

**Canadian Nuclear
Safety Commission**

**Commission canadienne de
sûreté nucléaire**

Public hearing

Audience publique

June 6th, 2012

Le 6 juin 2012

Neoskwekau Sports Complex
206 Main Street,
Mistissini, Québec

Neoskwekau Sports Complex
206, rue Principale
Mistissini (Québec)

Commission Members present

Commissaires présents

Dr. Michael Binder
Dr. Moyra McDill
Dr. Ronald Barriault
Mr. André Harvey

M. Michael Binder
Mme Moyra McDill
M. Ronald Barriault
M. André Harvey

Secretary:

Secrétaire:

Mr. Marc Leblanc

M. Marc Leblanc

Senior General Counsel :

Avocat général principal:

Mr. Jacques Lavoie

M. Jacques Lavoie

(ii)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Opening remarks	1
12-H7.36	2
Oral presentation by William Mianscum	
12-H7.39	11
Oral presentation by Rachel MacLeod	
12-H7.25	30
Exposé oral par Élaine Hébert	
12-H7.34	52
Oral presentation by the Cree Health Board, Public Health Department	
12-H7.40	67
Oral presentation by Luke MacLeod	
12-H7.43	73
Oral presentation by Philip Petawabano	
Oral presentation by Andrew Coon	78
12-H7.13	93
Exposé oral par les CentricoisES et MauricienNES pour le déclassement nucléaire	
Oral presentation by Winnie Awashish	111
12-H7.52	118
Oral presentation by Patrick D'Astous	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
12-H7.46 Oral presentation by Minganie sans uranium	128
12-H7.21 Oral presentation by George Gunner	141
Oral presentation by Morley Gunner	148
12-H7.37 Written Submission by The Cree Trappers Association	159
12-H7.41 Written Submission by Mr. Charlie Loon	161
12-H7.42 Written Submission by Ms. Maggie Voyageur	162
12-H7.10 Written Submission by Canadian Nuclear Association	162
12-H7.11 Written Submission by Ms. Elaine MacLeod	162
12-H7.30 Written Submission by Ms. Virginia Coonishish	163
12-H7.54 Written Submission by Mr. John Bobbish	163
12-H7.55 Written Submission by Ms. Victoria Bobbish	163

(iv)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
12-H7.56 Written Submission by Ms. Darlene Neeposh	164
12-H7.57 Written Submission by Mr. Ernest Nakogee	164
12-H7.59 Written Submission by Mrs. Mary Mark	165
12-H7.60 Written Submission by Mr. Ronald Blackned	166
12-H7.61 Written Submission by Mr. Titus Mianscum	166
12-H7.62 Written Submission by Mrs. Annie Pauline Bosum	166
12-H7.63 Written Submission by Ms. Hattie Coonishish	167
12-H7.64 Written Submission by Stacy Anderson	167
12-H7.65 Written Submission by Mr. Moses Brien	167
12-H7.66 Written Submission by Mrs. Annie Mark Blacksmith	167
12-H7.67 Written Submission by Mr. Giiwedin Matoush	168

(v)
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
12-H7.68 Written Submission by Ms. Lynn Neeposh	169
12-H7.69 Written Submission by M. Alexandre Brien	169
12-H7.70 Written Submission by Mr. Clifford Loon	170
12-H7.71 Written Submission by Ms. Elisabeth Shecapio	170
12-H7.72 Written Submission by Mr. Matthew Wapachee	170
12-H7.73 Written Submission by Mrs. Emily Shecapio	170
12-H7.74 Written Submission by Mr. Leonard Brien	171
12-H7.75 Written Submission by Mr. Matthew Shecapio	171
12-H7.76 Written Submission by Ms. Theresa MacLeod	171
12-H7.77 Written Submission by Mrs. Karen Coonishish	172
12-H7.78 Written Submission by Mr. Kevin Mianscum	172

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
12-H7.79	172
Written Submission by Mrs. Mary Bosum	
12-H7.80	173
Written Submission by Mr. Maverick Loon-Swallow	
12-H7.81	173
Written Submission by Mr. George Coon	
12-H7.82	173
Written Submission by Mrs. Priscilla Coon-Come	
12-H7.83	174
Written Submission by Ms. Natalie Guttormsson	
12-H7.84	174
Memoire de Groupe de recherché en éducation et formation relatives à l'environnement	
12-H7.90	174
Written Submission by Mrs. Elizabeth Coon	
12-H7.47	175
Oral presentation by Michel Duguay	
12-H7.48 / 12-H7.48A	184
Oral presentation by Robert Del Tredici, The Atomic Photographers Guild	
12-H7.49	200
Written submissions by l'Association de protection de l'environnement des Hautes-Laurentides	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
12-H7.53	200
Oral presentation by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibilities	
12-H7.28	212
Oral presentation by Zach Ruitter	
12-H7.44	222
Oral presentation by Alice Petawabano	
Oral presentation by Paul Dixon	232

Mistissini, Québec

--- Upon commencing on Wednesday, June 6, 2012 at 9:08
a.m./

L'audience débute à 9h08, mercredi le 6 juin 2012

Opening Remarks

MR. LEBLANC: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Bonjour à tous. Welcome to the continuation of the public hearing of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission on the Matoush Project.

During today's business, we have simultaneous translation like yesterday, in English, French and Cree. Des appareils de traduction sont disponibles à la réception. La version française est au poste 4, the English version is on channel 3 and the Cree version is on channel 5.

I'd also like to note that this proceeding is again being video webcast live and that the proceedings will be archived on our website for a three-month period after the closure of the hearing.

To make the transcripts as meaningful as possible, we would ask everyone to identify themselves before speaking.

And as a courtesy to others in the room, please silence your cell phones and other electronic devices.

Mr. Binder, Président et premier dirigeant de la CCSN va présider l'audience publique d'aujourd'hui.

Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Marc, and good morning everybody.

We are continuing the hearing and what I would like to do is I would like to remind everybody that we've still got something like 18, 19 oral presentations and we haven't got much time beyond somewhere mid-afternoon before we have to move our equipment to Chibougamau.

So please respect our request for shortened introduction to the material that you submitted to us and then maybe engage in some discussion.

Now, our first -- I'm not sure, Marc, whether our first presenter is available, this is Mr. Mianscum. Is Mr. Mianscum here?

Please, sir.

12-H7.36

Oral presentation by

William Mianscum

MR. W. MIANSCUM: Good morning. My name is -- for the record, my name is William Mianscum.

I am a member of the Council of the Cree Nation of Mistissini, but I do not speak for the Council at this presentation. I work for the Grand Council of the Crees; I am their governance coordinator. I do not speak for the Grand Council of the Crees at this presentation.

(Cree language spoken without interpretation)

(Interpreted from Cree) These words are mine and mine only from Mistissini.

Panel, good morning visitors, what a beautiful morning it is.

This is our territory, all 370,000 square kilometres of it. It is bigger than the United Kingdom; it is bigger than the State of Texas; it is three times the size of Newfoundland; this is our homeland.

Since time immemorial our people have occupied this land, our people have used this land, our people have governed this land. Our people have government systems over this land, governance over hunting territories that have been handed down from generation to generation to heads of leadership called Uundowho Uchimalich(phonetic).

The Uundowho Uuchimalich(phonetic) took on the roles of stewards of the land making sure there will be plenty of animals, and that the land would be environmentally friendly for their generation and for generations to come.

To this day, this system of governance over our territory applies. Our people have had to stand up and defend our homeland.

In 1971, then-Premier Robert Bourassa announced his project of the century for Quebec on Cree territory, on Eeyou Istchee. He was going to dam three major river systems and flood 20,000 square kilometres of prime Cree territory, Eeyou Istchee.

Collectively, the Cree leadership of the day organized themselves politically and met right here in Mistissini in 1971, the summer of 1971, for the first time and decided they will unite and be of one voice to meet and face the challenge they were up against. And in 1975, the Grand Council of the Crees of Québec was created.

I'm sorry; I'm trying to turn my page here. You see I have type B diabetes and my mouth dries fast and I'm trying to lick my fingers so. Excuse me.

Prior to this period in history, Cree land has been claimed by strangers in tall ships. Cree land was transferred from kings to princes without the

consultation of the Cree people. Land was designated from federal government to provincial governments without the consultation of the Cree people.

In East Maine, at the first meeting of the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec, they look to the young chief from Waskaganish, Chief Billy Diamond, to lead them. Their vision and their mission in 1975 was to take back the social injustice that has taken place to the Cree people.

Today we are a proud nation; we are a strong nation, able to face whatever challenges that may confront us. We have nothing to fear but fear itself. We have, over the last 36 years, incrementally built up this Cree Nation. And we put into place our systems for health, our systems for education, our systems for policing and justice. We have also built systems that will ensure we play a role, a big role, in how development will take place in our territory, Eeyou Istchee.

I am in support of allowing Strateco Resources the licence to proceed with further advanced exploration on the Matoush Project. I believe in resource development in our territory, Eeyou Istchee, so long as we have a say on how development will take place; so long as we have a role in the monitoring processes of resource development, we must put our systems to the test. Our

Cree mining policy, Sections 24 of the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement, deals with processes for environmental protection in our territory, Eeyou Istchee.

I'm sorry once again.

Uranium mining today is the most regulated in the mining industry. There are nuclear watchdogs that are empowered to shut down exploration works, mining operations, if they see regulations and safety nets, networks en-breached.

In 1995, as chief of this nation, the Cree Nation of Mistissini, I was asked to be a keynote speaker at a mining conference in Yellowknife. We had just signed the Troilus Agreement. This mining conference was a major one in which the mining industry was ready to start working with Aboriginal communities in the development of mining of natural resources on their territories.

I knew, as the keynote speaker, I had to help First Nations bring home the benefits from resource development on their territories. I am proud of First Nations. Whenever I hear an impact benefit agreement had been signed, this helps the First Nations break away from dependence from the federal government and to begin to live lives from poverty to sovereignty on their territories.

I brought along with me a young man to

witness that conference. And I'm very glad to say that that young man was hooked in the industry, in the mining industry. And today, he works as a blaster for Eureka at the Osisko Mines in Malartic.

We have to take hold of the business opportunities that present themselves because if we don't, someone else will. There will be economic development spinoffs from these industries on our territory. And I believe we can benefit from these spinoffs.

I had a dream, and in my dream I saw young Cree people, well groomed, and well presented in their buckskins. I saw them in their well-to-do communities, driving new vehicles, respected by their neighbours to the south.

I believe we can do this. We have nothing to fear but fear it self.

Thank you/Mîkwêc.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Thank you very much.

Anybody, questions?

Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you for your presentation.

Could you elaborate on the nature of the

benefits for your nation that could come from that project?

MR. W. MIANSCUM: Well, the benefits I'm talking about the economic benefits mainly. We have all kinds of social problems in our communities. We need to build up our young people. And I believe, and I sincerely believe, that economic development is the way to go. I think we need to build up our communities. We need to build up the finances of our people. We need to fill up -- to build up the finances of our communities.

We can no longer depend on government handouts. I believe that that is no longer the way to go. We need to move forward. We need to grab hold of the opportunities that are presented. Those are the benefits that I'm talking about.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

We heard yesterday that the project could have impacts on hunting, trapping, harvesting, fishing. So what do you think about that?

MR. W. MIANSCUM: I am a hunter; I am a fisher. I am learning to trap. There's a bear in my freezer that I brought home last night. We will dress that bear this morning after my presentation.

I believe that the rights of the people are there, they are protected, their harvesting rights. And

protected as well in the Constitution. We are a blessed Nation; we are free to choose; we are free to choose traditionally off the land; we are free to chose and live, you know, as society lives, western society. We take on jobs; we take on the wage economy. We are a proud Nation.

MEMBER HARVEY: Saying that -- we saw yesterday there's a large portion of your community against the project. Being for the project, how do you feel about that?

MR. W. MIANSCUM: I respect their opinions. I mean -- we -- I honour the enthusiasm presented by our young people of today and I would like to say that stand-up -- continue to stand-up for those rights.

But I would also like to ask you, the young people, to respect as well the rights of those, you know, that walk that talk and speak, you know, for economic development, for non-reliance of government handouts.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you Mr. Mianscum.

MR. W. MIANSCUM: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

No?

MR. B. FIELDER: Can I just ask a question.

Have you considered talking to some of the Indian Nations in northern Saskatchewan that have been living with exploration and development for 30 years?

MR. W. MIANSCUM: I have -- we had the opportunity to go on a trip just before Goose Break, but unfortunately that did not happen. I am looking forward to touching base with those in northern Saskatchewan and exchange -- and take on their experience. What they have to say about, you know, what has been happening on their territory, what happened to them as a people when these uranium mines started up, I'm looking forward to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I have only one question.

Did you -- you have obviously -- you're a senior -- boy, I'm not using the right title -- well-respected person in the community, did you try to go to Strateco and cut this benefit deal that you're talking about?

MR. W. MIANSCUM: I -- we have to honour the processes that are in place. I mean this hearing is part of the process and I believe if we move further with this, the next step would be to sit down with the Proponent. And the process says that we can do that, that we will do that. Just wait for the process to happen and we'll move on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

MR. W. MIANSCUM: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We're trying to adjust the agenda to the availability of people. So I understand that the next submission is an oral presentation for Ms. Rachel MacLeod as outlined in CMD 7.39.

Ms. MacLeod, the floor is yours.

12-H7.39

Oral presentation by

Rachel MacLeod

MS. R. MacLEOD: Thank you. Good morning/(In Cree). My name is Rachel MacLeod and I am a member of the Cree Nation of Mistissini.

I am a mother of four and I speak here on behalf -- on their behalf, and I stand here against uranium. I have lived in my community all my life but had the opportunity down south for about five years. But home is really where the heart is.

My son is eight years old and last year, we celebrated his first kill on Goose Break. Goose Break happens in the spring when the geese fly here from the south. And 10 to 20 years from now, will we be celebrating our grandchildren or great-grandchildren's first kill? Will we be able to go off into the bush for our annual goose hunt or moose hunt? Will it be safe?

Today our Elders still live off from the land and go off into the bush for several months where they hunt bear, moose or fish. They teach us of who we are as Cree people. Will we be able to teach our children or grandchildren?

If a uranium mine is started up here near our community, it will almost only have serious long lasting negative repercussions far beyond the immediate mine site. We will not be safe. The high risks of exposure to depleted uranium or radioactive waste have several effects: increase risk of birth defects, lung cancer, kidney failures, respiratory problems.

Look around you, our community is not advanced as it is in the city to treat people with health problems or defects. Our closest advanced medical resource institution is Montreal. With the possible birth defects that could be exposed to our children, we are not equipped to care our children with severe special needs.

Uranium poses a major environmental health threat throughout the region. What makes this uranium mine any safer compared to any other uranium mines? No uranium mine is a safe mine. Uranium can cause reproductive defects in animals. What will happen to the animals we hunt seasonally, the moose, caribou, beaver, bear and the fish?

The land, the bush, is our medicine. We go off into the bush to find ourselves, to find peace, comfort. It is our identity. Our grandparents and great-grandparents lived off from the land. We Crees value and respect our land, a land that is rich with culture and heritage that only we Crees can only understand.

Hydro has caused so much environmental damage in Cree land, therefore our hunting grounds on the verge of being wiped off if this uranium goes through.

How will we explain to our children if our land is contaminated and destroyed that they won't be able to hunt and practice Cree life? What can we say to them?

In response to the man from Saskatchewan yesterday regarding Saskatchewan uranium mines, I was going to read a bit about a newspaper article I found.

"Saskatchewan uranium mines create toxic legacy. The community where the conference took place is situated in the heartland of uranium production in Saskatchewan. As of 2007, Canada accounted 23 percent of world uranium production. There are many health concerns related to uranium mining, both for minors and for people living in communities where mining is

occurring. The community of Wollaston Lake, where the keepers for conference was held, experience a uranium tailings contamination of Wollaston Lake. Uranium is soluble in water. Uranium emits radiation until it stabilizes as lead in 4.5 billion years. Radon gas is a by-product of uranium. The World Health Organization names radon as the second leading cause of lung cancer after smoking. Unlike most developed countries, Canada has no national program to deal with contaminated sites. Abandoned mines and tailing ponds create toxic nightmares contaminating rivers, lakes, and surrounding lands. Local communities are left with toxic legacy. A 2001 report, Toxi-Canada by Mine Watch and Sierra Canada."

There are legal levels of radiation that people may be exposed to. However, scientific research has found that there are no safe levels of radiation. Radiation contaminated fish are not accepted for

commercial sale. So there is concern across northern Saskatchewan that uranium contamination from tailing sites may destroy the commercial fisheries.

In addition to fish and water contamination, there is concern about displacement of caribou through linear disturbance from mining development.

The Dene and Cree people of Northern Saskatchewan rely upon fish and caribou for their survival.

In the Navajo Nation, many homes are contaminated with uranium. Either the tenant was asked to leave their home or had to rebuild a new home. Will we be facing a crisis such as the Navajos? In the Navajo Nation, 155 miners worked in a uranium mine. A hundred and thirty-three (133) of them died within 10 years after working in a uranium mine from lung cancer caused by exposure to radon daughters or radon gas.

When we met on May 23 with Strateco, I asked what radon gas is. And to my understanding, radon gas is everywhere in our homes, buildings, but I did not ask the right question. The question I was referring to; what are radon daughters? When miners dig uranium, they inevitably release large quantities of radioactive radon gas in the mine atmosphere. The air in the mine is

heavily contaminated with what is called "radon daughters," microscopic dust particles which increases the cause of lung cancer. Not even a mask can protect you from breathing into this toxic poison.

I found that the responses from Strateco were technical and too scientific, that it was hard for me and my people to understand.

Money does not last but our children's future should. Is Quebec willing to spend millions of dollars to relocate our people in case there is an exposure or a spill that could contaminate our community and lake? What is the possibility of having a meltdown and what will be the radius?

Exposure to uranium in drinking water may cause toxic effects to the kidney and other health concerns. Water is extensively used to contain airborne dust in uranium mining. And the plans for the mine site, the pit, and campsite beside our freshwater lake.

The risks of a spill in our lake are increasingly high, and it is a concern. We hold the biggest freshwater lake in Quebec. We have tourists come in from all over just to explore and tour on our lake and expect to catch a nice big lake trout.

Our community has developed to a modern society. Businesses have bloomed. Buildings have

developed. We are proud of our community and of who we are as Cree people. And we still mark our land as Cree territory, and it is ours to claim. We will not be remembered as the people that sold off their land. We will be remembered as the people who fought for their land.

With this uranium exploration money project, it will take away our land, our traditions, our culture by poisoning our lakes and environment and also our health.

Other Aboriginal nations throughout the country say we are lucky to have our language and culture. Will we be lucky in 10 to 20 years from now?

This is our home, our land, our future, and we are not going anywhere. I believe that some of the people that spoke up are in conflict of interest because they are working for Strateco or has a contract with Strateco. We are here to convince CNSC that we don't want uranium in our land. No uranium mine is a safe mine.

We our mother tongue, we translate uranium in Cree; it's called Gamiya cheechnee(phonetic). In Cree it means the rock of sickness. And it was our wise Elders that came up with that name.

And I say "no" to uranium exploration mining in Eeyou Istchee.

Migwech. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you. I'd like to address a technical question first and then a second question.

You asked if there was a risk of criticality. Were you referring to the exploration line or in your community or more generally?

MS. R. MacLEOD: Generally, like within the site and then ---

MEMBER McDILL: Within the site, okay. So I'm going to ask staff to address that immediately.

MS. R. MacLEOD: Okay.

MEMBER McDILL: Because I think that's ---

MS. R. MacLEOD: Our lakes in our community, like, will it ---

MEMBER McDILL: Sorry?

MS. R. MacLEOD: Could it affect our community if there is a spill?

MEMBER McDILL: I'll ask staff first to talk about -- because I think it's a fear that needs to be addressed immediately about any potential risk of criticality from the exploration or if it were to go further to a mine.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal for the record.

There are no issues, no risk. It's humanly impossible, chemically impossible against nature. There is no criticality. There is no meltdown. There is no reactivity. There is no nuclear reaction or fission reaction.

I'm sorry I have to use technical terms. But if you -- these -- yesterday, we were talking about atoms, but if you take these rocks, even the refined substance, there is no criticality, there is no meltdown, there is no nuclear reaction.

MEMBER McDILL: Is that an acceptable answer for you? Do you understand? I don't mean to be insulting. Is that an acceptable answer?

MS. R. MacLEOD: I'll just read something that I found on the Internet:

"The radioactive fallout that was released in the atmosphere traveled over an extensive geographical area and had spread all over through Western Europe."

This was April 26, 1986.

"It spread out through western Europe in just a span of one week. The effect of this disaster was nuclear

rain contamination in large areas. Many animals died and the few remaining saw thyroid and reproductive problems, large-scale loss of life and lifestyle. About 336,000 people were evacuated and resettled due to this tragedy."

MEMBER McDILL: Okay, that was Chernobyl.

MS. R. MacLEOD: And the other one is a spill, a nuclear spill:

"An accident in 2005, which was categorized as Scale 3 because of a serious leak in radioactive inventory that went unnoticed over several months."

MEMBER McDILL: Did you say seventy -- what year?

MS. R. MacLEOD: This is 2005:

"The radioactive inventory that went unnoticed over several months. The leak that first started in July 2004 was only detected on the 9th of May 2005."

MEMBER McDILL: It's hard to know what that is, but my question to staff was with respect to the risk

of a nuclear reaction occurring in this community, which I thought was the question you were asking.

MS. R. MacLEOD: I guess my question is, what are the possibilities?

MEMBER McDILL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can we get to real clarity. We are not talking -- we're talking about uranium mine and you're talking about a nuclear spill of a nuclear plant. Is that what we are talking about?

So you are now talking about -- not about the nuclear, you're talking about a nuclear plant rather than a nuclear -- or a uranium mine.

MS. R. MacLEOD: Uranium ---

THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to talk about uranium mine, ---

MS. R. MacLEOD: Uranium, yes. Uranium.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're talking about uranium mine and what can happen about uranium. So you are now -- I just want to make sure that we understand what we are talking about.

MS. R. MacLEOD: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: So the spills and the radiation was not from a mine.

MS. R. MacLEOD: Okay. Okay. On the Internet, there are a lot of horror stories about uranium,

okay?

THE CHAIRMAN: There's a lot of stuff on the Internet.

MS. R. MacLEOD: There was another one in Pennsylvania:

"Water worries continue to flow around uranium controversy. Heller explains that one large or several small spills would significantly change the predicted environmental and economic outcomes."

You know, it is possible.

MEMBER McDILL: It's definitely clear that there are worrisome concerns. You have them and your community has them.

Maybe I can try a different question.

MS. R. MACLEOD: I would like to read another article I found about Strateco, okay?

MEMBER McDILL: Can I try this question first and then we'll do yours?

MS. R. MACLEOD: Okay.

MEMBER McDILL: Do you believe within your community there is a real stress reaction, an emotional gut-level concern that has the potential to, I don't know, affect the mental health of the community? I'll try and

say it that way. Because this is something we've heard from several sources, and we see sitting in front of us. Obviously this causes you enough concern to come forward and speak, and it has done the same for other members of the community.

Do you think that there is a real risk to the emotional well-being of your community?

MS. R. MACLEOD: Yes. Yes, because we still live off the land and we still practise our Cree life.

MEMBER MCDILL: That was the question, and I've got several answers, which is good.

The internet is full of very good information and some quite dreadful information.

MS. R. MACLEOD: Too many, too much.

MEMBER MCDILL: And it makes it extremely difficult to find one's way through sometimes. And it doesn't have to be about uranium. It can be about the risk of cockroaches or bees, or any number of things.

What is the major health concern in your community right now?

MS. R. MACLEOD: I believe it's ---

MEMBER MCDILL: Other than this.

MS. R. MACLEOD: --- diabetes.

MEMBER MCDILL: Diabetes.

And is there a lot of smoking in the youth?
Is there a risk of lung cancer in the youth from smoking?

MS. R. MACLEOD: Lung cancer, I think it's low.

MEMBER MCDILL: Maybe when the Health Board comes forward I can ask this question.

Okay. You said you wanted to read something?

MS. R. MACLEOD: Well, going back to my question about radon gas -- and again, you know, I found this on the internet, that they say that not even a mask -- like, the most advanced mask can protect you from this.

So how can our miners be protected from the radon gas or the radon daughters?

MEMBER MCDILL: Let me direct that to staff and Strateco can answer also with respect to radon progeny -- radon daughters and sons, if you like?

MR. JAMMAL: It's Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

We're going to give you -- Dr. McDill, it's very evident that we have to present information for the community, and the reason I'm saying this as the answer is going to be given by two individuals, Mr. Jean Leclair and Dr. Patsy Thompson.

Mr. Jean Leclair is going to speak of the

miners' functionality in the mine and the protection and Dr. Thompson will talk about the radon itself.

MR. J. LECLAIR: So I think the first thing is maybe to talk about -- because we're hearing about radon, radon daughters, radon progeny, half lives is 2.3 days and half a day, and times and how long it's going to be there, and can it be filtered, can it not be filtered. And that's part of the difficulty when we're trying to talk about things like radon.

So when mention is made of polonium-210 and lead-210, when we actually talk about controlling radon, the real reason why we're controlling radon is for the polonium-210 and the lead-210. That really is the elements that present the high risk from a health point of view.

So we tend to try to simplify it, and sometimes that's oversimplification when we start talking about radon. And then people hear about radon daughters and they go, "Well, what about the radon daughters?"

So that's the first part of the difficulty in communications. When we talk about controlling radon, we really are, at the same time, controlling the concentration of radon daughters.

So when we talk about Health Canada's Guidelines for 200 becquerels of cubic metres in your

home, really they're talking about radon and the radon daughters, and they try to present it in a way that's simpler for people to generally understand, but sometimes that doesn't quite work out as well.

So if we come back to the mine, the main way we control exposure to miners and workers underground is to ensure there's enough fresh air in the mine so that when the radon comes out from the rock, that that radon can be removed from the mine so the concentration in the mine doesn't get too high.

So it's all about providing fresh air. So when we look at a mine and we look at how a mine is operated, we spend a lot of time looking at how they ventilate the mine, how they make sure that there's good ventilation, that air is moving through the mine to make sure that the amount of radon that's in the mine doesn't get too high.

So that's the whole idea.

In fact, in our radiation protection approach we actually don't want a work environment where workers have to wear masks in order to protect themselves. We avoid that. We don't want workers to have to work in an environment where they would have to wear a mask all day to protect themselves.

So when we look at ventilation in a mine,

we actually make sure that there's enough ventilation in that mine so they won't have to wear masks and they won't have to wear equipment.

Yes, there are certain situations that may arise where they may need to use masks, and we know when those are and we control that.

But the main issue for radon -- and again coming back to that, radon and radon daughters -- is trying to keep the concentration in the mine low, and we do that through proper ventilation, ventilation controls.

I'll now pass it over to Dr. Thompson who can speak a little bit more about the health effects.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Before I talk about the health effects, just to add to what Mr. Leclair has just said, for people who were here yesterday when Strateco made their presentation, there was one slide they used where they had radiation monitors, and one of those monitors was a monitor for radon progeny.

And the way the programs are designed is with the ventilation and those instruments to monitor, we know exactly how much radon people are potentially exposed to. So every worker has the information on exposures to radon, and that's very, very tightly controlled.

We have a lot of information about the health effects of radon and the radon particles, the decay particles, because workers in the thirties, forties, and fifties were exposed to high levels of radon.

It's the same type of approach with what we know about smoking now. Many, many decades ago, people smoked and didn't know it caused cancer. Now we know better and we have public health programs in place.

So the nuclear regulators and the public health agencies did the same thing for uranium miners. When we had information about the effects on lung cancer of radon, people took measures to understand, to make sure that this would not happen again.

And in Canada and every other country where uranium mining is in place, radon is really well controlled. And we know in Canada from the scientific studies that have been done, not only by the CNSC staff but by other agencies, that the radon that mine workers are exposed to from the seventies, eighties, nineties and today are so low that it's not a risk of lung cancer.

But it is a risk that existed. We have the information and we've acted on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we've got to move on. Time is really our enemy here.

MS. R. MACLEOD: I just have one question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry?

MS. R. MACLEOD: I have one question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MS. R. MACLEOD: How poisonous is polonious (sic), or is it polodium (sic)?

MR. JAMMAL: It's Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

Just before I pass it on to Dr. Thompson, I know we're pressed for time, but the intervenor is a very knowledgeable person and we owe it that we give her information, and we will be more than happy to share with her the Saskatchewan Health Report that is really looking at the social benefit factor, the effect of uranium mine for northern Saskatchewan. So I will be more than happy to provide her with the information and we can link it to her. So we owe it to her to give her such information.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought this information is already available on the web?

MR. JAMMAL: It's already available on the web. We can assist in providing the link if we are asked to do so.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

So in terms of the health effects of polonium, as we said we control radon to control polonium and the other decay products. We know from many studies

that polonium is naturally occurring. It is present in very large concentrations in lichens, for example, and caribou.

And we also knew that caribou herds have been exposed to this ever since caribou have been on this earth. And they are healthy; there are no health effects. Inuits have been eating caribou with very high concentrations of polonium 210 forever; not related to uranium mining, but just naturally because there's a lot of radon in the atmosphere naturally. And there is -- has not been any health effects from eating caribou that have fairly high concentrations of polonium 210.

We also know that polonium 210 around uranium mines in animals and fish are not measurable. The concentrations are just too small.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

We have to stop it here and move on to the next presentation. C'est par madame Éline Hébert qui est indiquée au document H7.25. Alors Madame Hébert, la parole est à vous.

12-H7.25

Exposé oral par

Éline Hébert

Mme É. HÉBERT: Merci monsieur. Alors bonjour tout le monde. Thank you President.

I would like to salute the band council, if he's here, Members of the Board, Commissaries, and the people of Mistissini.

My name is Élane Hébert, I have been a teacher here at VMS for four years. I would like to speak first as a member of the Mistsini (phon.) coalition. The coalition has gathered more than 200 signatures of mostly Cree people from Mistissini and other Cree communities. This paper petition is asking for a complete ban on uranium exploration and exploitation in Eeyou Istchee. This petition can eventually be deposited at the National Assembly if need be.

I would like to mention that members of the ENQ, that's the union I'm part of, have voted at more than 85 percent against this project and that unions like the CSQ, and the provincial government employee's union, the SFPQ, also support the position of Québec Meilleure Mine, namely uranium mining and exploration and the closer fizzing out of Gentilly nuclear reactor.

Now, I would like to talk in my own name. After reading the document CMD-12, demand for permit to prepare and construct a uranium mine, I would like to

raise some questions as to the CNSC recommendations, or the personnel of it, regarding Strateco's management plan and regarding the economic and environmental politics at play here at all levels of government.

My first question was about the fact that there was no amount that was under nuclear liability on the point 2.2, other matters of regulatory interest. Now, I understand that this would maybe only affect if it would be either truly a mine or maybe a nuclear reactor.

On the other hand, I was wondering how much is evaluated the risk of an environmental accident in dollars? How contaminated are the Saskatchewan lands? And what are the projected costs of decommissioning all these abandoned and active mines in that province? Because I do not believe that there is one mine that has received a paper saying that it is totally decommissioned.

Now,

"Which solution established by expert
..."

And this is in your document.

"... in exploration, exploitation, and transformation of uranium in yellow cake, Strateco is slowly elaborating a management plan to prepare and construct a mine. In short, the CNSC

adapts the surveillance process for the enterprise, supports this enterprise, guides it and lobbies for the nuclear industry by coming here to demystify uranium and dissipate the so-called worries of the population about contamination and irradiation."

It seems that the personnel of the Commission, I will summarize as Commission, is very happy with Strateco's work. Not only does the Commission leave to Strateco the benefit of establishing its management plan, but, above all:

"To establish and collect the data concerning the surface and underground waters and the control of the radioactivity levels."

Previously, in his answer to the 90 question, Strateco stated 12 times that it would answer certain questions only if the company got the licence to advance exploration, build the mine. This is exactly what the Commission is offering Strateco.

My second point is about neebee, and neebee is water in Cree, and the laws that protect it. Are the water studies done in regards of the law that protect drinking water? Will they be done according to the new

law proposed by the NDDEP to protect drinking water? Stratégie de protection et de conservation de source destinée à l'alimentation en eau potable. Aren't the Registre d'acquisition des connaissances and the OBV, watershed organization, legally qualified to do such study that will be used by the Quebec government to verify and protect the quality of drinking water? Are Strateco water studies admissible in the case of the installation of a nuclear facility, a.k.a., the baby mine?

I know that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission personnel is reassured, but could the compromise that is granted here by the federal administration and the Commission substitute itself to the environmental duty of the provincial government? This provincial duty is to protect citizens, the water that so called belongs to Quebec, and even more so, Lake Mistissini which belongs to the cultural heritage of the Cree.

Enoch have been here for over 6,000 years. They know the region, its health, its generosity, and its fragility. Contrary to Maasu, who killed the Kâchâmishikunich, we cannot recreate the world, but only protect it. How can we believe in nuclear sites decommission when not even one mine has been totally decommissioned in Saskatchewan.

In the case of Matoush, what can be said about the radioactivity level measurement of the "stériles" that's coming out of the mine? Each truckload will be checked for the level of radiation and visual inspection will help determine where these loads will be dumped and how they will be used.

(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead please.

Mme É. HÉBERT: Yeah, that's good? Okay so let me rewind a little bit here. I don't know if you heard that part.

Enoch have been here for 6,000 years. They know the region, its health, its generosity and its fragility. Contrary to Maasu who killed the Kâchâmishikunich, we cannot recreate the world, but only protect it. So how can we believe in nuclear sites decommission when not only one mine has been totally decommissioned in Saskatchewan?

In the case of Matoush, what can be said about the radioactivity level measurements of the "stériles" coming out of the mine? Each truckload will be checked for the level of radiation and visual inspection will help -- we wonder how -- determine where these loads will be dumped and how they will be used. The so-called least radioactive one will be used to build roads and

camp.

How many loads will be checked in a day? Where will be stored the 750 tonnes of uranium ore? How does the PPM and the Cr content compare to what is in U.S. and Europe? Which administrative level is allowed in Saskatchewan so that these "stériles" can be used to build a road or a park?

In the piles of "stériles" there is also thorium, radium, lead, bismuth and polonium, all bio available. It has been said over and over -- and you will deny it once again but let's remember that there are no secure method to store "stériles" and tailing. Mass imploding will not protect workers against radon and irradiation. There are no safe level of radiation according to the prestigious National Academy of Science in its BEIR Report, the Biological Effect of Ionizing Radiation.

So why start to feed the nuclear chain in Eeyou Istchee or elsewhere in Quebec? We already have a ton of tailings and other radioactive waste to be dealt with by our children. It represents a huge economic, scientific and logistic problem.

Germany, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland are phasing out all their nuclear reactors and are developing green energy. So we do not have to alleviate France's

uranium needs after it has polluted its own land and did such a poor job in Niger and Gabon.

I would like also to tell the people that last week Germany managed to produce only with their solar panel the equivalent of 22 nuclear reactor in energy. So I wonder what we're waiting for.

The present day bans are threatened by the nuclear industry which is trying to make us believe that we need nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. In La Presse, of December 5th -- you see in annexe in the French version -- it is said that some business men are looking for a nuclear repository in Quebec. Could it be the Matoush underground tunnel?

The same article talks about the surprising links between Serge Genest, the nuclear industry, and the -- MMRNF -- in the person of monsieur Pierre Velpeast, one of the director of the Observatoire de la géosphère de Charlevoix and also director of the Mineral Exploration at the MMRNF.

Serge Genest is president of the Observatoire and president of Omerga Alpha, a company that he sold for 30 million euros to AREVA. Mr. Genest lobbies to be able to explore inside parks and protected area on the first come, first serve basis.

Now, one thing that has shocked me all over

these hearings, the future park -- ATO Park -- is ignored by the CNSC document. It seems that no mention is made of the ATO Park in the document in regards of the cleavage between the Matoush Nuclear Project and the purpose of the park, which is consecrated to the Cree culture and where Tallyman will be able to bring guests or go on with their traditional activities.

How can the CNSC say that no one lives in the area? This is not knowing Cree history and underestimating the deep-seated love that Innus have for their land outside of land categories and treaties.

To go in the bush with parents and grandparents is very important to my students, another reality that is ignored by the COFEX and the CNSC personnel.

Why is it that in 2006 the ATO Park limits were not enlarged as planned? This would probably have protected all of the Témiscamie watershed that feeds the Lake Albanel that feeds the Lac Mistissini.

Following the intervention of Serge Genest in 2006 -- and I think he was lobbying much before that -- so at the hearing in Chibougamau about the park, those limits were not enlarged, this is the year that the Matoush Project started. What justified such a decision for the MDDEP when only 50 percent of this watershed is

protected?

As Mr. Genest had a direct influence on the internal politics of the MDDEP through Mr. Velpeast, Director of Exploration at the MMRNF, there should be a public enquiry about what seems to be undue lobbying and influence in this particular case.

The CNSC says that the four to six trap lines impacted by the project has no habitation. Well you're not supposed to have habitation on Category 3 land unless they are teepees or structures that have no roof.

Anyway, it is not permissible so to do that, but teepees or semi-permanent habitation are permissible. Some people were born there, you know, and lots of people go there to hunt and trap.

Why is it considered that the project will impact four to six trap lines? Why four to six? What about the neighbours, are they rejoicing over that nuclear project close to their trap lines? What of all the medicinal plant, blueberry, bon, et cetera? What can be polluted by polonium and the radon and other radioactive element?

Should we also mention the fact that Benoît Taillon, President of the COFEX, was also working for the mining industry at the time that he was presiding at the COFEX, as he's Director of the Environment for New

Millennium.

While the COFEX remarked that there is a strong opposition to uranium mining and exploration in Quebec, it declared that the discussion should have happened before. Well, before what? Before the politics of Mr. Harper which aim at speeding the environmental process and the delivering of a permit for a nuclear project?

The Matoush Project was cited by the Harper government as one of those projects that took too much time to be evaluated. The Canadian government is bound on limiting the intervention of environmental groups and even the intervention of its own agency, the number going from about 50 to 2, as we know now through the proposed Bill C-38.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission only obeys the economic politics of the Harper government and takes refuge behind a technical role. Shouldn't we be surprised when important questions about safety, radioprotection and water studies are not yet answered by Strateco?

This company has yet to establish its future management plan, it already answered a federal administrator that it would give those answer only if it obtains the licence. This is exactly what the Commission

personnel is allowing Strateco to do.

With the help of some specialists in exploration, exploitation and transformation, Strateco is given more time to give the answers about the most important issues concerning that project and to build its management plan.

Now, consultation with Aboriginal people. I think that everybody -- I, myself, am very interested by the project and I couldn't come last time -- there was parents' night -- and it seems that there was this secret communication and information agreement; this is really, to me, a contradiction in term.

Anyhow, the CNSC consider that all necessary steps have been taken. What about the will of the population of Mistissini and Quebec? The population of Mistissini said no. The COFEX heard it loud and clear in November 2010.

Why this disrespect of the population opposition to the project? Was Strateco not supposed to come to inform about people other than those four to six tallyman? I thought that Strateco came four times but actually it came -- he came -- the company came only twice this spring. Meetings are set at hours when people work and let's remember that Strateco publicly lied about the acceptance of the project in local and international media

--I'm referring here to Mr. Cornis.

With a growing population, chances are that the trap line will be used more often by the families of Mistissini and that the number of person making a living out of trapping will grow larger.

My conclusion: Where is the traditional responsibility of the Tallyman, the first protectors of animal, if the same Tallyman accept that a nuclear project be developed on their traditional land?

Should the workers and the environment be contaminated and irradiated to favour an industry that we do not need or want? Why should we feel the nuclear chain and the tremendous cost associated to it?

Let's protect the territory with a truly democratic consultation of the Native and non-Native population of Quebec. Let the population decide if we want ---

--- Upon recessing at 10:15 a.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 10h15

--- Upon resuming at 10:38 a.m./

L'audience est reprise à 10h38

M. LEBLANC: On cherche Madame Hébert, qu'elle puisse -- o.k. Merci.

(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

THE CHAIRMAN: While we're waiting, Dr. Barriault, can anybody tell us what the status of this particular individual?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I'm sorry; he's going to be okay. It's confidential medical information, so I can't reveal any of that, but I think you all know he's had some kind of a seizure and he should be okay. That's about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Let's hope so, and maybe we'll get an update later on.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

M. LEBLANC: Merci, Madame Hébert.

Vous en étiez à votre conclusion et ensuite il y aura une période de questions. Je pense qu'il ne vous en restait pas beaucoup.

On a tous été affectés.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure that nothing that you said ---

M. LEBLANC: Votre micro, s'il vous plaît.

Mme E. HÉBERT: Merci, Monsieur.

Yes, so my conclusion, if I may repeat what I said? So where is the traditional responsibility of the Tallyman, the first protectors of animals, if these same Tallyman accept that a nuclear project be developed on

their traditional land.

Should the worker and the environment be contaminated for an industry that we do not need or want, then why should we feed the nuclear chain and the tremendous costs associated to it?

So let's protect the territory with a truly democratic consultation of Native and non-Native populations of Quebec. Let the population decide if we want to develop nuclear energy and uranium exploitation and exploration or encourage a sustainable future based on renewable energy.

Thank you. Meegwetch.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Merci, Madame Hébert.

Questions? Questions, Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Maybe.

Well, you put on the table, Madame Hébert

Mme E. HÉBERT: Pouvez-vous parler plus fort? Je suis un petit peu sourde.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Oui. Est-ce que vous m'entendez?

Mme E. HÉBERT: Oui, ça va.

MEMBER HARVEY: You put on the table -- you touched many subjects in your presentation, certain very specific to the project; others on a larger scale.

So it's difficult to put some priorities and give answers to that point.

Even I don't know if you want to have answers to a certain number of points, because you mention right at the beginning that the CNSC was here to promote uranium. So I suppose you won't believe certain answers.

Anyway, I will just go to the staff and maybe they took some notes and they would like to make some comments to your presentation.

MS. E. HÉBERT: Yes, sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: The one comment, if I may jump in, again, there was a statement about no decommissioned mines in Saskatchewan.

Now, if I recall, I thought there were a couple of them that in fact were given over to the Saskatchewan government to manage.

Can you say something about those and the costs?

MR. JAMMAL: It's Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

Before I pass it to my colleagues, to answer Mr. Harvey's question, I was a bit struck by the comment on the transport with respect to monitoring each truckload. I would like to clarify one thing, that the uranium or yellowcake, or even any substance cannot be

just loaded on a truck and then moved around.

So there is a transport requirement that is in place, and it's regulated by the CNSC and Transport Canada where the transporter must obtain a transport licence, must obtain approval for the container that will be used for the housing of the material, and all those require safety verifications. So there is a whole system of regulatory requirements with respect to transport.

I will pass it on to Dr. -- or actually Jean Leclair to talk about the decommissioning of the mines. We have quite an extensive experience in Saskatchewan with respect to the decommissioning of mines.

When we say mines, it's some of the parts of the mines have been released from the CNSC control to provincial authorities and -- when they are no longer require oversight by the CNSC.

But I will pass it on to Mr. Leclair to give any specific examples.

MS. E. HÉBERT: Excuse me, if I may interrupt? I was talking about the 750 tonnes of mineralized rock that Strateco wants to put, I don't know, a pantry maybe in the mine, how it's going to be dealt also with the rock, the "stériles" themselves; that is, a special sterile at the not-so-special sterile. There is a certain amount of PPM that is related to that, and I would

like to know what is the administrative level that is admitted for the building of roads and maybe whatever parks with those sterile that are not the special sterile, and what is the PPM?

M. JAMMAL: J'ai juste une chose à clarifier, si vous permettez, Monsieur le Président. C'est une question de traduction.

Our intervenor is talking about "stériles", which mean waste in translation.

MS. E. HÉBERT: Waste rock, yeah, waste rock.

MR. J. LECLAIR: So I'll answer those first two parts.

So first is the 750 tonnes of uranium ore that was mentioned, which is mineralized rock.

Strateco's proposal is to keep the material underground. That's our expectation as well. So it won't be coming up to surface. So they will be excavating it underground and keeping it underground so it won't be brought up to surface.

With regards to the waste rock, the cut-off that's set is 0.03 percent. When they were talking about looking at the rock, it's that they can also understand the rock -- a geologist, someone who looks at rocks, can understand the rocks themselves. So there's a combination

of measurements that can be done, as well as actually looking at it itself to understand the conditions of the rocks.

I'm not a geologist. I can't ---

MS. E. HÉBERT: Neither am I.

MR. J. LECLAIR: --- speak in details with regards to how that -- but that's a geologist.

So those are the two aspects.

The thing with the waste rock, and when the discussion is about the clean rock, is that the rock that's mined out near the surface is just like if you were mining out rock to build a road. It's not the rock near the surface that has a lot of uranium in it. If it did, then that would -- that might be the case, but in this case, that's not what's happening.

If you look at Strateco's submission, it shows where the actual uranium ore is and there's a whole portion of it that's rock. It's the rock that's around it that's clean. That rock, we want them to not just mine out -- if the rock is clean, we don't want them to just pile it somewhere and then start building roads with other rocks from someone else, because if they do that, then they have to go out and dig out more areas and disturb more area.

So this is the idea of recycling or re-use

of the waste rock. So the idea of the clean rock is to encourage, in fact, that they use that material for roadbed. It's not meant that they're going to take the rocks and ship it down somewhere and build -- no, no, I just want to make sure, for everyone's benefit, because I think you had mentioned using it in parks.

MS. E. HÉBERT: It has been done in France. It has been done heavily in France.

MR. J. LECLAIR: Okay. Well, I won't speak for what's happening in France. I'll speak for what's happening in Canada.

The waste rock is to be utilized on the site for material for road construction. And again, the idea is if the rock is clean, make use of it instead of going out and excavating other rocks somewhere else to build the roads that you need on the site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. JAMMAL: Mr. President, let me clarify one thing here. We're talking technical terms. I want to clarify in mining terminology, the waste rock is a clean rock that is any rock you pick up from the surface. And this is a mining terminology called the waste rock because you've moved it from its area. So even though it's labelled a waste rock, there is nothing "waste" about it. There is no contamination. There's nothing.

Naturally, a natural rock -- and this is what we need to clarify now -- we're going by a technical term called a waste rock when in fact it is no more, no less, than just any rock off the surface. In the mining terminology, it's being referred to as a waste rock. I want to clarify that.

Mme E. Hébert: Excuse me sir, we were talking translation here, you said that waste rock were also called "stériles" in French. Now, we're talking about "stériles" and "stériles spéciaux." So "stériles spéciaux," I assume they are slightly radioactive, if I may say?

MR. JAMMAL: "Stériles" -- again it's, the discussions we're having about the rocks, the waste rock and the mining terminology. And any rock will have minerals in it at a very small percentage. And that's why there was that label of waste rock because it's 0.00 -- I mean, it's a fraction; it's a fraction, but it's naturally occurring. So we can determine what it is. And the PPM is extremely -- no different than background. But since it's been disturbed, so the analysis was done to really ensure and assure it is a "waste rock."

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay ---

Mme E. HÉBERT: Excuse me, you haven't answered whether sterile equals -- stériles en français

equals waste rock. Can you confirm that, madame, maybe madame?

MR. J. LECLAIR: So I'll say both in French and English.

Mme E. HÉBERT: Oui, s'il vous plaît.

MR. J. LECLAIR: So stériles, les stériles spéciaux, tu as dit les deux. Fait que c'est deux différentes formes de stériles. Fait qu'en anglais, waste rock, special waste rock. Yeah, so the waste rock is what we call the clean rock that you can use to do road bed material. And they do that at any mine. That's not unique to uranium mining. You use the waste rock to road bed and things like that.

Special waste is the waste that needs to be handled carefully. Again, you have special waste in any mine, again. It's not a thing that's unique to uranium mining. Special waste are rocks that need to be handled carefully because there's different properties in the rock that can make -- if it's not properly managed, that can be a problem.

In the case of the Matoush Project, so if we come back to the project, in this case the special waste rock, the rock that needs to be handled carefully, what Strateco's proposed is they will keep it on surface on a lined pad to contain the rock. At the end of the

project, on the basis of what they're proposing from a decommissioning perspective, what's in the preliminary decommissioning plan, that special waste rock would go back into the mine after the -- at the end of the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thanks, I think we got the essence of this. Anything else?

Thank you, thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: The next submission is an oral presentation by the Cree Health Board, Public Health Department as outlined CMD 7.34. And I understand that Jason Coonishish will make the presentation.

Please proceed.

12-H7.34

Oral Presentation by

Cree Health Board,

Public Health Department

MR. J. COONISHISH: (Interpreted from Cree)
I'm going to speak in Cree -- in English so you can all understand.

The Matoush Project determining the health and social impacts. Today we are discussing the specific Matoush Project, which has already been covered by other

presentations during this hearing. Instead, I want to focus on what would be an appropriate process for determining the potential impacts on human health from the project like this.

We, the Eeyou in Northern Quebec, have used this land and its resources in a productive and sustainable way from time immemorial. Unlike the rest of Quebec, we are a rapidly growing population, and this will continue into the future. We are dealing with issues of low levels of education and high unemployment, especially among youths. Which in turn link to poverty and social and health issues. However, we Eeyou in Eeyou Istchee provides us with many protective factors and it's from here we find our strength as families, communities, and the nation.

For Eeyou, spending time out on land hunting, fishing, and living in the bush camp is a way of wellbeing. According to the James Bay Agreement, the development should be compatible with the Cree way of life. Our experience of development until today has not been as good as we hoped. The last experience is what we have relate to, but it was not good enough. And you will have to do much better. Can you ensure that this project will be compatible to the Cree way of life? How will you do that? And what is the company planning to make sure it

is acceptable?

Potential impacts on human health -- now I want to turn to look at the potential impacts on human health. From large scale development projects, we all know that some will benefit from the positive impacts and others will suffer harm from negative impacts. Therefore, our goal must be to maximize the potential health and social benefits, minimize potential harms and ensure that the distribution of benefits and harms within the -- between the population is fair.

From other development projects on the lands of Aboriginal people in subarctic, we know that the actual impacts on employment are small but often have unexpected negative impacts. Projects are often associated with an increase of social and health problems in small communities. Health and social services often become overwhelmed.

Environmental and social impact assessment processes do not sufficiently identify nor effectively address important health and social impacts relating to economic development. Past experience in the region has shown that the consideration of health and social impacts as part of this process has been very weak at best, at times non-existent. It is therefore necessary to put in place a more effective process for examining the potential

health and social impacts of the economic development projects in more explicit, comprehensive, and systematic way.

We propose the following approach. List all who could be affected, determine potential impacts, and make recommendations.

Examples of groups who will potentially be affected by the proposed development project: Eeyou workers working on the development project, Eeyou workers employed by spinoff business, the families of Eeyou workers, hunters and their families who use the land near the project, communities downstream from the project site, providers of health and social services, the entire Cree Nation, the animals, the fish, the land, and the water.

For each group, we need to answer how will the project impact the factors determining their health and social wellbeing. What will be the impact of this on individual and community health and wellbeing. Will this lead to benefit or harm?

The factors determining the health and wellbeing, and influenced by the proposed development projects, are lifestyle factors; diet, exercising, engaging in safe behaviours at work and at home and at play, absence of harmful behaviours; alcohol, tobacco, drugs, gambling, et cetera, physical environment; air,

water, land, food, housing, et cetera, social environment including cultural and identity; income and education, employment and working conditions, social support and social cohesion, early childhood development, gender, self-determination, traditional way of life, health and social services availability, accessibility, quality, effectiveness, and efficacy.

The economic development project may have impact on physical health, mental health, social health, and spiritual health. It may also result in greater health inequality within the population, between the population, and Quebec overall.

Finally, we need to assess if the benefits to an individual or group outweigh the potential harms. Examples of benefits are improved health, greater prosperity, increased social support, fewer health and social inequalities, et cetera. Examples of harms: Poor health, increased social stressors, deteriorated sense of wellbeing, unable to follow traditional way of life, growing health, social inequalities, contaminated environment, disturbance and desecration of sacred sites.

So we make recommendations to maximize benefits and minimize harm. Each group has to be assessed for its potential benefits and risks, harms. Then overall assessment of this has to be done for each community of

the Cree Nation of Eeyou Istchee.

We have outlined this in more detail of the presentation that we will be submitting.

We must continue to ask who will bear the human cost of economic development in the North? The northern population are already in a disadvantage due to their remote location and suffer considerable health and social inequities as compared to the rest of Quebec.

Profiting from the natural resources and tourism potential in the North at the expense of these northern populations would be unjust, further increase inequities rather than helping those who need it most.

We must continue to ask: Can health and social services cope with these increased demands? Can institutions created through the provisions of the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement, such as the Cree Health Board, have to be examined to see if their mandate and jurisdiction need to be redefined and whether resources available will be adequate to do the additional work that will likely arise from health, social and public health challenges related to the new ongoing development projects in the North.

It is important to minimize the potential risks and maximize the benefits for the Cree communities as a whole.

The decision of the Cree Nation is therefore not whether there will be an impact -- there will be -- but the impact from this project for this generation and for the future generations is sufficiently counterbalanced by the benefits to make this worthwhile.

If the land is not healthy, how can we be?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

I appreciate the scope that you've got already and the holistic approach that you've taken to the development, but for the sake of clarity, really, what we're looking at, as you know, is the licensing of exploration.

Now, if I understand correctly, and CNSC can correct me, before a development is done, there will be an environmental assessment done, and I would assume that a lot of these issues should be raised at that level at that time. I agree that they're very, very important.

But having said that, really, they're more of a quasi-political nature than covered by the CNSC, even though we are responsible for the environment, if you want, in terms of uranium contamination.

So perhaps the CNSC could comment on that?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Doing the environmental assessment for this project has been a challenge because the environmental assessment was done under two different regimes with two sets of requirements, as you know.

The environmental assessment that was done under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement had as a requirement consideration of social impacts as well as environmental impacts.

That environmental assessment was initiated under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement, and at that time, with the information we had from court decisions, an environmental assessment under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* was not required.

And so during that period, CNSC staff acted as technical advisors to the federal environmental assessment committee and the provincial environmental assessment committee and contributed to the development of the guidelines or the "Directives" as people have mentioned.

So during that period we were more sort of providing technical advice on things that are related to the CNSC's mandate, so impacts on the environment, impacts on human health, but from a radiological or contaminant

perspective, and issues with radiation protection.

The assessment done under the COMEX did look at social impacts as well as environmental impacts, and while the project had been started, another court decision was made and the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* came into being for this project, and at that time the CNSC became involved as a responsible authority.

And so as far as we know, the environmental assessment that was done under the COMEX, the federal committee rendered its report. The federal administrator made her decision with recommendations. Some of those recommendations speak to the social aspects.

The CNSC and the Minister of the Environment made decisions under CEAA related to health and environmental impacts, but under our mandate, health impacts are in relation to effects on the environment of the project, such as radioactive contamination, metals, and the things we've been talking about for the last couple of days.

And so within that complexity, the social impacts were under the jurisdiction of the assessments being done under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I -- I'm trying to

understand your position.

So assuming that all those measurements are done during this kind of a project, do you think that the project should proceed if a system is put in place to measure all the things you've measured, or do you think it's not measurable?

MR. J. COONISHISH: It is measurable.

THE CHAIRMAN: So ---

MR. J. COONISHISH: They have to do a systematic process.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco?

MR. G. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert, for the record.

In CIA signed in December, they had a Member Committee which is already in place. We have met six times. There will be a committee working with the Health Department covering all the subjects we have.

So the advantage to having this advance exploration phase is we are getting information to answer questions from the underground, but also answer questions on the -- all the questions raised here today. It's on all the benefits, the social impacts.

As I said yesterday, it's almost a dry run. It's a dry run. You know, they have negligible impact because we are working almost all the time in the waste. We put everything in place. People will work at the camp

on a 14-day -- we will put in place and discuss with the Mistissini people everything to preserve their way of life, if they need -- this is an ideal -- it's almost perfect, you know, to adjust all that before the final decision is made, because once again it's a negligible impact, and we will have the time to work together and put in place all those committees and answer almost all the questions.

Sometimes there's always more questions, but we'll be in -- my people had discussions with some people at the Health Committee already and discussed about all those points.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know that -- I think one of the intervenors, I believe yesterday, suggested that it should be kind of -- the monitoring should be shared by the community and Strateco.

Is that something that you would consider? Monitoring of performance, the health impacts, all of those things?

MR. G. HÉBERT: Oh yes, oh yes. It's already -- it's through the CIA I've been negotiating in December. For sure they will monitor everything with us, you know, and they will on the water, on the air, on the dust ---

THE CHAIRMAN: You keep making reference to

the CIA, which is not a public document. So, I mean, you understand the dilemma here. You're talking about a document which is not in the public domain. So I don't know ---

MR. G. HÉBERT: You know, you have to ask the Chief. For our side, we would be willing to put, but it's an agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Or you'll have to extract from it all the public stuff that people actually want to hear and see, I would argue.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Yeah.

MR. J. COONISHISH: From a Cree perspective, there is no difference between human and environmental impacts. The land is alive.

THE CHAIRMAN: We didn't say there was a difference.

I'm saying all of them, all the measurements that you mentioned, Strateco and then staff.

MR. J.-P. LACHANCE: Jean-Pierre Lachance, for the record.

Mr. President, on February 26th or 28th, there was -- we were invited by Chief Shecapio during a session for the Mistissini, for the community, and at that time, the Chief presented to the community at large a summary of this so-called CIA, and Strateco was asked to

present an update on the project at Matoush, which we did, and at that time also, the Chief Shecapio introduced through the CIA, the members of the liaison officer, Mr. Mianscum and the community relations manager, Mr. Allen Matoush. And it's since that time that we've been doing lots of meetings and we're -- lots of -- the doors are opening.

And recently, two days ago, we had the conference call, Mr. Paul Linton (phon.) also from the Health Board department, and we discussed, more or less, the issues, the concerns of Mr. Jason's (phon.) address and definitely we will be working together because we feel the door is opened.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

Anybody else?

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER MCDILL: Perhaps you could answer whether or not you believe the community has enough information about the CIA. We have an oral summary, is that sufficient? We have been told there's an oral summary. But does the community want to see in writing this CIA?

MR. COONISHISH: What is the CIA?

MEMBER MCDILL: This is the agreement between the Cree and Strateco.

MR. LACHANCE: Jean-Pierre Lachance, for the record.

There was a written summary of agreement, I believe, that day of the February 26th, 28th, that was submitted. Probably a part of the community is -- was able to be in possession of this so called document. But again, like Mr. Hébert just said, Guy, it is the Chief -- under Chief authority to -- it's a confidential agreement. But the summary should be available to the community.

THE CHAIRMAN: All I'm observing here is if the Cree health board don't know what CIA is, you've got a problem. That's my observation here.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

The intervenor has requested a systematic approach to the evaluation and it has been presented that the multi-jurisdiction evaluation done is unique to this project.

I will pass you on to Dr. Thompson who had the experience that this is not unique to this project where you have multi authorities reviewing the impacts.

DR. THOMPSON: Pasty Thompson, for the record.

What I wanted to add is that the -- having

environmental assessment processes that take into consideration social -- and social and environmental impacts in the way that the Cree health board intervenors have described is not unusual.

It's a very common approach, systematic approach to assessments. And in the places where it's been conducted, these assessments are conducted very intimately with the communities because the information needs to come from community members as to what is important, what needs to be assessed, and in what manner. But there are many, many, many good examples of such assessments that have been done. So there's a lot of good practices that can be obtained from experiences that have been quite positive.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

We need ---

MR. LEBLANC: Just before we go to the next intervenor, we are trying to locate the person who would present after Mr. McLeod, which is Mr. George Gunner. So if Mr. Gunner is there, please present yourself at the reception table, thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The next submission is an oral presentation from Mr. Luke MacLeod as outlined in CMD 7.40.

Mr. MacLeod, please proceed.

12-H7.40

Oral presentation by

Luke McLeod

MR. L. MacLEOD: Good morning, thank you.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to present at this hearing. Just a few words in Cree first.

(Translation from Cree):

Thank you from myself to be allowed to speak a little bit on the subject that is being discussed and the beginning of this project on Eeyou Istchee. I will be doing my presentation in English. At times I will be speaking Cree. All of you that hear me now know who I am out in Cree land. I can say things now and talk about them more accurately in Cree and not remember so much of my English. (End of translation.)

I've worked in radio for 30 years -- going on 30 years -- for Cree people, broadcasting the Cree language. I want to give you a Cree lesson first. Mistissini in our language means big rock. We call ourselves Istchee Eeyou. We call our territory Mistissini.

Recently, I've been hearing Michasini Coma

Istcheechini (phon.); I would hate for our name to change to that for it means bad rock. Micha (phon.) means bad. We say Shamando (phon.) which is the creator, God. We also say muchimundo (phon.) which refers to the devil. I wouldn't want our area to be referred to as the devil's rock.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. L. MacLEOD: I'm very proud of our Chief and his presentation yesterday.

I am very proud of our youth for taking this challenge on to bring this information to our people, to rally them. I support them fully. I support our Chief and Council, and our leadership. I encourage the youth to continue this work that they've started. It shows their determination to decide their future. I am with them on this for as long as I can.

Therefore, like many of our people, I'm not in favour of the uranium mining in our territory. I am very scared of it. I think this is a question that has been raised a number of times at this hearing. I am really scared of it and because of where I work I pick up the news every day and I relay that news to our people.

Very often our Elders will come up to me and say, I watched on television, what was going on. Then I would tune the radio on in the morning and listen to you

and then I would understand what is going on. I can't understand it when I'm just watching it on television.

So very often I am the one that relates the news to our people. And you can imagine how difficult it can be sometimes to try to relate incidents such as happened in Japan most recently.

How do you explain that to people? How can you make them understand what exactly is going on? And this is the problem I see here. How do we make our people understand how dangerous this might be?

I can't accept anybody telling me no, there's no danger to your lake. No, there's no danger to your waters. No, there's no danger to your land. No, there's no danger to your people. I cannot accept that for too often it's been said all over this world, it's no danger, you know? It's not the same. It doesn't matter to me. It's the product we're making. There is no place yet, nobody has figured out yet how to store all of this waste.

I know we're talking about just exploration at this point. I understand that. But also, I am terrified of the doors that stand open, that activity will open.

We're talking about already over 20 other sites they're looking at.

My grandfather's hunting ground is next to M16 as they -- sorry, M17, as they call it. M16 is my grandfather's hunting ground. I don't think he would ever allow such a thing on his land.

I often think about the people that work in their first uranium mining in Northwest Territories. I wonder how many of them knew what they were -- what was being made into. And if they did, would they have worked on that?

Dr. McDill, right? You asked a few questions that I thought were very important or made suggestion, you know, you wish you could hear grandmother here, and you have.

I had the opportunity also to work on the healing projects in our community. Many of our people are survivors of the residential schools. The impact of that is still felt through many generations, to the present generations. We work on trying to help the people heal. And we form committees, we heal ourselves from alcohol or whatever was hurting us, those working in the group. We had Elders in our group. The Elders immediately told us, when we formed the organization:

"Take it to the land. Let's not do it here in this community, take it to the land. Far out on the land is where

we're going to find healing."

And they were right. To this day, every winter, every summer, we have healing journeys that people take. Out onto the land. Out on the rivers and lakes. Two to four-week journeys to help them get over a lot of the things that they face in this community or in this, you know, in their lives. So the land is still being used.

You wanted to understand a bit about maybe our culture, I would suggest one of these you can -- I know it's probably impossible for you ever to go to any of the camps that still exist out there that people go and hunt, but look at the National Film Board's Cree Hunters of Mistassini. That will give you a good idea. There's still people that live that life. Maybe use more modern technology, but they still live that life.

I want to say this in Cree.

(Interpreted from Cree.) A little bit you're hearing about what are some of things that I am in fear of. And everyone is hearing this within my voice. Most of the people are hearing me now in Quebec, wherever you are, if you are listening and hearing this.

There has been no one that has been able to say that nothing will ever be destroyed nor contaminated. They have no way of disposing of this uranium. Once it's

disposed of, where it can be sealed and contained. It hasn't been proven. If we open to this door for this mine to be erected.

There has been 20 sites proposed to open up mines. And we're looking at what has been found in the 20 sites and what they have been used for and what extreme causes of this is still being researched. And they're still looking for sites where they can dispose of this uranium. This long life expectancy of this rock and we're looking at bringing this rock to Indian lands.

And if we open the doors for this rock to be exposed in this land, could it give a chance to the government to say that -- for that rock to be taken back from where it was exploited; that can never happen. We can never trust what can be said.

For the people in Manitoba, they didn't agree. This is one of the things I caution when they start this project. It's not to say that I'm not looking at the possibility of people who are looking for employment, that's not what I'm saying. This is what I'm saying. I am talking about this rock, uranium; we are not in favour of this rock being exploited in this area. And I thank you for allowing me to speak and hear what I've said.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any questions?

Okay, thank you.

Thank you very much.

The next presentation is oral presentation by Mr. Philip Petawabano, as outlined in CMD H7.43. The floor is yours, sir.

12-H7.43

Oral presentation by

Philip Petawabano

MR. P. PETAWABANO: Thank you.

Before I commence, I was supposed to have a young gentleman here with me, Andrew.

We're just going through a checklist, it's one of the pre-flight duties of a pilot. For the record, my name is Philip Petawabano.

And I'm a proud member of the -- a member of the Cree Nation of Mastissini. I mentioned I have brought Mr. Cooner with me here, a youth from this community. I will, myself, make a statement. I will not ask questions, I have my decision made so I will make a statement.

I was born on a land not far from the

Troilus Mine site, about 40 miles, 45 miles north from here. And my mother, who is still alive today, at that time, did not have pre-natal check-ups during her pregnancy. Today, I am proud to say my first home is in a Cree home. Members of the Commission Tribunal, CNSC staff, Strateco, participants and members of the Cree Nation, I welcome you all and I tsajinaw (phon.).

Today, I would like to voice my opinions on the Proponent's application to CNSC to request a licence to construct an underground excavation ramp. Obviously the Proponent has his own agenda to proceed with this process without the Cree consent.

A couple years ago, I took -- I could count with one hand the number of trips I've done with Strateco. They have been in the area for six years. I can count, honestly count with one hand how many trips I've done for them.

I had the opportunity to fly out the chief and council to that site Camp Matoush. And during that summer, I did not fly the Otish Mountains until that day when we were coming over -- coming -- as I was approaching Mount Otish, just south of the mining site, I was disturbed to see what I saw, the development of an air strip.

That's what I mean when I say these -- the

proponents, they just proceed without our Cree consent. I don't know what they -- they went through the right channels when they developed that air strip.

These are the concerns I have for the land. It is the land that sustains and preserves the Cree way of life, and I have concerns with that, with this development.

A project of this magnitude will have a negative impact on the Cree way of life. We take pride in our Cree way of life for it is our identity.

Then today -- I used to be able to -- as a Cree pilot, one of my rights is to fish in this territory, the Cree land. I was -- I'm entitled to make a landing on the lakes, on the Otish Mountains and catch my supper for my family. Lately, I haven't done that because of all that activity. I have concerns. I have fears about the fish. Are the fish contaminated? Is the water contaminated? Those are the concerns I have.

Fishing is one of the traditional practices we have and it will have a great impact on our Cree way of life, and I think Mr. Coon will elaborate more on that in his presentation.

I've mentioned numerous times, you know, the Cree way of life is still practiced and is still going strong, and the land itself is -- it was mentioned many

times yesterday that we do not own the land; we just borrow it from the future generations.

Over the last couple of weeks, I have gathered information through the comprehensive study done by the federal review panel, and I have concerns with the proponent saying that it has a minimum impact. There is no such thing as minimal impact when you disturb the land.

And there is no subsequent study that will convince me otherwise.

Today, as I process that information, you know, the impacts, the negative impacts that it will have on the land, I have made a decision and I will act on my decision.

Today, my position is I do not support the proponent's project for uranium mining in the Eeyou Istchee.

Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Questions?

You're a pilot. I guess you fly all over the territory.

MR. P. PETAWABANO: Roger.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: So what I'm trying to

understand is are you against any mine or particularly uranium mines? Because, you know, in terms of footprint, some of the other mines are bigger. They're probably also going to build air strips.

MR. P. PETAWABANO: I think at this time it's irrelevant to talk about other mines.

Today, the topic is on the proponent's request to a licence to construct an underground excavation ramp.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

I have nothing against mining. As a matter of fact, I support it if it's done the proper way.

But where the site is right now, you have to understand, it's at a higher elevation. It's roughly 2,600 feet above sea level where this activity is going to take place. And where the waters flow down to the Mistissini Lake, you're looking at 1,200 -- the elevation there is 1,200. There's no way you can defy the law of gravity. That's just physics. There's no way that you can contain -- where the proponent is saying that they're able to contain the waste, I am not convinced.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

I'm trying to find the next submission, so

bear with me for one minute.

MR. P. PETAWABANO: This is the gentleman I was talking about, Andrew. He's with me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it a short presentation?

Oral presentation by

Andrew Coon

MR. A. COON: Yes, sir.

For the record, my name is Andrew Coon. I'm a member of the community and I'm an employee of the Cree Nation and my title here is Tourism Coordinator.

In my work, I've been involved with the proposed -- I've been involved in the Mistissini Otish Mountain Provincial Park negotiations with the Quebec government since 2004.

We've -- the introduction to the name "park" to a community, again, was not well received in the beginning.

As a worker at the Tourism Office working with the government, we have conducted studies also, not just within the park limits, but also outside the park limits.

Yesterday, during one of the presentations, I

believe the President of the Commission had asked "Why is everybody mentioning watersheds?" and asked "What is this watershed that everybody has talked about?" My colleague just briefly mentioned to you the location of the underground -- where the project is.

As we speak, one of my coworkers at the Tourism Office is looking for a map that shows the water flow from Mistassini Lake all the way up from the Otish. If I may, before the end of today, I want to provide each member here that map that clearly shows that the source of water from Mistassini Lake, Albana Lake, Temiscamingue River is from the Otish.

The location of this proposed mine is located between two lakes, between two lakes, fairly good sized lakes, I would say, with fish in them. If you look at the map that I will provide to you before the end of the day, the waterways of those two lakes go downstream, and those streams also have many arms, if you want to put it that way, but the main streams go down, flow to Temiscamingue River.

Temiscamingue River is the principal body of water, the river that connects from Otish to Albana Lake. Where the Temiscamingue River meets Albana Lake, at the map, if you go -- if you look west, the west end of that Albana Lake, you'll see the Grand Rapids that

connects Albana Lake to Mistissini Lake via the old, Via Post Outfitting Camp. We all know that.

When we talk about health risks, in my work, when I started work for the Tourism Office in 2001, the fish study was ongoing, a fish study that was done on the brook trout, the health and the population of the brook trout. The results of those -- of that specific brook trout study showed that Papas River, a river with three arms, we call them Papas 1, 2 and 3, the flow comes from Otish Mountains through those rivers.

Seventy (70) percent of the brook trout that we harvest from the lake comes from Papas River. Next door to Papas River, I believe we have Takwa (phon.) River. Again, Takwa (phon.) River, it's home of the walleye I would say. If any of you here -- either the staff, the CNSC -- if you are walleye fishermen, if you had the chance to go fishing at that river, you'd say that's the walleye capital of the world for fishing, it is really dear to us.

Another river, Chanou (phon.) River, located northeast end of the lake, right beside Témiscamie River, again, the flow from Otish Mountain. Chanou (phon.) River represents approximately 10 percent of the population of brook trout from Mistassini Lake.

With those three rivers, 80 percent of our

speckled trout, brook trout population stems from up north. These fish rely on clean water that comes from Otish Mountain.

In any mine -- I had talked to a few people concerning the -- it's not a chemical I believe it's an element called selenium. Selenium -- again, I'm not a specialist or an expert in this field -- the lowest -- even at the lowest concentration of selenium affects the juvenile stage of a fish, brook trout, pike, walleye, any species of fish.

The Crees of Mistissini hired an aquatic specialist back in -- a few years ago -- in her studies -- this was at an information session when she presented this result. In a uranium mine in Saskatchewan, approximately 50 -- maybe up to 70 kilometres downstream of where that mine is, they found traces of selenium.

If -- or should I say when -- the fish are affected where that location is -- the proposed location of this project -- we harvest fish to eat, to nurture.

If you look at a mammal, which mammal do you think relies on fish to survive as part of its diet? It's a bear. Témiscamie River, I said, it's a long river. A bear goes to a river to find fish in the spring and fall, why? That's where fish spawn.

The community members and myself, bear is

part of our cultural diet. If selenium has a huge effect on fish, even at a very low concentration, imagine the spread of the disease of one fish can do doing a spring or a fall spawning.

You know what fish do when they spawn; right? They get together, there's a big population that go into the river; it's going to spread, spread really fast.

You wonder why I believe -- think of a caribou; four years ago the caribou faced a disease that was detrimental to their health. It caught all the population so much that a few outfitting camps that offered caribou hunting had to close down. Why did this disease spread to so many caribous? It's a herd; caribous form a herds, a group; that's why it spread fast.

It's no different for the fish, twice a year they spawn. Imagine how much effect it will have on the health of our people. We harvest that fish, we harvest the bear.

Again, we've heard yesterday from the Commission, from Strateco saying, "We are at the exploration stage of this project; we're not talking about the mine." We understand that. Our Chief stated yesterday, "Long term is where we're looking at."

The Chief asked the question yesterday, "Of

all other companies in Canada that had -- that were at the exploration stage ..." the Chief asked, "... what percentage of those companies eventually got their licensing to actually open a mine?" The answer from the Commission was, "All of them." You see why we're looking at long term?

As a community member, as tourism coordinator, we have stated in the first public hearings, at information session, still today we are, we will and will always be against this project.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Thank you.

Anybody?

Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: I thank you for your presentation. And I agree with you that fish -- you touched a very important point and I would never be part of a decision that will -- if we know that there could be problem with fish.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MEMBER HARVEY: So -- but I have to have the certainty or certain data that would show me that the fish could be contaminated. So the only way for us to --

is to have experts working on that and to be sure that the exploration and -- will be done the right way.

MR. A. COON: I don't want to cut you off there but this is one of the main concerns that we -- the tourism office had -- is the fish, okay? When -- the first meeting we had the chap who came through the community is concerning the draft version of the environmental assessment that was done. In there, I did question already the fish study that they did. Again, the fish study that Strateco had performed, they only did fish study on those two lakes. The ones I'm talking about located between -- the two -- located between the proposed mine.

They did not do any fish studies within downstream.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay.

MR. A. COON: They said they did around, okay? But me, if you look at how far a fish can spawn, I have facts for you, sir. We have information from our office that we can provide to you. I have no problems at all providing this information to you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MEMBER HARVEY: I will turn to the staff to get their opinion and to see if the studies have been done correctly and did, in fact, touch the points you

mentioned.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

The information that the intervenor has just described in terms of selenium impacts on fish, the studies that he has talked about were the ones that were done at the Key Lake site in northern Saskatchewan.

As you know, the Commission has dealt with the selenium issues by requiring that Cameco put in place additional treatment to reduce the selenium levels to levels that would not be -- would not harm the reproduction of fish on the Key Lake site.

CNSC staff, with Environment Canada, became aware of selenium issues at the Beaver Lodge site in the mid-nineties, and it's from that experience that we started looking at operating mine sites. And to date, the only mine site where we found selenium issues is at Key Lake because of the ore characteristics and because of the characteristics of the watershed.

So it is an impact on fish. It's an impact that is hard to detect because essentially selenium goes into the gonads and reduces reproduction of the fish. You end up with a population of very old fish with little recruitment in the population.

What I would like to say though that is not

factual is that selenium is not like a bacteria or a virus, and it's not when fish spawn together they will not contaminate each other, as selenium is taken up from the water and from the food the fish eat. But it's not something that they can spread around.

But it is an issue, we are aware of it, and it's something that has been assessed for the Strateco proposal to make sure that it doesn't happen if this project goes ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN: But in general terms, can you say something about whether the watershed analysis was done; that during the environmental assessment or what have you, was the flow from high elevation to low elevation was done -- and can you give any assurances that there will be no contamination?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

We discussed -- I believe it's yesterday, the amount of baseline information that's available. And the statements are right. The availability of baseline information at this time is limited. That's why we flagged this as an issue moving forward.

And so do we have all the information we would need if this project was more advanced, the answer is no.

But if the project would go ahead at this stage, we have sufficient information. If the project were to move forward to a full mine with a mill, a lot more information would be needed and much more detailed assessments would also be conducted.

MR. JAMMAL: For the record, Ramzi Jammal.

As Dr. Thompson mentioned, for this scope, there is enough information. However, I would like to request from the Intervenor, if they have any information to provide to us, and we'll take this into consideration immediately. So we'll welcome that information.

DR. THOMPSON: If I could, just for a minute, I was waiting for someone to give me information. For the Strateco Project, we looked at selenium specifically and in the risk assessment, the concentrations are below the levels we know to be harmful to fish.

So it has been looked at, and at this stage, there's absolutely no risk from selenium. It's present, but at very, very low concentrations and we know that this is not harmful at this stage.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Yes, we did several more -- since the EIS, we did several more tests and Caroline will explain that.

MS. C. HARDY: Caroline Hardy, for the record.

We have looked at about 12 lakes for fish, in 12 lakes. We have provided additional baseline program because we needed more information on fish, and we've been conducting experimental fishing as of -- since last year to complete these data gap. So that will be completed soon and we will be issuing a report on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MEMBER HARVEY: Sorry, is that information available for the public?

MS. C. HARDY: Yes, it will be available to the public.

MEMBER HARVEY: So you could -- I don't know where the public can find this information? It's your -- on the Internet?

MS. C. HARDY: Well, this document will be filed through the CNSC, so ---

MEMBER HARVEY: When?

MS. C. HARDY: In the fall. It's just a matter of having the analytical results. That takes quite a while to have when you do fish analysis. So by the time we get the chemical analysis from the fish and reporting time, so I would say maybe mid-summer to end of summer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't you also put it on

your website, the moment you have it? Why does it have to go through CNSC?

MS. C. HARDY: This could be put on a website as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Last word.

MR. A. COON: Yes, just a couple of questions, really short questions. You're the President of the Panel, right, Mr. Binder?

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. A. COON: Okay. My quick question is; were you aware of the watersheds that I've just talked about?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yeah, it's part of the environmental assessment that was done and some of the recommendations that were coming.

MR. A. COON: So how much will this affect your decision, this whole thing about the fish study, potential of selenium? And when do you think will the Commission make a decision on this concerning the licensee?

THE CHAIRMAN: We first listen to all-day information -- this is one of them -- and then we are going to deliberation, as we call it, and now to come to a decision.

MR. A. COON: So that's about at the end of

the year?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we would like to -- we normally have a benchmark of 30 to 60 days and we'd like to adhere to that.

MR. A. COON: Thirty (30) to -- from today? She just said that she'll only have the information -- she'll only have that information in the fall.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but remember -- remember we're talking about two different projects here. One is the ramp, the exploration; and the other one is the long-term concern of the uranium mine. We have to factor all of this in our decision.

Strateco?

MR. J.-P. LACHANCE: Jean-Pierre Lachance, for the record.

Last year, I believe, on June 15th, we met here, the Strateco team along with Chief Shecapio, Deputy Chief, and some representatives of the Environment. And we agreed together that it will be important to carry a regional study regarding the fish.

So we went ahead, indeed, and there was a decision taken by Strateco in collaboration with the Cree -- the community of Mistissini, as part of the process, I would say again with the agreement.

But the mandate of the study was already

granted to Dr. Bruce Kilgour who was recommended by Dr. Monique Dubé, probably Mr. Coon is referring to.

And during the course of the mandate, it will -- including the identification of the study science and data collection, all this will be carried along with the Tallyman that have been already identified along the watershed and the streams.

So this is very important to note and this agreement -- this contract had been already given, and we do hope that we'll be able to carry this study along with the collaboration of the Cree Nation of Mistissini, especially with the Environmental Department.

We had a meeting here, one of the meetings with the committee, Dr. Kilgour was here, presented the -- what was expected to do in the study, and it was very well received by representatives of the Environment Department.

We were supposed to have another meeting, but we didn't get a response from the environmental department of the community, but we are definitely going to go ahead with this study.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

At this time, I would like to call for a 15 -- no, sorry, we're going quick.

Okay, go ahead. But, I mean, we have a biological requirement.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. I want -- what is the timetable for your study? When do you expect to have the results?

MR. J.-P. LACHANCE: The original study?

MEMBER HARVEY: Yes.

MR. J.-P. LACHANCE: No, the original study, I said we were, but we expect to start it like in June. It has to be started in June and it will be over a two-year period. But we need the collaboration, along with the Cree community of Mistissini, along with the Chief and the Environmental Department and Dr. Kilgore's mandate has been given. He's ready to start his study in early June.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. I just wanted to have the delay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now ---

MR. P. PETAWABANO: A final comment, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN: Very quickly, please.

MR. P. PETWABANO: I trust the Commission Tribunal and the CNSC when they gathered all this information and processed this information that you will come to make a good decision, you know.

And if you make that decision, in the event that you grant the Proponent the licence, I would recommend that you would reevaluate that decision-making.

That's my final comment. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We are going to reconvene at 12:15.

Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 12:00 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 12h00

--- Upon resuming at 12:20 p.m./

L'audience est reprise à 12h20

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We are here again.

Alors la prochaine présentation est pour le mémoire du groupe CentricoisES et MauricienNES pour les déclassements nucléaires tel qu'indiqué au document H7.13.

Alors c'est monsieur Sébastien Bois. Vous avez la parole.

12-H7.13

**Exposé oral par les
CentricoisES et MauricienNES
pour le déclassement nucléaire**

M. S. BOIS: Mon nom c'est Sébastien Bois. Je suis porte-parole des CentricoisES et MauricienNES pour

le déclassement nucléaire.

Tout d'abord, j'aimerais remercier -- bien, tout d'abord j'aimerais dire que je vais pas parler en Cree puisque c'est pas ma langue. Donc, je suis désolé; je vais m'adresser en français.

Puis j'aimerais remercier toute la communauté ici de votre accueil, énormément, puis de votre énergie aussi.

Merci aussi au Youth Cree Council pour leur accueil aussi chaleureux et puis aussi pour les superbes T-shirt qu'ils ont faits, que vous avez vus hier, qui étaient "Ban uranium", qui ne provient pas d'un groupe de lobby qui les a payés, qui ne provient pas de URACAN qui a payé des gilets de hockey aussi à des jeunes sur la Côte Nord. C'est des jeunes Cree qui les ont payés eux-mêmes ces T-shirts nucléaires.

On est donc venu en solidarité avec les Crees de Mistissini pour venir exprimer notre opposition au projet de Strateco.

J'aimerais vous expliquer un peu la signification du carré jaune que vous avez vu que plusieurs personnes arboraient. Vous pouvez peut-être vous doutez que ce symbole signifie l'opposition à l'ensemble de la filière nucléaire, le jaune étant la couleur du nucléaire, et puis ça signifie aussi que nous,

on veut de la transparence et puis on veut aussi mettre de la lumière sur l'industrie nucléaire, ainsi que sur ces institutions.

Puis quand on entend aussi filière nucléaire -- excusez-moi -- puis quand on entend aussi au niveau filière nucléaire, nous, on a commencé au début à Trois-Rivières, à Bécancour, dans la région de la Mauricie, à se questionner sur la centrale nucléaire Gentilly-2, à rencontrer plusieurs intervenants avant de prendre position, puis on a réalisé ensuite, par la suite, l'ensemble de la filière nucléaire de l'extraction à la gestion des déchets et en passant par l'armement.

Les fameux carrés jaunes ont été découpés. Plusieurs milliers de carrés jaunes ont été découpés par Marcel Jetté, qui est un ancien travailleur de la centrale nucléaire Gentilly-2, un travailleur accidenté de la centrale nucléaire Gentilly-2, celui aussi comme travailleur du nucléaire au nucléaire.

Donc c'est pas seulement des citoyens ou des têtes brûlées qui s'opposent au nucléaire. On a des travailleurs. On a des gens de divers milieux, des docteurs, des financiers, et cetera.

Merci Monsieur Jetté. Maintenant je vais juste vous lire le communiqué que j'ai fait parvenir lundi matin.

Est-ce que je parle trop fort encore? O.k.

"Les centricois et mauriciens pour le déclassement nucléaire s'opposent à la première mine d'uranium en territoire québécois, l'uranium, carburant toxique de centrales nucléaires, joignant leur voix à celles de plus en plus nombreuses demandant la sortie du Québec du nucléaire.

L'annonce prochaine par le gouvernement québécois d'appuyer ou non la réfection de la centrale nucléaire Gentilly-2 et son refus de rencontrer l'ensemble du mouvement 'Sortons le Québec du nucléaire' et les citoyens depuis plus de trois ans, oblige les citoyens à intensifier la lutte.

Le risque nucléaire et ses dommages permanents et irréversibles ne sont pas l'apanage d'une centrale nucléaire, mais bien de l'ensemble de la filière nucléaire."

Comme je le disais tout-à-l'heure.

"Nous venons rencontrer la Commission

canadienne de sûreté nucléaire
mercredi le 6 juin. Cette fois-ci,
après de multiples rencontres, nous
venons simplement demander à la CCSN
de quitter le Québec."

La dernière fois, vous êtes venu à
Bécancour, je vous ai souhaité bienvenue en tant
qu'individu, pas nécessairement la CCSN. Mais maintenant,
c'est ma demande aujourd'hui de quitter le Québec même
aujourd'hui, de retourner à Ottawa faire vos devoirs.

"Nous considérons que le plus grand
risque nucléaire canadien est un
problème de gouvernance. L'Agence des
régulations est victime d'ingérence de
l'industrie et des partis politiques.
Elle est redevable au ministre des
ressources naturelles qui, lui,
promeut l'industrie nucléaire.
Des suites de l'accident nucléaire de
Fukushima, l'une des premières
recommandations du gouvernement fut la
mise sur pied d'une agence
indépendante de l'industrie des
politiciens."

Un arbitre vendu au hockey, c'est

enrageant, mais là on parle de sûreté nucléaire, on n'est pas au hockey ici là.

"SNC Lavalin, Desso, Genivar, Areva doivent sécuriser et protéger les profits, pas les humains. SNC Lavalin et ses liens avec la famille Kadhafi en Lybie en est un bel exemple, d'ailleurs.

Peut-on s'inquiéter que cette même firme qui a acquéri la technologie Candu -- technologie aussi potentiellement utilisée à des fins militaires -- ait des liens avec la dictature de Khadafi?

Si la CCSN est imputable à l'industrie et à ses sous-contractants, technocrates, et politiciens, et non à la sécurité pleine et entière des citoyens et citoyennes, pourquoi alors la financer?

La CCSN est une institution illégitime et dangereuse pour la santé publique et financière des populations. Les CMDN, notre regroupement, demandent une mise en tutelle de l'Agence et le

départ des commissaires actuels. Fini l'infantilisation et le mépris, bonjour la démocratisation et le respect."

Donc ça c'est le communiqué que j'ai envoyé lundi matin. Pour nous, on trouve que la CCSN effectivement est infantilisante. On pourrait sortir des petits exemples. On a souvent comparé la radioactivité des centrales nucléaires à la radioactivité naturelle en disant que les bananes aussi émettent de la radioactivité. Excusez-moi, mais une banane, c'est pas une centrale nucléaire.

Puis ça c'est des choses que je trouve pas tolérables quand on pose des questions au niveau de la radioactivité puisqu'on est tout-à-fait conscient qu'il y a de la radioactivité naturelle dans l'air.

Qui plus est, la radioactivité naturelle dans l'air augmente à chaque année. On parle du bruit de fond. On en est conscient. J'aurais -- en même temps, c'est comme aussi des échanges, j'ai le communiqué, j'aurais une question pour Madame Thompson au niveau du bruit de fond naturel.

Jusqu'à combien de millisieverts d'ajouts par l'humain de millisieverts peut-on encore accumuler? Et pourquoi doit-on encore endurer l'accumulation de

substances radioactives qui ne sont pas naturelles au bruit de fond? On parle dans le fond de bombes atomiques ou d'autres substances radioactives. Donc c'est quoi le bruit -- jusqu'à quel point on peut tolérer l'empoisonnement?

Voulez-vous répondre ou ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: Non, non, non. Finissez votre présentation s'il vous plaît.

M. S. BOIS: L'autre aspect aussi qui m'a choqué c'était aussi l'aspect de si on est contre, c'est qu'on est mal informé ou qu'on est endoctriné. Je me disais ce matin, peut-être que les gens qui sont ici pensent qu'on est dans une secte anti-nucléaire.

Quand je restais à Montréal voilà une dizaine d'années, j'ai déjà été sympathisant nucléaire. Particulièrement parce que j'étais mal informé puis j'étais baigné dans une propagande. J'ai même déjà cru que le nucléaire ne faisait pas de gaz à effet de serre puis c'était l'industrie de l'avenir; il y avait de l'uranium à volonté, et cetera, et cetera. Jusqu'à temps que je m'informe puis je lise de plus en plus. Puis je réalise que le nucléaire, pour moi, c'est un des pires scandales financiers, scientifiques et humains du siècle.

La CCSN a tendance à donner des permis rapidement. Suite au permis qui a été distribué à

Gentilly-2, c'était la même chose ici au niveau de Matoush, les gens ont dit, "C'est quoi la presse? C'est quoi la -- qu'est-ce qui est urgent?"

Qu'est-ce qui est urgent, pour moi, c'est entre autres de pouvoir faire faire des profits, ça c'est une chose. Mais la CCSN a donné le permis à Gentilly-2 des suites de Fukushima alors qu'elle n'avait même pas encore en main le rapport de sûreté de Gentilly-2 puis que elle-même n'avait même pas fait un rapport des suites de Fukushima pour éviter que cet accident se reproduise au Québec.

J'ai une question Madame Thompson, pourquoi les travailleurs des États-Unis peuvent-ils être dédommagés au niveau nucléaire -- au niveau des mines, au niveau de la gestion des déchets, du transport -- et au Canada, les travailleurs du nucléaire ne peuvent pas être indemnisés? Ou, parfois, c'est pas au niveau de la CSST, c'est pas encore reconnu au Québec. Pourquoi?

L'autre question à Monsieur Jammal, Madame Thompson et Monsieur Binder, si le nucléaire est si sécuritaire, alors pourquoi la centrale à Chalk River en Ontario a-t-elle déversée des milliers de litres d'eau lourde radioactives dans l'eau; que seulement pour G2 en trois ans, trois travailleurs ont été éclaboussés par de l'eau fortement radioactive?

Les accidents répertoriés sont nombreux, mensuels. On parle pas ici d'une flaque d'huile qui est répertoriée, on parle d'émission de tritium, que ce soit en Illinois voilà encore, je sais pas, un an. Qu'on pense en Russie, en janvier dernier aussi, qui a eu une explosion. C'est sûr, c'est pas nécessairement la même rigueur, mais bon. Quoi qu'ici, c'est pas nécessairement une rigueur très élevée non plus.

Je m'inquiète. Sérieusement, je m'inquiète vraiment. Puis c'est pas nécessairement je vais avoir une montée de lait ou j'ai de l'agressivité, je m'inquiète pour ma santé puis mes proches.

Je vais continuer. En fait, ça me fait capoter un peu le spectacle que je vois ici. C'est si je vois une grandeur chez vous présentement, c'est juste le stage. Je trouve ça dommage.

Madame Thompson, puis Madame McDill, vous comparez -- vous parliez de radiographies des dents. Puis la radiographie des dents, c'est pas nécessairement naturel. C'est bio-accumulatif. Puis dans les années '50, '60, on en donnait abondamment des radiographies. J'aimerais ça poser la question à Madame Thompson, pourquoi on a diminué le nombre de radiographies aux patients et pourquoi qu'on en donne pas à tous les jours, pourquoi c'est pas des bonbons la radiographie?

LE PRÉSIDENT: Pourriez-vous commencer votre conclusion s'il vous plaît.

M. S. BOIS: Oui. Madame Thompson, j'aimerais savoir quelle est la différence entre une mine d'uranium et une mine de diamants?

Monsieur Jammal, j'aimerais savoir s'il y a une solution permanente pour la gestion des déchets.

Monsieur Jammal, j'aimerais savoir, le maire de Bécancour a dit que les déchets, "Inquiétez-vous pas dans la région de Trois-Rivières de la Mauricie, on va les envoyer dans les mines dans le nord." Est-ce que le projet Matoush a déjà été considéré pour être un site d'entreposage permanent de déchets? Parce que moi ça m'intéresse pas d'envoyer nécessairement mes déchets à la population de Mistissini.

Avez-vous déjà -- Monsieur Binder, comment s'assurer que la Chine, l'Inde, que le gouvernement conservateur a ré-ouvert l'entente dernièrement, ne fassent pas la prolifération de l'armement nucléaire? D'autant plus que le Canada a déjà fourni des réacteurs Candu à l'Inde qui lui aussi favorise le développement de son armement atomique, tout comme le Pakistan et d'autres pays. Le Candu est une merveilleuse technologie -- si c'est pas la meilleure technologie pour faire l'armement militaire.

Quels furent les liens nucléaires --
Monsieur Binder, quels furent les liens nucléaires entre
l'Iran et le Canada avant notre rupture politique ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: O.k. C'est assez. Nous
sommes ici pour discuter une mine d'uranium.

M. S. BOIS: Je reviens -- bien,
l'industrie ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: Faites votre conclusion tout
de suite.

M. S. BOIS: Je vais aller à Strateco
d'abord.

Si, comme moi, citoyen bénévole, je me
joins à d'autres citoyens, j'aimerais savoir si Strateco
est inscrit comme groupe de lobbyistes et combien il
dépense annuellement pour un influencer les décisions
citoyennes versus ces coûts d'étude d'environnementale?

Strateco, vous dites que votre priorité est
de dialoguer avec les jeunes de Mistissini. La priorité
de Strateco, qui n'est pas un humain mais une compagnie,
n'était pas plutôt de faire des profits le plus tôt
possible?

Monsieur Jammal ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: Merci beaucoup. C'est fini.

M. S. BOIS: J'ai pas fait la conclusion.

LE PRÉSIDENT: C'est fini.

M. S. BOIS: O.k.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Je vais laisser la parole à staff et à Strateco pour répondre des choses qui étaient soulignées, et c'est tout.

CCSN?

M. R. JAMMAL: Veux-tu que je donne la réponse en français ou en anglais? Les deux?

LE PRÉSIDENT: Comme tu veux.

M. R. JAMMAL: I will try to do it in both.
For the record, it's Ramzi Jammal.

Le monsieur a demandé la question est-ce que Matoush sera utilisé pour entreposer les déchets nucléaires. La réponse simple c'est non.

Est-ce qu'il y a un programme pour la gestion des déchets nucléaires à long terme? La réponse c'est oui. Ça veut dire qu'il y a un programme que le Gouvernement du Canada a déjà établi. Il y a un -- je dois faire de la traduction là -- Nuclear Waste Management Office. C'est le Bureau de la gestion des déchets qui effectue maintenant des études et de trouver une communauté pour mettre les déchets.

Alors c'est un processus qui est un programme. Ça veut dire que la capacité à entreposer les déchets nucléaires c'est bien connu dans le monde entier et maintenant le Canada s'avance à ce niveau-là.

Je passe la parole à Docteure Thompson pour qu'elle puisse répondre aux questions.

M. S. BOIS: Monsieur Jammal, la question c'est est-ce qu'il y a une solution permanente dans le monde pour les déchets nucléaires?

M. R. JAMMAL: Oui, au niveau technique il y a des solutions qui existent et puis la permanence sera déterminée avec le temps.

DR. THOMPSON: Alors, mon nom est Patsy Thompson.

Monsieur Bois pose plusieurs questions dont, en étant bien informé, je suis certaine qu'il connaît les réponses.

Quant à la question par rapport au bruit de fond et l'ajout au bruit de fond à cause des essais nucléaires, l'armement nucléaire, la réponse est simple. C'est que suite aux essais d'armement, il y avait des niveaux mesurables de radioactivité dans l'atmosphère. Ces programmes de mesures ont été abandonnés il y a quelques années parce qu'on ne réussit plus à détecter les niveaux de radioactivité qui ont été mis dans l'atmosphère par les essais nucléaires.

Donc au lieu de continuer à ajouter au bruit de fond, le bruit de fond a diminué parce que le résultat des essais nucléaires n'est plus mesurable.

C'est une information qui est vérifiable à beaucoup, beaucoup d'endroits.

Au niveau de la question par rapport aux travailleurs indemnisés, pourquoi qu'il y a des travailleurs indemnisés aux États-Unis et puis qu'il n'y en a pas au Canada, le seul programme aux États-Unis qui indemnise les travailleurs c'est des travailleurs qui étaient impliqués au niveau de la fabrication d'armements nucléaires.

Il n'y a aucun programme pour indemniser les travailleurs dans des programmes civils nucléaires parce qu'il n'y a pas d'effets sur la santé pour les travailleurs qui sont actuellement employés dans l'industrie.

C'est la même chose avec les employés des centrales nucléaires au Canada. Les études qui ont été faites sur 22,000 travailleurs canadiens démontrent qu'il n'y a aucun effet sur la santé. Il n'y a aucune augmentation du risque de cancer chez les travailleurs canadiens qui sont actuellement à l'emploi de Hydro Ontario, Hydro-Québec et Nouveau-Brunswick.

M. S. BOIS: Avez-vous terminé, Dre Thompson?

MR. JAMMAL: For the record, it's Ramzi Jammal.

Je pense que mon collègue, Dre Thompson, a terminé et puis moi je voulais ---

M. S. BOIS: Ah, excusez-moi. C'est parce que je voulais juste répondre à Madame Thompson avant.

M. JAMMAL: Tu nous a demandé des questions et puis c'est le Président qui nous gère ici. Il m'a demandé de vous donner une réponse. Je voudrais vous donner une réponse concernant l'exportation d'uranium à l'extérieur du Canada.

Alors, l'exportation d'uranium se fait sous le programme de garantie. En anglais it's "Safeguard". Ça veut dire que chaque gramme ou bien microgramme d'uranium canadien est "tracké", tracé et inspecté, pas juste par le Canada; c'est inspecté par l'agence internationale.

C'est-à-dire que les installations, la fabrication est toujours pour des garanties et des fins pacifiques.

Alors je passe la parole à Dre Thompson si elle a quelque chose à ajouter ou bien à vous ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: Non, non, c'est assez.

M. S. BOIS: J'avais -- Madame Thompson ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: Excusez-moi ---

M. S. BOIS: Oui.

LE PRÉSIDENT: On va laisser à Strateco à

répondre.

Est-ce qu'il y a quelque chose à ---

M. G. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert pour le record.

Deux questions. La première, non, Strateco n'est pas enregistré et n'a jamais été enregistré lobbyiste en date d'aujourd'hui.

Deuxième question, oui, Strateco est là pour informer les gens pour les quatre prochaines années parce qu'un programme d'exploration, ça ne fait pas de profit.

Ça fait que notre objectif pour les quatre prochaines années c'est vraiment informer la population de Mistissini que c'est ça qu'est notre objectif, comme ça a été dit. Une compagnie d'exploration ne fait pas de profit.

LE PRÉSIDENT: O.k.

M. S. BOIS: Ben ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: Seulement pour finir.

M. S. BOIS: Bien, pour finir, trois interventions ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: On doit avancer.

M. S. BOIS: Une seconde.

Ben, merci pour votre générosité très humaine et généreuse d'être ici pour l'amour fraternel, Strateco.

Madame Patsy Thompson, votre étude que vous sortez sur les travailleurs du nucléaire a aussi été remise en question. Votre étude fait même, dans le fond -- rapproche même en disant que travailler dans une centrale nucléaire c'est meilleur pour la santé.

Est-ce qu'une centrale nucléaire est bonne pour la santé? C'est une question que je vous pose.

Et je termine, pour Monsieur Jammal, au niveau des bombes et de la traçabilité, le Canada n'est pas un pays pacifique. Actuellement c'est un pays vote en guerre. C'est un pays qui a construit aussi la bombe atomique. C'est l'uranium aussi canadien qui a servi à Hiroshima. Nous avons exporté de l'uranium dernièrement aux États-Unis. Nous avons les mains sales, sales, sales d'uranium appauvri et de meurtres. Donc nous sommes complices.

La traçabilité, oui, je la mets en doute sérieusement.

Merci. Bonne journée, en espérant que vous dormez pas trop bien ce soir.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Ça ne mérite pas de réponse.

DR. THOMPSON: Je me dois -- Patsy Thompson -- je me dois de répondre par rapport au fait que l'étude canadienne a été remise en question au niveau scientifique.

Ce n'est pas le cas. L'étude a été faite rigoureusement par des chercheurs indépendants qui ont une bonne réputation et ça a été revu par des pairs indépendants.

LE PRÉSIDENT: O.k. Merci beaucoup.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LEBLANC: You will recall that yesterday we had Dr. McDill that asked whether there were any grandmothers and we had two that expressed themselves yesterday and they're again with us today in the room. But we have another grandmother that would like to express and say a word today. This is Ms. Winnie Awashish.

Please honour us with a few words.

Oral presentation by

Winnie Awashish

MS. W. AWASHISH: (Interpreted from Cree)

My name is Winnie Awashish. Can they hear me? And it is Winnie Awashish.

My -- Sam Awashish was my husband and Trollis was our land and we were always in the Trollis mine environment. That is our hunting territory. We were always there and when the work began there we were always there, we were always present. My grandchildren -- I kept

my grandchildren there too when there was work done.

My husband worked and my partner worked there, and he worked there for five years. And when they actually opened the mine and the actual work began, there were not many Crees working there -- there were many Crees and many non-Natives. We were always invited when there were speaking engagements or when the leaders would speak. And they would invite us to their meetings. They always sat us together. That's how we were. It's when he passed away that I would sit alone there, we were not sitting in a partnership, I sat alone without my husband and I still attended. And I was still asked something, "What did I see? What have I witnessed? What is it -- what bothers you about what you've seen on this land?"

And I used to -- I'd be driven around the site on the mine, they took me everywhere, I'd see garbage. I would say that I don't like the garbage; it was like kind of all over the place. I don't like that.

The animals -- it's not good for the animals and I would tell them that. Then they would take me to the lakes where the tailings were, the tailing lakes, and I would look at those and I would tell them, "I don't like those lakes either, I don't like that lake."

The trees seemed burnt, the ones that surround the lake -- around my lake. I really did not

appreciate seeing that. It was in a pathetic state.

We all -- we brought our children up in the bush. We were given nine children, we were blessed with nine children and that's where we brought them up, it was in the land, the heartland. That's where they grew up and that's where they lived.

We survived, even when we had very little of modern food, I would tell my husband, "We would be pretty hungry if we didn't have it." And he would say, "No, there's a store, we have our own store inland. We just have to go knock." And that's what he did. We never starved; we were never short on food and sustenance, nor my children. Whatever we ate, whatever we wanted was on his hunting and that's how we survived.

Much of their childhood and growing up was on the land. It was very important and it was beautiful to be out there. That's what I really wanted to say.

Every time that we went inland and flew in, even up river and before the plane even existed, my husband and I, we would do it as a family. We were still able to do the portages and everything that we needed and that was a beautiful way of life. It was beautiful.

We were all strong, we all had the strength, we were not sick, there was no sickness. We did not even have medicine as a supply. We got our medicine

from the land and we made our own medicine and made for our children when they were sick.

I saw much on the land and I saw my way of life, I saw much of the culture of who I was. Now, today, I'm affected, it's these mines, I see them. I see that mine where we are now. I was there this spring. I have a sickness, I have a disease, I inhaled the air there, I've seen it. It's like the dust in the air constantly; wherever they put their waste, there was dust. So where must that dust carry? In the water for the fish -- that affects the fish.

One time -- two years that the mine was there -- my husband said, "I'm going to go lay a net at that lake, we will eat some fish for the spring." And it's when the snow melts, the water goes -- flows into that lake -- or lakes. And it was where the mine was, that's where the lake was, so all that water from the snow -- he put -- went into that water and he put his net and he pulled out a beautiful fish.

I thought this winter it's going to be beautiful, we're going to be okay for the winter. And I cleaned that fish and then I -- we boiled it and then we ate it. And then the more the pot boiled, you know, when you cook something there's a lovely smell, a lovely scent from that -- whatever you're cooking, and I was looking at

my pot that smell never came, that scent. And I looked into the pot to look at the fish, I said, "Hey, old man, we cannot eat this fish" I told him. "Look at it, look at the way it's reacting to being boiled." And then I smelled it, it smelled like gas, like oil, that's what the fish smelled like.

I was very displeased and upset and I just looked at the fish, I'm trying to consider eating it but I'm smelling it and I'm just -- I'm unable -- so we went to go tell the project manager and whatnot and said, "You're doing..." I was upset, I was mad and I was giving hell and saying, "You're -- this is your doing." I told him, "Go get the boss."

So they brought him and I showed him, I said, "I can't eat this here on this site. I can't eat this fish and you said nothing was going to be wrong. You guaranteed us that everything would be okay and we couldn't eat the fish." I said, "I want you to try it." He's not too sure, so he took a little bite, it was definitely like oil. And he did not approve of the taste or of the fish.

So I told him, I said, "You go and find out about the fish, this cannot be like this, this lake here -- it's a river here, there are rivers here and that water goes downstream into the rivers. So the water will be

contaminated elsewhere." I said, "You go find out right away, you find out as soon as possible." And I spoke to him very passionately about this, that there was an immediacy to all this.

So I told my husband, "The water that comes from..."

CREE INTERPRETER: I'm not really understanding this part of it.

MS. M. AWASHISH: (Interpreted from Cree) I said, "Do you want to try the water from..." I guess it was a cleaning facility. I said, "You want to go try that water at that cleaning facility?" And he told -- he said, "I will not try that water until you drink that water." So he really tested the patience of that boss and tested him, and we challenged him. We stood up to him and that's how we were.

We were always around that mine, I still go there now and I still -- it's the same, that dust is still up in the air and we want them to clean it. And I want the bushes to grow where it's supposed to be -- where they're supposed to be. I see it when I fly, I see the land and I see that mine and there's a dust there and it's a dust that's airborne.

There's -- where the rock comes from -- where they exit the rock, where does that rock land? And

that dust goes into the forest, into the woods, into the bush and I did not approve of that at all either.

And all of that affects -- it goes into the trees and the lakes and underwater. I told them one time we lived around that lake area, we had our prospector tent, our tent and we were told we cannot live there, we were forbidden from living at that area.

And one time I went -- there was no lake where I had lived before, the lake was gone and that upset me greatly, the destruction of the land. And then I hear that they're going to make another mine and that's even more severe in its effects than that mine. The animals will die, we will have no more animals and it's -- the mine will kill them, we won't have food, then we will starve. We will be like the people before.

Today there is plenty here to get at the store and so on, but there's also -- we have plenty -- right now there's plenty of bear, moose, beaver. There's -- (she names where her area is). That's where they go and fish. (I'm assuming it's a camp on one of her -- a tourist camp) and that's what -- so somebody wants to open up a tourism place and there will be no land for that either.

That's why I wanted to speak. I want to speak about our little mine.

So I've definitely talked way too much and God bless you all and I love all of you. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for this wonderful historical overview. Anybody wants to ask a question? Okay.

Well, thank you.

And we will be moving on to -- I understand next on the list is Mr. Patrick D'Astous as outlined in CMD-12 H7.52. Mr. D'Astous, please proceed.

12-H7.52

Oral presentation by

Patrick D'Astous

MR. P. D'ASTOUS: Bonjour. Mon nom est Patrick D'Astous. Je viens ici en tant que père d'un Enoch de Waswanipi (phonétique), en tant qu'enseignant à la Commission scolaire Cree, en tant que président de l'Association des employés du nord québécois, qui représente plus de 1,600 membres au Nunavik et dans Eeyou Istchee.

First, I want to mention that I feel very humbled here coming after so many high-quality and knowledgeable presentations done by Enoch giving us a real

crash course about their deep knowledge of the land.

I want to dedicate this presentation to one of my former students, Jason Dixon, son of Paul Dixon, that fought a lot to heal from residential schools.

I quote Jason that won with this quote the public speaking contest of the school board.

"My role model (as he said), my hero is not a man of universities, but a man of the universe, read here the land. My Giunshun (phonetic), Grandpa Issac Dixon, born and raised around Windy Lake."

The first comments, I want to thank some people. I think it's very important to acknowledge and respect the people around. I first thank the First Nation of Mistissini for welcoming all of us here and being able to express ourselves.

I want also to thank you -- to thank the Commission for giving me the opportunity to carry out the mandate I have from our Enoch, Eeyou, Nunavinit and non-native members. Thanks to Chief Shecapio. Thanks to Deputy Grand Chief Iserhoff, and Giunshun Thomas Coon for giving us a PhD level class on Cree culture and values yesterday evening.

Taking a strong stand for the Grand Council

of the Cree in this issue, in my opinion, it's taking the responsibility to carry on their duty to protect Eeyou Istchee. Thanks to the youth of Mistissini and especially to their Chief, Shawn Iserhoff, that has taken on his shoulder the burden of standing strong within his own people in an uncertain time. He gave us a true lesson of leadership.

I have to mention that the youth of Mistissini can always count on the Cree School Board staff that are members of our association to be standing by them and to support them in their decision regarding those kinds of issues.

In 2010, the member I represent here, working in all schools of Cree and Kativik School Board gave my association, AENQ, a strong mandate to stand against uranium projects in Eeyou Istchee and also in Nunavik land. They gave me also the mandate to support the local leadership aiming to oppose such a project, which I did for the last few weeks.

If I understood correctly, yesterday -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- Chief Shecapio expressed clearly and strongly the opposition of Mistissini to such projects now and also for the future. The Commission, of what I understood, said that no matter of social unacceptability, licence should be issued.

May I suggest, with all respect to the Commission, to the people of Mistissini, that we could learn the Cree wisdom that the laws governing the land are stronger and should be above the one governing people. That higher set of laws is called nature.

The Japanese people -- and again correct me if I'm wrong -- didn't think that they had -- did think they had mitigated almost all risk at Fukushima. We saw, like the rest of the world, what happened when we put the laws of the men above the laws of nature. Thanks to Chief Shecapio to have reminded us of those truths.

Eeyou Istchee is a diamond yet to be polished, as a paradise for ecotourism, which is by all means the real economic sustainable future, not uranium mining, with all respect to Mr. Mianscum.

I had two questions for the Commission -- actually, three. The granddad of my son, George Iseboum (phonetic) an Inuk from Waswanipi living on the land, not speaking French or English. I would like to know what the Commission did to inform such people about their rights about what's happening, the project, and how could they give their input?

My organization, AENQ, is a small organization, but we acknowledge the importance of letting people express themselves in their mother tongue, Cree,

Inuktitut, English, or French. It's always a burden, but it's something that is very important to us. How come I see here something that is not really like this? I see an effort, but I don't see something like this. So I would like to know if it's like this all the time?

Also, I was wondering why the Commission is having half of the hearing done in Mistissini and half of it done in Chibougamau? This project is on the James Bay, Northern Quebec Agreement territory, actually, on the Mistissini trap line, borderline map. That consultation should be done either only here or in the whole region of Quebec. What is the logic behind having half of it done in Chibougamau and half of it on Cree territories in Mistissini, as a matter of fact?

And finally, I would like to know what the federal Commission that you are and if you are aware that one of the main sources of capital financing Strateco here present is the Sentient Group, which is based in the Cayman Islands. Everybody knows about the fabulous capacity of tax evasion those islands are.

As a federal Commission, do you think there is question to be asked there if indeed there is proof that the money will not escape the federal regulation on tax?

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. P. D'ASTOUS: Oh, sorry. Sorry. (In Cree). Thank you. Merci beaucoup de m'avoir écouté si respectueusement et aurevoir.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Merci.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions?

Anybody, questions?

Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBRE HARVEY: Monsieur D'Astous asked three questions. So I would like -- I don't know who will answer the first one which is what did the Commission about the non-French or English speaking people? What has been done?

I mean there has been an effort here to get the translation which is not common to have three languages, but I don't know if you want a longer answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe staff -- maybe it's a good time for staff to explain the kind of outreach that CNSC has done to inform people about this project.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

If that's okay, I'll start and then others will add to the information.

When the project was launched, the process was managed by the COMEX under the James Bay Northern

Quebec Agreement. And it is within that process that the method by which people could get engaged, the consultations were done, public information sessions were held, was managed by the COFEX and COMEX under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement.

The CNSC participated in a technical support capacity when these public information sessions were being held by the COFEX and COMEX.

And I will let my colleagues speak to the other activities that CNSC staff have been involved in.

MR. LECLAIR: Jean Leclair, for the record.

So in addition to the activities that were done under the Environmental Assessment, we also participated in a number of information sessions that were organized by le Comité régional des Élus de la Baie James, where we went to Chibougamau, Chapais, Mistissini, and provided some information.

In addition, at the invitation of the Chief of Mistissini in September of 2010, I came to the community, participated in radio talk shows as well as a one-day information session, where I made a brief presentation ---

THE CHAIRMAN: We understand all of this. We heard all this. I want to know all the kinds of notices that were sent out.

You've got Kim over there. Maybe if you can talk to us, take us through all this.

MR. LECLAIR: I'll pass that back to someone at the back table who will have all those details. Just give me a second.

MS. MANN: Kimberley Mann, for the record. We're just trying to confirm the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency acted as the Crown consultation coordinator during the COFEX hearings and review process. I'm just trying to confirm -- I believe the directive and the Executive Summary of the EIS was translated into Cree and posted on the Sierra registry as well as the Executive Summary of the Comprehensive Study Report.

I'm just making sure that I'm providing the correct information.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, while you're seeking this information, can somebody reply as to how Chibougamau fits into the hearing, aside from the fact that we got lots of requests to be heard?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record. I'll attempt to provide an answer why Chibougamau. As you heard, as part of transparency of the Commission, hearing from intervenors and stakeholders, as part of the licence application, Chibougamau is a -- the

community itself is a stakeholder. And that's all I have to add from why Chibougamau. Because they are stakeholders and there has been an interest from that community.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many submissions did we get from Chibougamau?

MR. JAMMAL: Okay, I -- I'm going to go by -- I have to refer to the secretary on this to help me. It's over 35-40 I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: So I think it's -- you know, so again, it's probably a practical reason for holding the hearing in Chibougamau when you've got 20 representations. Okay.

Anything else, Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: There was another question asked. I don't know if Strateco wants to say something about the possibility that the money will step out of the country. I don't know if you want to ---

MR. HÉBERT: You know, we have about, I will say around 2000-2500 shareholders in the company. Our main shareholders actually is the Sentient Group, it's an Australian pension group, pension funds. It's four funds and the first was started by the Case de Dépôt of Quebec, and the initial fund. It's the reason why we have a director on our Board. Paul-André Couture is the

President of Sentient Group Canada, and he's representatives of the shareholders.

The question of Caymans, you know, for us it's our main shareholders. And those are 30 pension funds and including Chicago University, Harvard University and all those big institutions from all over the place.

Thank you.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Monsieur Jammal.

MR. JAMMAL: For the record, Ramzi Jammal.

Obviously, I multiplied the number of interventions by two, it's around -- over a dozen interventions. It's less than 20, it's around 16.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Anything else?

Kim, do you still want to say anything on this?

MS. MANN: Sorry, I'm just waiting for headquarters to confirm which documents were translated into Cree. I know there was a couple.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so you will update us when you get an answer. Thank you.

MS. MANN: Definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Last word?

MR. P. D'ASTOUS: Yes, just maybe for the future, people like the person I was talking about, George Isvan (phon.) or many people in this generation that have a lot of wisdom and knowledge, those people don't even read Cree.

Okay, that's why I was wondering what kind of reach was done to them. That's the only comment I wanted to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

We'll move on.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

LE PRÉSIDENT: La prochaine présentation est pour les mémoires du Groupe Minganie sans uranium, tel qu'indiqué au document 7,46. Monsieur Claude Lussier, vous avez la parole.

12-H7.46

Oral presentation by

Minganie sans uranium

M. C. LUSSIER: Oui, merci. Bonjour.

J'aurais aimé présenter mon mémoire en Cree ou en anglais ici, mais malheureusement, comme je suis plus à l'aise en français, je vais le faire en français.

D'abord, je dois dire que je suis très

heureux d'être ici pour avoir une tribune pour parler de la filière uranifère et je remercie tout particulièrement la communauté de Mistissini de nous accueillir si chaleureusement.

Je me présente d'abord. Je suis Claude Lussier, technicien en protection de l'environnement et porte-parole de Minganie sans uranium.

J'ai quelquefois des contrats dans les mines. Alors, d'entrée de jeu, je peux vous dire que je ne suis pas contre le secteur minier. Je suis contre la filière uranifère seulement.

Il y a plusieurs points dans mon mémoire mais on va aller au plus important. Le reste sera déposé sous peu à la Commission parce que comme le temps est assez restreint ici, je pourrai pas passer à travers tous les points que j'ai notés depuis le début de ces audiences-ci.

Alors, les points du mémoire de -- il y a d'abord, je parle des gaz à effet de serre et de l'acceptabilité sociale. On va y revenir.

Je décris un petit peu aussi là les problèmes environnement et santé. Juste pour résumer ça, on peut dire qu'il y a le regroupement Québec Meilleure Mine qui comprend 27 groupes, syndicats, et organismes de partout au Québec. Des organismes qui se préoccupent sur

la qualité de l'air, de l'eau, des habitats, des écosystèmes, et de la société aussi en général.

Qu'on travaille sur n'importe quel dossier dans ces dossiers-là, le constat c'est qu'il y a un consensus de tous ces organismes-là à travers le Québec qui vont contre les projets uranifères, contre le nucléaire et qui demande un moratoire au Québec pour toute la filière.

Je parle aussi des résidus radioactifs. Je pense que c'est pas nécessaire d'en reparler plus, je pense que tout le monde est conscient des problématiques avec ça. Et il faut dire que les mines d'uranium, ce ne sont pas des mines comme les autres parce qu'il y a des résidus radioactifs qui sont concernés.

Je parle aussi de l'énergie nucléaire qui est totalement non sécuritaire. On a qu'à penser à Tchernobyl et à Fukushima. Et aux rejets polluants constants de Gentilly-2 dont Hydro-Québec a divulgué les données, c'est disponible sur Internet si vous voulez aller voir. On a tous les rejets de la centrale Gentilly-2 sur le site d'Hydro-Québec.

On a aussi le cas des Navarro qui est très, très bien documenté. Quoique la Commission semble nier cet état de fait. C'est très bien documenté. On peut trouver plein de documents là-dessus. Je décris un petit

peu aussi les problèmes de la filière militaire. Et finalement, pour dire que toute cette filière-là d'uranium est sale et destructrice.

Maintenant, on va parler un petit peu des valeurs de la Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire reliées à l'acceptabilité sociale. Dans les valeurs décrites sur le site Web de la Commission, on parle d'intégrité. Et ça va comme suit:

"Nous adoptons dans nos interactions, une démarche éthique, objective, et impartiale."

Parenthèse: On ne sent pas beaucoup d'impartialité ici dans vos interactions. Les gens qui disent non sont mal informés. Les gens qui disent oui sont bien informés.

On continue le texte intégrité de la Commission:

"Nos gestes, nos décisions et nos motifs sont transparents."

Parenthèse: Vous niez systématiquement toutes les données que les opposants apportent. On est des activistes, des gens mal informés; on est des charlatans, des incompetents. On dirait qu'après la Commission, c'est Dieu; le reste n'est que foutaise. On dirait qu'il n'y a aucun expert en dehors de la

Commission.

Vous répétez que vous pouvez nous fournir tous les documents, mais les nôtres qu'on peut vous fournir, ils seront toujours invalides. Et ça c'est la Commission, et c'est aussi les experts qui viennent nous désinformer dans nos régions comme ça a été le cas chez nous avec le professeur Lacroix.

On continue ce qui est écrit sur votre site. Vous dites aussi que les -- vos décisions et vos motifs "sont transparents et peuvent satisfaire à l'examen du public." Est-ce que vous considérez ici que vous rencontrez encore ça? Est-ce que vous trouvez encore que le public est satisfait de votre examen?

"Nous agissons toujours dans l'intérêt du public et pour susciter des liens de confiance."

Pour la confiance, on dirait qu'il y a des doutes sérieux dans le public envers la confiance qu'on peut porter à la Commission.

Une autre valeur, le respect des autres.

"Nous agissons de manière respectueuse, équitable, et courtoise envers nos collègues, nos titulaires de permis, et le grand public. Nous écoutons les autres et nous respectons

leur point de vue, même en cas de divergence.

Lorsque nous cherchons une solution, nous communiquons de façon ouverte, fréquente, honnête, et objective.

Nous favorisons la consultation, le travail d'équipe, et la collaboration."

Or, comme il n'y a pas d'acceptabilité sociale pour l'uranium au Québec, et plus particulièrement dans le cas qui nous concerne ici avec l'énoncé du chef Shecapio et de sa communauté de Mistissini, votre intégrité et votre désir de respecter les autres vous conduira très certainement à la conclusion qu'au Québec, il ne devrait y avoir aucune mine d'uranium.

Question à la Commission. Maintenant, qu'allez-vous faire avec le refus de la communauté de Mistissini? Est-ce que vous répondez tout de suite ou vous la gardez pour tantôt?

LE PRÉSIDENT: Pas tout de suite, s'il vous plaît finir.

M. C. LUSSIER: On continue.

Au niveau des gaz à effet de serre, Madame Thompson a dit hier que le calcul de l'Institut Pembina concernant les gaz à effet de serre de la filière était

juste. Vous avez bien dit ça, Madame Thompson, hier, n'est-ce pas?

LE PRÉSIDENT: Continuez s'il vous plaît.

M. C. LUSSIER: Bien c'est parce que j'ai besoin de la réponse pour continuer.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Non, c'est pas -- vous allez faire votre soumission. On va discuter après ça.

M. C. LUSSIER: C'est parce que ça, si la réponse vient pas, ma présentation ---

LE PRÉSIDENT: C'est pas une question et réponse ici, c'est pas le processus.

M. C. LUSSIER: Bon. Après ça j'aurais une question à Monsieur Hébert. Pouvez-vous nous dire quel est le slogan qui figure au bas du nom de votre compagnie? Bien là, si j'ai pas de réponse, moi je vais vous la donner la réponse. Madame Thompson a bien dit hier que l'Institut Pembina avait un calcul juste pour les gaz à effet de serre. Et le slogan de la compagnie Strateco, c'est:

"Ressources Strateco axée sur
l'uranium: source d'énergie sans gaz à
effet de serre".

C'est la présentation de la compagnie, ils se présentent comme ça. Alors il semble assez clair que nous ne pouvons pas faire confiance à Strateco qui se

présente déjà avec un énoncé mensonger.

Question à la Commission: Pouvez-vous faire confiance à une compagnie qui utilise le mensonge pour se présenter? Comment pouvez-vous juger que les documents de Strateco contiennent des données justes considérant cette présentation mensongère?

Considérant la non-acceptabilité sociale de la communauté de Mistissini et de la population du Québec en général, autochtone comme allochtone, avec 320 municipalités, des MRC, beaucoup de communautés Cree, Innu, Mohawk, Malécites, algonquiennes, considérant que le message de Strateco est basé sur un mensonge, considérant la dangerosité de l'uranium pour la santé et l'environnement même si c'est nié par la Commission, considérant l'omerta entourant l'uranium et la filière nucléaire, considérant l'impartialité apparente de la Commission, considérant l'acharnement de l'industrie et de la Commission à convaincre les gens d'accepter l'inacceptable, Minganie sans uranium demande un moratoire permanent sur toute la filière nucléaire au Québec, de l'exploration de l'uranium jusqu'à l'enfouissement de déchets nucléaires, en passant par le déclassement de Gentilly-2. Nous exigeons plus de transparence et d'impartialité de la part de la Commission.

Minganie sans uranium demande à la

Commission de ne pas accorder de permis à Strateco et de leur signaler la fin des travaux et le démantèlement des installations dans les plus brefs délais.

Nous demandons de remettre un rapport sur la situation au gouvernement du Québec, particulièrement au sujet du manque d'acceptabilité sociale de la filière dans la province. Nous sommes d'avis que la Commission devrait proposer au gouvernement du Québec de faire des consultations publiques élargies sur la filière afin d'éclaircir ce sujet.

Merci.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Merci beaucoup.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

LE PRÉSIDENT: Alors je vais laisser à la CCSN et à Strateco à répondre. Alors on va commencer avec Strateco.

M. G. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert pour Strateco, concernant la déclaration sur notre site Web disant que cette énergie, sans gaz à effet de serre, il y a plusieurs sources qu'on a consultées, dont monsieur Gérald Declerck, membre de l'Association des écologistes pour le nucléaire, dans un de ses articles, il dit:

"Je suis en faveur de l'énergie nucléaire parce que c'est la seule énergie maîtrisable et renouvelable

qui, sans émission de gaz à effet de serre, sur une surface réduite, peut être produite et distribuée à proximité des besoins."

Lorsqu'on considère c'est certain que tout a un effet de serre -- je parle présentement, j'ai un effet de serre -- sur une surface réduite, avec les centrales, c'est un produit sans gaz à effet de serre.

On a de la littérature, il y a sûrement de la littérature qui contredit ça; mais on a de la littérature qui appuie ça. On peut choisir entre deux littératures.

Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

Peut-être par rapport à la controverse pour les gaz à effet de serre, il y a beaucoup eu de déclarations par, par exemple de l'Association canadienne nucléaire, et par les personnes dont Monsieur Hébert vient de faire état, qui parlent de la centrale nucléaire comme telle, par unités de kilowatts-heure produites en électricité.

Par contre, ce que l'Institut Pembina a fait, puis beaucoup d'organisations internationales font, c'est de faire l'estimé sur le cycle de vie en tenant

compte d'extractions minières, de la production, du combustible, et cetera. Donc, c'est deux façons de voir ou de calculer. Mais généralement, c'est plus approprié de faire le calcul sur l'ensemble du cycle de vie du produit.

Mais, par rapport aux énoncés qui ont été faits que des intervenants amènent de l'information sur la santé ou les effets sur l'environnement, puis le personnel de la Commission les rejette du revers de la main, ce que je voudrais dire, c'est que tous les documents d'information publique qui ont été produits par la Commission, qui sont sur notre site Web, on a toujours dit que si le gens avaient de l'information dont on n'avait pas tenu compte, puis qu'ils nous faisaient parvenir, qu'on en tiendrait compte.

Par contre, quand on parle des effets ici sur les enfants Navajo, c'est pas moi qui dit qu'il n'y a pas d'effets sur la santé; c'est quand on lit le rapport qui a été fourni par le Dr. Gingras dans son intervention, le rapport dit clairement qu'il n'y a pas d'effets significatifs chez les enfants Navajo. Le rapport dit aussi que le cancer, les taux de cancer chez les enfants autochtones étaient plus faibles que chez les enfants blancs. C'est pas moi qui le dit, c'est pas mon personnel de la Commission, c'est le rapport comme tel qui donne

cette information.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Autres questions?

MEMBRE HARVEY: Je veux souligner à Monsieur Lussier que la nature de ses commentaires sont faits à la mauvaise tribune. Et je ne sais pas si Monsieur Lussier a lu, même, le mandat de la Commission et du Tribunal de la Commission qui est de s'assurer, c'est pas de faire la promotion du nucléaire, pas du tout, mais de s'assurer que si le nucléaire est utilisé, qu'il va être fait en sécurité et qu'on va protéger la santé des personnes, la protection de l'environnement.

Donc, je l'invite à -- c'est beau de dire n'importe quoi. Et quant à l'indépendance, je pense qu'on écoute autant les gens qui viennent pour que les gens qui sont contre. Et lorsque quelqu'un est contre, on aimerait bien qu'il nous fournisse, en plus de son avis qu'il est contre, de données comparables pour qu'on puisse les comparer avec les données des spécialistes qu'on a.

Merci.

LE PRÉSIDENT: O.k. Le dernier mot, s'il vous plaît?

M. C. LUSSIER: Je voudrais juste dire qu'aux États-Unis, il y a des poursuites pour publicité mensongère qui ont été faites pour des gens qui ont dit que le nucléaire n'émettait pas de CO². Puis en France,

même Énergie de France admet que la filiale nucléaire émet des gaz à effet de serre.

Alors, moi, ce que je me rends compte ce matin, c'est que la Commission continue à nier les faits, qu'on leur apporte n'importe quoi; alors, vous venez juste prouver que ce que j'ai dit était vrai et que la Commission est vraiment impartiale.

Qu'on arrive avec n'importe quel document de n'importe quel expert au monde, Madame Thompson l'a bien dit tantôt, il y a toujours deux façons de voir la chose, hein? Puis vous autres, bien, vous prenez toujours les rapports et les arguments qui sont pour l'industrie.

On a dit, hier, ici, qu'on était comme à un tribunal, bien moi, je vais vous avouer, je cherche encore qui est juge et qui est partie dans ce tribunal-là.

Merci.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Merci beaucoup.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll move to the next submission which is an oral presentation from Mr. George Gunner as outlined in CMD 12-H7.21.

Mr. Gunner, the floor is yours.

12-H7.21

Oral presentation by

George Gunner

MR. G. GUNNER: Thank you very much. For the people that don't know me, my name is George Gunner. I'm a resident of Mistassini and a member of the Cree Nation of Mistassini, and I'm proud to be one too.

What I want to talk about is my experience in drilling, drilling and blasting. My livelihood, I'm a driller, and I'm also an instructor for drilling and blasting. Presently, I'm working at the Osisko Mine in Malartic. In 1971-72-73, I worked an underground in Chibougamau. After that, I worked in Cholis (phon.) for about 7 to 8 years.

The drilling part that I want to talk about is -- it's a surface drilling first. I've heard just recently that, coming from Malartic to here, at the conference here, I heard a lot of people taking turns, there are pros, or hardly -- the pros and cons, some of them are very negative into mining, but as for myself, that's my livelihood.

Every time I drill, I know where the water comes from, where it leaks, how many feet you drill. You can hit water at 10, 20, 30, 40, at 60 feet at times. And as for the project, the Matoush project, my dad sent me down, along with the first lady that spoke here Sophie

Coonishish Gunner. I hunted there; I trapped there; and I am concerned about the leakage.

I also worked in the Rufus Tanrow (phon.), down in the Rufus (phon.) River. I was a drilling under 120 feet below the water, I mean the lake. And the leaks of the water can go anywhere and this is where my concern is at the Matoush project. What can Strateco do to stop the leakage?

As you know, in Val d'Or, there is a mine, after a blast, brought down a big portion of the town, which is close by to the mine. Right now, you should see the devastation that is done at the houses surrounding the mine. They're shooting concrete, drilling and shooting concrete into the soil, the ground, to make it solid, so the houses won't be able to be time-dated.

And same thing with the Strateco -- not Strateco -- Osisko, the care that they take, the expense that they make into preventing such -- it still doesn't guarantee the Town of Malartic the safety that they're looking for. Even the amount of money that is spent on exploding explosives; and the wind is a big factor too there.

I forgot to bring a newspaper, a newsclip from the local Malartic newspaper, a clip that -- a shot that was taken after a blast where these gas fumes went up

into the air. It shows in the newspaper.

So, the question that I'm going to ask Strateco is: what can they do to prevent disasters from happening like that? I'm not against them or am I not for them? I'm neutral.

Because, like I said, I am -- that's my livelihood. I am a miner, I'm also a surface driller.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Strateco, you want to reply to this?

MR. P. TERREAUULT: Pierre Terreault, for the record.

I know the mine you were talking about in Val d'Or, it's named Goldex, and they were using mining methods called block caving, which mean you start blasting at the bottom, you let it go right through the -- part of it going up to the surface almost.

The -- I don't know what really happened I didn't see the report, but it seemed that the rock went faster than we expect to go and that's what happened. And the other thing they had problem is the surface water, they went in the crack and they had problem with that. So that's about Goldex.

I know they're doing some -- they've been shutdown I believe for almost a year now and they're doing study and they're doing some backfill to prevent any more

damage.

The one from Osisko, we have to remember that this mine is mining over some old opening from 1950 and more, and those drift or old stope are not always surveyed so they have problems. So they have to justify or take care of the drilling as they go and make some drilling test to make sure that they don't have any opening on it.

What exactly happened with the dust when they blast, I cannot tell because I didn't see the report either for that. But that's the main difference between the two mines now.

For our part, well it's only a ramp for now, as everybody know, and we won't have any mining there until we'll do the feasibility study in a few years -- four years, and then we'll decide roughly what kind of mining method we're going to use.

But the depth where the ore body start, it's 120 metres roughly -- 180. And the rock are not necessarily the same as the one from Goldex, so the -- and we won't use the block caving because the ore body doesn't fit for that kind of mining, it's more vein, so the rock will not go up right through the surface. So we'll start on 180 and we'll go down so that we won't see that kind of problem in the mining situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. G. GUNNER: I have another question for Strateco.

What type of mining are you going to be doing? Is this an open pit or is it an underground shaft? And why is -- can you clarify me on an issue that was brought to my attention by one of your local -- well, future contractors that has to drill up there already for the ramp, and he had asked me if I could work for the ramp. Is it a green light for Strateco to go ahead with the ramp?

THE CHAIRMAN: The answer is no.

MR. G. GUNNER: M'hm?

THE CHAIRMAN: The answer is no ---

MR. G. GUNNER: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- on your last one.

But what kind of a mine? Please answer.

MR. P. TERREAUULT: Pierre Terreault, for the record.

Well, we did a scoping study and in the scoping study we decide to put some long-hole drilling for narrow vein mining. That will be -- well, that was an estimation for now with the resource we have -- mineral resource that we have presently, that was an estimation only. And that's why we're going underground to estimate

more and define more the mining methods.

The -- it will be an underground mine and we'll -- and probably the contractor who asked you to come to drill, it's -- we have some quote -- some quotation from different mining contractor for the portal. And for now it's -- it will be only the portal we -- to take some a bit advance though we won't -- to make sure that when we're going to have the licence, we won't wait a few months before we have somebody on site do the job. So it's only for that purpose only.

THE CHAIRMAN: Last question.

MR. G. GUNNER: Yes, thank you, thank you very much.

The other question that I have is you're storing the waste for a very long period of time, okay. And my concern right now is after listening and thinking about a lot what happened to the mine -- to the waste storage site in Chapais, it destroyed the highway from Chapais to Waswanipi there; will that occur?

MR. P. TERREAUULT: Pierre Terreault, for the record.

I don't know if you're talking about the tailing that went out?

MR. G. GUNNER: Yes.

MR. P. TERREAUULT: Okay, for this project

we don't have any tailing and we don't have any dam for retaining tailings, so it won't happen for that part.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, I'm curious. I'm not familiar here, what happened to -- what happened in Chapais waste tailings? Can you ---

MR. G. GUNNER: The sewage flew down -- I mean flowed down to the main highway and apparently one driver, at the early stages of the -- that accident -- that incident went in and he was not injured. But the damage to the highway was probably about three metres in width and four metres in depth and it did a lot of damage to the forestry near -- downstream as it went there. Because they had to divert the road from going there because I had to travel to work, that's the reason why I'm asking that. That's why I was concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was an engineering problem, not the type of the waste rock, that's what I'm thinking.

MR. G. GUNNER: Nature can do that too from the rain, snow -- it can destroy those sites, the stockpiles that are doing even in the -- presently in Osisko. That's what's happening to the stock waste that they're doing -- they're starting to slide down.

Since I've been working in the Osisko Mine, I've been very concerned about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. G. GUNNER: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Now, we still got logistic order here.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LEBLANC: So we're waiting so we can connect with some people by teleconference. There's also Madame Alice Petawabano who is waiting for her son, so we're waiting for her son.

Meanwhile, we had a request at numerous instances for Mr. Morley Gunner to say a few words. So, Mr. Gunner, if you want to say a few words right now?

(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

THE CHAIRMAN: Welcome.

Oral presentation by

Morley Gunner

MR. M. GUNNER: Welcome to Mistissini. My name is the Honky Tonk Man, I'll sign you a song and it won't take long.

I have -- I've got the little report from Pembina Institute on lifecycle study on nuclear power. But anyway, I'll -- the thing with -- that I'm going to read here is about the tailings that you were just talking

about a while ago:

"Tailings or waste left by milling process consists of ground rock particles, water, mill chemicals, and radioactive and otherwise hazardous contaminants, such as heavy metal."

Not heavy metal music though.

"In fact, up to 85 percent of the radiological elements contained in the original uranium ore end up in the tailings. Canadian uranium mines produce more than half a million tonnes of tailings each year. As of 2003, there were 213 million tonnes of uranium mill tailings in storage at 24 tailings sites across Canada."

And I just heard a while ago Strateco say we have no tailings. They will have no tailings. I think you're lying, as all mining companies do. And:

"Enough material to fill the Toronto Rogers Centre, formerly the SkyDome, approximately 100 times."

I mean, that's a lot.

"Other mining methods, such as the in-situ leaching where powerful chemicals

are injected into the ground to leach uranium out of the ore, are sometimes presented as a way of mining uranium without the need of milling operations. However, the practice is associated with the underground contamination, that is impossible to mediate -- remediate.

Uranium mining operations also produce waste rock..."

They were talking about rocks there a while ago for the roads:

"...which contains both radionuclides and heavy metal such as nickel, copper, arsenic and..."

Oh boy, these other ones are tongue-twisters, yeah -- molybdenum (unintelligible).

(LAUGHTER/RIRES)

MR. M. GUNNER: Anyway:

"Depending on the type of the rock, these wastes may be acid-generating with the results of radionuclides and heavy metals may be leached out of the waste of contaminated surfaces of the groundwater.

Surface mines can generate up to 40 tonnes of waste rock for every tonne of uranium produced, while underground mines produce about one tonne of waste rock per tonne of ore.

Because of their hazardous nature, uranium mine tailings and waste rock require perpetual care."

Did you hear that, Strateco?

(LAUGHTER/RIRES)

MR. M. GUNNER: "Operating a now-closed uranium tailing management facilities have been associated with severe pollution..."

Hear that, Strateco?

"...of surface and groundwater and radionuclides, principally uranium, [whatever it is] heavy metal and conventional pollutants."

Boy, we're talking heavy here, heavy metal, pollutants. Anyway, now:

"The windblown dust from the tailings facility contains radionuclides, heavy metals and particulate matters. The facilities can also be significant

sources of radon gas.

Major failures of tailing management facilities have occurred in Canada, Rabbit Lake, Key Lake and Elliott Lake, and around the world, the United States, Australia, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria..."

And a couple of other countries. I don't know how to pronounce their names.

In addition:

"With the air impacts, in addition to the radionuclides and radon gas, heavy metals and particulate matters that can be released from underground ventilation systems.

Waste rocks and tailing storage areas in service mining operations and uranium milling processes are a significant source of air pollution. Milling operations release nitrogen-oxide, volatile organic compounds, carbon dioxide and PM.

Acid plants producing acid for milling operations release large amounts of sulphur dioxide in a major carburetor

through acid rain."

And we don't want acid rain here.

Now, with the water impacts:

"In addition to the leaching of the contamination of tailings..."

Which nobody ever talks about -- management facilities:

"...the waste rock storage sites, uranium mines and mills release radioactive, principally uranium, hazardous heavy metals and conventional, total suspended solids, contaminants to underground and surface waters through discharges of mills and mine waters and general runoff from the mine sites."

In fact, Environment Canada and Health Canada have included the effects from uranium mining and milling operations in Canada to meet the definitions of toxic substances of the purposes of the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act*.

"Groundwater near the Cluff Lake mine sites have been found, for example, to have arsenic concentration of 66 times higher than the background level of

the nickel levels of 1,250 times higher. Both of these metals are CEPA toxic. Fish in the water receiving discharges from the Key Lake mines have been found to have a heavy metal, nickel, cobalt, cadmium, concentrations up to 43 times higher than at normal levels."

Now, this is the health effects from mine workers, uranium mining ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, excuse me, please.

MR. M. GUNNER: We've heard a lot of discussions on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, we're familiar with the paper. We know Pembina very well. We know all this. So please tell us your view about what you're trying to tell us.

MR. M. GUNNER: Okay. The -- okay, now this is the last thing I'll read here for you.

"The concentration of the airborne radionuclides in leeches that are eaten by caribou, which are eaten by people..."

We have caribou up here:

"...is considered one of the most serious threats in the health of the living -- of those living in the area of uranium mining operations.

A tissue study of 18 Wollaston Lake area caribou concluded that the adult eating 100 grams a day of caribou meat received annual effective radiation doses of 0.5 mSv a year. Additional eating to one liver, 10 kidneys per year would double this dose of 1.7 mSv a year, when your old child would consume only 10 percent of the adult caribou intake would receive more than half of the adult dose of radiation. The consumption of a caribou was found in the increase of the chance of developing cancer as high as 0.6 percent over 70 years of lifetime, which is equivalent to the -- to a rate of six cancer per 1,000 people. This far exceeds the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's range of acceptable chance of risks of 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 1,000,000."

So we do have caribou up here and we have a lot of caribou that come down here, and this is what I'm concerned about, the caribou getting cancer and we eat caribou that have cancer. This is what I don't like.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Any quick reply? Any comment from both CNSC or Strateco?

MR. G. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert, Strateco.

Just to say that we are not liars. We don't have tailings. For this actual project, for the next four years there's absolutely no tailings there.

So when talking about the exploration advance program, they have no tailings. So it's not a question. Thanks.

THE CHAIRMAN: CNSC, you want to say anything?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

I wanted to say something about the caribou studies that are quoted in Pembina. The studies were done by Pat Thomas with funding from Environment Canada and the Atomic Energy Control Board at the time. The studies that were done showed that there was high levels of polonium-210 in caribou meat.

The same type of studies done in the Arctic have shown very similar concentrations of polonium, and

the paper actually says that there was no evidence that the caribou had actually spent any time around Wollaston Lake.

And so the levels of polonium in caribou are natural. They're not related to uranium mining, and it's a well-known phenomena. Inuit people have eaten caribous for millennia and it has never caused health effects in Inuit people consuming caribou.

So this is not going to change if there's a uranium mine or a uranium exploration project in this area. Caribou will not be contaminated by the uranium project. Polonium is natural in caribou.

THE CHAIRMAN: One last thing. The intervenor was reading us an impressive list of contamination, if you like, in a uranium mine.

Does anybody know the equivalent list of contamination in a PQ mine, a gold mine? What kind of contamination have you seen you know in a gold mine, for example. Nobody talks about arsenic, for example.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

Actually, Environment Canada does an evaluation of the environmental performance of the mining sectors in Canada and uranium mining sector has always come as the best environmental performance.

In terms of the impressive list of chemicals, they would -- and metals and radionuclides, they are very similar for other mines. The quantity of uranium and radium varies depending on the type of rock.

When you look at gold mine, cyanide is an additional problem and for many, many, many years, gold mines have been a health and environmental problem because of cyanide use.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the Environment Canada study available to the public?

DR. THOMPSON: It is available. The report is on their website and there's a joint CNSC/Environment Canada report that has been published for the last three or four years. That provides the information as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Thank you.

MR. GUNNER: Okay, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Marc, what are we going to do now?

MR. LEBLANC: Well, we have one oral intervenor that is live, that's Madame Petawabano. But your son has not arrived yet so what we're going to do is to proceed with the written submissions. A number of people in the community have sent us written submissions. I'm going to go through them, ask the Commission Members

if they have any questions. Many were of a similar nature about issues that have already been dealt with. And after that we will proceed with either the teleconference from Madame Petawabano.

So there were a number of oral interventions that were changed into written submissions by the intervenor. So the first one it's H7.37, the Cree Trappers Association.

12-H7.37

Written Submission by

The Cree Trappers Association

MR. LEBLANC: That had been scheduled to take place yesterday.

So is there any question from the Commission Members on this intervention?

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Since that was meant to be an oral report yesterday, I would just ask for staff and Strateco to discuss briefly the protection of harvesting rights, the rights of trappers that the intervenor mentions on -- I've got the right one? Yes.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

Dr. McDill, the intervenor talks about the

rights and access and we'll let Strateco answer that question.

With respect to the health impacts, I will ask Dr. Thompson to address the issue because as it's been discussed, that there will be no restrictions for the trapping.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah but, wait a second. I thought that those rights are enshrined in the James Bay Agreement?

DR. THOMPSON: That's correct, and one of the areas of the assessment considered the levels of contamination of wildlife and fish that are eaten in the traditional Cree diet, and in terms of trapping as well. And the assessment has indicated that at this stage, there will not be any impacts to anything that would prevent people from using the land as they do today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me put it in a positive sense or the negative, Strateco cannot interfere with those rights.

DR. THOMPSON: Sorry. That's correct, and one of the considerations is to maintain access and traditional rights and their means of compensation measures and other items, to make sure that this is the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco, do you want to add

anything to this or not?

MR. G. HÉBERT: In fact, the footprint -- it's Guy Hébert, Strateco.

The footprint actually is .5 square kilometres and because requests from the CNSC will have a gate, okay, for security, for access to the property, so people will have to register, but the -- we are very close of the Coonishish family who has access to their trap lines all the time, and I don't think that will change, you know.

But we will have additional security on site for allowing the licence, if it's given.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Marc?

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission that was an oral and became a written is Mr. Charlie Loon, at H7.41.

12-H7.41

Written Submission by

Mr. Charlie Loon

MR. LEBLANC: Any question?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. LEBLANC: So the next presentation --

the next intervention was from Ms. Maggie Voyageur, H7.42.

12-H7.42

Written Submission by

Ms. Maggie Voyageur

MR. LEBLANC: Any question?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from the Canadian Nuclear Association, as outlined CMD 12-H7.10. Yes, I'll repeat, H7.10, in today's submissions.

12-H7.10

Written Submission by

Canadian Nuclear Association

MR. LEBLANC: As there's no questions, the next submission was from Ms. Elaine MacLeod, CMD H7.11.

12-H7.11

Written Submission by

Ms. Elaine MacLeod

MR. LEBLANC: Any questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: From today too?

MR. LEBLANC: Yes.

Can I move to the next submission, which is from Virginia Coonishish, 12-H7.30.

12-H7.30

Written Submission by

Ms. Virginia Coonishish

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from Mr. John Bobbish as outlined in CMD 12-H7.54.

12-H7.54

Written Submission by

Mr. John Bobbish

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from Ms. Victoria Bobbish, 12-H7.55.

12-H7.55

Written Submission by

Ms. Victoria Bobbish

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Darlene Neeposh, as outlined in CMD H7.56. Again, those items have already been discussed by the Commission.

12-H7.56

Written Submission by

Ms. Darlene Neeposh

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Ernest Nakogee, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.57.

12-H7.57

Written Submission by

Mr. Ernest Nakogee

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from Mrs. Helen Petawabano as outlined in CMD 12-H7.58.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I have a question. The statement is made that I think staff may want to comment on.

"I don't approve the project, dangerous with women who are pregnant, causing deformed babies."

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record. The ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Where would stuff like this come from anyhow?

DR. THOMPSON: I'm not sure where those

types of statements come from. The evidence -- there are 30,000 children that have been followed for three generations that have been exposed to the nuclear bombs of Hiroshima-Nagasaki and there has never been any evidence of birth defects in those 30,000 children. The only evidence of effects of radiation on infants, on babies has been when pregnant women have been x-rayed and the doses were directly on the foetus at very high doses. But under natural radiation conditions around uranium mines or even in situations of nuclear bombs, there's never been any evidence of children that have been affected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from Mrs. Mary Mark in CMD H7.59.

12-H7.59

Written Submission by

Mrs. Mary Mark

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from Mr. Ronald Blackned at CMD 12-H7.60.

12-H7.60

Written Submission by

Mr. Ronald Blackned

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Titus Mianscum, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.61.

12-H7.61

Written Submission by

Mr. Titus Mianscum

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mrs. Annie Pauline Bosum at CMD 12-H7.62.

12-H7.62

Written Submission by

Mrs. Annie Pauline Bosum

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Ms. Hattie Coonishish, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.63.

12-H7.63

Written Submission by

Ms. Hattie Coonishish

MR. LEBLANC: The next submission is from Stacy Anderson in CMD 12-H7.64.

12-H7.64

Written Submission by

Stacy Anderson

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Moses Brien or Brien, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.65.

12-H7.65

Written Submission by

Mr. Moses Brien

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mrs. Annie Mark Blacksmith, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.66.

12-H7.66

Written Submission by

Mrs. Annie Mark Blacksmith

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission -
- oops, sorry.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: There was supposed to be a picture attached to this presentation. I don't have a

picture.

MR. LEBLANC: There was -- we did not receive a picture.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Did CNSC receive the picture for this?

MR. LEBLANC: No.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay, thank you.

MR. LEBLANC: So the next written submission is from Mr. Giiwedini Matoush, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.67.

12-H7.67

**Written Submission by
Mr. Giiwedini Matoush**

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Ms. Lynn Neeposh, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.68.

12-H7.68

**Written Submission by
Ms. Lynn Neeposh**

THE CHAIRMAN: Here, again, I'm looking forward to the picture. I like pictures. No pictures.

MR. LEBLANC: There were no pictures

attached.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have -- did we follow-up and find out what happened?

MR. LEBLANC: I believe we did, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Monsieur Alexandre Brien or Brien, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.69.

12-H7.69

Written Submission by

M. Alexandre Brien

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Clifford Loon, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.70.

12-H7.70

Written Submission by

Mr. Clifford Loon

MR. LEBLANC: We have also received a written submission from Ms. Elisabeth Shecapio, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.71.

12-H7.71

Written Submission by

Ms. Elisabeth Shecapio

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Matthew Wapachee, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.72.

12-H7.72

Written Submission by

Mr. Matthew Wapachee

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mrs. Emily Shecapio, as outlined in CDM 12-H7.73.

12-H7.73

Written Submission by

Mrs. Emily Shecapio

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Leonard Brien, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.74.

12-H7.74

Written Submission by

Mr. Leonard Brien

MR. LEBLANC: We have also received a

written submission from Mr. Matthew Shecapio, at outlined in CMD 12-H7.75.

12-H7.75

**Written Submission by
Mr. Matthew Shecapio**

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Ms. Theresa MacLeod, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.76.

12-H7.76

**Written Submission by
Ms. Theresa MacLeod**

MR. LEBLANC: We have also received a written submission from Mrs. Karen Coonishish, as outlined in CMD 12-J7.77.

12-H7.77

**Written Submission by
Mrs. Karen Coonishish**

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. Kevin Mianscum, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.78.

12-H7.78

Written Submission by

Mr. Kevin Mianscum

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mrs. Mary Bosum, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.79.

12-H7.79

Written Submission by

Mrs. Mary Bosum

MR. LEBLANC: We have also received a written submission from Mr. Maverick Loon-Swallow, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.80.

12-H7.80

Written Submission by

Mr. Maverick Loon-Swallow

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Mr. George Coon, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.81.

12-H7.81

Written Submission by

Mr. George Coon

MR. LEBLANC: We have also received a submission from Mrs. Priscilla Coon-Come, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.82.

12-H7.82

Written Submission by

Mrs. Priscilla Coon-Come

MR. LEBLANC: The next written submission is from Ms. Natalie Guttormsson, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.83.

12-H7.83

Written Submission by

Ms. Natalie Guttormsson

MR. LEBLANC: Le prochain mémoire est du Groupe de recherche en éducation et formation relatives à l'environnement, tel qu'indiqué au CMD 12-H7.84.

12-H7.84

Memoire de Groupe de recherché

en éducation et formation

relatives à l'environnement

MR. LEBLANC: We have also received a written submission from Mrs. Elizabeth Coon, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.90.

12-H7.90

Written Submission by

Mrs. Elizabeth Coon

MR. LEBLANC: And this concludes the list of written submissions. We will take a 15-minute break and proceed with the remaining oral interventions when we come back at 2:26 -- 2:30; 2:25?

THE CHAIRMAN: Two twenty-five (2:25).

MR. LEBLANC: Two twenty-five (2:25).

--- Upon recessing at 2:20 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 14h20

--- Upon resuming at 2:33 p.m./

L'audience est reprise à 14h33

THE CHAIRMAN: And the next four presenters are joining us via teleconference starting with a presentation for Michel Duguay, as outlined in CMD 12-

H7.47.

Hello, Mr. Duguay.

MR. M. DUGUAY: Yes, I'm here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Over to you.

12-H7.47

Oral presentation by

Michel Duguay

MR. M. DUGUAY: Okay, thank you, Dr. Binder. Well, so I'm Michel Duguay from Laval University and also with the Mouvement Sortons le Québec du Nucléaire.

Thank you for accepting my presentation.

In connection with the Matoush Uranium Mining Project, I'd like to present several arguments against uranium mining in the Mistissini region, as well as in the Province of Quebec.

The first point is that uranium mining is not part of sustainable development. Part of the uranium metal extracted from a mine is fissioned in nuclear reactors; that is, it is broken up into smaller elements, the so-called radioactive waste, and it can never be put back together. A great many of these fission products are highly radioactive, like cesium-137, and they present a danger to living organisms for several centuries because

cesium-137, in particular, gets into the food chain, eventually gets into our bodies and can cause damage.

In nuclear reactors, part of the uranium metal is converted into plutonium 239, which remains dangerous for 250,000 years. And plutonium 239 is the metal of choice to make nuclear weapons. Uranium mining is a direct offense to the concept of inter-generational equity, which is dear to the native people. In other words, our generation would consume the nuclear electricity by finishing the uranium, and then the upcoming generations for dozens and even hundreds of generations, would have to cope with the deadly radioactive waste.

When it comes to uranium mines per se, as you all very well know, it leaves behind mountains of tailings, which contain many radioactive elements which remain dangerous for quite a long time. In fact, much longer than the typical 100-year limit for engineering constructions. People in civil engineering in general will not guarantee any construction for more than 100 years. So that if you -- even if you try to put barriers against -- around the tailings of uranium mines, who's to say what will happen in 100 years or in 200 years from now?

The second point I want to make is that

uranium mining supports nuclear reactors, of course, which the majority of people living in Quebec do not wish to have an operation, as many public opinion polls have shown. The Quebecois fear the risk of a severe nuclear accident. And they do not believe that nuclear power is cost effective against other sources of electricity in Quebec. In addition, uranium mining leaves behind enormous quantities of uranium tailings, which could contaminate the underground water table and cause all kinds of problems.

The third point I want to mention is that nuclear weapons proliferation is still a topic of interest nowadays. Canada has helped India and Pakistan acquire nuclear weapons by letting them build nuclear reactors. And that problem is still very much alive in the newspapers because countries don't get along too well and everybody's afraid that a nuclear war could break out.

The fourth point is that our movement had the signatures of 320 municipalities throughout Quebec who have argued to stop uranium mining and nuclear power and instead concentrate our efforts in developing renewable energy. In connection with renewable energy, there was a very good article published in *Le Devoir* last Saturday where they showed where the situation is in Germany with renewable energy.

Germany has already closed down eight nuclear reactors and will close down its remaining nine reactors by 2020 or 2022. And they're going heavily into wind power and solar power. And already they're producing as much wind power and solar power as something like 20 nuclear reactors would produce. So it's a great example to follow, the example of Germany dropping nuclear power, and going into renewable energy.

There's been studies recently from MIT where they claim that with better manufacturing techniques, the cost of solar panels -- which is already quite reasonable -- is going to be dropped by probably 50 percent within the next 10 years. Already, it's easy to argue, as I did in the previous presentation on Matoush, that in the native nations' territories, the vast territories, probably the cheapest source of electricity would be wind power and photovoltaic power. Because it's very expensive to build a dam and to build electric power lines and to keep them up. And the native peoples in those regions, as well as the Quebecois government, should look into wind power and photovoltaic power in a very serious manner.

Our opponents claim that when the wind is out and the sun is out, at night especially, that there is no power from renewables. That is not true because some

high-capacity batteries have been developed for cars, and are being developed for electric buses and even trucks. With high-capacity batteries, you'll be able to store wind power and solar power and use it at whatever time you wish.

So all the ingredients are there for the native people to really develop their land, their territories, not just for the next five years that a mine, a uranium mine might be open, but basically for hundreds and thousands of years. So that is the direction I think that the native peoples ought to take. And as I understand it, they already have intentions in this direction. That is the end of my presentation. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

DR. BARRIAULT: Merci monsieur le président. I'm sort of interested in the concept of the wind power generation and solar. But I guess what I'm questioning is the -- whether the production of batteries for storage of power is actually considered green power?

MR. DUGUAY: Well, the -- I'm a proponent of the sodium batteries. I've read quite a bit about sodium. The advantage of sodium over lithium, sodium has

about an equal performance as lithium, but it is exceedingly abundant. The oceans are filled with sodium chloride salt. So sodium is not -- well no the -- even the cost factor, because it's so cheap, so abundant. And these people claim that their batteries are entirely recyclable. Now, I have not checked that in detail, but you know, salt is not toxic, you put some on your food every day.

So the sodium batteries use nickel and iron and aluminum. These are not toxic metals. So I don't see any reason why it should not be possible to completely recycle those batteries.

DR. BARRIAULT: So you're going to put them into category of green power?

MR. DUGUAY: Well why wouldn't a battery be called green power?

DR. BARRIAULT: Because of the production process involved in producing these batteries. Much the same as you apply to other forms of energy when you're talking about green power. We have the same problem, wind generation, you got to produce turbines, generators, alternators, whatever you're going to use to generation your power from your windmills. So I guess I'm questioning that concept also.

MR. DUGUAY: So there's a question of ratio

here. It's well known that with wind turbines, you can -- yes, in the production, you'll put out carbon dioxide, but it will be 10 times less than you do when you build nuclear reactors.

DR. BARRIAULT: Thank you. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Professor today, I just want to ask you one question. You deal with sustainable development. Are you against all mining? Because if you apply the sustainability concept, I don't know what's sustainable about gold, diamond, oil, gas. Comments?

MR. GUAY: Yes well, you know, I have preferences in what I would like to mine. I'm very much interested in iron and nickel. And I would argue that Quebec would do well in keeping its nickel and manufacturing batteries because if we sell the nickel cheap to the Chinese, you know, we'll pay 10 times, 100 times more for the Chinese batteries that use nickel. So we're not going to make well -- do well economically if we sell our nickel cheap as Sudbury in Ontario has done for years and decades. So there's, you know, we have to really look at the complete economic cycle. Maybe it's better for us to keep the nickel and produce batteries in Quebec.

THE CHAIRMAN: But then you're arguing economics, and if China want to buy Canadian uranium, then

what's the difference between selling them nickel and selling them uranium.

MR. GUAY: Well I think when you touch on uranium, as the native peoples have told you many times, you hit very deep philosophical principles. Who wants to sell uranium to a country that wants to build nuclear weapons? Who wants to do that?

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, just for the record, the uranium that comes from Canada will not be used for anything but peaceful application. And we can verify this and we can guarantee this. We would not send the materials unless we know what its end use is.

MR. GUAY: But in any case, I present to you the argument that I once did on television that, you know, on television you can see gold every once in a while.

And people who buy gold and make gold lingots, they don't destroy the gold. They store it.

Now, in the uranium business, you talk about destroying the uranium in a nuclear reactor. If uranium is such a great thing, why destroy it? And why not leave some for the coming generations?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we'll end up on this -- we can get into a long discussion about that,

about the reusing of uranium, but I don't think this is the place and time to do that.

So thank you for your intervention.

MR. M. DUGUAY: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Binder.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we will move on to the next presenter. So the next submission is an oral presentation from Mr. Robert Del Tredici of the Atomic Photographer Guild, as outlined in CMD 7.48 and 7.48A.

Mr. Tredici, the floor is yours. I understand you're joining us. Can you hear us?

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yes. Will my pictures be shown as I speak?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, well, let's test the technology. Can we see the pictures?

MR. DEL TREDICI: And it's not being broadcast now. So I'm looking at the television screen, the computer screen. I don't see anything. So if you can tell me that it is on the screen in the auditorium, that would be good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry. Can you get closer to the mic? We can't make you out.

MR. DEL TREDICI: You cannot hear me?

THE CHAIRMAN: That's worse.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Can you hear me now?

THE CHAIRMAN: Try one more time.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Can you hear me now? Am I clear?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, much better.

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right. Much better, he says.

THE CHAIRMAN: And we have the pictures, so please proceed.

12-H7.48 / 12-H7.48A

Oral presentation by

Robert Del Tredici,

The Atomic Photographers Guild

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right. My name is Robert Del Tredici and I founded a group called the Atomic Photographers Guild. It's made up of photographers who want to make visible all different aspects of the nuclear age. This has been a very critical era for humanity and yet it remains culturally invisible.

So what is the point of making the nuclear age visible? The point is to help make it real for people.

This picture here is a photograph of the world's first uranium mine. It's Port Radium just beneath

the Arctic Circle in the Northwest Territories.

The man you see there was born on the mine site while it was very active in the 70's.

The burlap sacks that you see in the rocks there, rotting in the sun, were once used by the Dene to carry crushed uranium ore from the mine onto a barge that went across Great Bear Lake and was sent south into the U.S. Manhattan project to be made into atomic bombs.

The Dene miners there did not know the use to which the uranium was being put.

Next slide please. In this slide, we see the first two atomic bombs. In the background is the Nagasaki bomb, which used plutonium, and in the foreground is the Hiroshima bomb. These are replicas of the Hiroshima bomb, which used uranium.

Uranium and bombs go together. It is essential. You cannot have a bomb without uranium. Of course, uranium is also used for energy and for medical isotopes. But energy and isotopes can both be created by other means but not nuclear weapons. So uranium is an essential ingredient for nuclear weapons.

Next slide please. In this picture, we see that two Dene Natives are holding up a sign that shows why uranium mining is different from all other minings. Why does it require a different institutional structure to

deal with it? The answer is because uranium mining is dangerous in unique long-lasting ways.

It came out earlier this morning at the hearing that it wasn't until much later on in the early 70's that people realized the full danger.

But this is a document from 1931 in Ottawa regarding radium ores. And where there is radium, there is uranium. And what it says is that the ingestion of small amounts of radioactive dust over a long period of time will cause a building up of radioactive material in the body, which eventually may have serious consequences, lung cancer, bone necrosis, and rapid anaemia or possible diseases due to the deposition of radioactive substances in the cell tissue or bone structure of the body.

Next slide. We will show this document in a more legible form. So we seen in 1931, the dangers were very clearly seen and expressed, except that this document was not sent out to the people who had to haul the sacks of ore onto the barges. These warnings were issued to the technicians in Ottawa who were tasked with analyzing the ore that came in from that mine. So it was known, but it was not widely published.

Next slide please. They say that radiation, you can't see it. You can't smell it. You can't taste it. But here, we see it in an image of a

particle of plutonium in the lung tissue of an ape. Now actually, the particle under question is so small, you cannot see it, but what you see are these little spiky black lines emanating from where the particle is. Each line represents a burst of alpha energy that makes an imprint on the emulsion that's covering this slide. And so all these black lines represent how many bursts of alpha radiation occur within a 48-hour period. This is a particle of plutonium, which is an alpha emitter, but it's very similar in this regard to a particle of uranium. They both put out alpha radiation, which people say is non-penetrating. It can be stopped by a sheet of paper, which is true.

But once that particle is inhaled into the lungs or enters the body by the blood stream, within the range of those black lines, there are 10,000 cells that have no protection and are heavily impacted.

I have a question at this point, which I would like to ask the CNSC and maybe they can respond later. What information has the CNSC disseminated on alpha radiation? I would like to know that.

Next slide please. And here we see the infamous tailings pile. This is what is left behind after uranium mining and milling occur. Most of the uranium is removed from these tailings piles but not the thorium, the

radon, the radium or the polonium all of which are dangerous alpha emitters.

This is a Stanrock Tailings Mine in Elliot Lake, Ontario. The Chamber of Commerce in Elliot Lake refers to the town as the "jewel in the wilderness." These tailings, this mountain of tailings fills an entire lake behind it, and it was from uranium mined in the 50's for the bomb.

Next slide please. Now, there have been some improvements in the open-air storage of these tailings. It can be blown by the wind and washed by the rain. They've been covered in rock. This is now what the Stanrock tailings pile looks like.

Elsewhere nearby, the tailings have been submerged in water but as we know, the requirements for safeguarding this material are very demanding. It lasts tens of thousands of years. So to cover it in rock or submerge it in water is only a very short-term quick fix by comparison.

Next slide please. Now, we've heard any number of times that we don't have to talk about tailings here at this hearing. There will be no tailings at all from the exploration phase, where we dig a ramp and drill into the orebody underground.

But I think it's somewhat disingenuous to

compartmentalize this process of uranium mining by putting the exploration portion of the project in a box and not looking outside the box. It gives the impression that there's little to worry about, but we need to take the long-term on this because this is what exploration looks like in Uranium City. There's these mountains of cores that have been drilled and are lying about. Now, it probably won't look like that at all in the Matoush region but the point to be made is that once you drill to explore, you open up the ore body. And we heard just not too long ago that the percentage of licences that had been granted for exploration that turn into licences for mining is 100 percent.

So that's why we have to take into account -- we can't just bypass the fact that there won't be any tailings in this very moment that we're looking at the slide of the uranium mines.

Next slide, please. Now this is a picture that was taken in Chelyabinsk of women who had their -- they had their land taken out from under them. They lived next to the Chelyabinsk reactor which made nuclear weapons for the Russians. So we're in a great hurry to catch up with the Americans so they dumped liquid high-level waste into the river Techa which flows past their town.

Now we're not talking about high-level

waste, but what we are talking about is people coming late into understanding what has happened to them from the nuclear age. These women are looking at westerners who are watching them take radiation readings from their river 40 years after the fact that the stuff has been released into their territory.

So it's -- this group of people, their expressions, they represent everybody. I think in the nuclear age we're playing catch-up to what has -- had to happen in order to get a grip on what's going on.

I will conclude by asking what I think is the real question. We have the laws of the land, we have the law of gravity, we have the laws of rocks, we also have the laws of social acceptance. Can a big mine like this, with a big project like this, go into a region like this, the first mine in Quebec for uranium, without the laws of social acceptance?

So my question is this, who, finally after the debate is settled, who gets to decide the fate of the land and of the water and of the people?

Mîkwêc. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco?

MR. G. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert, Strateco.

Mr. Del Tredici ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yes.

MR. G. HÉBERT: --- or call I call you Robert, it will be easier for me.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yes, certainly.

MR. G. HÉBERT: I have three small questions, short questions. And the first -- if you don't want to answer it, it's okay -- how old are you?

MR. DEL TREDICI: I'm 72.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Seventy-two (72), okay.

MR. DEL TREDICI: How old are you?

MR. G. HÉBERT: Sixty-two (62), so younger than you.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Okay.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Okay, the second question. Did you come to Mistissini to present those picture at the high school recently with Doctor Gordon Edwards?

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yes, I've been twice to Mistissini. Once nearly a year ago where I believe I met you, and -- yes, very recently, m'hm, a couple of weeks ago.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Yeah, in 2010 we met, November.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yeah.

MR. G. HÉBERT: And third question, are you

the photographer who brought the picture of the baby with malformation in Mistissini?

MR. DEL TREDICI: No, I did not meet or photograph any babies malformed in Mistissini, so if you've seen a photograph of that it must have been another photographer.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Okay, thank you.

MR. DEL TREDICI: I'm not aware of that image.

MR. G. HÉBERT: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Question? Staff?

MR. JAMMAL: It's Ramzi Jammal for the record.

A couple of things, we don't buy a car that was designed in 1931 or we accept -- right now you can not license a vehicle that is designed to -- or does not meet the current requirements. So the pictures are -- if there's a mine currently, this mine will be shut down, will not be allowed to operate and there are indicators in place so such activity will not occur any more.

So that's the key point I want to make, so it's fine, it's okay to show the pictures, we are learning, we will continue to mitigate at any cost in order to protect the public and the environment.

Now there has been a lot of discussions and I would like to take the opportunity to answer -- not to answer questions but I'd like to clarify one thing. Mr. Duguay -- or Dr. Duguay has mentioned about the wind turbines capacity of 20 power reactors, an intervenor mentioned the capacity of wind turbine of the equivalence of roughly 20 pressurized-water reactors.

In Germany, they have turbines installed with a capacity of 20,000 roughly -- let's round up the numbers -- 29,000 megawatts, this is their capacity. No one is actually clarifying to the public -- with respect to accurate information -- that there is an effectiveness associated with those turbines. And the worldwide effectiveness of turbines and wind turbines is 17 percent.

So, there is the design perspective and there is the output perspective and the output in Germany is known to be on average around 5 megawatt. But no one is talking about the environmental footprint, no one is talking about how much space and area does it take to have those turbines in place.

So that's one thing I wanted to clarify from a scientific basis.

MR. DEL TREDICI: And the pertinence of this to the Matoush Uranium Project? I'm not sure, could you make that clear?

MR. JAMMAL: The pertinence is clarity on the fact that's been presented time after time.

Now I will pass it on to Dr. Thompson with respect to address your pictures on the alpha protection for the workers and -- in existing mines.

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

Just to clarify the statement that the intervenor made that this morning I said that we did not know about the effects of radon on lung cancer until the 70s. That's not what I said.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Right.

DR. THOMPSON: What I said was that the data we have on workers in the 30s, 40s and 50s revealed that there were lung problem issues. There are a number of studies of groups of workers that were done, and starting in Canadian mines in the 1970s, the doses were very low and we no longer see effects on lung cancer.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Is it true that you no longer do the studies as well?

DR. THOMPSON: What I was going to add is that we have published a number of papers on uranium miners cohorts in the scientific literature and those publications have been peer-reviewed and are published in

reputable journals. And some of those papers ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: Have you done any studies

DR. THOMPSON: --- were published in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

MR. DEL TREDICI: --- health studies?

DR. THOMPSON: Health effects on workers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you -- did you get a chance to actually log on CNSC website?

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yes, from time to time. Do you have something there on alpha radiation?

THE CHAIRMAN: We recently had -- in fact an alpha incident and there is tons -- there's more than you can read in a lifetime on alpha on our website. My understanding ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: So if you haven't found it, I think you should -- there's a button called "info" ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- you can send a message and they'll dig it up for you.

MR. DEL TREDICI: Thank you.

DR. THOMPSON: And, Dr. Binder, if I could, there's also -- as you know the number on our website -- a number of information documents and fact sheets that talk

about radiation, radiation effects. It talks about alpha emitters, alpha radiation. It talks about the methods to monitor doses in people. It talks about radon and radon health effects. The papers that have been published I've just talked about are available from our website as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay? Anybody else has a question?

So thank you, thank you for this -- ah, sorry ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right, you're welcome.

MR. G. FEASBY: Grant Feasby, Strateco, for the record.

I have some comments and questions about your photographs. First comment, I'm pleased to see you backed up the Stanrock picture you've shown many times, with a modern condition where it's actually in full control. Thank you for that.

The picture of the Dricore uranium city ...

MR. DEL TREDICI: Alright.

MR. FEASBY: The ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: My point was not that it was -- looked uncleaned up, it's just that it's as vivid a picture as I can imagine of the fact that when you explore, you open upon the ore body, that's what you do.

Now, you can clean up the cores and put them away so it's nice and neat, but the opening of the ore body is an irreversible process and it almost always leads to mining.

MR. FEASBY: And modern storage practices for drill core are secure and fenced areas are never, never left out in the open like that, especially, uranium drill core. The burlap sacks has interesting photographs from -- historical photographs where burlap sacks were actually used in the 1930's to transport hand-cobbed pitch plant and, after that, it was concentrated from the process in plants, shipped in drums.

The picture that you showed, Robert, of the two Dene people showing the sign, that would have been taken in what year?

MR. DEL TREDICI: When were we up? That was about in the 80's, middle 80's.

MR. FEASBY: Yeah, okay, just for the record.

MR. DEL TREDICI: I think it was in the early '90s.

MR. FEASBY: It should be clear. That is a 1980's picture, long after the part radium site was closed and you may recall in that picture a ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: Yes, it was close, right?

MR. FEASBY: It was closed ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: The point is that the knowledge of the hazards of handling this material started in 1931. That's the point.

MR. FEASBY: This is correct. This is correct. But the site was closed when that picture was taken and there was a plaque commemorating the people that worked there and ---

MR. DEL TREDICI: That plaque is visible in the background of that photograph.

MR. FEASBY: In the background.

MR. DEL TREDICI: It states explicitly how this uranium was used in the Manhattan projects for the development of the atomic bomb, which is not something that is normally said so explicitly, but it's in that plaque, you're right.

MR. FEASBY: Just a final -- a final comment: that site, the two-part radium site has been re-cleaned up to very high standards supervised by the CNSC. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we get the picture. Thank you.

MR. DEL TREDICI: All right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MR. DEL TREDICI: You're welcome.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, Mark.

MR. LEBLANC: Yes, I'd just like you to know that I forgot to mention earlier that l'Association de protection de l'environnement des Hautes-Laurentides, which is CMD 12-H7.49, was to make an oral presentation. I've asked that their submission be considered as a written submission.

So, if the members can't find the document, it's 12-H7.49 and whether there's any questions.

Okay then, Mr. President, for the next oral intervention from the Canadian Coalition.

12-H7.49

Written submissions by

l'Association de protection de

l'environnement des Hautes-Laurentides

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll move now to the next submission which is an oral presentation by the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibilities outlined in CMD 12-H7.53, and Dr. Gordon Edwards, please proceed.

DR. EDWARDS: ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Edwards, can you hear us?

DR. EDWARDS: ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess not.

DR. EDWARDS: Hello, can you hear me?

THE CHAIRMAN: We can hear you now.

DR. EDWARDS: Okay. Shall I proceed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

12-H7.53

**oral presentation by the
Canadian Coalition for Nuclear
Responsibilities**

DR. EDWARDS: All right. My name is Gordon Edwards. I am a Ph.D. in Mathematics. I graduated originally in Mathematics and Physics from the University of Toronto many years ago and I have been active on the nuclear dossier for -- about 40 years -- as a question of my sense of social responsibility and how paying communities to come to grips with the issues involved in uranium mining, nuclear reactors, nuclear weapons, and other issues surrounding nuclear power, nuclear energy.

Now, one thing I would like to talk about today is the procedure that is going on right here, this licensing procedure. I heard one of the Commissioner say early on today: "We're not here to promote uranium. It's just IF it's going to be done, it should be done safely."

Well, this raises two important questions and that is: who decides if it's to be done and who

decides what safety means? And I believe that the real important question here is: is it really a question of the Commission feeling that they have to be sure it's done safely, or is it the fact that the Commission feels that their job is to issue a license, that they are in fact a licensing agency. And that if an applicant comes before them with a license application and claims that they can satisfy all the regulations which have been laid down, then they are automatically entitled to a license. So, that's really the question here: who gets to decide this?

Just to draw a comparison, I live in a lovely neighbourhood, here in Montreal, and if I heard of a project that was going to convert an area of this community into a toxic waste dump that was going to remain dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years, well, let's face it: the radioactive content in the residues from uranium milling process do remain dangerous for hundreds of thousands of years.

Then -- But after consultation with my community colleagues, if we decided we didn't want to have this, regardless of whatever economic benefits were offered, I think that we would feel that we should have the controlling decision which is to say no, thank you, but no thank you, we don't want this.

And I believe that this is the situation

here with the Cree Nation. The Cree Nation has decided they don't want this, whatever the economic benefits are to be offered, they really would rather pass on it. Thank you, but no thanks.

So, I think that that's really where we're at. And the question I have to ask the Commission, the Commissioners, is similar to a question which they had been asking some of the interveners. I have heard many interveners, several interveners being questioned as to what would it take for you to change your mind to relax your opposition to this project, for possibly to compromise, to possibly consider approving the project? Under what conditions?

Well, let me turn that question around. What would it take for the Commission members to refuse to grant a license? What kind of considerations are needed for the community to bring forward for the Commission to say: "All right. We're not going to grant a license."

Is it the case that Strateco has a right to a license no matter how the community feels about it. And if that's the case, then, what really is the purpose of these public hearings? Because I would think that with a quasi-judicial tribunal, I would think that the tribunal would be impartial and would be in a position of judging between two parties.

But I'm not sure that's the case here. And I would like the Commission, the Commissioners to clarify this after I finish with my presentation. I would really like to hear an answer from the Commissioners. Do they feel that they have the ability to deny a license based on the fact that the community simply doesn't want it?

In this context, it is important to realize not only that the community has expressed its concern in this matter, but that this project would not only open up this region, this particular region, to uranium mining in the future, all kinds of uranium mining, but it would open up the entire province of Quebec to uranium mining.

And Quebec, as you heard, also has expressed some strong feelings about nuclear power. It's been said previously by previous speakers that public opinion polls have shown Quebeckers to be opposed to nuclear power. But what has not been said is that there has been, in fact, a government-imposed moratorium on any new nuclear power plants in this province since 1978. And that moratorium has been upheld by all subsequent governments here in Quebec and, in fact, just within the last six months, there was a reiteration of this policy by the current government saying that the Government of Quebec has no plans for going further down the nuclear path.

So, uranium to be mined in Mistissini would not be serving the needs of Quebec and, I guess, it would not also be serving the needs of Canada; it would be exported to other countries.

So, this project is really for the benefit of a corporation and its shareholders, for the benefit of other countries who would be getting the uranium, and yet, the residues which remain toxic for hundreds of thousands of years and which are a matter of great concern in the community, even though those concerns seem to be almost denied by the Commission staff members, those residues will remain here in perpetuity for a period of time much, much longer than the span of -- well, for example, the lifetime of the pyramids of Egypt.

The pyramids of Egypt are only 5,000 years old. These tailings will remain dangerous for 20 times that length of time.

And whatever regulations may be satisfied today, who is going to be there to see that they're being satisfied 1,000, 5,000, 10,000, 20,000 years from now? It just dwarfs the imagination.

Now, not only do we have a situation where the community has expressed its intention, but it's not just the community. It's a different nation. The Cree Nation is an integral nation of great pride and great

antiquity, which has treaty rights which are enshrined in a formal treaty, the James Bay Agreement, between two governments really, the Government of Canada and the Government of the Cree Nation.

And so we're talking here about -- even though the environmental assessment panels were joint panels involving representatives from the Cree Nation, why is it that the licensing body has no representation from the Cree Nation?

And when it comes to resolving some of these anxieties about radioactivity, why does not the Commission itself show leadership by providing new stronger regulations that go much further than the current regulations, which are certainly a big improvement over past practices, but still do not solve the problem for the long term.

What if the Commission were to go back to the drawing board and say, "We are not going to grant any licence, especially not imposing it on the Cree Nation, unless we draft new regulations which will require the proponent, when they extract uranium, to extract all the radioactivity in the ore body." Now, all the long-lived radioactivity, that means in particular the uranium and the thorium-230 and the radium-226.

Uranium itself, of course, is going to be

extracted, but the thorium-230 has a half life of 76,000 years all by itself, and if that is left behind, it is going to become a source of all the other radionuclides for hundreds of thousands of years to come.

Once that thorium-230 is extracted and removed, there is a tremendous decrease in the radiological burden over the very long term.

Similarly, if radium-226 is extracted and removed, radium-226 has a half life of 1,600 years. If that is extracted and removed, then you have reduced the effective half life of the radioactivity in the residues from hundreds of thousands of years to just a couple of centuries.

Now, even a couple of centuries is a formidable task, but this will have gone a long way towards addressing, in a creative way, some of the genuine concerns of the community.

And I have to say that I am very disappointed to hear the way in which science is being twisted by CNSC staff, and I think it's really because of the anxiety, the wish on the part of the Commission staff to see that the licence is granted.

They may say that they don't promote the project, but boy, they sure sound like they do.

When we hear from, for example, Patsy

Thompson today virtually that radon is virtually harmless, that it doesn't -- it's "not a risk of lung cancer", and yet not mentioning the fact that it is a major killer in the world today, killing tens of thousands of people every year; when Patsy Thompson talks about polonium-210 creating no health effects among the Inuit even though we know, according to the American Health Physics Society that up to 90 percent of the deaths attributed to cigarette smoking may in fact be due to polonium-210, which is a byproduct of uranium, so that that means that there's hundreds of thousands of people being killed by polonium-210 every year; where is the balance? Where's the objectivity?

We're hearing only one side of the health question, and that side is denial, blanket denial that there's a problem.

Even the Wall Street Journal had a front-page story some years ago, saying that uranium tailings in the United States were described as an ecological and economic time bomb, and yet we hear from CNSC staff that this is virtually harmless.

What would happen, I ask the staff, if, for example, in the future people were to take truckloads of these residues away and use it for constructing homes and so on? Would this not be a major public health concern as

it was in Florida, even without using uranium mining but using radioactive tailings?

We've had this problem here in Montreal with radioactive tailings from Oka and from Varennes being used in housing.

I think that it is really shameful to tell people that these tailings do not pose a problem when it's well known that they can pose terrible problems.

So I would just like to end with this one question, and that is: Is the Commission empowered to refuse a licence on the basis of community wishes?

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Dr. Edwards, you've been in front of us many, many times. We're very familiar with your views and you know our process as well as we do.

We're going through a procedure of hearing everybody. We have another day of hearing tomorrow in Chibougamau, after which the Commission will get into its deliberation phase, and in the fullness of time, we'll issue a decision taking into account all that we have heard.

That's all I can tell you right now.

DR. G. EDWARDS: So I get no answer to my question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry?

DR. G. EDWARDS: My question was simply whether you have the power to decline a licence on the basis of social acceptability?

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not going to debate with you a legal issue here about power and all the components that go into our decision. We're not going to do it on the fly. We'll have to think about this. We'll have to hear -- we'll have to analyze all the stuff we have heard, and then we'll make a decision.

DR. G. EDWARDS: But everybody else that has asked a question has got an answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you allow us please to start asking you questions, if there are any?

Anybody?

MEMBER McDILL: I will state that I am an independent person. The Commissioners are independent, legally independent.

(COMMOTION FROM THE CROWD)

THE CHAIRMAN: Didn't you guys talk about respect? Didn't you? Well, where is it now?

DR. G. EDWARDS: I'm sorry?

THE CHAIRMAN: So we spent here two bloody days listening to everything you say. Allow us now to absorb all of this and then make a decision, and then you

can react to our decision.

(COMMOTION FROM THE CROWD)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Gordon, do you have any further comments?

DR. G. EDWARDS: No, I just don't understand why -- my question was not about independence. My question was about whether you have the capacity, whether you have the power to do it, if you chose to, not whether you will or whether you won't but just whether you have the ability.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm just trying to tell you that we've heard a lot of stuff that has to be considered before we decide whether we have the capacity or not. We definitely don't have the capacity to deal about moratoriums across Quebec.

DR. G. EDWARDS: No, I understand that. I'm asking about the licensing.

THE CHAIRMAN: And whether ---

DR. G. EDWARDS: Whether you have the capacity to refuse the licence.

THE CHAIRMAN: Whether the project continues or not requires another provincial government decision. So all of this will be factored in our deliberations.

Thank you.

DR. G. EDWARDS: My question was solely about the licensing, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm trying to tell you all of these are factors that we will deliberate about.

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that.

DR. G. EDWARDS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Marc, do we have the next?

We will now move to the next submission, which is an oral presentation from Zach Ruitter as outlined in CMD H7.28.

Mr. Ruitter, the floor is yours.

12-H7.28

Oral presentation by

Zach Ruitter

MR. Z. RUITER: Hi. Can you hear me?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we can.

MR. Z. RUITER: You can hear me?

MR. LEBLANC: Please proceed, Mr. Ruitter.

We hear you very well.

MR. RUITER: Okay. I'd like to pick up where Mr. Binder left off. You've been here for two bloody days listening to the people here. You are there for two days, but they are there for their entire life.

For the life of their ancestors and for the life of their descendants. So two bloody days is definitely what we're talking it here, and the blood is on your hands.

And thank you Commissioner McDill for pointing out that you are independent people on this Commission. Your behaviour here, having accepted some of the logic in the response from the CNSC, including Dr. Patsy Thompson, really makes me question your behaviour and the behaviour then of the institution you represent, which is also Carleton University. And I will be speaking with the student association at Carleton University about your behaviour. And I will be informing class A in Montreal about your behaviour and the plan here for northern Quebec.

To reiterate what some of the students on the streets of Montreal have been saying, "Les étudiants sont en colère, révolution." And that is going to apply just as much for you as faculty person at the Carleton University as it is to the rest of the members of the Commission here.

So the question obviously you couldn't answer is if, Mr. Binder, is if the community rejects the proposal, whether you have the capacity to not grant the licence. I've been hearing some very dodgy logic from Dr. Patsy Thompson who said that we can no longer measure for

atomic weapons testing. There is something called the comprehensive test ban treaty organization out of the United Nations. Has not been ratified yet, but we do have CBTO sensors all throughout Canada that will detect atomic weapons testing. And conveniently, by Health Canada or by the responsible authority, those have either been turned off or been shown to say that there is no readable detection or detection wasn't measured after Fukushima.

So what we have here is the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission as the regulator complicity in censoring and suppressing information. And I hear that Strateco says that, you know, you safeguard things inspected by IEA, which promotes nuclear power. There are no comprehensive international nor domestic safeguards or audits of the uranium that leaves.

And we all know that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is the vehicle for nuclear weapons proliferation. The evidence of this is 1974 in India, followed by 1998 in Pakistan, and I do not need to go on. So I do not trust a word that CNSC says about its independent safe regulations and studies when they cannot admit to a simple evidenced fact that Canadian uranium and Canadian nuclear technology has been used in nuclear weapons proliferation in the past.

In October '93, the Joint Federal -

Provincial Panel on Uranium Mining Development in Northern Saskatchewan noted that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, of which Canada is a signatory, prohibits the use of uranium for military applications. However, there's no process whereby exported Canadian uranium can be separated from uranium derived from other sources. Therefore, no proven method exists for preventing incorporation of Canadian uranium into military applications. Jim Harding of Saskatchewan says there's still no baseline data, which is the first step to any credible social or health impact research, and the industry continues to be allowed to operate in the dark without fundamental ecological or legal accountability.

Now, what I've seen here today, which you call two bloody days of listening to us, is different strategies to incorporate yet simultaneously disenfranchise dissonant voices. I'd like to make side note and ask you why you are drinking bottled water. I hear lots of questions from Strateco and the CNSC questioning whether wind power is green because of the batteries, and I heard absurd questions from Strateco about whether there is a calculated ecological footprint to wind as if it's some sort of argument to continue on with uranium mining.

And you know, everyone here who's listening

in the room, you know, Dr. McDill, how do you sit there and listen to such flawed argument and such flawed logic? This is criminal negligence, in the words of Dr. Linda Thompson, a physician for global responsibility. This is criminally negligent. And you're drinking bottled water, could you please stop that? That's my first question. At hearings from now on, can you please see to drinking water from the place where the water is going to be drank?

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: I'd be delighted to.

MR. RUITER: You know, the problem with the Erin Brokovich school of, you know, environmental justice is that she hands a glass of water to the regulators or to the company and asks them to drink it. But that contains one dose of whatever contamination is in the water. Whereas what she really needed to do, and what you deserve, is to drink an entire lifetime's cumulative dose of what will be in that water because of the decision that you are capable of making. But that's not enough, as someone told me, because the poisoning of a lifetime does not compare to the in and out experience of a poisoning of a lifetime.

And what I'm watching you do here today is the colonial act of cultural genocide and ecocide. And the problem here is that you have no right to put us in a position of dealing with waste for thousands of years.

You do not have the capacity to make that commission and you're not prepared as evidenced by your incremental approach. You say, "Oh, we're just building a ramp."

I mean, how myopic is to say, "Oh, we're just building a ramp." What we have here is what Pierre Timmerman has described as day two ethics where the original situation, day one, "Oh, well we built a ramp", is not subject to the ethical scrutiny that everything subsequent is subject to all kinds of ethical norms and value statements.

But the problem here is that you use Aboriginal knowledge and the fact that you consult Aboriginals -- even though you condescendingly laugh at them and, you know, laugh at their grandmother -- you reinforce the positions of your own industry, which is the nuclear industry. And you re-contextualize their participation to validate your process, which has no validity whatsoever.

But looking back from today, what you guys are doing right now with nuclear waste and its thousands-of-years half life, looking back from today, this would be the equivalent of North American French explorers or Iroquois confederacy developing policies for 2012.

So, obviously those policies have not worked because you're not respecting Indigenous land

rights. And when I tell you that this is the colonial act, this is the colonial act from when settlers came here and made a genocide of the native people, and this is the colonial act today. And you're not going to do this in my name as a Canadian.

So what I feel like is you are trying to co-opt us by participating in your decision regime, but your decision regime is lax and it is bankrupt. And I can use the evidence about tritium for this. You're going to produce tritium out of this uranium. And tritium, for -- since '86 was polluted where I live in Peterborough with no regard. And you gave a licence to a company, Shield Source, which also owns Safety Light, which has left the people of Bloomsberg, Pennsylvania, with a \$120 million EPA clean up fund. So you have no problem licensing criminals, but you have a problem hearing what people are saying to you. You're listening to them, but you're not hearing them. It's really a shame.

And when I hear Binder say that, you know, we have more than a lifetime's worth of information you can read on our study, the message is, is that, you know, before we bury you in radioactive tailings and contaminate your homeland, we'll bury you in a lifetime of paper. Well you don't need a lifetime of paper and we know that that is a strategy by the CNSC to quell dissent by framing

it as an issue of expertise.

Well we know that these experts are not credible. And one of the reasons why we know that they are not credible is that they are paid to produce results-oriented work and it's subjective. If I want a study that says that, you know, six out of six CNSC commissioners are somehow genetically deceptive and their minds don't work properly, I can probably pay someone to make that study. Does it mean it has scientific valid basis? Not necessarily. So, you know, it's just a huge joke. And I'll remind you that the nuclear waste advisory Council in 2005 said:

"The potential of nuclear energy in addressing Canada's future electricity requirements needs to be placed within a larger policy framework that examines the costs, benefits, hazards or all available forms of energy electricity supply. And the framework needs to make provision for the comprehensive informed public participation."

So this is not comprehensive and this is not informed.

And what you're doing here is you are deferring to your mandate. As you interpret it, in a quasi-judicial manner, which is - I emphasize the "quasi" to justify your neglect of the broader implications of nuclear energy. And you claim to obey your mandate by avoiding discussing energy policy. Yet, you're willing to take cheap shots at energy policy when it suits you by saying, "Oh, you know, wind power, you can't recycle the blades."

You level -- sort of like do based arguments about, you know, the environmental sustainability about wind power, and that's the whole brainwashing strategy.

So I would really, really encourage this Commission of puppets or this kangaroo court as, you know, you've been called before. And you may think it's disrespectful but no, it's taking you with the most sincere sincerity to say that this is a kangaroo court because it's actually pointing out the truth, and we know it.

We know it and everyone else knows it. So I'm actually here to talk, you know, as a Canadian and save the people ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, can -- can you wind up

please.

MR. Z. RUITER: --- as Cree Mistassini that we are here to support you, and we will not let this happen. We will not let them put ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you ---

MR. Z. RUITER: --- a shovel in the ground as we'll not let them put a shovel in the ground for deep geological repository underneath Lake Huron. There's massive resistance right now to the pipelines being built. There's infringements on native ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please wind ---

MR. Z. RUITER: --- land rights everywhere.

THE CHAIRMAN: Hello! Hello!

MR. Z. RUITER: And for ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Take some -- inhale ---

MR. Z. RUITER: --- to what the corporations and the regulators are doing and ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Hello! Hello!

MR. Z. RUITER: Hello! Hi, you're there. I can't believe you're there. Hello.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please wind it up. There are people who are waiting in line here.

MR. Z. RUITER: There are people waiting in line, yeah. And I'm sure. I'll just tell you that the Egyptians have been able to protect the tombs of the

Pharaohs for as long as 4,000 years, but some of the graves were looted within centuries.

Yet, here we have an obligation to protect our nuclear waste from the environment for tens of thousands of years. You inspire no confidence. How are you able to demonstrate and give evidence that you are able to protect us from this now, and then for the future?

And when you -- and here's another question. My last question is how do you possibly not take responsibility for things that happened in the 80s or the 90s? And how do you think it's ethical to say, "This happened in the past and it's not happening now. So it's not a concern."

If you know the radioactive half-life, this did not happen in the past. This happened in the first instant on the scale of radioactivity.

So my question is how do you live with yourself? Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We'll move on to the -- any questions?

Okay. We'll move on to the next presentation.

(SHORT PAUSE/COURTE PAUSE)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your patience.

The next submission is an oral presentation from Mrs. Alice Petawabano, as outlined in CMD 7.44.

Please proceed.

12-H7.44

Oral presentation by

Alice Petawabano

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Thank you. Before I go into my comments and concerns, I would like to thank the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to come to our community, to listen, and to understand the concerns of the environmental impacts and the impacts to our culture that we'll have on this proposed uranium projects in the Otish Mountains.

I'm not going to go into the details of all the effects of uranium and all the definitions. I believe Mr. Len Taylor did a good job on that already. And I'm just going to mention that uranium is a highly radioactive metal, chemical, which is detrimental to all living things.

I will speak in defence, like my other members, youth, and other leaders that have done for the past two days, in defence of the Cree traditional lands, territory against this development of uranium mine in our

ancestral lands. I share the same views. I share the same concerns on the wildlife, on our culture, the human health, the water, rivers, and all the vegetation that will impact on this proposed uranium mine.

The waterways, the watersheds is all interconnected in our lands. Water is the livelihood of any living thing, which includes plants, trees, wildlife, humans.

When we talk about the proposed uranium in the Otish Mountains, from the Otish Mountains the watershed connects to the -- to all the waters in the Albanel, from Temiscamie, Albanel, Mistissini Lake, to all the big rivers here in Quebec.

This past two days, we've heard a lot of knowledge, traditional knowledge from our Elders and leaders, and I have a question to the Nuclear Commission. Is all this traditional knowledge that has been brought forth to your attention, will it be heard and will it be considered in your review?

MEMBER McDILL: Yes.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Thank you.

I'm going to go into my questions to Strateco and once I am done with my questions, I have my son, who is 11 years old, that would like to share his views or comments.

My first question to Strateco is how much environmental damage has been done through the uranium exploration in the Otish Mountains?

I'm talking about the -- just the exploration part of the project. We -- I haven't heard any, any -- I haven't seen any pictures or heard any of the environmental impacts already incurred with the exploration.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I suggest, ask all your questions and then they can answer one after another.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: It will be a little more efficient.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: My second question is -- I have five questions all together. My second question is has an airstrip been built already in the Otish Mountains? If so, where did it get its permit?

Was the airstrip subject to environmental review under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement?

My third question is: How advanced is the exploration today?

My fourth question: I would like to know which provinces has banned uranium mining in the provinces and why here in Canada?

My fifth question. Strateco claims that

they've spent \$110 million in exploration. Who and how was it subsidized? Who subsidized this exploration?

Where did they get their funding?

Those are my questions to Strateco.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Strateco, you want to start answering?

MR. HÉBERT: Guy Hebert.

I will answer several of the questions. Maybe my people will answer others.

Your first question was what we did actually on the field?

MS. A. PETAWABANO: On the exploration, yes.

MR. HÉBERT: We did actually over 250,000 metres of drilling, core drillings, and we did several roads, gravel roads on the site. We have a camp for about 60 to 90 people -- 60 people actually -- and we have a fuel farm with tanks on it, and we have the air strip.

So we have probably a total of 7 kilometres of road done plus 10 kilometres to go to connect to the Highway 167, a winter road. So this is what has been done yet.

And on the airstrip we got a permit from the Quebec COMEV in 2009.

So under the James Bay Treaty, as you said

or we said, we have spent about \$110 million. Roughly about \$30 million are from tax credits and all the companies are eligible to the tax credit. It's against future review and the balance is from our shareholders.

Any other questions? I have four questions.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: I want to go back to when you mentioned about the airstrip. Did it go under the environmental review as entailed in the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement? Any airstrips ---

MR. HÉBERT: No.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Isn't that an environmental regime established by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement?

MR. HÉBERT: We went through ---

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Any airline strip project has to go under environmental review with Cree consent.

MR. HÉBERT: We followed the law on that for sure. We made a request to the COMEV.

Caroline will explain it because she is in charge of the Environmental Department. I know the general stuff, but she will answer about that specific question.

MS. HARDY: We asked for a certificate

THE CHAIRMAN: We can't hear you. Can you talk into the microphone please?

MS. HARDY: We asked for a -- we filed a certificate of authorization to the Province and that was filed. The document that needs to be filed goes through assessing the surrounding environments. So we did complete that along with a consultant and we filed the application and we received the certificate of authorization to proceed with the land strip by the province.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: The environmental review under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, three parties have to agree, not just one or two parties.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're not party to that particular agreement, so it's nothing to do with the CNSC, and if there's any recourse, you'll have to follow it up with the Quebec government, I assume.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Definitely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I hear from your son? He's sitting here and behaving himself.

MR. T. JUTRAS-PETAWABANO: It is bad for our land, bad for the water, bad for the fish, ducks, loons, and animals that swim. I don't like the project. I'm scared of it. I want back things to normal. They do

their thing and we do our thing. It is bad for nature.

My opinion is that we don't want this here.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you for that.

MR. T. JUTRAS-PETAWABANO: No problem.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: In conclusion, the proposed uranium project poses such environmental risks and dangers if it continues its exploration.

I say to the panel "Ban uranium mining exploration in Eeyou Istchee and in Quebec.

Thank you. Thank youk, sir.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: That's true. Thank you, member.

Which province has banned uranium mine and why? I believe there's two provinces that had banned uranium mines.

THE CHAIRMAN: B.C. and Nova Scotia, if my memory serves.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: And why?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was a political decision.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Just a political decision?

THE CHAIRMAN: It was a political decision. We have not seen any documented explanation as to the why. It's as simple as that.

Strateco?

MR. HÉBERT: Guy Hebert.

I would like to add a word to that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. HÉBERT: B.C. and Nova Scotia and also, a few months ago, Labrador.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Thank you.

MR. HÉBERT: Labrador, they had a lot of pressure in 2008 to ban or to get a moratorium on their uranium, and finally the Inuit has decided to put a three-year moratorium and they did their survey. They did an independent survey, a little bit as the Cree B.G. did and in September 2011, they decided that they were satisfied and they lifted that moratorium.

And now they passed in March 2012 a bill to confirm that they lifted the moratorium.

I have to say also I think it's important to know that Nova Scotia is the first or second largest coal producer in Canada and over 70 percent of their electricity is coming from coal generation. If you want to protect the planet and you support Nova Scotia politically because they are getting a lot of pollution

from coal, and it is your decision, you know, to support that kind of approach. But I think the nuclear power is a lot cleaner than coal, and if you think it's a danger and you talk about 100,000 years, if no uranium, no nuclear plant is coming in the near future in India, in China, I don't think 100 years from now your children will enjoy the forestry here, because an increase -- it's the dramatic global warming is the most greater danger for your future, the future of your kids. It's not uranium; it's pollution and global warming, and Nova Scotia produces 70 percent of their electricity and more from coal.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. A. PETAWABANO: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Now, I think this is all -- even though I said it has been a long, long, long kind of a hearing where we're trying to absorb all of the information and the knowledge, that's what we came over here for, to get all this information. I'm told that somebody, a Mr. Dixon, Paul Dixon, wanted to make a short statement. Ms. Thompson, go ahead.

DR. THOMPSON: If I could, we received the response to the question that was asked by an earlier

intervenor about in what language were things available to facilitate participation. So we received the information from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and during the Federal Review Panel process the hearings and public information sessions in May 2010 and November 2010, translation in Cree was available.

There was also a glossary of uranium and mining terms that was developed in English and in Cree to explain the relevant terms that -- to support participation. As well, the Federal Review Panel report with the recommendations, the summary of that report was translated into Cree.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Mr. Dixon?

Oral presentation by

Paul Dixon

MR. DIXON: Testing. I'm still trying to get used to technology. Been too long in the bush.

Now, it's -- bush life will always be part of our life, it's always been part of our past and it's always been part of our future. I'm -- in a way I'm glad that I'm here, and it's very hard for me to trust the non-natives, you know? Looking at it historically, what happened.

We've always -- we aboriginal people have always been begging to the white man and then we could never ask for anything. They clear cut our ancestral lands and I have so much concern about this mine. And it's not just a copper or a gold mine we're talking about, we're talking about a uranium mine.

I was telling a friend back there that guys like that don't even read Cree, only talk Cree, you know? They don't know the figures, they don't know the scientific studies. They don't even know an ordinary scientist from a top geologist. I know for sure that if we were all top geologists, and you were all top geologists up there, and everybody was in a room, we'd be dead set against this mine, uranium mine in Mistissini.

So it's all this -- what I look at -- it's always a mind game with non-natives. They're only aware of the environment. Historically you've got to look at -- unless you're ignorant to the history -- you've got to look. The non-natives only cared about the environment, or woke up to it after they boiled a frog. That's sad.

We listened to this lady here Awashish who had a mine there. In old time north was discussed with us in Waswanipi and they were bragging about that the recovery, or the -- how do you put back the Tretrolis (phonetic) mine, the back to the way it was, you know?

Fill it up with rocks and -- I told them the mine is -- let me see this project, that you put it back pristine, you know, the way it was. And it really surprised and knocked me over when I heard this lady talk -- late Sam's wife.

And you know, I'd like to trust people, but it's very hard for me and the only thing we have going for us is that your government only listens to people that are -- that they're going to build the economy of this province. They never have and never will listen to a poor man's wisdom, and this is what we're talking about here.

But the one thing that I had was -- I'd like to say I'm blessed that I have convinced non-natives and white people much like -- once I am one on one on them, no matter what. I mean this white guy was dead set against hydro -- I mean he was against hydro projects because it would bring economy -- he was a Royal Bank manager. After a couple of beer and preaching at him for 10 years in our village, while he was drunk he told me I hope the projects never get built because I explained about our life, our way of life.

You know that there's a lot of things my people don't know. I had, you know, somebody in my office come in one time, he said, I work with the Cree Trappers Association. Since our trap line was clear cut I was

forced to take a job with the Cree Trapper Association because I'm trying to wait for our land to grow back, you know? But you know, an Elder came to me one time and said -- not only an Elder, a young person -- he speaks fluent in French, fluent in English, and fluent in Cree, but he cannot read none of the languages.

But there was this young guy that totally spoke only in Cree, came to me and said, Paul, this plan north, I'm really, really scared. I only speak Cree. Do you think that the mines will hire me? Actually, being honest with him, told him maybe big foot has a better chance of getting hired because, you know, he's strong and mighty, you know, maybe even move the big rocks. That's what I was going to tell him but no, he was too serious for me.

It's -- people say, you know, the history of the white man, the legacy of the mine, you know, astonishes me. It belongs only to the white man in this country. It's never to the -- to aboriginal people of this country, the people that were here since B.C., before Columbus, Cartier. I can't believe it.

And you're sitting there and I don't see no aboriginal up there and I don't even know if you guys are toxicologists, you know? If we had toxicologists in this -- a room full of them in here and people with actual

knowledge of our traditions which we do have, even some of the young ones, and a few lawyers, no project tomorrow for uranium, maybe in the whole province, or maybe this whole country. But no, we're just playing with people's minds and people's -- you know why -- what I found out about our people?

You always -- the non-natives have always abused the rights of the people because they don't know it. We don't even have a word to rights in Cree. It's with sharing -- I come to you and say look, where would we have been 12,000 years ago? We both came from caves, we take it from there. But no, the government, since they've been here how long? Five hundred (500) years, 375 years celebration of Three Rivers and some other town was 500 years. You've always rammed things down our throat, even the poison fish, everything.

This is a very simple message for my people, you know? And I stand with my people here in Mistissini, the people -- Mistissini people that were here since B.C. We don't want this project because it's so detrimental to our people. The pyramids 5,000 years they looked after them and -- there's 100,000's of years. You know our ancestors are buried here. We're the only people probably in this -- okay, let's say universe -- that maybe we have 100 generations of ancestors buried here. My

father met my mother on a portage and my father's buried where he grew up.

He was born in May and somebody told me, my step-grandmother told me that when he was born my mother -- my late -- his mother still had snow on his moccasins. And people travelled, they had newborns in tents, while canoeing, on a sled. They were just moving around putting shelter sheers so the child can be born. This is our life.

From November to May, before global warming it was a walking freezer in our trap line. We could keep things forever right up until May, you know? But no, we shared it. The young guy, Andrew, was talking about the fish, how you -- how easily -- we don't use lures from out west or anywhere. We're not to profit -- profit hunting. We live for sustenance because we might poison our trap lines from the lures and everything.

We have our own home remedies, we have -- the fish is quite something. In the fall we -- when the white fish are spawning we collect large amounts of it. Some for our own consumption, but large portions of it is for our traps. We just freeze them. The Elders know what I'm talking about, and the young hunters know and all this is the bait for our lynx, our mink, everything, except the mouse. And it will contaminate all our trap lines.

And, you know, my Elder, George Eshbaun (phonetic), my dad, Isaac, they only spoke what I call Hudson Bay English, and they still got ripped off -- anyways, that's another story. But, you know, they don't comprehend. They talk about borrowing, you know. We're not allowed to possess the land forever because if you own something, you can trash it.

And what we do -- I had this non-Native friend who killed a caribou. He was from Montreal. I really liked him. It was his first caribou, one caribou. I told him, "What are you going to do with the head?" I said, "If you're not going to eat the head, could you at least try something? You know the head is a delicacy for us." I said, "Could you at least try something? Can you go take it somewhere nobody knows and bury it so it will go back in the ground?"

Because I've seen so many moose heads, caribou heads in the non-Native -- at their dumps, so much. You'd be astonished at the meals we have, and we could show the United Nations.

And I said, "If you could try that, it will determine where you're going to stand in the future, at a dump site or a clean environment. It's your choice." The choices we make today.

And I can't believe that the non-Native --

they say humans are intelligent. Our Elders are intelligent; they know everything from the moose, to the mouse.

Because I had this one guy in university come down, and he was studying the ducks. And I pointed to a frog, and I said, "What kind of frog is that?" "Oh, I don't know. I don't even know if it's a frog". All he knew was about the birds, but my father knew everything about the trap line. I mean, everything that's on it, and how some of the things that our people cherish that we still have, you know.

We're the same as our fathers, we'll always be, our children, it's a bloodline. My father said, "I'm not 92". He passed about a year and a half ago. He said, "I don't even have one life. It's one," he says, "not 92".

It's very different, numbers and all that. Life is simple on this planet. My father used to come in and say, "You see that star up there? For thousands of years it always was there, knew where it was. Well, same thing with me as a human being," he used to tell me.

At 15, he told me -- once I explained the white man's world, because I went to residential school. He says, "At 15, if I got the papers that the white man gives me certifying I pass," he says, "you know this tent

-- my big tent I have," he says, "it wouldn't fit in here if I got everything that I passed in life. At 15, I killed my first moose." And he says, "It was 60 or 70 below zero a long time ago". He says, "I slept outside three nights already".

That's my people. I know what they're talking about and I hope my blessing and my luck will salvage you guys. Maybe I just put something in you to make you curious and find out more about what it means to live on this beautiful, beautiful planet.

And the first time when the settlers came and my dad told me -- he found out, you know, after talking to -- only in Cree, he said, "There's only two types of people, my son, I want you to know. There's people that care about life on this planet and I'm finding out there's people that don't care". Only two types, he told me.

You know, we know about minerals, rocks. This white guy might come and explore our land for 40 years, I could show him in 10 days the rocks he could never find in 10 years; I could find in one week if I went by helicopter, and how many stories we have of us throwing rocks in the river.

The great story 50 years ago at the mine, the two Dixon brothers, my grandfather and his father took

the rock and said, "Don't". Threw it in the river.

My grandfather and my father never worked in the mine. My dad passed away at 92 years old. He was -- well, according to the white man -- but according to us, he was around about 100 years old. That's what my grandfather had told me. They made him younger. And he never worked in that mine, never cut a tree down, never cut -- never lived in the shanties.

And in the mine, we ate from the dump. We gathered everything from the dump, our shanties and 40 years the mine was there, it didn't -- I can't remember anybody that worked there but, you know, it's total -- 40 years, 50 years.

I went up on that mountain where the mine was when they took it down. I felt such a calm, and I remember my grandfather saying, "They'll leave one day. We'll be around".

I can't believe it; 500 homes that were built there, they're shut down. You can buy them for 9,000 bucks now. It's a closed town. The people left; came and just left.

Some are retired, maybe in California with a bunch of houses and pension plans, importing fish from - - maybe from China, the rubbery walleye they have there, I heard.

But, you know -- I don't know what it takes to -- an Elder told me, maybe one day we'll meet a good white man, because he was talking to me about -- I had to explain to him why the white man didn't listen to us for such a long time, and I told him, "We've got a poor man's system, you know that? Nobody's going to listen to us. That's the reason we've got to try harder".

And that's why I feel that -- I have a suggestion to make, but you know, Grand Council is there to protect our rights, should be here and adamantly opposed to this project.

And Plan North, you know, it's -- if we don't do it right -- I'm not talking about uranium, but this is going to be -- I'm going to tell the youth that this is going to be the nail that's going to be put in our coffin. That's our culture you know, will not survive because of the era of wildlife.

We're going to have petting zoos maybe in the next 50 years with the parks that are -- we're talking about Cree-protected soils which are different.

Go down in your parks in Pointe Bleue and you'll have an easy time killing moose because they're almost semi-tame. Up here, they're totally wild. We leave them wild. It's hard to get moose up here.

You have to really know what to pick. The

non-Natives have here, since arriving, the settlers, I call them, and the settlers, you know, it does affect how you live with us and how we want to share with you. We're so kind, we want to share with you.

My dad used to say, "You know, I killed a moose for this white guy because his family would have starved". That was in the early times.

But you know, I told my dad, the settlers, it's all self-interest things they do for themselves and the laws, the bylaws.

And my dad, one time, told me -- well, he got jailed one time for killing a moose. That was way before the James Bay Agreement was signed. And thanks to somebody here -- I think Ed Nanikwash (phonetic) helped him out -- but my dad had gone to town and this moose was going to be taken. I think I was one of the children that was left in the bush, and something might have happened if he didn't come back soon, but somehow he came back. They let him go.

And you know, my dad said, "If I listen to all the bylaws and how the white man is forcing us in the reserves," he says, "if I was a law-abiding citizen, according to the settlers, their rules, I'd starve to death". This is the honest truth.

I'm only giving you a glimpse. You have to

look at the history of this country. Some people are ignorant to it. You know, we cannot be so sure about the future because we're not so sure about the past.

I'm not talking about a past here, you know. I'm not living in the past, I'm assessing the past so I can reinforce the future.

Mistassini people here, the Cree people here, and part of the Quebec people here, our destiny is in your hands. I'm telling you that. I'm going to pray hard. I think that's when you've got hope, right?

I have a grandchild by the name of Faith. Maybe I'll name the next one Hope, and the other one Love. Because we don't have much and we're grasping at straws as Aboriginal people, you know.

And we're thinking about the United Nations. I want to propose to go to the United Nations, not because of disrespecting people, but we have that right.

But then again, we have a slight problem with the United Nations because if I go there and the white man stands beside me and he says "human rights abuse", that's a totally different definition for him and me. Mine is in a class somewhere. They'll listen to him and they'll be prejudice to me, I'll guarantee you that, because I've shown -- I've learned that.

I went to white man school, I know so much about your culture. The billions of moneys you make in the industries, the corruption -- the Premiers talking about that plan north and looking for investors elsewhere, we're around here you know; we live here.

And -- you can't even control the corruption that's happening with the construction, he's already making a plan north. We already have for millions of years -- thousands of years a pre-plan north here you know.

It was very ignorant for Normandeau to say that this land is begging to be known, and we've known it.

The last thing I want to say is one day you'll realize, your children will realize, your grandchildren will realize that we are in the best position to monitor wildlife. I can guarantee you that, my Cree people can guarantee you that.

We've known things that you'll never learn in universities, not in a thousand years. Take my word for it at least.

I'm so glad that you listened. I sat in front of you; I have a lot of respect for you. I have emotions too and I'm fearful of the future, you know, once somebody wants to take my hand and try to make me commit suicide or something, you know, that's totally wrong.

That's wrong.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for this presentation and education.

What I would like to do now is enter into -
- I'm not sure that after all the material and all the presentation if there's any other subject that -- you know, remember, Commissioners, that we have another round. This is the second round of questions. So here's a chance to ask all those questions that have never been asked.

Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before I leave though I have to clear something up really.

I got insult a while ago for drinking the water that you folks gave me -- sorry -- but I still enjoy. Thank you.

My question is that -- to Strateco.

We've heard about safety measures and whatnot, I'm wondering, what kind of protection do you have in the case of a forest fire, for example, in the area? Do you have a system organized for fire protection?

M. MAURICE: Gabriele Maurice.

Concernant la prévention incendie, Matoush est situé dans la zone restreinte Nord. Elle n'est pas

couverte par la SOPFEU, donc on a nos propres pompes à incendie installées actuellement sur le site pour couvrir. Si on doit faire une évacuation du site, à ce moment-là on peut communiquer avec la Sûreté du Québec et eux vont donner l'ordre à la SOPFEU pour venir faire une couverture pour une évacuation des travailleurs, de la main-d'œuvre. Ce n'est pas pour protéger le matériel, on se comprend là-dessus.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Alors strictement pour les employés, la main-d'œuvre. Pas de protection pour le site-même.

M. MAURICE: La SOPFEU ne couvre que pour la main-d'oeuvre. Nous, on s'occupe pour le matériel et naturellement on s'entend pour la main-d'œuvre.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Merci.

THE CHAIRMAN: Monsieur Harvey, pas de question? Dr. Mc Dill?

I think it's been a long two days and first of all I'd like to thank all of you for being patient with us because we have to absorb all this material.

Sorry, go ahead, sir.

JOHN MATOOSH: Yeah, just one final question. I'm sure a lot of people are wondering when -- when to expect an outcome, a decision to be made and also for the audience that are listening to us on radio. I

think it would be important that you give us an idea of when to expect a decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So let me start; first of all you all know -- I think you know that we are driving tonight to Chibougamau and tomorrow morning we are having the last day hearing in Chibougamau.

And you can actually listen to it, it's going to be webcasted, if technology works. We have to take all this technology from here and move it over there and that's a challenge all by itself as you well know.

And after that we will -- the Commission itself will go into what we call deliberations. And that means that we try to analyze and absorb all the material that we heard here, all the material that staff presented, all the material that Strateco and then make a decision.

We will make a decision. It will be published -- I can't give you a precise time because it's a complicated -- it's going to be a very complicated decision, I can tell you that.

And what we will need to take our time to make sure that we considered all the dimensions of the material that was presented to us.

Once we issue the decision the Quebec government will have to decide their part of this particular process.

So it's a bit complicated but that's the process that we inherited and I know you'd like to have a quick answer but we can't give it to you right now.

Anything else Commissioners would like to add?

Go ahead.

JOHNNY LOON: Just one question. As I was sitting here for two days hearing other people talking, besides myself, the question I have is, when I listen to the people that -- with the Strateco that are in favour or people that had the -- like the youth or people that didn't really look at the reports, you had a lot of questions for them.

But the people that really hit you hard you didn't have any questions for them, you just shut them up and move on to the next one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't read into our question. We have read all the material. I don't know how many of you actually read the 13 -- how many hundred pages -- we read every single page and many of the people that ---

JOHNNY LOON: Just one question. The question is why did you have to do that to the people?

THE CHAIRMAN: We just ask questions about what we need to get to know. We do not discriminate

between our questions.

JOHNNY LOON: So you didn't cross off anything after?

THE CHAIRMAN: We do not cross over -- don't try to put words in my mouth.

JOHNNY LOON: I'm not putting anything, I'm just ---

THE CHAIRMAN: So just read -- read our decision. Read our decision when it comes out.

JOHNNY LOON: All right. I hope I'm happy after that.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

JOHNNY LOON: Have a safe trip.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: If it's only one minute because I've got to allow staff to dismantle this place.

MR. SPENCER: My name is Jeff Spencer, Mr. Chair. Welcome to our community.

For the past 20 years I've considered it my community. This is my home, these are my people.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: I've put more respect to these people in 20 years than you have in two days. Your

comment earlier today, "we've spent two bloody days here", I'll tell you right now that I am insulted as a white person, I am shocked that you would disrespect the people of the Cree Nation here.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: You're a Chairman of a National Commission; I'm a Vice-Chair of a national Aboriginal support body, I have never treated people with disrespect the way you people have here and I'm shocked. I'm going to tell you that.

Secondly, you came into our lands, you told our people -- you wouldn't walk into a Court of Law and say that, well guess what, when our people speak here we let them speak. We tell them your voice is important. They're not bloody people that you had to listen to for two days.

This is our land here; our people have the right to speak. You're now coming into Eeyou Istchee, we're not coming into your land or my land or someone else's land.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: I will definitely make it be known with some national Chief and federal ministers at how disrespectful you were to these people.

You talk about Nova Scotia and B.C. put the

moratorium on mining, I believe your answer to Ellis was "It's a political decision and we have no documents or back up to say why they did it". I find that very very funny. Omission of information comes from them, comes from you, and comes from them.

All the information needs to be relayed to our people, you ever want people to come together and talk and agree to even consider something respect is the first and foremost thing I learned in my life, and these people have shown.

You cut everybody off, you interrogated the people that were against and the people that were for you put white gloves. Did you ever pose the question -- not one of you, "All those that are for this project, are you employed by Strateco? Are you on their payroll? Are you contracted by Strateco", and every single one of them, their answer would have been yes. So, that's a biased opinion.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: I have an unbiased opinion. I have no stake in this other than my children and their children, my in-laws, what I saw the value -- my father in-law was a big part of the federal cases for the forestry. He believed in his land, he believed in his people as I believe in these people.

I want you to take all this home with you. You probably say: "Who cares, it's just a guy from the community." I am not from the community but I am the community because I've been here, this is my life here.

Politically, Nova Scotia, B.C., said no. You heard the Chief last night; you should have packed up and left right then because the political decision was no.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: The Deputy Grand Chief supported the Chief in that position. The political decision was no. We govern this land, this is our land, our people control this land, you heard the Elder, Paul Dixon say "The thousand years of your university, PhD's or whatever will never teach you anything, Dr. McDill, about our land". Live it.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: I've lived it, I've been out on the land with the people, I've lived in the bush, I've seen what beauty there is. You talk about a beautiful morning this morning, well, I certainly would love my grandchildren to live that beautiful life and see that morning.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: Are you all cut off? You were -- pretty disrespectful to a young man that was very

well spoken, his questions weren't answered, many questions weren't answered, Johnny Loon had a question that the last meeting with Strateco that this gentleman here, John, Paul, or whatever -- I'm sorry, your name, sir?

MR. LACHANCE: Jean-Pierre.

MR. SPENCER: Jean-Pierre said: "I will get you the information by the next meeting".

There was an omission of all the negative effects that were in that document they provided and they cannot answer, why they cannot answer a simple question.

Here today, you had simple questions to yourselves, it's not a question of whether you're going to say yes or no. The question is do you have the capacity to say no? And you couldn't even answer that.

As a man with respect for the world, respect with your decision, I would say absolutely, yes or no I have the capacity, and you don't have it which means you're biased too.

I want you to take all this home, I want you to think about it ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. SPENCER: --- and at the end of the day, no matter what they say, they say it and everybody says, our Chief whom I respect very much since he was a

youth has said no, that's a political decision, this is our land, and the answer is no.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: First of all, let me tell you that we came here to listen. All right, we did not come here -- we knew it was going to be, shall we say, a difficult kind of a hearing because of the opposition this particular project.

MR. SPENCER: Just to cut that off, sir ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't cut me off, please, I

MR. SPENCER: I'm going to because you've cut everybody off for two days.

THE CHAIRMAN: I've listened -- I've listened to your long reply.

MR. SPENCER: You came here to listen to people, let me finish. You came here to listen to people; you cut people off, just what I'm doing to you.

You did not respect them, you cut them off, you came here already saying, "Okay, we have to come here and listen", now you're going to go to Chibougamau. This has been a very quiet and respectful crowd. Dr. McDill has said it herself of the youth.

I've seen demonstrations, I've seen

meetings, I've seen public commissions, I've seen them all for many years, and to say it was difficult, it was very undifficult and you're lucky that not more people spoke like I did.

If people know -- and people here know me -- I will say it to you and not behind your back, that's why I felt compelled to come up here.

So, you're being here and listening to people, why don't you hear what they said instead of just listening.

THE CHAIRMAN: I did hear. We did hear. And I want you to know that we've negotiated with the Chief the modus operandi because for us to allow everybody to have the time to talk to us and for us to question and to try to extract all the information we need -- this is our protocol, we are running it now for about 30 years in which people come, people make submissions to us, we read them, then we ask the questions, this is the procedure.

And when I said it is being long -- when I use the word "bloody" and maybe I shouldn't have used the word, I didn't mean bloody people, I meant bloody long, in terms of long, long, long.

And I didn't mean to be disrespectful here, I just want to make the obvious statement that we originally anticipated to finish somewhere today around --

I don't know, 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock, and here we are and we are still in a -- in a discussion.

We never, never came here with a "fait accompli" with an ideas as to how it's going to come out.

That's why we're here, to listen to you and to learn from you and to share this kind of information that you have.

And if we sound like we're disrespectful, all I can tell you is all we're trying to do is extract as much information as we can.

MR. SPENCER: Okay. So, that's your idea of an apology for saying "the bloody two days". We've heard those kind of apologies for many years.

You know what? The words "I'm sorry for the way I spoke in disrespect of your people" would probably be a good thing for me, but now it's too late.

I just ask that in the future, if you're going to consider talking to people and listening to people, that, you know, that you really, really do consider and listen and that you ask the same questions and you provide the same services to all people.

An example is, yesterday, checking bags. The security guy watched five non-native people walk in with their bags, he doesn't check their bags. One Cree youth goes, he checks his bag.

I told him like I'm telling you, "Respect our people. Why didn't you search them?"

I work for them. Well, guess what? We don't know your people that came into our community. How do we know that they're safe to our people?

So, maybe that respect should go to everybody. And that's all I was trying to tell you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

So this is now concluded.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LEBLANC: I would be remiss if, in addition to thanking, as the President did, everybody who participated, we did not also thank the staff of the Sports Complex that really helped us in setting up this room and in providing services to us during our stay; the people at the Mistissini Lodge who fed us, the caterer who really brought some great food for us in the last two days, the interpreters in the three languages, the technicians and the police authorities that assisted us in the normal process for our hearings.

So, thank you very much and drive carefully. Thank you.

I should also mention that when the President mentioned that it will be webcast, there will be screens in this complex at 10:30 tomorrow morning, when we start in Chibougamau, and so you can visualize the proceedings if you're not watching it from your own computer at home, here in this facility.

Thank you.

MR. LOON: Before everybody leaves, I'd like to ask one of our Elders to come and do a closing prayer. So, if you can go back to your seats and we'll do a closing prayer.

MR. MATOOSH: Can we all please stand up?

As you can see, uranium is a very important subject to this community, it's a very hot issue, it's a very difficult subject to deal with. And of course, opinions differ.

The Cree, in 1975, signed the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement. They agreed in Category III they will share the land with the white people. That is some 36 years ago, and that has not changed.

The Cree want to be part of the planning of development in Eeyou Istchee.

Despite our differences, we have to find a way how to walk side by side and work side by side for our future generations in this generation that exists today.

We've got to find a way because we are all here to stay. And with God's help, we will find a way how we can live, walk and work together.

(Speaking in Cree language without interpretation)

The worst thing that we need from you and to help us to understand each other and to help us to understand that you made this beautiful world for all of us to use.

Help us to walk side by side. Help us to find a way how to work side by side.

And most importantly, help us how to find to live together side by side.

Thank you, Dear Lord, for this blessed two days and thank you for all your blessings to all the people in this world, both great and small. We ask that you continue to bless the people and especially the hard work that the Commission has to do. We ask that you individually bless the Members of the Commission and the staff of the Commission in their difficult task. It's going to be an important decision that the Crees will be waiting for.

We also ask that you bless the proponents, the people, in Category III that are working like Strateco and all the staff of Strateco. We ask that you continue to bless and guide and keep us all. In your name, we

pray. Amen.

(Speaking in Cree language without interpretation) It's our tradition. In our tradition we got to say goodbye. So please line up here. I know you're in a hurry.

--- Upon adjourning at 4:38 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 16h38