

TABLE OF CONTENTS
PART I: INTRODUCTION

A. THE ISSUES ARE JOINED.....1

B. NOVA SCOTIA'S PHASE TWO COUNTER-MEMORIAL.....2

TABLE OF CONTENTS
PART II: THE APPLICABLE LAW

INTRODUCTION1

A. THE FUNDAMENTAL MISCONCEPTIONS OF LAW THAT UNDERLIE NEWFOUNDLAND’S CASE2

i. Newfoundland Misconceives The Nature Of The Legal Principles Governing Maritime Delimitation2

a) Newfoundland Incorrectly Equates Equitable Principles And Relevant Circumstances With Mandatory Rules Of Law2

b) Newfoundland Incorrectly Limits The Range Of Circumstances Relevant To The Delimitation Process.....6

ii. Newfoundland Ignores The Basis Of Legal Entitlement In This Case8

a) The Parties Agree On The Central Relevance Of Basis Of Entitlement9

b) Newfoundland Ignores The Basis Of Title To The “Offshore Areas” 10

c) Newfoundland Proposes The Delimitation Of A Juridical Zone – The Continental Shelf – That Is Not The Object Of This Arbitration..... 12

d) The Consequences Of Newfoundland’s Error Are Pervasive 15

iii. Newfoundland Misconceives The Role Of Previous Decisions17

a) Newfoundland Applies The Results But Ignores The Reasoning In Previous Decisions 17

b) Newfoundland Applies Factual Findings From the *St. Pierre and Miquelon Award* As “Facts” In This Case20

- Coastal Geography, Coastal Relationship and Relevant Coasts23
- The Area Of The Delimitation.....25
- Newfoundland’s Supposedly “Dominant” Coast.....26
- The True Impact Of Newfoundland’s Use Of The *St. Pierre And Miquelon Award*.....28

iv. Summary And Conclusion28

B.	NEWFOUNDLAND'S PARTICULAR ERRORS OF LAW	29
i.	The Impact Of Other Delimitations	30
ii.	Inequity In Theory And Inequity In Fact	31
iii.	Natural Prolongation, Seaward Extension And Frontal Projections	32
a)	The Structure Of Newfoundland's Argument On Frontal Projection	33
b)	Natural Prolongation, Seaward Extension And The Impact Of Article 76 of the <i>LOS 1982</i>	34
•	The Definition Of Natural Prolongation And Seaward Extension.....	34
•	The Impact Of Article 76 of The <i>LOS 1982</i>	36
c)	There Is No Authority For Newfoundland's Frontal Projection Theory.....	38
d)	Newfoundland's Theory Of Primary And Secondary Coasts	42
iv.	Resource Location And Access	44
v.	The Conduct Of The Parties	47
a)	Newfoundland Misapplies The Tests For Acquiescence And Estoppel To The Determination Of "Relevant" Conduct.....	48
b)	Newfoundland Misstates The Rationale In The <i>Tunisia/Libya</i> Case	51
c)	The Proper Role Of Conduct	54
C.	CONCLUSION	54

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART III: NEWFOUNDLAND'S FLAWED DELIMITATION

INTRODUCTION	1
A. NEWFOUNDLAND'S SELECTION OF "RELEVANT" CIRCUMSTANCES AND "EQUITABLE" CRITERIA.....	1
i. The Conduct Of The Parties	2
a) The "Political Relations" Of The Parties	3
b) Permit-Related Conduct.....	5
c) The Duration Of Conduct	7
ii. Newfoundland Misstates The Law And The Facts Respecting Islands	9
a) The Treatment Of Islands In International Law.....	9
b) Newfoundland's Errors Regarding The Islands In This Case.....	12
c) The True Impact Of St. Paul And Sable Islands	15
iii. The Criterion Of Non-Encroachment Is Of Limited Usefulness Here	16
B. NEWFOUNDLAND'S SUBJECTIVE DEFINITION OF "RELEVANT" COASTS AND MARITIME AREAS.....	19
i. Newfoundland's Selective Choice Of "Relevant" Coasts.....	20
a) The Relevant Coast Of Newfoundland	20
b) The Relevant Coast of Nova Scotia	21
• The Inapplicability Of The Findings In St. Pierre And Miquelon	22
• Newfoundland's Subjective Definition Of Where Coasts "Face"	25
ii. The Relevant Maritime Area	29
a) The Relevant Maritime Area As Defined By Newfoundland	29
b) The 200 Nautical Mile Limit Is Irrelevant In This Arbitration	30
• The Alleged Irrelevance Of The Outer Shelf – According to Newfoundland	30
• The Significance Of Canada's Potential Article 76 Claim	32

c)	Newfoundland's Use Of Perpendiculars To Define The Relevant Area.....	33
	• Newfoundland Does Not Adopt The "General Approach" From The St. Pierre And Miquelon Award	34
	• The Eritrea/Yemen Decision Is Inapplicable To This Case.....	36
	• The Differential Application Of The Perpendiculars.....	37
iii.	The Circularity Of Newfoundland's Argument On Relevant Coasts And Areas.....	38
iv.	The Correct Approach To The Definition Of Relevant Coasts And Offshore Areas	40
C.	NEWFOUNDLAND'S "INNER SECTOR" DELIMITATION.....	44
i.	The Provisional Median Line In The Inner Sector	44
a)	The Alleged Inequity Of Equidistance: Where's The Beef?.....	44
b)	The Median Line In The Inner Sector.....	46
c)	The Impact Of St. Paul Island On A Median Line.....	47
d)	The Alleged Impact Of Convex And Concave Coasts.....	48
e)	The Alleged Concavity Created By St. Pierre And Cape Breton.....	52
f)	Comparing The Results Of The Median Line And The Newfoundland Line.....	55
ii.	Newfoundland's Proposed Lines In The Inner Sector	56
a)	The Bisector In The Area Of Cabot Strait: A Means To An End.....	56
b)	The Termination Of The First Bisector And The New "Coastal Front"	57
	• The Alleged Turn To The South At Connaigre Head.....	58
	• The Connaigre Head-Lamaline Shag Rock Line	58
	• The "Projection" Of The "Coastal Front".....	59
c)	The Westward Shift Along The "Closing Line"	60
d)	The Use Of The Inner Sector To Manipulate The Result In The Outer Sector.....	61
D.	NEWFOUNDLAND'S PROPOSED OUTER SECTOR LINE.....	65
i.	Newfoundland Over-States The Status Of The Perpendicular Method.....	66
ii.	The Adoption Of The Perpendicular In The <i>Gulf Of Maine Case</i>	67
a)	The Geographical Context Of The Gulf Of Maine	67
b)	Further Justifications For The Perpendicular In The <i>Gulf Of Maine Case</i>	70

iii.	Summary And Conclusion	70
E.	NEWFOUNDLAND'S TEST OF THE EQUITABLE NATURE OF THE RESULT	72
i.	Newfoundland's Restatement Of Its Earlier Justifications	73
ii.	Proportionality Of Result	74
iii.	Conduct Of The Parties	75
iv.	Resource Location And Access	76
F.	CONCLUSION: THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF NEWFOUNDLAND'S CLAIMED LINE.....	78
i.	Newfoundland's Claim Anticipates A "Compromise" Solution	78

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART IV: RESTATEMENT OF NOVA SCOTIA'S CASE

INTRODUCTION	1
A. NOVA SCOTIA'S PROPOSED DELIMITATION: AN EQUITABLE RESULT IN ALL THE RELEVANT CIRCUMSTANCES.....	1
i. The Applicable Law	1
ii. The Relevant Circumstances Of This Case.....	2
a) The Legal Zone And The Basis Of The Parties' Entitlements.....	2
b) The Area Relevant To The Delimitation	4
c) The Conduct Of The Parties	5
• The Parties' Conduct Is Relevant	5
• Summary Of The Parties' Conduct.....	6
• Newfoundland's Purported Objections Or Contrary Conduct.....	9
• Summary	9
d) Resource Location And Access	9
e) Other Delimitations In The Region	10
f) Geographic Circumstances	12
iii. The Applicable Equitable Criteria	14
a) Primary Criteria: Conduct And Equal Division Of Overlapping Entitlements	14
b) Auxiliary Criteria.....	17
iv. The Practical Method – Drawing the Line.....	17
a) Methods Based On The Conduct Of The Parties.....	17
b) Methods Based On Equal Division.....	19
v. Testing The Equitableness Of The Result.....	20
a) Testing The Delimitation	20
b) Proportionality of Result.....	21
c) The Concordance Of The Proposed Line With Other Methods.....	23
vi. The “Balancing Up”.....	26
B. CONCLUSION: TAKING ACCOUNT OF <i>ALL</i> RELEVANT CIRCUMSTANCES	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART V: CONCLUSIONS AND SUBMISSION

A.	CONCLUSIONS	1
i.	Newfoundland's Flawed Approach	1
ii.	Nova Scotia's Proposed Delimitation	3
B.	SUBMISSION	7