915:17
- 919:12,19 928:16  
935:6 942:14  
959:8,18 962:3  
968:13,19 979:5,8  
983:21 984:6  
989:18 999:5  
1028:11,25  
1044:9 1045:24  
1053:9 1054:7  
1061:24  
leave 957:14  
leaves 961:13  
leaving 965:26  
led 906:4 957:9  
leeward 991:15  
left 905:19 950:19  
972:16 976:14,22  
979:19 999:24  
1001:15 1010:10  
leg 971:7  
legal 896:14 907:6  
907:16,18,22,25  
909:12,23 910:6  
910:15,24,25,26  
911:2 913:10,13  
918:3,16,18  
920:17 927:19  
930:14 931:7  
937:20 942:2  
949:20 972:21  
973:2 1023:13  
1042:5 1046:23  
1056:23 1057:11  
1058:22  
legally 942:18  
legault 894:13  
906:17,19,24  
907:10 910:20,21  
910:22 912:24  
914:5 917:22,25  
917:26 918:21  
941:20 984:13  
legislated 903:2  
905:15 911:25  
1052:4  
legislation 899:12  
900:11,18 901:7,8  
901:9 902:2,24  
903:14 904:4  
910:17 912:6,7,8  
915:12 918:9,20  
933:6 936:4 937:2  
939:19 1000:21  
1020:8,19 1021:4  
1021:13 1022:2  
1023:8,14,14  
1024:18 1026:5  
1026:23 1028:24  
1036:14 1038:2,3  
1038:25 1057:25  
legislators 901:11  
legislature 912:16  
lend 1034:26  
length 958:18  
960:12 963:21,24  
970:6 1006:6,14  
1006:14 1029:19  
1033:12 1035:7  
1038:8
- lengths 950:7  
970:23 979:20  
Leonard 894:13  
less 921:5 942:26  
985:24 987:22  
1005:7 1033:23  
1035:20 1049:13  
lesson 960:13 962:8  
lessons 959:15,21  
959:22,25 961:25  
961:26 962:2,3  
lest 908:15 929:8  
1050:3 1056:3  
let 918:15 971:18  
1003:12,13  
1027:18  
letter 900:5 903:6  
933:12,22,26  
934:6 937:5,12,26  
1033:4,15,18  
1034:2 1036:5,5  
letters 1017:26  
1027:7  
let's 912:7 951:18  
953:18 1005:5  
1030:4 1050:15  
level 898:25 917:15  
936:4 1008:18  
1048:9  
liable 922:18  
liberties 1036:18  
Libya-Malta 931:7  
949:15 966:15  
1044:15,23  
lie 939:14  
light 1023:5  
1024:15 1046:9  
1046:12 1047:23  
like 924:14 929:8  
946:11 950:16,20  
954:20 962:13  
966:15 977:13,13  
981:20 987:17  
994:25 996:6,8  
997:4,16 1005:13  
1006:21 1015:12  
1016:2,21  
1019:10 1020:7  
1034:14 1035:13  
1046:22 1059:12  
1061:6,9,11,11,13  
1061:24 1062:3  
1062:10,15  
likely 1012:14  
limit 958:21 963:22  
976:9,11 978:13  
1000:4 1002:14  
1002:17,19  
1044:5  
limitation 966:21  
979:2  
limited 949:22  
977:18 981:18  
983:13 998:11  
1025:2  
limiting 977:23  
limits 897:19,20,24  
899:13,24 926:12  
971:24 972:20,22

- 972:24,24 973:19  
1032:19 1045:4  
1062:9  
limpid 936:14  
linear 1025:7  
lines 904:9 926:19  
944:22,24 947:12  
950:17 964:10  
970:17 995:4,5  
1035:22,22  
lingering 945:14  
link 907:13 916:22  
1036:12,20  
1042:3,3 1043:26  
1051:21  
linked 972:26  
listens 913:11  
litigation 995:8  
1056:22  
little 899:8 940:11  
954:15 969:23  
978:6 991:17  
996:20 998:15  
1003:21 1007:20  
1033:21 1050:4  
live 952:10  
lived 901:7 1054:6  
load 904:7  
localized 974:18  
located 996:22  
1001:20 1017:21  
1052:11  
location 926:17  
938:11 957:5  
970:4,11,15,21  
971:13 985:20  
993:6 996:14,19  
996:21 1005:24  
1044:25 1057:15  
1057:18  
locked 1040:8  
logic 956:3 978:4  
logically 978:6  
long 901:21 917:24  
935:22 952:21  
964:10 970:24  
971:2 995:4,11  
1003:6 1006:15  
1006:17 1031:2  
1034:15 1037:15  
1039:15 1042:6  
1042:16 1046:10  
1046:15 1052:6  
longer 946:17 947:6  
947:16 954:9  
974:25 989:17  
1031:25  
longs 1034:11  
look 902:7 911:12  
911:23 913:17  
918:6,7,9,10,12  
920:4 922:9  
928:26 946:13  
951:19 963:20  
971:4 1003:5  
1010:10 1013:18  
1030:10 1034:2  
1034:14 1045:13  
looked 1045:3
- 1049:15  
looking 916:6  
928:20 980:12,24  
1005:14 1023:21  
1038:16  
looks 987:17  
loosely 1052:18  
lose 1004:4 1052:2  
loses 1055:24  
lost 896:5 1019:20  
lot 997:25 1000:18  
1001:4 1003:8  
1009:24,25  
1031:11  
lots 966:24  
lowest 915:14  
lull 939:14  
lunch 935:22  
995:18,19  
lure 1049:13
- M**
- M 894:17  
Macdonald 1013:23  
macro 963:16  
980:26  
macro-geographic  
951:24  
Madame 1061:22  
made 897:22 901:2  
911:13 914:15  
930:25 939:24  
941:4,16 942:13  
949:24,26 956:10  
958:2 961:22  
968:23 977:16  
996:10 997:16  
998:3 1013:11  
1016:5,11 1020:8  
1024:10,10  
1026:5 1035:16  
1036:4 1052:19  
1060:19 1061:8  
magic 978:2  
magnifying 1034:26  
main 946:10 977:17  
Maine 907:11 909:3  
911:14 913:16  
918:14 920:11  
947:20,26 948:16  
955:19,21 956:2,4  
956:8 957:18,23  
958:17,22 959:6  
959:15,23,26  
960:13,22 961:10  
961:25 962:6,8  
963:2,11 968:24  
969:14 971:5  
994:11 997:5,10  
1041:5,6  
mainland 948:2  
969:3 979:12,16  
maintained 1052:4  
maintaining 986:22  
make 906:7 919:11  
919:19,20 922:19  
923:16 935:8  
946:16 956:10  
959:10 1006:18
- 1010:5 1013:23  
1018:6 1034:3  
1035:15 1040:6  
1047:14  
makes 897:16  
905:21 955:9  
1006:18  
making 919:7 927:2  
936:9 940:8  
950:10 964:26  
966:19 970:7  
1025:18  
man 1052:17  
management  
1047:10  
mandate 897:7  
929:20 930:24  
931:6 1037:3  
1049:4  
mandated 1047:11  
mandatory 949:24  
manifestly 1005:25  
1050:2  
manipulation 961:3  
manner 906:2 932:8  
957:2 985:11  
1029:15 1060:13  
mantle 896:6  
mantra 896:8  
many 895:19  
947:23 956:23  
961:17 1000:13  
1000:22 1030:13  
1046:18 1053:25  
1061:14,26  
map 937:7 938:2  
955:3 1002:19  
1003:2,3,3,5,5,14  
1003:16,19,20  
1004:2,7 1005:6  
1005:13,14,17  
1009:24 1010:10  
1014:21 1016:15  
1028:17 1052:24  
maps 1010:10  
1014:13 1054:19  
march 932:17  
944:20 1027:9  
1042:16  
margin 916:19,24  
974:16,24 975:6  
975:12 976:11  
977:20 978:26  
979:13,15,26  
986:23 994:25  
1026:10 1033:14  
1045:14  
marine 927:9,12  
maritime 896:24  
904:17 906:20,25  
907:7,17,23  
909:15 912:13  
917:8 918:3,17,25  
920:9 925:7  
927:18 929:23  
931:3 943:16  
947:6 948:5  
949:18 960:17  
974:26 975:11,14
- 975:21 976:23  
977:2,8,12 978:23  
992:22 996:13  
1042:15,16,20  
1046:3,8,14,19  
1047:11,25  
1048:8 1050:10  
1058:3 1060:22  
mark 1005:14  
1006:16  
marked 1043:21  
Marys 965:18,19  
mass 986:26  
mast 1049:12  
match 946:8  
1006:19 1007:19  
1011:12,26  
matches 1004:12,14  
matching 1013:7  
material 895:17  
932:13 938:4  
1035:4  
materialize 924:15  
1023:9  
mathematical  
953:10  
Mathys 1040:21  
1061:19  
matter 896:26  
899:12 905:23  
924:21 928:6  
934:21 994:23  
1038:2,4 1051:10  
1055:17  
mattered 947:19  
matters 905:8  
1029:13 1039:25  
1042:9  
maxim 907:3  
maybe 916:9 941:19  
968:7 996:24  
1018:14 1034:19  
Mayen 957:6  
966:15,22 970:2  
970:11 973:4  
990:26  
mcrae 896:11,13  
897:9 900:17  
905:13,18 911:17  
924:23 925:2  
932:16 951:12  
953:18 959:4,11  
960:2,21 961:9,26  
965:13 972:5  
976:5 982:5,13  
983:3 989:2,12  
996:10,12 1019:8  
1040:24 1042:13  
1049:10 1050:16  
1062:14,20  
McRae's 903:13  
957:7 964:18  
mean 902:18 906:9  
906:10 915:6,20  
915:25 916:10  
923:19 926:22  
935:7 936:13  
940:2 967:14  
986:5 1007:20
- 1010:21 1012:17  
1023:19 1030:9  
1031:15,20,22,24  
1040:25  
meaning 1002:12  
1011:14 1051:17  
1057:15  
meaningful 955:3  
972:15  
means 899:26  
902:26 971:23  
977:17 993:10,12  
1005:5,12 1048:7  
meant 949:19  
980:18,21 985:5  
1000:7,8 1005:25  
1050:16 1051:12  
measure 919:12  
928:16,24 949:19  
972:13 1003:25  
1057:26  
measured 972:19  
1057:14  
measurement  
1002:12  
measurements  
1006:8  
measures 909:8  
measuring 980:3  
mechanism 899:16  
1021:14 1022:4  
median 949:2 955:8  
955:24 966:17,20  
969:20 973:13,18  
973:26 989:24  
medium 907:3  
meet 1059:19  
meeting 932:24  
934:14 937:12,15  
1013:24  
meetings 939:3,4  
member 1040:19  
members 894:22  
895:5 896:8 897:5  
903:22 905:20  
906:8 908:16  
924:20 927:3  
929:15 931:18  
932:10 939:13,15  
940:16 943:5  
945:13 946:2  
996:4 1039:8,24  
1042:26 1045:20  
1047:13 1048:2  
1049:16 1051:3  
1053:10 1054:12  
1055:3 1058:4  
1059:11,26  
1061:7,12 1062:3  
memorandum  
932:23 933:3  
Memorial 936:12  
939:25 948:23  
950:4 962:14  
964:9 999:5  
1016:17 1045:9  
1060:26  
memory 1034:17  
men 1061:16



- mention 938:6  
946:6 949:14  
994:6
- mentioned 921:24  
946:12 955:23  
976:6 1025:14  
1041:21 1055:14
- Mercator 1003:3,5  
1003:10
- Merci 1039:23
- mere 965:14  
1005:18
- merely 912:9
- merged 981:3
- merit 907:21 927:7
- met 932:19
- metaphor 1049:12
- method 898:19  
902:20 923:25  
953:8,17 955:8  
958:2 960:16,18  
960:19 964:16  
973:10 974:6  
979:14,18 982:17  
982:18,20 984:7,9  
986:11 1038:14
- methodology  
1003:15,26
- methods 909:18  
930:2 957:23,24  
959:17,17,20,23  
960:3,7 962:5,6,9  
977:23 1045:9  
1050:18 1059:4
- microscopic 947:8
- mid 1038:22
- middle 965:25  
969:7 977:11  
1019:24 1031:12
- midpoint 969:10
- mid-coastal 979:17
- mid-80s 900:18
- might 896:4 904:11  
922:16 926:19  
928:21 929:4  
933:24 938:10  
945:20 946:17  
949:8,10 956:19  
958:21 963:11  
968:9 972:25  
974:11 979:17  
988:19 989:15  
993:4 995:16  
1039:13,15  
1040:17 1052:17  
1055:10
- mile 973:7,13,14,19  
975:5,24 976:9  
977:22
- miles 909:16 963:19  
964:2 969:7 980:8  
1002:15,17  
1006:4,10,10,12  
1006:12,15  
1045:13
- millennium 1046:11
- millimetre 1005:7  
1005:13
- million 946:24
- Milton's 896:4
- mimic 1050:18
- mind 903:19 908:17  
912:17 915:19  
931:5 957:12  
961:5 999:25  
1012:10 1051:4  
1055:22 1057:6  
1062:5
- mindful 1024:3
- mine 1034:18  
1050:23
- mineral 1014:10  
1031:19
- Mines 1026:11
- minimize 986:8
- minimized 959:4
- minister 898:12,19  
902:14 933:2,4,9  
933:16 934:8,12  
934:23,25,25  
936:26 937:9  
1013:23 1014:7  
1021:15 1033:4  
1033:18 1036:5
- Ministers 936:24,25
- Minister's 937:12
- minute 1006:16  
1018:5
- minutes 897:9  
937:17 945:24  
997:14 1004:21  
1004:24 1005:3,4  
1005:5,11  
1032:20,25  
1039:20
- Miquelon 904:18  
932:18 990:18
- mirror 1050:16
- misled 932:10
- misplaced 1005:16
- missed 948:9 973:15
- missing 945:11  
1036:12 1042:3,3
- misstated 932:8
- mixture 977:5
- Mobil 998:15,21  
999:3,8,11,15,21  
1004:10,11,16  
1006:22,24,26  
1007:13 1008:5  
1010:7,9,13,22,24  
1011:11,13,18  
1012:4,9,18  
1013:7 1016:24  
1017:5 1018:20  
1024:11 1026:26  
1027:11,15,19  
1028:12,17  
1029:24 1032:9  
1041:15,18
- Mobil's 1041:22
- mock 941:12
- mockery 942:22
- model 953:5,6
- modern 1047:10
- modern-day  
1049:11
- modestly 989:23
- modification 966:7  
969:26
- modifications  
912:12 913:2
- modified 950:9
- modify 913:6  
931:16 973:22
- modifying 903:15  
903:16,17
- moment 923:23  
925:6 955:21  
958:12 972:7  
981:21 983:10  
993:17 1015:4  
1021:10 1051:13  
1057:23
- Monday 895:10  
896:11 897:9  
903:14 905:10,18  
942:23 947:10  
949:25 951:11,20  
957:20 959:3  
962:13 966:10  
973:3 977:16,23  
984:11 987:4  
989:2 992:4 995:8  
1007:11 1011:10  
1016:4 1018:7  
1019:8 1020:9  
1026:20 1032:13  
1035:16 1041:20  
1043:10
- Monday's 1002:8  
1016:7 1024:14  
1029:8
- money 1017:16  
1031:11
- monologues 895:24
- Monsieur 1039:23  
1040:21
- month 933:16
- months 934:10  
937:22,25 1012:5
- Moore's 1058:5,21
- moot 941:2
- moratorium 900:18  
900:24 938:22  
1001:21,22  
1016:4,5,8,10,20  
1018:3,11,17,19  
1018:22,23,25  
1019:5,12,12,24  
1031:8,12
- moreover 1035:8
- morning 894:21  
895:2 903:21  
904:5 931:25  
946:3 1019:7  
1022:6 1047:21  
1048:3
- mortals 1049:14
- most 896:18 898:17  
918:16 921:7  
924:19 945:10  
947:6 956:22  
967:11 969:20  
995:16 1020:2  
1021:12 1025:17  
1025:23 1035:6
- 1047:23 1054:9  
1055:18 1059:26
- mostly 1001:26
- mother 941:20  
982:11
- motion 900:10
- move 920:7 953:18  
957:19 974:5,20  
974:26 990:4,16  
991:21 1016:2
- movement 971:14
- moves 961:14
- moving 983:13
- much 920:25  
947:16,22 964:20  
976:17 977:7  
983:5 1011:13  
1012:26 1013:6,6  
1020:3 1030:8  
1031:7 1034:18  
1045:8 1062:19
- Mulroney 898:12  
899:6 1022:19
- multi-purpose  
920:8
- Murphy 998:18
- must 911:8 919:21  
920:4 931:5  
947:14 949:16  
960:23 961:8,11  
961:13 962:9  
964:3 970:19  
972:25 974:12  
979:6 985:19  
987:10 993:18  
997:19 1026:10  
1038:18 1039:3  
1044:17 1045:3  
1047:14 1057:14
- muster 1049:7
- mutuality 1038:10
- myself 920:6
- mystery 945:9,12
- N**
- nail 1026:14
- namely 1057:11
- narrow 909:19
- narrowing 974:20
- natural 907:24  
908:23 920:20  
924:5 934:13  
936:25 979:8  
990:5 991:22  
1013:22 1043:4,8  
1043:22,25  
1044:7,19  
1045:16
- naturally 988:20
- nature 896:25 905:4  
908:2,5,6 910:24  
910:25 911:12,16  
911:17 913:17,19  
913:20,26 914:2  
918:2,6,8,8,9,11  
918:12 920:4,5  
924:4,5 931:26  
1046:2 1051:4
- naught 924:18
- nautical 963:26  
973:7 975:24  
976:9 977:22  
980:8 1002:15,17  
1006:10,10,11,12  
1006:15 1045:13
- nearby 978:3
- nearly 901:17
- necessarily 942:2  
950:12 960:14  
1009:12 1048:4
- necessary 913:6  
919:14 932:25  
948:17 979:3  
1048:10
- necessity 895:8
- need 921:19 954:21  
955:7,14 960:4  
963:3,16 971:19  
984:17 1017:12  
1023:16 1044:12  
1046:20
- needed 936:17
- negative 1050:4
- negotiate 1019:20
- negotiated 905:15  
910:17 915:20  
916:2 917:11  
926:11 928:14
- negotiation 898:24  
922:17 924:16  
935:2,20 936:6
- negotiations 898:9  
898:15 900:2  
915:21 917:12  
922:9 935:19  
937:2,11,14 941:8  
991:18 1042:7  
1054:2,3
- neighboring  
1020:24
- neighbouring  
1044:5
- neighbours 1054:9
- neither 930:22
- Netherlands 914:26
- neutral 932:2
- never 896:19  
915:12 919:3  
923:4,4,21 928:9  
940:26 942:9  
947:19 949:17  
955:16 960:6  
971:26 972:18  
991:10 1048:19  
1050:2 1052:3
- nevertheless 1001:5  
1018:13
- new 894:8 898:11  
946:26 947:12,13  
950:17,17,23  
952:18 974:8,10  
974:11 975:4  
977:14 979:24  
989:10,25  
1001:10 1022:18  
1023:5 1027:20  
1027:21 1028:3  
1028:13 1030:5

- 1037:11 1048:9  
1049:20 1059:14  
Newfoundland/N...  
935:3  
news 947:18  
next 949:8 954:23  
960:12 979:18  
990:4 991:21  
992:5,20 997:14  
1003:19 1011:17  
1034:21 1051:20  
nine 999:6,6  
non 981:25  
none 914:19 932:3  
932:15 937:7  
958:9 965:4  
nonencroachment  
951:3 981:14,17  
981:25 982:15  
983:6,14 984:14  
984:15 988:10  
1045:18  
nonetheless 943:18  
967:25 972:25  
nongeographic  
993:6  
non-binding 943:3  
non-coast 948:19  
non-exclusive  
1009:21,23  
non-geographic  
1045:25 1046:2  
norm 919:2,2,4,5,23  
925:7 929:25,25  
normal 1003:3,5  
1025:24  
normally 963:22  
966:25  
north 915:2 948:22  
969:19,22 978:23  
982:24,25 983:19  
984:24 988:4  
989:22 1032:21  
1032:25 1042:21  
1043:9,12,16  
northeast 965:24  
1004:22  
northern 928:4  
1002:14 1005:19  
1006:5,11 1012:8  
1012:8  
notable 984:11  
note 938:3 951:24  
964:25 969:18  
972:3,4 985:22  
1028:15  
noted 937:12  
943:22 960:2,24  
961:23 964:3  
968:16 981:22  
982:18  
nothing 896:16  
906:11 909:12,13  
909:16 922:5,5  
934:19,20 935:5  
955:8 956:4 961:3  
964:20 969:25  
972:16 974:8  
983:11 1001:4
- 1008:6,7 1023:11  
1035:20 1037:16  
1037:17 1051:12  
1051:18 1052:2  
notice 1016:12  
1021:17 1022:16  
noticeable 1005:6  
1006:4  
noticed 1008:10  
notified 937:10  
notion 910:18  
926:23 949:9  
979:5 985:26  
1039:15  
notional 951:6  
notwithstanding  
909:23  
November 894:7  
904:16 934:10  
936:20 1002:9  
1006:22 1026:20  
no-effect 969:5  
number 895:8 930:5  
932:22 934:11,16  
972:3,5 975:4  
982:21 998:7,11  
999:5 1000:5,20  
1008:17 1013:18  
1013:19 1014:20  
1014:23 1017:22  
1017:25 1019:2,2  
1019:3 1025:4,9  
1025:19 1030:23  
numbers 946:8  
980:14 998:25
- O**
- objection 938:5,7  
994:16 1033:19  
objective 947:23  
956:17 957:12  
1031:12 1035:18  
obligation 900:10  
1040:22  
oblige 1017:16  
observation 906:7  
939:7 1049:2  
obstruction 1052:9  
obtain 1026:6  
1027:20  
obtaining 1026:7  
obvious 954:23  
1055:15  
obviously 900:17  
928:23 935:20  
944:25 992:2  
999:15 1001:4  
1003:20 1006:2  
1007:10 1010:16  
1010:25 1011:5  
1012:23 1013:2  
1022:18 1028:6  
1031:9 1036:15  
1037:25 1053:17  
occasions 1027:12  
occupy 999:21  
occur 932:21 988:6  
occurred 934:20  
939:3 990:25
- 997:8 1009:8,8  
1023:3 1032:25  
occurs 1056:24  
Oceans 916:23  
917:6  
October 1033:4  
odd 983:7  
oddly 989:19  
Odysseus 1049:11  
off 915:2 968:2  
981:7 986:17  
987:22 991:2  
1006:16 1051:18  
offer 894:25 933:20  
934:9 952:5  
offered 949:12  
969:25  
offers 994:8  
official 932:25  
1014:6  
officials 937:19  
1015:13  
oh 914:5 1003:13  
1040:13  
oil 932:20 958:25  
998:18 1008:7  
1032:26 1052:16  
okay 915:24 917:18  
919:13 980:23  
990:14 1007:17  
1013:4 1035:2  
1041:2,3  
old 908:15 1029:20  
1059:19  
older 1027:18  
1043:24  
omissions 949:13  
omitted 1020:13  
once 911:10 935:3  
954:19 968:23  
1017:17 1034:15  
1057:22  
ones 990:12,12  
999:16  
one's 1047:4  
one-tenth 1005:7  
onward 943:10  
open 950:2 960:3  
opened 1041:22  
opening 897:9  
906:17 957:7  
964:26  
openly 1054:15  
operate 913:3  
1008:26  
operating 938:25  
962:11  
operation 907:18,26  
911:2,2,9 913:10  
918:18 919:24  
920:2 953:10  
980:10  
operational 981:18  
operations 1026:9  
opinion 906:12  
966:13  
opportune 1020:2  
opportunity 946:13  
1059:19
- opposed 1003:25  
1006:10,12  
1016:19 1044:20  
opposite 950:4  
955:25 966:18,23  
966:25 967:5  
opposition 958:5  
968:4,12 969:22  
option 955:16,22,22  
977:5 978:2,16  
options 951:19  
981:4 995:7  
oral 921:12,23  
977:16 1056:6  
1060:19  
orals 959:22 961:10  
962:4 975:7  
orange 1010:16  
orbit 1020:11  
order 918:5 920:3  
923:23 1021:11  
ordinary 1030:21  
orientation 965:23  
965:24 968:25  
971:5  
origin 895:18  
909:25 1042:8  
original 950:19  
952:4 974:22  
1005:16 1027:15  
originates 1042:5  
orthodoxy 896:7  
ostensibly 905:25  
others 906:15  
956:26 998:17  
1008:8 1009:18  
1017:25  
otherwise 926:19  
Otto 1036:5  
ought 927:7 946:8  
ourselves 895:14  
outcome 905:12  
959:10 1014:11  
outer 916:18 952:18  
953:2,3,19,22  
954:5,7,12,16,25  
955:9,10,20 958:7  
960:26 961:6,14  
962:15,23 964:4  
965:16,26 967:7  
968:10 971:7,16  
971:24 975:12,17  
976:11,11 977:20  
978:25 979:25  
992:17,22 994:22  
995:4 1033:22  
1034:3 1045:14  
outmoded 1045:16  
outset 1029:10  
outside 960:23  
1019:11,16  
1023:22  
over 906:20,22  
907:2 908:12,20  
909:25 912:3  
913:18,23 914:8  
918:3 928:4  
936:15,16 940:20  
947:2,3,11 979:19
- 986:5 991:19  
993:22 994:6  
1000:25 1006:4  
1006:17 1014:9  
1025:11,20  
1026:17 1029:19  
1029:21 1030:12  
1030:22 1031:16  
1033:11 1034:19  
1035:6 1038:20  
1038:20 1044:2  
1046:9 1052:17  
1052:20  
overlap 915:13  
1009:24,25  
1011:8  
overlapping 949:18  
949:20 971:21  
973:2,6,11,21,26  
1032:17  
overriding 994:5  
oversight 1024:24  
overtaken 1021:5  
1023:8  
overview 1020:11  
over-reaching  
1028:26  
own 907:6 930:11  
946:10 947:4  
968:13 974:23  
976:3 978:5 979:9  
994:14 998:11  
1007:24 1031:20  
1049:12,15  
1050:4 1061:5,26  
ownership 1014:10  
1035:19  
o'clock 995:22
- P**
- Pacific 1018:26  
1019:3  
package 946:7  
packaged 896:2  
page 931:23 938:2  
961:10 976:5  
996:12,20 997:10  
1002:8 1006:22  
1016:7 1018:7  
1020:9,14  
1024:14 1026:21  
1029:8 1036:11  
1041:21,23  
1060:9  
pages 1025:16  
1032:11,12  
1035:17  
paper 937:18  
1025:16 1026:4  
Paquette 1027:8  
Paradise 896:5  
paragraph 907:15  
907:21 909:4,11  
973:10,16,16  
974:4,4 997:10,11  
997:13 1013:11  
1013:13 1014:13  
1016:16 1036:6  
1041:9 1043:11

- 1060:26  
 paragraphs 973:22  
 parallel 958:14,15  
 961:21 971:11  
 1025:7  
 paralleled 958:17  
 Paris 1040:9  
 part 901:12 913:2  
 917:8 921:7  
 923:11,14 941:15  
 952:9 953:24  
 960:17 965:3  
 969:4 990:23  
 998:11 1025:24  
 1035:7 1052:10  
 1060:26  
 partial 972:19  
 981:5  
 participation 924:8  
 particular 912:21  
 919:15 920:17  
 923:8 930:13  
 959:6 972:24  
 983:15 998:10  
 1009:12 1038:7  
 1049:22  
 particularly 957:17  
 959:20 981:16  
 991:17 992:25  
 996:7  
 partly 984:21  
 partner 904:23  
 parts 971:12  
 party 902:26 903:11  
 969:21 985:11  
 990:24 995:6  
 1053:11  
 pass 1031:6  
 passage 942:9  
 943:24  
 passages 913:15  
 918:16 944:18  
 950:5  
 passing 969:2  
 past 944:15 965:3  
 975:22 978:5  
 1042:4 1051:15  
 1051:21  
 pastiche 1035:23  
 path 1005:3,23  
 patience 995:14  
 Paul 955:6 1025:10  
 1053:8  
 Paul's 955:4  
 pay 1013:6,6  
 pearling 1037:14  
 peculiar 983:4  
 PEI 998:17  
 pen 1051:11  
 pencil 1005:13  
 1006:2,16  
 peninsula 952:3,17  
 990:21  
 peninsulas 965:14  
 965:15,18,21  
 people 956:22  
 1059:22 1061:14  
 1062:18  
 perceived 1003:11
- 1021:4 1031:18  
 perceives 984:20  
 percent 947:2,3  
 952:12 975:15  
 percentages 975:14  
 perception 1031:18  
 perfect 982:12  
 perfectly 916:24  
 972:26  
 perhaps 950:25  
 955:2,20 956:10  
 967:11 968:2,12  
 968:15 970:25  
 984:11 993:17  
 995:15 1015:20  
 1024:4 1047:23  
 1053:7  
 period 900:19  
 935:11 938:21,24  
 1000:25 1001:9  
 1029:19 1030:15  
 1030:18,23  
 1033:7 1038:20  
 1042:6 1051:19  
 permission 1017:13  
 1034:25  
 permittees 999:6  
 permitted 930:23  
 1030:8,8,9 1031:7  
 permitting 1030:22  
 perpendicular  
 908:18 953:23  
 954:5 956:4 958:5  
 958:16 959:20  
 962:17,24 963:5,6  
 963:19,22 975:22  
 977:10 979:16  
 perpendiculars  
 974:18  
 person 1003:23  
 1032:2  
 personal 1047:25  
 perspective 914:11  
 941:26 963:17  
 pertinent 1037:22  
 1054:18  
 petitioned 903:23  
 petroleum 1000:10  
 1013:26 1014:15  
 1014:24 1015:3,6  
 1018:26 1019:3  
 1028:2,10  
 1052:25  
 Petro-Canada  
 1028:15  
 phase 895:7 900:7  
 931:12,20 932:14  
 934:12 939:25  
 940:24 941:5,6,11  
 941:15,16,24  
 942:7,10,13,21  
 944:12,12,17  
 1004:5 1008:15  
 1010:11 1013:12  
 1033:2 1036:6  
 1037:4 1045:9  
 1050:9 1054:21  
 1054:24 1056:6  
 1058:12,23
- 1059:3 1060:26  
 phases 940:17  
 1061:9 1062:1  
 phenomenon  
 1024:5  
 Phillip 894:17  
 phrase 917:5  
 physical 907:21,23  
 piece 981:19 986:2  
 Pierre 904:18  
 932:18 952:9  
 976:4 978:14  
 982:24 983:2  
 986:26 987:19,24  
 988:14 989:4  
 990:18 992:10  
 993:12  
 piety 1049:7  
 pink 948:19  
 pioneer 896:10,12  
 1049:19  
 place 934:15 937:13  
 961:23 972:25  
 1001:24 1005:17  
 1032:3 1046:5,5  
 1051:19 1059:24  
 1060:3  
 placement 1050:14  
 places 994:4  
 placing 951:18  
 plainly 1010:6  
 1043:3  
 plane 993:13  
 plausible 1019:17  
 play 911:3 921:7  
 1019:26 1038:13  
 playing 978:5  
 plea 896:17  
 pleaded 896:11  
 1054:20  
 pleading 911:5  
 pleadings 921:11  
 1020:17 1040:4,7  
 1040:7,12,18,20  
 1041:17,17  
 please 1004:3  
 1005:18 1011:17  
 pleasing 896:2  
 pleasure 1059:18,21  
 plenty 985:15  
 plus 946:24  
 podium 905:3  
 945:19 994:7  
 pointed 942:15  
 950:5 957:21  
 968:21 983:3  
 1025:15 1037:6  
 1045:6  
 points 936:8 952:13  
 961:18,18 963:15  
 964:4,6,11,14  
 965:25 972:10  
 973:13 976:20  
 978:20 990:12,13  
 990:18 1002:22  
 1004:25 1011:25  
 1011:25 1012:13  
 1034:12,13,25  
 policy 898:25 899:7
- political 928:19  
 944:14 992:11  
 993:9 995:10  
 1020:15  
 politics 931:16  
 ponder 1050:26  
 pooling 922:10  
 924:11  
 portion 952:8  
 963:11 968:11  
 987:23 1010:13  
 1010:20 1021:22  
 1033:16  
 portions 1043:14  
 Portugal 943:15  
 posed 895:11  
 position 904:14  
 905:4 923:22  
 934:7 935:9,13,23  
 936:2 938:9 950:4  
 966:2 971:19  
 972:2 982:2  
 983:12 986:6,6  
 987:11 1023:13  
 1026:3  
 positions 921:15  
 positive 1047:26  
 possess 930:20  
 possession 895:17  
 possibility 944:6  
 987:21 1021:15  
 possible 945:8  
 952:24 961:22  
 962:19 964:24  
 966:6 971:6  
 977:13,15 986:8  
 987:4 1021:13,14  
 possibly 996:22  
 1001:11  
 potential 983:9  
 985:3 997:7,12  
 1041:6,12  
 power 1022:18  
 powers 923:18  
 practical 907:4  
 943:9 965:7 974:3  
 982:16 1044:4,16  
 1045:23  
 practicality 992:18  
 practice 992:11  
 995:11 996:7  
 997:25 998:7,26  
 1000:6 1001:6  
 1007:24 1008:3  
 1016:3 1030:22  
 1034:22 1035:5  
 1036:25 1037:9  
 1037:14,20  
 1038:11  
 precautionary  
 1047:11  
 precise 946:22  
 949:5 984:9  
 1007:14  
 precisely 912:17  
 940:5 991:16  
 1017:21 1055:25  
 precision 897:26  
 899 14,21
- predetermines  
 987:15  
 predominant  
 1047:9  
 prefaced 938:8  
 prehistoric 1046:13  
 prejudice 938:9  
 940:4,5,6 952:5  
 1052:25  
 preliminary 905:8  
 905:23 946:6  
 972:10  
 premature 968:8  
 Premier 929:6  
 1058:5,6,21  
 1059:13,15  
 1060:8  
 premiers 929:11  
 943:8 944:24  
 1059:14,25  
 1060:4,7,15  
 premise 951:9  
 premised 1042:18  
 premises 989:14  
 preparation 995:7  
 preparations 935:4  
 prepared 898:15  
 936:5 944:15  
 preparing 1019:19  
 prescient 1062:6  
 presence 958:6,18  
 983:16 985:11  
 986:17  
 present 920:16,26  
 921:17 929:18  
 937:19 944:17,20  
 945:2 946:24  
 958:10 971:22  
 991:4 1026:10  
 1033:11 1036:20  
 1038:19 1041:11  
 1045:12 1046:4  
 1048:15 1051:19  
 1058:13,23  
 presentation 897:10  
 903:21 905:18  
 946:9,11 948:13  
 961:16 1010:12  
 1016:11 1025:15  
 1061:15  
 presentations  
 1036:23 1061:8  
 presented 936:11  
 938:15 949:7  
 950:17 951:10,19  
 969:3 975:4 981:4  
 998:5 1062:5  
 presently 905:24  
 presents 958:15  
 preserves 992:25  
 preside 940:20  
 President 950:26  
 956:26 957:3  
 964:21 966:5,13  
 968:6 969:16  
 970:2,19 989:26  
 1039:23 1047:20  
 1047:24 1048:5  
 1048:16

- pressed 1053:3  
 presumably 921:25  
   969:4 1012:17,25  
 presumption 967:5  
 presumptive 966:6  
   966:17 968:3  
 pretended 942:9  
 pretends 941:2  
 pretty 1030:7  
   1031:7,23  
 prevent 909:8  
   1001:23,23  
   1018:17  
 prevented 958:19  
   1019:11,14,16  
 preventing 1038:15  
 previous 1002:26  
   1003:12  
 pre-drilling 1026:7  
 pride 1046:4,5  
 prima 973:17,20  
   974:2  
 primarily 920:12  
   970:9 998:21  
 primary 1031:12  
   1055:19  
 prime 898:12,19  
   1047:10  
 principal 1041:7,11  
 principally 1045:24  
 principle 917:8  
   953:12 981:17  
   983:18,19,24,26  
   994:23 1043:8  
 principles 912:13  
   912:23 913:3,7  
   918:24 919:17  
   925:22,23 928:15  
   931:17 956:25  
   981:24 989:7  
   1058:2 1060:21  
 printed 895:3  
 prior 904:16 939:24  
   960:26 1025:18  
   1055:6  
 priority 923:7  
   989:25  
 private 1013:15  
 privilege 894:24  
   1061:4  
 prize 1035:19  
 pro 1035:18  
 probably 902:4  
   919:12 1033:7  
 problem 912:5  
   920:26 974:17  
   976:12,16,20  
   990:23 991:5,9,10  
   991:16 992:4  
   1037:11,12  
 problematic 953:22  
 problems 962:21  
   963:14  
 proceed 911:22  
   1051:22  
 proceeding 944:17  
 proceedings 932:4  
   1038:5 1041:8,12  
   1062:23
- process 897:11,19  
   897:19 900:11  
   901:12 906:18  
   909:2 910:5 911:7  
   911:8 913:9  
   916:25 917:2  
   932:2 935:2,17  
   936:6 939:8  
   940:21 942:7,23  
   943:11 945:2  
   956:14 957:15  
   1025:24 1044:13  
   1048:22,24  
 proclaim 1058:8  
 produce 1025:19,22  
 produced 922:6  
   924:26 939:10,25  
   1062:6  
 product 1053:25  
 production 1000:9  
 professional  
   1040:21  
 professorial 982:8  
 profit 1052:8  
 profits 914:23  
 profoundly 906:9  
 program 1026:11  
 progression  
   1042:22  
 prohibited 1016:20  
   1019:5  
 project 978:11,12  
   985:10,15 986:11  
   986:19 988:7  
   1006:17  
 projected 961:6  
 projection 977:4,4  
   978:17 979:11  
   984:26 985:5  
   986:2,22,25 987:2  
   987:9,9 988:5,8  
   992:6 1003:7,9,22  
 projections 949:18  
 prolongation  
   907:25 981:25  
   1043:5,8,22,25  
   1044:8,19  
   1045:16  
 promise 997:16  
   1024:23  
 promises 898:13  
 pronounced 899:19  
 proof 1047:26  
 proper 923:26  
   971:20 1021:9  
   1028:23 1044:12  
   1045:26  
 properly 914:6  
   933:5  
 proportion 976:13  
   980:9  
 proportional  
   979:26  
 proportionality  
   949:23 950:10,22  
   971:14,18 972:12  
   972:14,19 976:7,8  
   977:10 981:9  
 proposal 922:10  
   950:19 954:4,12  
   956:3,16 968:26  
   995:9  
 proposals 946:5  
   951:11  
 propose 903:2  
   950:14 957:19  
   966:10 972:9  
   998:6 1054:23  
 proposed 926:18  
   930:7 933:12  
   938:3 951:22  
   956:9 957:15  
   971:15 989:11  
   994:25 997:19  
   1035:11,22  
   1055:2 1059:6  
 proposes 896:22  
   984:8 1053:23  
   1054:25  
 proposition 897:2,4  
   897:6 906:23  
   941:22 949:5  
   952:11 983:6  
 prospective 958:25  
   1030:10,22  
 prospectivity  
   1052:17  
 Prosper 1047:3  
   1061:19  
 protect 914:9  
 protection 985:22  
 protest 1020:3,5,18  
   1022:17,22  
   1029:20 1032:24  
   1033:8  
 protestations  
   947:17 966:16  
 protests 1032:16,18  
 prove 997:2  
 proverbial 1051:6  
 proves 1007:20,21  
   1050:4  
 provide 931:14  
   934:15 942:13  
   948:6 980:14  
   988:25 989:12  
   990:5 997:16  
   1003:14,15  
   1046:23  
 provided 905:26  
   926:18 938:4,9  
   997:21 1011:3  
   1020:21,23  
   1027:16 1043:26  
   1044:3 1062:18  
 provides 896:13  
   941:22 942:10,14  
   958:14 990:7  
   991:22,24  
   1003:15  
 province 898:10,18  
   923:14 1012:24  
   1024:19,20,21,22  
   1029:13,14  
   1033:23 1042:10  
   1061:4  
 provinces 897:13  
   898:2,14,15,20  
   899:22,23 901:7  
   910:13 913:5,18  
   913:20 914:12,17  
   922:11,22 924:17  
   924:24 927:24  
   928:4,5,7,11,18  
   932:19 934:18  
   935:26 937:10,16  
   939:9 984:22  
   993:11 1007:24  
   1012:16 1029:9  
   1029:10,17  
   1037:22 1038:21  
   1051:23 1058:9  
   1058:11  
 provincial 901:9  
   915:20 929:6,11  
   933:11 944:24  
   1006:26 1007:4,9  
   1007:19 1008:24  
   1009:9,14 1011:6  
   1013:10 1014:17  
   1014:18 1015:13  
   1015:14 1024:4  
   1024:18 1029:16  
   1031:19 1037:21  
   1038:25 1054:8  
   1060:5  
 provincial-federal  
   1014:9  
 provision 899:25  
   901:25 903:15,17  
   939:18 1023:3  
   1024:2  
 provisions 915:14  
   931:4 933:19  
 proximity 985:25  
 public 1057:17  
 publicist 943:22  
 publicists 908:4  
 published 1014:14  
   1015:5 1052:24  
 pure 913:25  
 purely 907:21,23  
   917:4 991:20  
 purport 1009:16  
 purported 1003:26  
 purpose 908:2,22  
   909:20 911:24,25  
   913:17,19,26  
   914:2 918:2,7,8,8  
   918:10,11,12  
   920:4,5 921:6  
   924:4,5 1004:13  
   1035:25 1056:21  
 purposes 908:13  
   910:18 912:9  
   913:24 916:3  
   920:18 947:9  
   948:8 949:6  
   976:21,24 987:3  
   1035:23  
 Pursuant 1026:8  
 push 940:11  
 pushes 953:26  
 put 900:10 903:5  
   912:25 915:13  
   918:21 939:14  
   948:25 982:19  
   989:5 1022:5  
   1031:21 1033:7  
   1041:14,24  
 puts 1026:14  
 puzzling 959:8  
 p.m 996:3,3  
 péroration 1040:2
- Q**
- Qatar 967:7  
 Qatar-Bahrain  
   967:7 968:7  
   1037:13,14  
 Quai 1040:9  
 qualify 1017:17  
 quantify 972:15  
 quantitative 949:23  
   972:12  
 quasi-legislative  
   932:2  
 Quebec 998:16  
   1005:21  
 queries 1027:8  
 query 904:10  
 question 895:20  
   899:25 906:24  
   911:18 912:22  
   915:16,19 916:8  
   917:5 918:7,21  
   923:12 924:4  
   925:26,26 928:3  
   940:21,26 946:13  
   947:7 950:21  
   951:2 954:23  
   959:11 976:23  
   984:2,13 986:14  
   987:16 988:10,13  
   988:18 989:16  
   1018:8,15 1019:6  
   1026:2 1031:17  
   1038:21 1041:14  
   1041:24 1043:4  
   1056:4  
 questioned 1033:17  
 questions 895:11,25  
   906:8 924:20  
   945:18 950:24  
   972:4 974:13  
   984:12 995:13  
   1039:7,17,26  
 quibble 940:2  
 quick 951:19  
 quicker 997:20  
 quid 1035:18  
 quite 905:14 909:19  
   914:6 918:21  
   940:3 952:15  
   953:9 968:10,21  
   970:14 971:11  
   973:15 1037:23  
   1037:24  
 quo 1035:18  
 quote 897:10,22  
   907:15 909:4  
   920:23 931:6  
   933:2 934:16  
   936:22 961:10  
   965:14 973:18,20  
   982:20 1002:9

- 1020:14,23  
1023:6 1024:15  
1026:22 1058:22  
1059:12  
quoting 904:15  
1043:12  
Q.C 894:13,16
- R**
- race 952:21 968:13  
975:22 978:9,16  
978:21,25  
radial 977:4 978:17  
radiate 1046:14  
radical 922:5  
924:25  
ragged 1030:12  
raise 901:17 917:2,3  
936:3  
raised 901:19 932:5  
948:13 950:24  
982:24 984:13  
1029:21 1032:18  
1033:19  
raises 899:23  
916:25  
range 956:18  
rare 983:25  
rasa 989:3,3  
rather 895:13  
905:16 907:25  
908:21 936:15  
937:15 970:16  
977:11 999:6  
1000:17,21  
1012:12 1022:5  
1024:10 1028:25  
1047:26  
Ray 952:2,20  
953:21 954:17  
978:9  
Raymond 1061:18  
reach 941:26  
reached 919:12  
920:6 943:8  
1048:9 1054:8  
reaches 1046:10  
reacted 1054:13  
reaction 952:8  
1031:9 1047:22  
read 934:5,6 946:8  
967:15,18  
1011:13 1016:22  
1025:17 1043:14  
reader 1014:19,25  
readily 992:19  
reading 901:26  
reads 913:11  
1024:15  
ready 896:13 948:7  
ready-made 896:24  
reaffirm 925:6,7  
1060:18  
reaffirmed 943:8  
real 956:16 962:8  
968:22 969:13,16  
985:4 988:4  
993:15 995:2  
1033:8 1041:10
- 1051:9 1059:18  
reality 993:7  
1018:16  
really 911:15  
914:14 916:12  
947:19 956:13  
961:15 965:10  
966:13 967:4,10  
972:18 977:8  
985:18 986:3  
991:4 993:23  
1005:17 1023:9  
1029:11 1039:26  
1040:13 1062:14  
reason 896:21  
915:11 940:21  
957:9 970:21  
979:9 987:12  
999:13,19  
1001:16,17,18  
1006:7 1022:15  
1031:17 1046:16  
1049:23 1057:20  
reasonable 901:22  
939:11 958:24  
974:21 1032:2  
reasonably 1051:4  
1054:15  
reasoned 1056:7  
reasoning 951:13  
956:9,15 978:10  
1050:14  
reasons 938:14  
966:26 967:3,6  
1018:12 1019:7  
1036:22 1044:17  
1056:9  
reassuring 897:2  
1021:24  
rebuttal 895:6,14  
rebutted 965:11  
971:26  
recall 894:24  
927:24 938:8,17  
939:12 964:8  
974:15 993:20  
1002:6 1016:16  
1037:19 1057:3  
1058:8  
Recalling 981:10  
recap 957:19  
receive 928:4  
received 927:25  
937:26 1006:24  
recent 905:24,25  
924:19 931:24  
recently 1047:18  
recess 945:26 996:3  
1039:21  
recipe 1011:9  
recognizable 953:17  
recognize 906:14  
963:3  
recognized 906:26  
909:2 960:2,22  
996:14 1043:24  
1044:15  
recollection 933:23  
record 903:4 932:12
- 935:21 957:5  
1026:22 1029:6  
1053:4 1054:2  
recorded 1062:24  
recount 1024:23  
recourse 896:2  
900:2 930:4  
rectangular 959:12  
959:13,16 961:21  
rectilinear 958:3  
red 953:15 954:26  
992:21 1035:11  
redraw 1020:25  
1021:16  
reduction 1042:25  
refer 897:21 918:25  
932:21 992:6  
998:14 1011:21  
1013:17 1020:17  
1021:17,19  
1061:16,17,18,19  
1061:20,22  
refereed 1061:22  
reference 897:15  
912:7 913:15  
918:20,24 924:11  
929:21 931:4,13  
931:16 944:11  
986:4 987:5 997:9  
997:12 1002:20  
1012:15 1014:11  
1014:17 1017:23  
1018:2 1019:19  
1021:13 1036:4  
1041:5 1042:2  
1044:14 1057:23  
1060:23 1062:7  
references 1015:11  
1035:24  
referred 899:26  
903:16 906:4  
918:26 932:9,15  
933:10 934:20  
935:19 940:15  
941:13,14 943:12  
944:18,20 956:11  
957:4 970:3 973:3  
973:4,24 974:3,8  
993:9 1007:26  
1012:12 1013:3  
1014:19,22  
1015:17 1016:16  
1022:3 1037:14  
1042:14 1043:14  
1045:8 1058:21  
referring 934:11  
943:24 982:12  
1014:8 1023:7  
1038:10 1041:9  
1041:20  
refers 970:9,10  
996:24  
reflect 949:19  
979:17 992:15  
1043:20 1048:23  
1054:5  
reflected 943:7  
1044:10 1048:2  
1060:16
- reflection 974:21  
reflects 977:8  
986:12 992:26  
1055:10 1056:17  
regard 920:23  
996:18 1028:21  
1031:6 1038:18  
1039:3 1044:12  
1048:7  
regarded 973:20  
regarding 899:24  
904:11 905:15  
906:2 933:13  
937:12,21 938:3  
944:12 1016:5  
1027:3,5,10  
1059:2,5  
regardless 985:19  
regards 910:2  
regime 1007:4  
1027:21 1028:14  
region 966:3 984:26  
993:10 1051:15  
1051:21  
Registrar 1040:6  
1061:11 1062:17  
regrettably 1040:10  
regulating 1026:7  
regulations 897:22  
1027:2,17,22  
1028:2,10,13  
1029:4 1032:3  
1052:25 1054:18  
rehash 941:14,18  
reinforcement  
1050:5  
reiterate 965:11  
1060:20  
rejected 922:14  
relate 919:19  
946:21 1036:11  
1040:26  
related 908:13,13  
910:2,11 920:14  
920:20 939:4  
957:17 958:13  
978:3 983:10  
1038:4  
relates 912:22  
919:15 920:17  
986:16 994:7  
relating 926:11,17  
927:25 934:17  
945:5 998:10  
1013:9 1020:7  
1037:21  
relation 908:3,7  
913:4 921:2  
926:16  
relations 1020:15  
1049:25 1056:5  
relationship 966:19  
981:11 992:9,10  
992:22 1035:10  
relative 928:17,26  
relatively 982:22  
1044:25  
released 1028:16  
relevance 917:16
- 942:16 944:12  
949:7 1029:9  
1038:6  
reliance 951:26  
957:17 994:4  
relied 950:2 972:12  
relief 905:4  
relies 981:11  
religiously 944:7  
relinquish 1030:19  
relinquished  
1030:13  
relinquishment  
1030:14  
rely 955:6,7  
1036:17 1037:9  
1039:4 1043:7  
relying 962:22  
remain 905:8 930:2  
1044:21  
remained 1000:20  
1023:10  
remaining 950:15  
972:4 974:13  
remains 920:24  
929:25 942:6  
971:20 972:2  
1060:18  
remarked 939:20  
1048:25  
remarks 895:4  
1039:6,25  
1042:16 1055:14  
1061:26  
remember 902:10  
921:10 944:17  
946:23 957:3,24  
985:13 997:17  
999:10 1000:25  
1003:12,13  
1012:20 1013:20  
1040:24 1044:25  
remind 918:15  
936:13 972:11  
1025:7 1058:4  
reminded 1036:3  
render 941:2  
renewal 1001:11  
1018:20  
renewed 999:9,10  
999:11 1028:7,8  
1029:25 1032:10  
repeat 901:13  
925:12 935:5  
966:10 1004:24  
1057:5  
repeating 920:6  
repetition 1016:13  
rephrase 950:20  
replaced 898:7,8  
replay 974:6  
replete 1054:2  
replicate 1010:18  
1011:6  
replicated 1003:26  
replied 933:16  
report 1017:5  
1028:16  
reported 932:24



1050:3	970:15,21 971:13	932:5 939:16	1009:22 1014:10	954:2,11,20 962:3
reporter 1061:12	993:6 1047:10	943:21 945:3	1026:2 1028:9	962:17 963:14,21
1062:17,26	resources 908:23	949:2 950:3,11	1031:19 1044:3	970:10 975:10
represent 948:17	909:15 914:13,17	954:22 955:15	1057:16	976:14 978:18
1042:4 1055:12	914:25 916:11	957:15 958:20	rings 953:19	981:23 989:20
1061:4	920:21 921:7	960:7 972:13	rise 988:11	994:24 996:20
representation	924:6 926:16,17	979:23,26 981:7	risk 1047:6	1005:3 1008:15
971:25	928:17,26 934:13	981:13,17 985:6	roads 951:16 957:8	1009:11 1011:8
representative	936:25 939:5	994:13 996:16	957:9	1011:19 1014:12
932:23 936:21	961:7 971:9	1000:10 1039:2	Rock 944:4 980:6	1018:8 1025:20
representatives	981:12 996:9,11	1047:8 1050:9	rocks 965:19	1027:21 1035:12
932:19 933:12	996:14,19,19,22	1056:19,22	role 895:23 964:23	1037:12 1046:24
937:16 944:15	997:2,6,7 1013:22	resulted 942:18	987:6 1038:13	1052:5,7 1062:8
represented 971:25	1041:6,13	949:2 1016:6	Rome 951:17,18	sampling 995:8
985:14 993:16	1052:11 1057:15	resulting 996:17	957:8,9	sand 1049:21
representing	1057:19	results 907:20 964:5	room 985:15 999:24	satellite 1020:11
1043:16	respect 897:14	976:7,8 978:8	1001:15 1005:8	satisfied 906:10
represents 974:17	904:25 908:8	1046:26	1033:21 1056:16	saunders 894:17
1056:18	915:2,18 919:18	resumption 932:20	1061:13	904:6,19,23 905:7
reproduce 1021:22	937:2 944:16	retaliation 1018:14	root 922:2,3 924:24	945:16,19 946:2
reproduced	958:23 959:16	return 905:3,21	rose 945:11 1058:6	967:2,9,13,17,22
1043:11	965:9 966:2 968:6	947:18 954:13	1058:7	967:26 970:6
reproduction	969:18 970:13,14	957:7 966:11	rote 962:2	980:4,8,18,21,26
1014:21	988:7 994:26	983:10 986:14	rough 948:6	982:11 984:4
request 1012:23	996:10 1014:3	1057:7,7	roughly 979:26	986:9 990:11,15
1031:10	1016:25 1018:7	returned 982:14	round 894:26 895:7	990:19,21 991:3,8
requested 1025:6	1024:10 1026:25	989:2 1035:21	915:17 959:22	991:12 1003:7
requests 946:26	1032:16,22	1060:2,3	962:4 1003:8	1004:5 1010:11
1000:2 1028:23	1036:16 1041:15	reveal 941:25	1047:17	1045:6,18
require 912:12	1043:2 1055:13	revenue 915:8,10,11	rule 907:20 908:15	1047:21 1050:24
956:19 963:23	1058:14,16	reverse 976:13	931:19 960:6	saw 940:13,14
972:8 1059:8	respected 1029:16	983:12 1000:2	1015:25 1038:15	959:19 961:15
required 930:22	respectful 896:16	1050:9	ruled 931:19 1033:2	995:8 1013:3
931:14 981:9	respectfully 897:4	review 907:9 931:24	rules 931:14	1029:24 1032:9
requirement 931:13	914:19 922:20	932:11 945:16	1046:21 1049:26	saying 910:9 913:3
958:4 959:19	1057:6	950:18 957:21	run 964:10 978:9	913:5 918:5
971:16 1026:5	respecting 966:5	993:25 1026:13	987:16	924:19 925:13,14
1030:14 1036:19	977:19	reviewed 938:12	running 929:14	929:10 940:6
1046:21	respective 910:3	975:8 1032:14	952:19 954:26	964:26 980:20
requirements	941:9 979:21	1055:6	955:6 994:24	994:22 1008:22
931:10	1029:17 1060:17	revise 904:3	runs 952:2,14	1008:25 1013:16
requires 934:3	1060:23	revised 997:17	953:13 994:19	1014:4,5 1040:23
1045:13 1059:2	respects 1053:14	rewrite 904:3	ruse 901:15	says 902:8,10
requiring 985:7	respond 904:10	re-visit 904:24	Russell 942:15	912:11 934:3
researcher 1061:21	946:11 947:12	rhetoric 896:3	Ryan 936:22	961:7 983:11
reservation 909:14	974:12 996:9	922:7 924:26	R-10 1005:18	994:15 996:20,22
reserved 1027:4	1020:7 1024:13	Richard 894:14	R-3 1001:14	1034:11 1035:25
1046:5	responded 959:3	right 899:9 908:3	R-7 1002:5	scale 963:18 980:10
resist 1049:13,18,19	responding 1027:8	910:26 911:6	R-9 1004:3	1005:6
1050:6,8	response 906:24	913:23 914:7	R.D 1015:8	Scatarie 954:17
resistance 1051:2	932:24 941:22	922:15 924:6		955:13
resisted 951:17	950:24 972:8	953:22 955:11	S	scenario 951:23
resolution 901:4,25	984:12 1000:2	963:20 966:14	Sable 953:14 965:6	953:18 954:14,14
933:18 939:18	1017:20 1035:15	967:2 988:13	965:15 978:3,5	955:4,10,18
1021:14 1022:4	responses 957:20	991:8 1019:24	979:7,9,13,15	scenarios 951:10,11
1023:3 1024:2	958:11 985:7	1025:19,21	1001:19 1019:25	956:12 957:13
1053:4	responsibilities	1031:20 1040:16	1031:14 1053:7	962:19 964:18
resolve 896:15	929:20 1047:14	righteously 942:21	sacrifice 987:22	schedule 897:26
935:2 940:19	rest 970:25 978:13	rights 907:14 908:6	sacrificing 977:17	1020:22
1019:13	984:23 1043:15	908:12,20,22	sake 897:20 977:17	scope 992:22
resolved 902:13,20	1062:11	909:15 910:19	salience 917:15	Scottian 935:13
940:23 1054:20	restrict 921:20	912:2,3 913:4,6	Sambro 955:13	Scotia's 895:6
resolving 899:16,19	979:4 987:12	913:19,20,22	same 895:2 903:9	904:26 905:6
937:11	1042:22	914:7,12,16,24	907:18 909:11	911:5 913:14
resonance 956:25	restricted 975:16	915:3,12 916:20	913:25 922:12	927:5 933:2
resonate 1051:16	982:22 1057:16	918:2 926:16	929:26 930:2	934:12 941:12,14
resonates 1049:2	rests 930:8,13	927:2,25 928:4	941:13 945:7	946:25 947:3
resource 957:5	940:13	993:13 999:11,12	948:18 952:9	953:3 972:21
958:24 970:4,11	result 907:23,25	1000:8,8,9	953:12,20,24	979:10 981:5

985:22 992:22	1003:5,20 1008:4	seriously 1022:12	short-lived 899:9	989:24 994:16
1020:16 1038:23	1008:16,18	1024:6	shot 908:15 917:23	simplistic 943:2
1047:16 1052:14	1009:24 1013:19	servant 1041:26	show 919:14 975:26	simply 895:23
1053:10 1056:20	1014:6 1016:14	serves 917:7	976:12 989:21	896:19 898:25
1058:25 1059:13	1019:2 1030:11	1011:10	1002:25,26	901:13 921:19
1060:9,19 1062:2	1048:11	session 946:12	1003:4 1004:13	928:22 935:21
screen 946:9	seeing 916:10	set 933:5 943:18	1005:17 1007:18	953:9 957:10
1052:22 1057:23	1013:16 1040:4	946:21 947:5	1013:5 1014:16	964:9,13 965:21
Scylla 1047:5	seek 995:14	979:22 1042:25	1020:10	967:15,23 987:15
sea 907:4 908:6,8,25	seeking 1033:21	1056:7 1060:25	showed 951:12	988:6 993:14
909:5,13,19,24	1039:5	setting 932:2	showing 954:5	999:20 1001:17
910:14,24 913:26	seeks 904:2 905:5	settlement 928:14	965:5 997:22	1003:24 1007:21
914:13,17 915:2	943:4 1055:7	seven 969:7 1033:5	999:4 1019:22	1011:14 1015:3
918:10 919:9	seem 916:23 985:20	seventies 1001:9,12	1034:6 1035:11	since 900:5 903:26
965:20 974:20	990:5 1023:15	1002:3	shown 953:15,16	932:10 935:10
984:16 1042:21	1024:3	several 959:15	960:20 962:6	936:16 937:13
1043:9,12,13,16	seemed 928:22	998:13 999:2	964:6 973:6	982:6 995:16
seabed 908:10	seems 903:9 939:11	1003:9 1005:9	975:17,23 989:23	1012:11 1031:11
927:26	944:15 952:24	1011:8 1020:12	990:3 992:21	1042:20 1043:17
search 970:19	968:4 975:17	1053:26	993:26 997:23	1052:19 1054:6
searching 1041:5	982:9 985:15	severely 960:26	1003:20 1011:23	1057:13
Seas 982:24,25	992:15 1016:9	Shag 980:6	1052:23,25	sincerity 1059:18
983:19 984:24	1038:17	shake 1022:21	1054:19	single 920:9 921:5
988:5	seen 919:18 935:11	shame 996:26	shows 955:5 956:14	938:2 940:19,20
seaward 950:2	937:8 943:10	shape 1007:18	978:16 986:21	994:12,17
952:15 961:4	947:12 956:22	1010:17,17,18	997:18 1008:2	sir 919:16,21 925:20
964:10 970:25	970:19 1010:19	1048:24	1014:13 1016:18	938:26
971:2 972:21	1016:26 1018:23	shapes 1007:19	1016:18,24	siren 1049:13,18,19
974:21 975:2	1024:25 1025:3	1030:21	shun 944:10	1050:7
978:15 984:25	1040:22,24	share 909:24 911:25	shy 929:17,19	situated 999:22
985:6,10,16 986:2	1057:23	913:20 914:20,23	side 952:21 953:14	situation 909:4
986:11,19,21	sees 1032:22	981:23	964:5 969:6 978:8	912:24 915:15
987:13 988:6	segment 943:17	sharing 924:8	978:20 979:7	920:15 943:23
994:17 1033:16	947:8 964:4	1048:13	984:26 987:11	949:15 963:7
1033:20 1044:5	985:19 986:7	Shaw 998:17	991:2 996:22	964:13 965:8
1045:4	990:3 992:17,20	1048:25	998:13,20 999:14	966:25 968:4,7,10
second 895:6	995:4 1005:22	sheaf 904:8	999:23 1000:14	968:14 981:22
905:23 931:20	1033:22 1034:3	shelf 908:7,21,23,26	1001:14 1010:15	983:2 987:5
942:7 950:20	segmentation 986:4	909:10,24 910:7	1010:15 1011:21	988:13 990:24
952:7 958:6,13	segments 994:15,18	910:15,25 911:23	1013:8 1026:15	992:16 1000:18
970:2 972:23	Seguin 1061:17	912:4 913:24,25	1047:15 1052:15	1013:2 1022:14
994:15,18 1002:4	seismic 1009:22,26	914:3,11,26	1061:13	1030:21 1032:14
1004:21 1012:7	1016:9,19,24	915:23 916:7,11	sides 938:25 953:12	1053:10,22
1014:5,12 1017:9	1017:10,13,18,21	916:20 917:12	979:11,20	1055:25
1018:6 1021:7	1018:25 1019:4	918:11 919:9	1006:25	situations 968:9,18
1023:14 1027:15	1024:9 1025:13	921:6 923:11	sight 1004:4	968:18 970:24
1036:8 1037:4	1025:18,20,23	925:10 926:14,22	sign 1033:3,8	1046:22
1055:8 1058:23	1026:6,7,9,15	926:25,26 971:24	significance 908:24	six 937:9,14 998:6
Secondly 1007:12	selection 925:3	981:23 985:3	1043:19 1051:18	sixth 1026:19
1019:19	981:5 982:2	1037:17 1044:3,4	significant 909:26	1047:18
secret 1022:19	selectively 1043:13	1044:6,18,22,24	938:24 980:12,24	sixties 1001:9
section 1005:20	sense 901:12 902:22	sheltered 1056:15	982:21 1022:7	skewed 1059:7
sector 947:21	941:22 978:5	shelves 905:17	1045:24	Skip 1016:26
948:15,21,25	980:22,25,26	shift 953:24 970:15	significantly 941:21	slide 999:4 1002:26
951:25 952:18	981:18 982:16	1003:11	980:14 1052:16	1010:5 1011:17
953:19 955:9,24	984:7 1035:14	ship 1049:18	silence 936:6 1024:4	1035:3
957:26 960:15,20	sent 1014:19	shipwrecks 948:5	silent 992:10	slides 894:24,25
971:7 990:4	sentence 1013:13	shocking 925:10	1023:10	1003:9
991:21	sentences 1014:12	shore 992:26	similar 906:23	slight 949:10 986:5
sectors 973:12	separate 988:23	1035:24	909:7 955:19	slightly 980:10
security 908:14	998:6 1016:5	shores 908:13	990:8 991:25	slowly 1046:9
sedentary 916:12	1025:20 1057:8	short 942:5 945:26	994:15 1008:13	small 944:10 1020:6
916:14 927:14	separated 963:8	954:7 964:4,7	similarities 959:5,5	1036:25 1037:2
seductive 922:7	September 1027:10	968:11 990:6	Similarly 975:16	smorgasbord
see 899:15 901:11	1059:15	991:23 992:2	985:3	941:18
913:11 916:24,26	sequence 946:7	1039:13,21	simple 896:13	sober 896:6
919:21 935:24,24	sequential 991:15	1044:25 1059:8	925:11 962:5	sole 950:3 972:13
971:10 978:4	series 951:10	shortly 1021:5	977:4 984:15	solely 926:16
1001:15,22	serious 922:10	1023:7	simplified 969:20	1053:19

- solution 1009:5  
 1053:26  
 solutions 896:24  
 solve 976:13  
 solved 945:14  
 somebody 1015:23  
 something 900:16  
 903:18,19 906:9  
 906:10 934:3  
 935:15,17,20  
 946:12 948:2  
 951:12 954:20  
 955:6,7 1005:13  
 1037:10 1053:19  
 sometimes 963:17  
 somewhat 1027:6  
 somewhere 1012:12  
 1040:8  
 soon 940:6  
 soothingly 896:11  
 sorry 900:26 914:5  
 922:24 983:17  
 990:10 1008:26  
 1023:18 1028:11  
 1029:26 1040:23  
 sort 896:3 898:23  
 939:22,23 953:17  
 966:16 967:4  
 1024:19 1030:24  
 sorts 912:18 913:4,5  
 sought 941:5  
 1019:20 1020:22  
 1033:12 1035:7  
 1045:23 1049:11  
 sound 1056:22  
 1062:18  
 source 1046:15  
 south 981:6 985:13  
 985:14 986:19,20  
 987:14,17 992:6  
 992:21 1032:20  
 1032:24  
 southeast 1001:20  
 southeastern  
 1011:20  
 southern 1002:17  
 1004:11  
 southwest 951:4  
 965:23  
 sovereign 907:14  
 908:22 910:19  
 914:7 1044:3  
 sovereignty 906:21  
 907:2,13 908:9,21  
 909:6,9,25 910:19  
 913:26 914:8,9  
 1044:2  
 so-called 910:12  
 span 1023:4  
 spans 1038:19  
 spare 1024:23  
 sparse 1001:6  
 speakers 948:12  
 speaking 967:21  
 1014:7  
 special 912:25  
 966:8 970:9,12  
 973:23 983:24  
 1026:2 1061 20  
 species 916:12,14  
 specific 920:18  
 962:7 989:10  
 1017:23 1018:2  
 1049:22  
 specifically 945:5  
 984:23  
 specifying 1024:26  
 speculated 1018:12  
 speculation 996:23  
 speculative 958:25  
 speech 894:26 990:2  
 1013:19,22,24  
 1047:18,22  
 1060:8  
 speeches 895:9  
 speedy 1053:4  
 spells 912:9  
 spending 1031:11  
 spent 965:3  
 sphinx-like 906:15  
 spirit 992:17  
 split 936:18 1055:21  
 spoke 1057:4  
 spot 1019:23  
 1031:11  
 spudded 1041:22  
 square 946:24  
 987:23 1024:26  
 1025:6  
 squarely 984:18  
 St 904:17 932:18  
 952:9 955:4,6  
 965:18,19 976:4  
 978:14 982:24  
 983:2 986:26  
 987:19,24 988:14  
 989:4 990:18  
 992:9 993:12  
 1005:23 1025:10  
 1053:8  
 stage 1051:20  
 stake 961:7 996:19  
 1041:8,11  
 stand 957:18 983:5  
 standard 942:25  
 1057:13  
 Stanfield 1059:13  
 1059:15  
 Stanfield's 1060:8  
 star 1046:10,10  
 stark 1021:25  
 start 920:2 936:5  
 940:6 957:11  
 963:13 966:25  
 978:20 1039:24  
 1041:3  
 started 957:10  
 982:26  
 starting 973:24  
 982:6  
 starts 919:24  
 976:13  
 state 906:21 908:8  
 908:14 909:6,25  
 910:12 912:3  
 913:23 914:10,25  
 988:6,23 991:6,9  
 1009:3,4 1028:26  
 1036:18 1044:2  
 stated 901:20  
 906:17,19 923:4  
 925:6 933:4 960:5  
 962:26 971:3  
 975:24 983:12  
 statement 907:6  
 934:6 983:13  
 986:6,9 988:17  
 1010:6 1011:10  
 1024:14 1028:25  
 1028:26 1029:4  
 1036:3 1045:2  
 1048:6 1058:5,21  
 statements 905:10  
 1013:11  
 states 904:14 914:7  
 920:22 931:11  
 951:7 988:14  
 990:5 991:6,15  
 992:8 1014:13  
 1041:11 1044:5  
 1044:26  
 state's 906:21 907:3  
 907:13 908:2,5,13  
 908:20 910:7  
 stating 933:17  
 936:22 966:18  
 stay 1062:9  
 stem 905:9  
 stemmed 1035:9  
 step 973:16 976:25  
 Stephen 1061:25  
 steps 906:3  
 stick 912:7 953:11  
 1049:21  
 still 900:18 902:22  
 946:16 952:12  
 953:21 957:18  
 966:18 968:11  
 976:22 977:19  
 980:24 988:22  
 989:4,13 1000:23  
 1005:12 1014:9  
 1028:17,21  
 1041:18  
 stone 919:26  
 stood 1007:24  
 stop 978:17 1030:24  
 stopped 1037:15  
 stopping 942:5  
 stops 976:14  
 stormy 1056:15  
 straight 908:18  
 956:5,6 963:4,21  
 990:6 991:23  
 994:12,17,24  
 1003:2,6 1004:25  
 1011:24 1042:21  
 Strait 948:19  
 998:16 1025:9  
 stranger 956:9  
 straws 1029:11  
 stress 967:14  
 stretch 924:20  
 963:4  
 strictly 924:8  
 strike 1046:20  
 stringent 942:26  
 strip 909:19  
 strives 1047:13  
 strong 971:12  
 strongly 970:14  
 1048:15  
 struck 898:11  
 structure 966:3  
 structures 938:25  
 studiously 1043:18  
 stuff 1050:23  
 Sub 1019:23  
 subject 909:6,7  
 936:19 956:17  
 966:7 974:9 999:7  
 1006:21 1026:13  
 1038:2,4 1041:10  
 1043:2  
 subjective 956:21  
 subjectivity 964:20  
 submarine 907:17  
 918:17  
 submerged 907:14  
 submission 896:16  
 919:6 1037:23,25  
 1060:21  
 submissions 895:6  
 895:12 906:17  
 921:12,23 945:15  
 947:10 1047:17  
 1056:6 1060:20  
 submit 910:10  
 922:5 924:25  
 930:15 972:23  
 981:20 1012:14  
 1015:10 1021:11  
 1021:26 1036:16  
 1044:14  
 submitted 969:4  
 1002:8 1012:23  
 submitting 1023:10  
 subsequent 936:23  
 973:22 1023:2  
 1036:26 1037:22  
 1048:12 1060:16  
 subsequently  
 1018:20 1027:9  
 1032:12  
 subset 949:20  
 subsoil 908:10  
 921:7 1041:7,13  
 substantial 950:6,9  
 963:4 977:2,12  
 substantially  
 985:24  
 substituted 952:2  
 subtle 965:4  
 1049:20  
 subtlety 948:9  
 sub-basin 951:18  
 996:25 999:22  
 1055:19  
 sub-text 1049:20  
 successive 943:9  
 sufficient 979:4  
 suggest 896:26  
 969:25 989:14  
 991:12  
 suggested 896:13  
 898:19 916:12  
 943:6 946:17  
 961:9 965:13  
 977:23 981:15  
 983:23 995:3  
 1048:3  
 suggesting 953:5  
 suggestion 903:13  
 979:24  
 suggestions 977:14  
 977:14  
 suggests 984:5  
 1053:4  
 summarize 905:3  
 summarized 1023:6  
 sums 1017:16  
 supplemental  
 1025:4  
 supplementary  
 1013:17,18  
 1014:20,23  
 supplied 1028:18  
 support 971:14  
 982:24 998:25  
 1045:21,23  
 supported 925:16  
 949:8,9 982:2  
 986:3  
 supports 922:17  
 935:2  
 suppose 922:19  
 938:22 990:26  
 supposed 949:4  
 supposedly 956:16  
 992:5  
 Supreme 930:20  
 sure 898:9 929:17  
 950:4 954:18,18  
 954:19 980:4  
 1013:20 1016:22  
 1034:3,13  
 surely 980:16  
 1037:11  
 surfaced 939:8  
 surmise 1031:6  
 surprise 1054:22,23  
 surprising 1014:6  
 1015:10 1027:6  
 surrender 1027:11  
 1027:14  
 surrendered  
 1000:19,23  
 surrounding 964:7  
 Survey 1015:9  
 surveys 1025:18,20  
 1025:24 1026:7  
 survived 1028:12  
 surviving 1026:22  
 suspect 996:5  
 sustainable 969:22  
 sweep 1051:11  
 sweet 1019:23  
 1031:11  
 switched 984:15  
 syllogisms 896:4  
 Symposium  
 1013:26  
 system 914:9  
 1017:15,16  
 systems 1030:18



- T**
- tabula 989:3  
 tacit 1037:2  
 tactic 895:15  
 tails 1055:23  
 take 899:8 900:6  
 927:9 928:17  
 938:10,22 943:19  
 959:26 962:15  
 963:16 968:2  
 970:22 971:21  
 976:25 985:16  
 995:17 1010:16  
 1022:16 1032:5  
 1036:18 1039:13  
 1046:25  
 taken 923:21 934:4  
 934:15 937:13,18  
 960:18 974:21  
 978:14 983:4  
 993:5 996:15  
 1033:10 1042:23  
 1044:9  
 takes 979:19 1055:4  
 taking 904:17  
 1001:24 1055:9  
 1056:9 1062:5,12  
 talk 918:23 1005:8  
 1005:9 1030:4  
 talked 981:2  
 1005:20 1038:9  
 1038:10,11  
 talking 940:7  
 963:25 1001:2,8  
 talks 1022:19  
 task 929:22 1059:9  
 1061:10 1062:5  
 team 1040:20  
 1061:12,20,23,23  
 technical 971:25  
 988:26 1003:23  
 1040:12 1061:17  
 1061:18 1062:16  
 techniques 929:26  
 tell 954:5 988:22  
 telling 965:4  
 1021:24  
 temptation 951:17  
 tempting 896:3  
 ten 1057:4  
 tending 943:20  
 terminal 958:9  
 terminated 1026:23  
 1026:26 1029:3  
 termination  
 1026:19 1027:11  
 1027:13  
 terminology 904:9  
 terminus 963:13  
 terms 896:2 912:6  
 912:10 918:20,24  
 929:20 930:23  
 931:4,13 989:11  
 989:19 994:14  
 1015:14 1017:6,8  
 1027:21 1043:19  
 1060:23 1062:7  
 terrible 905:12  
 territorial 908:6,8  
 908:25 909:5,8,13  
 909:24 910:24  
 913:26 914:8  
 918:10 919:8  
 965:20 978:12  
 territory 906:22  
 1025:3 1044:2  
 territory's 987:3  
 terrorem 927:6  
 test 942:15,17,17  
 949:24 950:3  
 972:13 976:6  
 981:9  
 tested 948:20  
 Texaco 998:15  
 1008:11,12  
 1010:25 1018:10  
 1018:26 1019:2  
 Texaco's 1025:8  
 text 895:3  
 thank 894:21  
 918:22 945:25  
 946:2 949:9  
 990:14 995:13  
 996:2,4 1039:8,16  
 1059:16 1061:6,9  
 1061:11,11,13,24  
 1062:2,3,3,10,13  
 1062:19,20  
 thanking 1062:16  
 their 897:14,16  
 905:20 910:3,14  
 912:10 913:13  
 915:2 927:26  
 928:5 932:26  
 941:7,9,26 944:21  
 945:6 947:17  
 948:3 949:6,13  
 950:4,19 951:20  
 956:2 957:17  
 962:17 966:15  
 968:3 972:18  
 973:25 979:21  
 986:6 987:16  
 991:18 994:19  
 995:10 1002:11  
 1008:14 1031:20  
 1038:7 1049:3,4  
 1049:14 1060:16  
 1060:17 1061:7  
 theirs 960:9  
 theme 927:3  
 1035:22  
 themselves 913:3  
 929:18 944:24  
 961:18 999:9  
 1051:25 1056:12  
 1057:21 1060:14  
 theory 974:23  
 985:13 1042:19  
 1045:22  
 therefrom 1026:8  
 thereto 909:17  
 thing 967:11 973:15  
 1014:3 1053:3  
 things 928:25  
 947:15 948:11  
 961:5 969:18  
 978:4 1008:25  
 1015:20 1030:20  
 third 951:2 955:12  
 958:16 985:11  
 990:24 991:5,9  
 994:15 1006:21  
 1014:12  
 thirdly 1019:20  
 1031:13  
 thorough 961:15  
 thoroughly 966:9  
 though 901:13  
 932:3 938:23  
 940:4 974:4  
 980:14 985:26  
 991:12 997:6  
 1006:19 1021:9  
 1032:3 1049:26  
 1051:18  
 thought 899:7 911:4  
 1016:26 1017:12  
 1023:25 1050:24  
 three 933:13 934:22  
 934:23 936:7  
 937:22,25 940:10  
 951:7 954:14,14  
 969:5 973:12  
 1015:24 1018:21  
 1039:25 1049:3  
 three-dimensional  
 908:9  
 through 907:2  
 948:4 978:11,12  
 986:25,26 987:3  
 1028:22  
 throughout 935:9  
 935:11 941:11  
 1051:19 1058:25  
 1062:18  
 throw 1053:9  
 thrown 1052:9  
 1053:16  
 Thursday 1036:4,23  
 1038:9 1047:16  
 tie 1051:5  
 ties 977:20  
 time 895:18 901:13  
 909:4 924:11  
 936:9 939:18  
 940:13 945:21,23  
 948:10 950:14  
 951:8 952:23  
 954:8 955:11,13  
 955:18,19 970:10  
 976:17,19 995:19  
 995:24 1000:23  
 1001:18 1012:22  
 1013:17 1014:8  
 1019:4,22,25  
 1020:2 1021:24  
 1028:9 1029:14  
 1029:19 1030:12  
 1030:19 1034:15  
 1037:16 1039:14  
 1039:19 1046:9  
 1046:24 1058:6  
 1059:12 1062:6,7  
 1062:9,9  
 times 930:6 986:9  
 1015:24  
 tip 965:24  
 title 905:11,22  
 906:16 907:16,19  
 907:22,25 908:6  
 908:25 910:3,7  
 911:8,10,11  
 913:10,13,17  
 918:3,6,16 919:6  
 919:7,8,14,22,24  
 919:25 920:3,4  
 921:13,21 924:3  
 925:2 926:4,4,7  
 930:8,11,16,19  
 931:23 993:23  
 1036:11,14  
 1037:26 1042:5  
 titles 951:24  
 today 895:21  
 945:14 948:13  
 993:26 1015:24  
 1016:12 1021:24  
 1028:22 1031:5  
 together 944:11  
 971:8 1035:23  
 1051:24  
 told 897:8 912:18  
 960:21 1050:12  
 1062:7  
 tongue 941:20  
 tools 929:26  
 topic 1016:2 1024:9  
 1026:19  
 topics 895:9  
 1035:13  
 total 975:14 978:16  
 978:18  
 touch 919:25,26  
 952:13  
 towards 1001:18,19  
 1017:19  
 trace 1042:7  
 traditional 971:23  
 traditionally 906:26  
 1043:22  
 transcended  
 1010:23  
 transcript 904:15  
 996:12 1002:9  
 1006:23 1016:7  
 1016:22 1018:8  
 1020:9 1024:14  
 1026:21 1029:8  
 1032:13 1041:21  
 1041:23 1062:23  
 transcripts 976:5  
 transference 962:5  
 transition 958:5  
 961:14 990:6,9  
 991:22 992:2  
 transposed 1003:10  
 treat 905:14  
 treated 909:9  
 922:11 926:25,26  
 940:23 943:26  
 treatment 944:4  
 1027:4  
 treaty 943:25  
 trial 957:15 962:18  
 triangle 958:8,19  
 tribunals 968:17  
 Tribunal's 904:20  
 940:25 941:6  
 944:11 974:13  
 1032:15 1037:3  
 1038:13 1061:10  
 tried 899:26 913:14  
 955:12 1032:11  
 tri-junction 989:22  
 990:15  
 Trudeau 898:19  
 1031:22  
 true 895:14 900:15  
 906:25 907:18  
 925:17,18 929:11  
 930:16 931:25  
 944:6 966:22  
 973:15 983:9  
 998:25 1000:17  
 1009:12 1040:23  
 1051:5 1057:11  
 1057:20 1062:23  
 truism 928:9  
 truly 945:3 1055:9  
 trust 895:22  
 truth 896:18,23  
 897:15 939:20  
 truths 896:18  
 925:12 1048:26  
 1057:4  
 try 900:8 947:24  
 950:25 954:24  
 trying 919:11  
 1003:24 1022:9  
 1037:7,18,19,20  
 1041:25  
 Tunisia-Italy  
 949:15  
 Tunisia-Libya  
 904:9 949:12  
 963:2 971:6 982:3  
 990:8 991:26  
 992:17 1029:21  
 1032:14,19,24  
 turn 931:23 953:3  
 954:22 964:23  
 968:7 971:18  
 981:14,21 994:6  
 1006:21 1015:12  
 turned 989:20  
 1009:19,20  
 1029:12  
 turning 973:12  
 997:24 999:13  
 1002:22 1004:8,9  
 1004:15,15,21,25  
 1008:13 1011:25  
 1012:13 1033:20  
 1034:13,14,21  
 turnings 1011:25  
 turns 953:14 975:10  
 1040:11  
 twenties 1037:15  
 twice 984:12  
 two-zone 994:10  
 type 928:3 1005:5  
 types 1039:2  
 typically 1046:5

U  
ultimately 947:7  
1045:20  
ultra 1029:10,12  
unacceptable  
994:13  
unaccounted  
977:12  
unambiguous  
1058:20  
uncertain 956:24  
uncertainty 900:25  
957:4 964:21  
unchanged 971:20  
972:3  
UNCLOS 1043:21  
undeniably 1057:9  
under 897:18 899:5  
914:12 922:21  
925:18 929:2,20  
930:23 931:3  
937:2 950:15  
988:19 998:6  
1007:8,9 1009:8  
1016:2 1017:14  
1017:15,19  
1023:13,14,25  
1024:17 1027:16  
1027:17,21  
1028:23 1040:21  
1058:2  
undergoing 917:23  
underlying 920:25  
undermine 1050:10  
underscore 940:16  
underscored  
1032:18  
understand 915:25  
997:21 1016:10  
understanding  
900:16 906:18,19  
911:16 1009:7  
1018:3  
understood 988:18  
1043:23  
undo 904:3 942:21  
unequivocally  
1029:2  
unfortunately 905:9  
unidirectional  
960:8  
unification 950:25  
970:20  
uninterrupted  
895:24  
unique 924:23  
929:18 993:9  
1046:25 1047:6  
1049:24 1055:26  
1056:25  
unit 985:13,14,16  
United 920:22  
1041:10  
unity 950:26 1048:9  
universally 929:12  
unless 945:18  
966:26 967:5,6  
987:8 1039:6  
unlike 895:13,13,26

910:15 917:11  
unlimited 956:18  
unload 895:16  
unobstructed  
985:11  
unprecedented  
927:18 1049:5,24  
unpredictable  
956:24  
unravel 945:12  
unrelated 1008:23  
unsupported 963:9  
1029:4  
unsure 975:8  
until 900:12,12,19  
901:20 903:3  
995:20 1000:20  
1032:4,21  
unusual 990:24  
unwarranted  
1055:13  
urge 1022:22  
use 894:23 903:26  
904:9 913:12  
919:25 945:22  
954:24 955:7,21  
956:21,24 957:22  
958:4 959:17  
961:22 963:6  
964:3,22,24 967:7  
972:21 974:5,18  
976:18 982:19  
984:2,6 1010:23  
1012:2,7 1036:12  
1049:11 1052:18  
used 902:12 952:4  
954:11 957:2  
960:15 970:11  
977:11 983:22  
984:5 997:13  
1004:9 1008:16  
1009:2 1010:11  
1026:16 1035:4  
1041:16 1050:18  
useful 955:3  
1047:23  
usefulness 982:15  
983:13  
uses 902:25 975:24  
using 894:25 895:2  
895:15 914:11  
954:9 986:20,23  
1002:7 1005:6  
1011:18  
usual 1026:14  
1048:25  
usually 982:12  
utility 981:18  
utilizes 952:16  
utterly 944:26  
U.N 1047:19  
U.S 1050:19

V  
V 894:12  
valid 1017:18  
1029:14  
value 973:17

1033:16  
variety 942:5  
1056:8,9  
various 918:2  
926:18 962:19  
1039:2  
vast 961:4  
vastly 1053:11,21  
vault 1040:8  
vehemently 993:21  
venture 939:6  
veracity 895:19  
version 903:9  
975:17 1046:13  
versions 947:23  
965:5 975:5  
versus 923:7 1008:5  
1008:6,7  
very 896:26 897:2,4  
897:7 900:13  
907:8 910:4,22,23  
929:16 932:11  
935:16 938:12  
941:10 942:13  
943:14 946:11  
951:19 960:9  
961:15 964:7  
967:3,6 968:11  
972:10 983:7,24  
983:25 984:8  
994:20 1004:16  
1004:18 1005:15  
1005:23 1012:11  
1021:5,25 1023:7  
1028:11 1030:20  
1042:12 1044:9  
1049:3 1050:22  
1054:7 1057:5  
1062:9,19  
vessel 1051:5  
vexatious 950:21  
vicinity 985:10  
1002:10 1007:14  
1057:19  
view 902:6 904:26  
919:19 936:22  
937:11,21 943:20  
945:7 951:21  
959:11 960:18,23  
962:18 967:24,24  
967:25 971:3  
983:18 984:21  
985:15 989:9  
1005:19 1040:17  
1042:19 1047:23  
viewed 947:25  
1042:21  
viewpoint 1041:12  
views 905:20  
1048:11  
vigorously 944:7  
violations 909:8  
vires 1029:10,12  
virtually 956:18  
virtue 933:18  
942:25  
vision 972:18  
visions 972:6  
visit 1059:20,21

visual 987:21  
vis-a-vis 934:13  
1023:13  
volte-face 1043:4,5

W  
wait 1048:11  
waited 901:17  
waiting 1019:26  
1021:9  
waived 1010:2  
want 906:7 917:22  
946:22 951:2  
954:22 967:16  
974:6 1012:18  
1015:25 1030:2  
wanted 965:2  
1005:17 1018:6  
1031:21  
wanting 948:22  
wants 975:3 996:11  
warm 1059:17  
wasn't 901:18,20  
915:18 918:21  
935:21 948:22  
water 952:12 953:9  
963:8 978:12  
986:25 987:3  
1013:8  
waters 908:10 914:8  
978:12  
watershed 1051:13  
way 912:9,22  
913:25 916:23  
917:5 921:13  
926:7 928:22  
938:4 939:4 954:2  
954:2,24 957:21  
960:19 970:20  
972:15 978:18  
984:19 985:25  
994:19 1018:14  
1042:9 1050:20  
ways 928:20 942:5  
961:17 969:17  
wedge 1041:25  
wedges 1022:10  
week 895:12 896:12  
904:8 906:16,23  
931:22 932:7,16  
942:15 944:19  
955:23 956:11  
961:16 965:3,11  
965:22 974:14  
981:15 983:3  
993:17 1040:3  
1042:14 1045:7  
1049:9 1055:15  
1057:3  
weeks 934:15 937:9  
1061:16  
week's 939:21  
weigh 900:13  
weighed 1057:14  
weighing 921:9,13  
923:6 926:5,8  
weight 917:19  
923:26 925:4,26  
926:2,13,19

927:20 979:5  
985:25 1056:26  
weighted 946:16  
Weil 1047:3  
1061:19  
welcome 895:25  
1059:17,21  
wells 997:18  
1041:21  
went 909:11 951:13  
956:15 973:22  
west 940:11 953:24  
953:26 983:15,17  
984:10,17 986:19  
987:7 988:8  
western 928:3  
1002:9,13,16,19  
1002:26 1004:14  
1004:23 1005:2  
1005:10 1006:8  
1006:14  
we'll 1001:22  
1013:4  
we're 937:13,18  
963:9 976:14  
978:5 1041:2  
1058:18 1059:24  
we've 1060:2,3  
whatsoever 914:19  
1035:10 1057:16  
while 929:3 930:17  
942:5 965:5  
977:19 979:5  
981:15 1004:22  
1018:21 1020:5  
1043:25 1048:10  
White 1025:16  
1026:3  
whole 913:9,9  
938:21,23 988:3  
995:17 1006:14  
1038:16 1045:3  
wholly 905:12  
921:20 1055:13  
wiggle 1033:21  
willingness 979:25  
1019:13  
Willis 905:18  
906:22 943:23  
944:9 963:15  
973:3,4,15 976:10  
982:5,6,13,18  
983:11 1000:18  
1002:8 1020:9,14  
1023:5 1024:13  
1026:20 1027:3,5  
1028:26 1029:7  
1033:6 1035:16  
1035:17 1036:3  
1036:10,16  
1037:18 1038:17  
win 1058:18  
windward 991:15  
wing 954:15  
wings 955:10  
962:15  
winner 947:25  
wins 1055:23  
wisdom 1049:2

1059:10  
 wish 904:20 923:7  
 976:25 980:15  
 994:6 1059:16  
 1062:11  
 wished 1044:7  
 wishes 901:11  
 wishing 1026:9  
 women 1061:16  
 won 1058:16  
 wonder 944:10  
 945:20 1039:9  
 wondering 1039:10  
 1039:10,13  
 word 899:19 902:11  
 902:12,25 913:13  
 929:5 997:12  
 1052:18  
 words 900:2 909:21  
 909:22 935:25  
 938:8 942:3  
 943:23 948:24  
 950:26 959:12  
 989:6 1002:24  
 1031:23 1036:12  
 1042:12,13  
 1050:23 1058:19  
 1062:15  
 work 923:24 952:14  
 1016:19,25  
 1017:6,8,10,13,18  
 1017:21 1062:20  
 worked 1041:19  
 world 993:15 995:2  
 worried 982:12  
 worst 1052:12  
 wouldn't 902:16  
 933:23 980:19,23  
 980:24  
 writ 967:23 1048:4  
 write 1015:13,21,25  
 writes 1047:3  
 writing 982:7  
 written 908:4  
 921:11,23  
 1020:16 1040:4  
 1041:17 1051:18  
 1051:26 1056:6  
 1060:19  
 wrong 966:14  
 998:23 1010:6  
 1050:15  
 wrote 933:10  
 934:13,25 936:21  
 1015:23  
 Wu 894:7

Y

year 1027:9  
 1033:23  
 years 901:17 904:2  
 934:22,23 936:7  
 937:14 940:10  
 996:25 1002:3  
 1020:4 1023:4,9  
 1030:23 1032:26  
 1033:5,8 1035:18  
 1038:20 1048:17  
 1051:12,16

1052:18,20  
 1053:25,26  
 1054:17 1058:12  
 1059:16  
 yellow 990:12  
 1010:12,13  
 Yves 894:16

Z

zone 908:3 909:5,10  
 909:13 914:9  
 918:7 919:10  
 920:16 921:18  
 947:3 968:12  
 972:19 974:20  
 984:22 987:19  
 1044:19  
 zones 906:20 908:25  
 918:3,4 920:10,10  
 920:13 921:5  
 975:5 985:2  
 1046:7

I

I 1004:21  
 1.5 946:24  
 1.7 1006:9  
 1:15 995:21,26  
 996:3  
 10 947:3 999:5  
 1006:10 1008:14  
 10,000 987:23  
 10.1 1002:15  
 100 952:12  
 1000 1000:1  
 1001 1001:1  
 1002 1002:1  
 1003 1003:1  
 1004 1004:1  
 1005 1005:1  
 1006 1006:1  
 1007 1007:1  
 1008 1008:1  
 1009 1009:1  
 1010 1010:1  
 1011 1011:1  
 1012 1012:1  
 1013 1013:1  
 1014 1014:1  
 1015 1015:1  
 1016 1016:1  
 1017 1017:1  
 1018 1018:1  
 1019 1019:1  
 102.6 975:15  
 1020 1020:1  
 1021 1021:1  
 1022 1022:1  
 1023 1023:1  
 1024 1024:1  
 1025 1025:1  
 1026 1026:1  
 1027 1027:1  
 1028 1028:1  
 1029 1029:1  
 103 907:15,21  
 1030 1030:1  
 1031 1031:1  
 1032 1032:1

1033 1033:1  
 1034 1034:1  
 1035 1035:1  
 1036 1036:1  
 1037 1037:1  
 1038 1038:1  
 1039 1039:1  
 1040 1040:1  
 1041 1041:1  
 1042 1042:1  
 1043 1043:1  
 1044 1044:1  
 1045 1045:1  
 1046 1046:1  
 1047 1047:1  
 1048 1048:1  
 1049 1049:1  
 1050 1050:1  
 1051 1051:1  
 1052 1052:1  
 1053 1053:1  
 1054 1054:1  
 1055 1055:1  
 1056 1056:1  
 1057 1057:1  
 1058 1058:1  
 1059 1059:1  
 1060 1060:1  
 1061 1061:1  
 1062 1062:1  
 108 997:21,23  
 1007:26 1008:15  
 1010:19 1018:24  
 109 932:22  
 112 934:11,16  
 118 1013:11  
 1014:13  
 119 975:7  
 12 1005:4 1006:11  
 1032:21  
 12:00 996:3  
 120 909:4,12 975:9  
 122 975:9,14  
 124 975:7  
 124.74 955:2  
 125 955:2 1033:19  
 126 975:23  
 13 1004:21,26  
 1005:5  
 135 953:16 999:23  
 1002:7,10,14,16  
 1002:20 1003:9  
 1004:12,18  
 1005:11 1006:9  
 1006:20,25  
 1034:4  
 136 1004:17,21,23  
 1004:26 1005:3  
 1005:11  
 15 945:24  
 150 1007:6,7  
 1028:17  
 16 1010:5 1016:14  
 1060:26  
 17 998:19 1007:25  
 178 1016:23,23  
 1017:5 1041:16  
 18 999:13 1018:24  
 180 1016:23

1886 943:15  
 1950s 1038:20  
 1956 1059:25  
 1958 1042:8  
 1051:19  
 1959 1059:15,23  
 1963 1029:23  
 1032:8  
 1964 922:25 934:17  
 935:10,26 955:3  
 1035:22 1052:19  
 1054:5 1060:15  
 1965 1002:2  
 1029:22,24  
 1967 1001:22  
 1010:8 1018:12  
 1027:19  
 1968 1010:26  
 1969 1015:2  
 1970 1002:2  
 1014:16  
 1970s 924:16  
 1971 1014:16  
 1972 999:9 1018:11  
 1018:21 1028:7  
 1029:22,25  
 1030:5,26 1031:3  
 1033:4 1052:24  
 1058:5  
 1973 1013:25  
 1024:16 1033:7  
 1974 1026:4  
 1041:19  
 1975 1041:22  
 1976 920:25  
 1024:16 1032:21  
 1032:26 1041:23  
 1977 1025:16  
 1027:2,25,25  
 1028:10 1029:3  
 1052:24  
 1979 899:10  
 1028:16  
 1980s 1038:22  
 1982 898:4,16  
 899:12 901:24  
 1000:14,15,20  
 1020:8,18  
 1021:26 1026:24  
 1043:13 1044:11  
 1984 898:12,13  
 899:3 903:14,26  
 1000:21 1020:8  
 1020:19 1021:4  
 1021:12 1022:2  
 1023:8 1026:23  
 1985 897:12  
 1022:26  
 1986 897:12 943:22  
 943:25 963:15  
 1023:4  
 1992 900:19 932:17  
 933:6,7 934:10  
 935:15 937:13  
 938:13,24  
 1995 934:22 935:5  
 935:20  
 1997 903:5,9,10  
 936:20 938:24

1998 900:12 901:18  
 901:20 903:3  
 937:9,14,17 938:4  
 938:13 939:17  
 940:3 952:5 954:3  
 1052:26

2

200 909:16 973:7,13  
 973:14,19 975:5  
 975:16 977:22  
 978:17 992:25  
 1045:13  
 200-mile 963:22  
 979:24  
 2001 894:7 936:10  
 939:24 940:14  
 954:3 1052:20  
 201 1016:18  
 2016 1002:22  
 1004:8,15,21,25  
 1011:25 1012:13  
 2017 994:20  
 1002:22 1004:9  
 1004:16,26  
 1011:25 1012:14  
 1033:16,20  
 209 1016:25,25  
 210 1016:26,26  
 213 1027:6  
 217 997:13  
 218 1016:26  
 22nd 1059:15  
 222 1017:2  
 224 1017:3  
 23rd 904:16  
 232 997:11 1041:9  
 24th 1013:25  
 242 1016:16  
 25 947:2 1004:24  
 1005:3,11  
 26 1002:9  
 26th 1006:22  
 1026:20  
 263 1006:15  
 277 985:23  
 28 1034:23 1035:4  
 28th 894:7  
 29 1035:3

3

3 918:23 933:25  
 1013:18,19  
 30 1038:20 1058:12  
 300 1006:4  
 33 997:17 1032:20  
 1032:25  
 340 997:11  
 350 975:24 976:9,12  
 976:14  
 38 1025:16  
 39 1002:17 1006:12  
 1025:16 1026:4  
 398 985:23

4

4 934:24 1014:20,23  
 4:00 995:22  
 40 901:17 903:26

1048:17 1051:12	899:12,17	954 954:1
1051:16 1054:17	861 976:5	955 955:1
400 1000:26	880 996:12	956 956:1
1029:21 1031:16	89 973:10,16	957 957:1
1032:7	895 895:1	958 958:1
41 1059:16	896 896:1	959 959:1
43 1043:11	897 897:1	960 960:1
45th 1004:22	898 898:1	961 961:1
46 948:21 969:19,22	899 899:1	962 962:1
989:22		963 963:1
	9	964 964:1
5	9 937:17 1059:25	965 965:1
5 934:24 937:4	1060:9	966 966:1
1014:20,23	9:30 894:9	967 967:1
5.14 1036:6	90s 935:14 1019:9	968 968:1
50 963.19 1025:4	900 900:1	969 969:1
55 1032:20,25	901 901:1	970 970:1
59 974:4	902 902:1	971 971:1
	903 903:1	972 972:1
6	904 904:1	973 973:1
6 1019:2 1025:9	905 905:1	974 974:1
64 943:8,10 944:20	906 906:1	975 975:1
956:8 973:16	907 907:1	976 976:1
648,000 946:25	908 908:1	977 977:1
65 1000:26 1032:7,9	909 909:1	978 978:1
67 1010:26	910 910:1	979 979:1
69 974:4	911 911:1	98 903:8 954:4
696 963:26	912 912:1	980 980:1
	913 913:1	981 981:1
7	914 914:1	982 982:1
7 938:3 1003:18	915 915:1	983 983:1
1014:13,21,25	916 916:1	984 984:1
1019:3 1060:26	917 917:1	985 985:1
70s 922:13 1031:20	918 918:1	986 986:1
700 958:20	919 919:1	987 987:1
71 1027:19	920 920:1	988 988:1
72 943:8 944:20	921 921:1	989 989:1
1000:26 1031:21	922 922:1	990 990:1
1032:8,10	923 923:1	991 991:1
73 1031:21	924 924:1	992 992:1
751 961:10	925 925:1	993 993:1
76 917:6 971:25	926 926:1	994 994:1
979:4 1043:13,19	927 927:1	995 995:1
1044:11 1045:3	928 928:1	996 996:1
1045:10	929 929:1	997 997:1
77 980:8	930 930:1	998 998:1
770 1036:11	931 931:1	999 999:1
771 1036:11	932 932:1	
776 1035:17	933 933:1	
777 1035:17	934 934:1	
78 1034:8	935 935:1	
785 1002:8 1026:21	936 936:1	
786 1024:14 1029:8	937 937:1	
789 1020:9,14	938 938:1	
	939 939:1	
8	940 940:1	
8 1008:17	941 941:1	
80 1027:16	942 942:1	
80s 1019:9	943 943:1	
82 898:6,8,17	944 944:1	
899:12,17 903:14	945 945:1	
836 1032:11	946 946:1	
837 1032:11	947 947:1	
840 1032:12	948 948:1	
841 1032:12	949 949:1	
845 1006:22 1016:7	950 950:1	
847 1018:8	951 951:1	
850 1041:21,23	952 952:1	
86 898:7,8,23,24	953 953:1	