

TABLE OF CONTENTS
PART I: INTRODUCTION

A.	NOVA SCOTIA HAS PROVED ITS CASE IN ITS MEMORIAL	1
B.	NEWFOUNDLAND’S CASE RELIES ON FACTUAL INACCURACIES AND INCORRECT LAW	2
	i) Newfoundland Distorts The Record	2
	ii) Newfoundland Erects A Straw Man	4
C.	OUTLINE OF NOVA SCOTIA’S COUNTER-MEMORIAL	6
	i) Newfoundland’s Error Regarding The Applicable Law Is Corrected	6
	ii) Newfoundland’s Errors Of Fact Are Revealed	7
	iii) Nova Scotia Sets The Record Straight	7
	iv) Conclusion	8
D.	NEW EVIDENCE CONFIRMS NOVA SCOTIA’S ARGUMENT	8
E.	THE PROOF IS INCONTROVERTIBLE: THE LINE HAS BEEN RESOLVED BY AGREEMENT	9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART II: NEWFOUNDLAND IS WRONG REGARDING THE APPLICABLE LAW

A.	INTRODUCTION	1
B.	THE APPLICABLE LAW IS INTERNATIONAL LAW	1
	i) The False Distinction Between “Delimitation Under International Law” And “Delimitation By Agreement”	2
	ii) Newfoundland Ignores The Plain Words Of The <i>Terms Of Reference</i>	5
	iii) The Status Of The Provinces Is Not A Circumstance Requiring Modification Of The Applicable Law	7
	iv) Newfoundland Proposes Rewriting The <i>Terms of Reference</i>	10
C.	NEWFOUNDLAND MISINTERPRETS INTERNATIONAL LAW	10
	i) <i>Qatar v. Bahrain</i>	11
	ii) <i>North Sea Continental Shelf Cases</i>	13
D.	CONCLUSION	14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART III: NEWFOUNDLAND IS WRONG REGARDING THE NATURE OF THE *1964 AGREEMENT*

A.	INTRODUCTION: THE 1964 AGREEMENT WAS AN AGREEMENT – NOT A PROPOSAL	1
B.	THE EVENTS OF 1964 DEMONSTRATE THAT THE PARTIES CONCLUDED A BINDING AGREEMENT	2
i)	Newfoundland Relies On An Inaccurate And Incomplete Version Of The Facts	3
ii)	The 1964 Communiqué From The September 30 Conference Contradicts Newfoundland’s Theory	4
iii)	The Record Of “Matters Discussed” From The September 30 Conference Contradicts Newfoundland’s Theory	7
iv)	The Documents Respecting The Accession Of Québec Contradict Newfoundland’s Theory	8
v)	Newfoundland Misinterprets The Joint Submission	11
vi)	Newfoundland Mischaracterize The Map Depicting The Agreed Boundaries Annexed To The Joint Submission	13
C.	THE PARTIES’ CONDUCT SUBSEQUENT TO 1964 CONFIRMS THAT THEY CONCLUDED A BINDING AGREEMENT.....	14
i)	Newfoundland’s Account Of The Parties’ Subsequent Conduct Is Riddled With Errors And Omissions.....	14
a)	Premier Smallwood’s July 1965 “Interjection”	16
b)	The Mandate And Work Of The JMRC.....	18
c)	The Allard Letter Of 1969.....	21
d)	The June And August 1972 Premiers’ Meetings.....	22
e)	Premier Moores’ Statement To The Newfoundland House Of Assembly	24
f)	The Premiers’ Meeting Of August 2, 1972	26
g)	The October 1972 Letter From Minister Doody	27

h)	New Evidence Of Federal-Provincial Negotiations In 1972-1973.....	28
•	The First Ministers' Meeting of August 23, 1972	28
•	The Work Of The Joint Committee Of Federal-Provincial Officials: October 1972 – May 1973	30
•	The Joint Officials' Report To First Ministers	33
i)	The Newfoundland Proposal Of September 1973.....	34
j)	Federal-Provincial Negotiations: 1974-1977.....	35
k)	The 1977 MOU And The 1982 Canada-Nova Scotia Agreement	35
ii)	The “Time Of Death” Problem In The Newfoundland Argument.....	38
D.	THE 1964 AGREEMENT WAS NOT “CONDITIONAL”	39
i)	The “Condition” Does Not Appear In The 1964 Documents.....	40
ii)	The Existence Of The “Condition” Is Belied By The Parties' Subsequent Conduct	41
iii)	Newfoundland Relies On A False And Misleading Account Of The Work Of The JMRC	41
iv)	Newfoundland's Argument Is Internally Inconsistent	43
E.	THE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PROVISIONS IN THE ACCORD LEGISLATION CONFIRM THE EXISTENCE OF A BINDING AGREEMENT	44
i)	Newfoundland's Position Is Wrong.....	45
a)	The Dispute Settlement Provisions Support The Binding Nature Of The Agreement On Boundaries.....	45
b)	Newfoundland's Position Is Internally Contradictory	46
c)	Newfoundland's Argument Leads To An Absurdity.....	46
ii)	Newfoundland Misstates The Facts.....	47
a)	Newfoundland Misstates The Origin Of The Dispute Settlement Provisions.....	47
•	The Purpose Of The Relevant Provision In The 1982 Canada-Nova Scotia Agreement.....	47
•	The Connection Between The 1982 Agreement And The 1986 Accord	49
b)	The Wording Of The Dispute Resolution Provisions Proves Newfoundland Wrong	50
F.	CONCLUSION	52

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART IV: NEWFOUNDLAND IS WRONG REGARDING THE SCOPE OF THE 1964 AGREEMENT

A.	INTRODUCTION: THE 1964 BOUNDARIES APPLY TO ALL FORMS OF JURISDICTION AND TO THE FULL EXTENT OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF.....	1
B.	THE BOUNDARIES APPLY TO ALL FORMS OF JURISDICTION – NOT JUST “OWNERSHIP”	2
	i) The Plain Words Of The Documents Demonstrate That The Boundaries Apply To All Forms Of Jurisdiction.....	2
	a) Newfoundland Misinterprets And Misapplies The Joint Submission.....	2
	b) Newfoundland’s Argument Is Irrational.....	4
	ii) The Parties’ Subsequent Conduct Confirms That The Boundaries Apply To All Forms of Jurisdiction	5
	a) The Allard Letter Of May 12, 1969	7
	b) Premier Smallwood’s Letter Of January 29, 1970	8
	c) The JMRC Recommendations Of May 24, 1972.....	10
	d) The Premiers’ Confirmation Of The Boundaries On June 17-18, 1972	11
	e) Premier Moores’ June 19, 1972 Statement To The Newfoundland House Of Assembly	13
	f) The Premiers’ Meeting Of August 2, 1972	14
	g) The Federal-Provincial First Ministers’ Meeting Of August 23, 1972	15
	h) The Work Of The Joint Committee Of Federal–Provincial Officials: October 1972 – May 1973	17
	i) Newfoundland’s Failure To Protest The 1977 MOU Or The 1982 Canada–Nova Scotia Agreement.....	18
C.	THE PARTIES INTENDED TO DIVIDE THE ENTIRE CONTINENTAL SHELF ACCRUING TO CANADA UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW	19
	i) The Record Clearly Demonstrates That The 1964 Boundaries Extended to The Outer Limit Of The Continental Shelf	19
	a) The Meeting Of September 23, 1964	19
	b) The “Missing” Laurentian Channel And Sub-Basin.....	21

c)	The Joint Submission.....	22
d)	The True Scope Of The 1964 Agreement	25
ii)	The Parties' Subsequent Conduct Puts The Matter Beyond Doubt.....	26
a)	Newfoundland Issued Permits In The Outer Area Along the Boundary	26
b)	Nova Scotia Issued Permits In The Outer Area Along The Boundary	26
c)	The Work Of The JMRC Technical Committee.....	27
d)	The Premiers Confirmed The Area Delineated In June, 1972	27
e)	The "Geographical Area Involved" Was Reiterated In August 1972	29
f)	Newfoundland Asked "Where" Not "Whether" The Line Was Drawn.....	29
g)	Newfoundland's 1973 Proposal Itself Covered The Shelf.....	30
h)	Newfoundland Never Protested The 1977 MOU Or The 1982 Canada-Nova Scotia Agreement.....	31
i)	Newfoundland Failed to Protest The Canada-Nova Scotia Accord	34
D.	THE OUTER SEGMENT IS DELIMITED BY THE 135° AZIMUTH LINE	34
i)	The Historical Documents Speak For Themselves	34
a)	Newfoundland's Account Of The Origin Of The Line Is Wrong.....	35
b)	Newfoundland Misinterprets The 1964 Agreement.....	36
c)	Newfoundland Makes No Effort To Interpret The Facts In Good Faith.....	39
ii)	The Parties' Conduct Related To The 135° Azimuth Line Is Indisputable	41
a)	Newfoundland Issued Permits Along The 135° Boundary.....	41
b)	Nova Scotia Issued Permits Along The 135° Boundary.....	41
c)	The East Coast Offshore Map Presented To The Premiers In 1972 Applied the 135° Azimuth Line.....	42
d)	The 1982 Canada-Nova Scotia Agreement.....	42
E.	CONCLUSION	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART V: RESTATEMENT OF NOVA SCOTIA'S CASE

A.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
B.	THE FACTS	1
C.	THE LAW	10
	i) The Parties Agree That Intent Is The Key	10
	ii) Binding Agreements Take Many Forms.....	11
D.	THE LAW APPLIED TO THE FACTS.....	12
	i) The Parties Fully Intended To Conclude A Binding Agreement	12
	ii) Newfoundland Has Acquiesced In The 1964 Boundaries And Is Estopped From Denying Their Existence.....	16
E.	CONCLUSION	17

TABLE OF CONTENTS
PART VI: CONCLUSION AND SUBMISSION