

ARBITRATION BETWEEN
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
AND
NOVA SCOTIA
CONCERNING THE DELIMITATION OF
THEIR OFFSHORE AREAS

PHASE TWO

COUNTER MEMORIAL OF
NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

17 OCTOBER 2001

CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II	AN OVERVIEW	3
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Nova Scotia’s Version of the Applicable Law.....	3
A.	The Legal Framework.....	3
B.	A Misconceived Criterion: the “Equal Division of Overlapping Areas”	5
C.	The Legally Discredited Concepts of an “Apportionment of an Undivided Whole” and “Relative Wealth and Poverty”	6
III.	Nova Scotia’s Geographical Framework	7
A.	The Relevant Coasts and the Relevant Area.....	7
B.	An Incidental Feature as the Pivotal Point of the Delimitation	8
C.	An Idiosyncratic Use of Geography on a Continental Scale	9
D.	An Expanded “Zone of Opposition”	10
E.	A Geographically Untenable Claim.....	11
IV.	Nova Scotia’s Version of the History of the Dispute	12
A.	The Political Relations between the Parties	12
B.	The Administrative Conduct of the Parties	13
C.	A Distorted Presentation of Resource Distribution	14
V.	Conclusion.....	15
CHAPTER III	GEOGRAPHY	16
I.	Introduction	16
II.	Nova Scotia’s Refashioning of Geography.....	17
A.	Macro-Geographical Perspective	17
B.	Coastal Length and Projection.....	19

(a)	The Arbitrary Selection of Coasts to Describe the “General Configuration of the Region”.....	20
(b)	Inconsistency in the Selection of Coasts	22
(c)	The Distortion of the Coastal Relationship	23
C.	Relevant Area.....	24
III.	The Proper Geographical Framework.....	25
CHAPTER IV	THE CONDUCT OF THE PARTIES	28
I.	Introduction	28
II.	The Political Relations of the Parties	28
A.	The Alleged 1964 Agreement.....	28
B.	Nova Scotia’s Misuse of the Doody Letter	31
C.	The Map that was not before the Premiers on June 17-18, 1972	33
D.	The 1984 Draft Legislation	34
E.	The Alleged Publication of a Map Showing the 135 Degree Line.....	36
III.	The Administrative Practice of the Parties.....	36
A.	Nova Scotia’s Permitting Practice.....	37
(a)	Nova Scotia Figure 33	38
(b)	Nova Scotia Annex 178.....	40
B.	Newfoundland and Labrador’s Permitting Practice	43
(a)	The Mobil Permit	45
(b)	The “Missing” Newfoundland and Labrador Permit Grid	45
(c)	The 1977 Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Regulations	47
IV.	Conclusion.....	47

CHAPTER V	THE LAW	49
I.	Introduction	49
II.	An Unprecedented Conception of the Basis of Title as Recognized by International Law	51
III.	The “Apportionment of an Undivided Whole” Based on “Relative Wealth and Poverty”	59
IV.	An Adjudication <i>De Novo</i> of Phase One	62
A.	The Purported 1964 Agreement	63
B.	The Early Permits Issued by the Parties	66
V.	A Radical Departure from Accepted Geographical Principles	73
A.	A Capricious Definition of the Relevant Area	73
B.	The “Equal Division of Overlapping Entitlements”	78
C.	The Use of an Incidental Feature as the Pivotal Point of the Delimitation	80
D.	The Use of a Single Straight Line	82
E.	A Misconceived “Zone of Opposition”	84
F.	A Misuse of Macro-Geographical Concepts	86
VI	Conclusion	89
CHAPTER VI	ACQUIESCENCE AND ESTOPPEL	91
I.	Acquiescence and Estoppel are Irrelevant	91
II.	Acquiescence and Estoppel Are Stringently Defined in International Law	92
III.	There is No Factual Basis for Acquiescence or Estoppel	93
CHAPTER VII	THE EQUITY OF THE RESULT	99
I.	Introduction	99
II.	Geographical Tests	99
A.	Proportionality	99

B.	Macro-Geography.....	101
III.	Non-Geographical Tests	102
IV.	Conclusion.....	103
CHAPTER VIII	THE POSITION OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR: A RECAPITULATION.....	105
CHAPTER IX	CONCLUSIONS AND SUBMISSION.....	110
APPENDIX A	TERMS OF REFERENCE	
APPENDIX B	LIST OF STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES	
ANNEXES:		
I	SUPPLEMENTARY AUTHORITIES (2 Volumes)	
II	SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTS AND STATUTORY AUTHORITIES (1 Volume)	
III	SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES (1 Volume)	

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1: The Gulf of St. Lawrence, Inner Concavity and the Outer Area
(after page 16)

Figure 2: The So-Called “Coastal Concavity”
(after page 18)

Figure 3: Nova Scotia Identifies as Relevant, Coasts Whose Projections Do Not Converge and Overlap
(after page 20)

Figure 4: The Relevant Area Must be an Area of Overlapping Coastal Projections
(after page 25)

Figure 5: The Relevant Coasts
(after page 26)

Figure 6: Drill Sites Identified in Nova Scotia Figure 33 Were in Areas Covered by Federal Permits
(after page 38)

Figure 7: Industry Depictions of Canadian Permits in the Late 60s and Early 70s Did Not Make Reference to Provincial Claims
(after page 39)

Figure 8: N & L Conduct Did Not Respect the Alleged 135° Line
(after page 44)

Figure 9: Interim Permit Issued to Katy on May 19, 1971
(after page 46)

Figure 10: Interim Permit Issued to Katy on May 19, 1971
(after page 46)

Figure 11: Nova Scotia Coasts West of Cape Canso Do Not Project Into the Area to be Delimited
(after page 76)

Figure 12: Nova Scotia Uses an Incidental Feature as the Pivotal Point for the Construction of its Line
(after page 80)

Figure 13: Nova Scotia Reconfigures the Alignment of its Coasts
(after page 81)

Figure 14: A Straight Line Inside and Outside a Concavity Would be Appropriate Only When the Controlling Coasts in Both Sections are the Same
(after page 83)

Figure 15: The Disproportionate Result Produced by the Nova Scotia Line
(after page 101)

Figure 16: Nova Scotia Demonstrates That Its Line Completely Blocks the Coastal Projection of the South Coast of Newfoundland
(after page 102)

Figure 17: The Relevant Coasts
(after page 105)

Figure 18: The Inner Concavity and the Outer Area; The Relevant Area
(after page 105)

Figure 19: The Construction of the Newfoundland and Labrador Line
(after page 108)

Figure 20: The Newfoundland and Labrador Line
(after page 109)

Figure 21: Equity of the Result – Proportionality Test
(after page 109)