Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire

Public hearing

Audience publique

June 5th, 2012

Le 5 juin 2012

Neoskweskau Sports Complex
206 Main Street,
Mistissini, Québec

Neoskweskau Sports Complex
206, rue Principale
Mistissini (Québec)

Commission Members present

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

Commissaires présents

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

Secretary:

Mr. Marc Leblanc

Secrétaire:

M. Marc Leblanc

Senior General Counsel :

Mr. Jacques Lavoie

Avocat général principal:

M. Jacques Lavoie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Mistissini, Québec

--- Upon commencing on Tuesday, June 5, 2012 at 9:27 a.m./
L'audience débute à 9h27, mardi le 5 juin 2012

Opening Remarks

M. LEBLANC: Bonjour mesdames et messieurs. Bienvenue à l'audience publique de la Commission canadienne de sûreté nucléaire.

Mon nom est Marc Leblanc. Je suis le secrétaire de la Commission et j'aimerais aborder certains aspects touchant le déroulement des audiences.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is about to start a public hearing on the application by Strateco Resources for the construction of an exploration ramp that may lead to a mine in the future. This is what we refer to as to the Matoush Project.

During today's business, we have simultaneous translation in English, French and Cree.

Des appareils de traduction sont disponibles à la réception. La version française est au poste 2, the English version is on channel 1 and the Cree version is on channel X.

Please keep the pace of speech relatively

slow so that the translators have a chance to keep up.

L’audience est enregistrée et transcrite textuellement; les transcriptions se font dans l’une ou l’autre des langues officielles compte tenu de la langue utilisée par le participant à l'audience publique.

The proceeding is also archived on our website for a three-month period after the closure of the hearing. I also understand that this proceeding is being broadcast on an Aboriginal community network.

Les transcriptions seront disponibles sur le site web de la Commission dès la semaine prochaine.

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

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

Monsieur Binder, président et premier dirigeant de la CCSN, présidera l’audience publique d'aujourd'hui.

Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

First of all let me, on behalf of the Commission, tell you how happy we are to be in your community. First time for me to visit this beautiful community. We’ve taken a look last night at the beautiful

lake and had a beautiful meal at the lodge and took a long walk this morning, got lost. But here we are. And we're really happy to be here. Any excuse to get out of Ottawa and be in a real community is a good thing.

So what I would like to do is I would like, first of all, welcome you to the public hearing of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. And I'm going to introduce the Members of the Commission and then I'm going to ask Chief Shecapio -- I don't know if I'm pronouncing the name right -- to say a few words and maybe lead in a prayer, and then we will start the proceeding.

So let me start, on my right is Dr. Moyra McDill, and on my left is Dr. Ronald Barriault and Mr. André Harvey.

We have heard from Marc Leblanc, the Secretary of the Commission and we also have with us monsieur Jacques Lavoie, Senior General Counsel to the Commission, with us on the podium.

So, Chief, if -- oh, first of all I've got to do something administrative; I've got to approve the agenda.

So I assume silence is golden, so we have concurrence and for the record, the agenda is approved.

Adoption of Agenda

THE CHAIRMAN: So I'd like to turn now to the Chief to guide us and take us through the prayer and the opening remarks.

Prayer from the Council of the Cree Nation of Mistissini and Opening Remarks from Chief Richard Shecapio

CHIEF SHECAPIO: Good morning.

Good morning everyone. (Speaking in native language)

So before we start we'll do the standard, we will welcome everybody for being here and our guests. I'll acknowledge our guests and our visitors and there's many of them in our community and they're from all over the place. They all have different responsibilities. So I welcome them, welcome them today and acknowledge them for being here with us today, also including tomorrow.

Welcome, I guess, the Commission Tribunal, President, Michael Binder, and all the representatives of the Commission, welcome to Mistissini.

Also to the CNSC staff, Mr. Jean Leclair

and all the people under CNSC, welcome to Mistissini, and of course from Strateco, Guy Hébert, Jean-Pierre Lachance, all the employees under Strateco, welcome to Mistissini.

Also, I want to take this opportunity to welcome all intervenors who will be presenting at the hearings today and tomorrow, from the community of Mistissini and also from various parts and representing different groups of Quebec.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

CHIEF SHECAPIO: I'd ask one of our Elders in our community to come and do an opening prayer.

I invite Sam Petawabano to do the opening prayer.

Pour faire la prière, monsieur Sam Petawabano.

MR. PETAWABANO: (Reciting a prayer in native language).

Amen. Thank you, Lord.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Chief Shecapio and the Elders for welcoming us to this community and to this hearing. And now, I will tend to Marc to take us through some of the procedures.

Strateco Resources Inc.:

Application for a Uranium Mine

Site Preparation and Construction

Licence for the Matoush Project

MR. LEBLANC: Thank you very much for honouring us this way this morning.

This is a One-Day public hearing. The Notice of Public Hearing 2012-H-04 was published on April 5th of this year. The public was invited to participate either by oral presentation or written submission. May 16th was the deadline set for filing by intervenors.

In order to take into account the traditional activities occurring at the beginning of May in the community, we announced on May 2nd a change of date to the deadline for filing an intervention. The deadline was extended from May 4th to May 16th.

The Commission received 89 requests for interventions in total. May 29th, 2012 was the deadline for filing of supplementary information. I note that it has been filed by Strateco, CNSC staff and several intervenors.

We will first hear today the presentations by Strateco Resources and CNSC staff. After that, we will go through a first round of questions from the Commission members and then we're going to hear from intervenors, which is the purpose of us being here in the community.

Twenty-seven (27) intervenors are scheduled to present today and 11, tomorrow.

Time allowing at the end of the day today, we will be addressing the written submissions. Should there not be enough time, some presentations scheduled for today may be scheduled for tomorrow. We'll know as the day proceeds. Your key contact will be Ms. Louise Levert and Ms. Julie Bouchard from the staff and you'll see them going around the room if you need information as to timing, et cetera.

The break for lunch today will be approximately around one o'clock until two o'clock, and there will be a short break in mid-morning and mid-afternoon. I understand that beverages and snacks will be available during the morning and afternoon breaks.

The break for dinner will be around six o'clock tonight, and we anticipate ending today at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Marc.

Before we start, I'd like to make a few introductory remarks. As Marc just told us, we are here and tomorrow to consider written submissions and oral presentations from a large number of citizens and organizations who wish to express their opinion on the

application by Strateco Resources to obtain a licence to allow it to conduct advanced explorations for Matoush Uranium Project.

So I'd like to start by clarifying some things prior to getting the hearing underway. First of all, I wish to emphasize that the Commission is a quasi-judicial administrative tribunal. It is independent from any political, government or private sector influence. Intervention for this hearing includes recommendations to the Commission. CNSC staff also make recommendations to the Commission.

But it is the Commission Members and only the Commission Members who will render a decision based on all the evidence presented in the context of the hearing process.

Our mandate is very simple. To ensure that nuclear activities are done in a manner that protects the environment as well as the health, safety and security of workers and the public.

Several intervenors have raised the important questions on the future of nuclear energy or uranium mining in the Province of Quebec. Many are asking for a moratorium on uranium mining in Quebec.

I trust that you will understand that the Commission as an administrative tribunal does not have

the statutory authority and will not consider questions that are of a political nature. And that it is the Quebec government, the Quebec provincial government that must address these fundamental energy policy questions, not this Commission.

To repeat, the purpose of this hearing is to consider the safety and impact of the project on the community, the workers, and the environment. And the Commission is here to hear your views and concern in this regard. Thank you for your attention.

So I would like now to start the hearing by calling on presentation from Strateco Resources, as outlined in Commission Member Documents 12-H7.1 and 7.1A. And I understand that Mr. Guy Hébert will make the presentation.

Monsieur Hébert, vous avez la parole.

12-H7.1 / 12-H7.1A
Oral presentation by
Strateco Resources Inc.

MR. HÉBERT: Doctor Binder, Chief Shecapio, thank you for your welcome in Mistissini, Commission Members. For the record, I am Guy Hébert, President and Chief Executive Officer of Strateco Resources.

I am pleased to have with me today Jean-Pierre Lachance, Executive, Exploration, Community Relations Vice-President; Pierre Terreault, Operations and Engineering Vice-President; in the back, Gabriel Maurice, Human Resources, Health and Safety Manager; and Caroline Hardy, Environmental Manager.

As well, from SENES Consulting, Stacey Fernandes and Grant Feasby; from Melis Engineering, Bruce Fielder; from Roscoe Postle Associates, Normand Lecuyer and Charles Gagnon; and from Fasken Martineau DuMoulin, Jean M. Gagné.

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, it's my pleasure to present to you a summary of Strateco Commission Member Document, CMD, for the Matoush underground exploration project. The activities filed under this licence application consist of the excavation of an exploration ramp, driving two exploration drifts in waste rock, three, excavation through the mineralized zone, and definition drilling of the mineralized zone.

It also includes the construction of surface facilities. The proposed project encompasses a site restoration. We anticipate that will be a five-year term licence.

We are not planning to carry out bulk sampling or test mining. The project will allow

verification of the continuity of the ore body, demineralization, and to complete geotechnical and hydrogeological characterization.

The project as described poses a low overall risk to health, safety, and the environment. The proposed activities and related risks are similar to those normally encountered in conventional mining.

Strateco is fortified to carry out the activities authorized by the licence and will, in carrying out that activity, make adequate provisions for the protection of the environment, people's health and safety, and the maintenance of national security.

The Matoush Project was discovered in 1980 by Uranerz, a German company. Strateco began its surface exploration activities in early 2006 with work done on the property mineral resources and the rent of 27 million pounds of uranium with an average rate of roughly 0.5 percent, 5,000 btm.

This makes the Matoush Project the most promising one in Quebec. More than $110 million have already been invested in the project. In order to continue the development, Strateco received in April 2008 the permission to begin the process of obtaining the authorization required to proceed with the underground exploration program. Strateco has filed a licence

application to the CNSC in November of 2009.

Strateco and the Cree Community of Mistissini conclude a communication and information agreement on December 23rd, 2011.

This four-year agreement reflect the Cree Community of Mistissini intention to receive additional information concerning the Matoush Project resulting, among other things, from the advanced exploration activities, and cannot be interpret as the Cree Nation of Mistissini support for the said-advanced exploration activities and for the construction and operation phase of the mine for the Matoush Project, Agreement Article 10.

This agreement is binding, open, and showing through to the benefit to the parties and their respective successor and assigned, Agreement Article 15.

The Matoush property is located in the centre of Quebec in the James Bay territory, approximately 200 kilometres northeast from the Cree Community of Mistissini, and about 275 kilometres northeast of the town of Chibougamau.

The Matoush property boundaries lie within two traditional Cree trap lines. The site is accessible by air via an airstrip built in 2010, or by a winter road serviceable eight to 10 weeks per year.

The future extension of Road 167 will run

10 kilometres west of the site. This permanent access is planned for the fall of 2012.

This slide presents a close-up of the property and the surrounding trap lines. As mentioned, the project sits on two trap lines, while Strateco property overlaps five trap lines.

So, without interruption I will now turn the floor over Pierre Terreault, our Vice President of Engineering.

MR. TERREAULT: For the record, I'm Pierre H. Terreault, Vice President of Operations and Engineering at Strateco Resources.

While 14 standard safety and control area are present in our CMD, we will address the most prevalent ones for the purpose of this presentation.

The management system developed by Strateco is based on the documents CSAM286, Management Systems Requirement for a Unit or a Power Plant. Strateco apply continuous improvement principle in order to proactively contribute to health and safety, environmental protection and social responsibility.

We are committed to the ALARA principle, an optimization program, and will therefore aim to reduce the expose to contaminate to a minimum when possible.

Safety is a priority for Strateco,

management and worker take it very seriously. Under no circumstances the safety of the worker or the public shall be put at risk. And if necessary, the suspension of the site activity will occur to ensure their safety.

Corrective action processes is a key component to improve quality performance at the site. This is already in place at the site with regard to protection of environmental and the worker health and safety. Any and all incidents are reported and analyzed.

The self-evaluation will be conduct via audit; these evaluations will identify the good practice to maintain and the area requirement improvement in the management system.

Strateco and its consultant have developed engineering measurements to eliminate or mitigate the effect of the project on environmental and the health and safety of workers and public. We have used the best industrial presenter in our design. The main facility associate with the underground exploration project are portal, waste, special waste, lock pad, water treatment plant, all the plant and fuel form, ventilation and ramp development.

In order to prevent potential damage for blasting activity to surrounding building or infrastructure, it is proposed to start with the

construction of the portal which consists of the ramp entries and the excavation of the first 30 metres of the ramp. This is an example of the portal proposed for the Matoush Exploration Project.

Following the construction of the portal, we will proceed with the construction of the waste pad. Management of the excavation rock is an important aspect of the project. To ensure protection of the worker and the environmental, Strateco will project with the waste rock verification procedure which involve the sampling, analyze of the rock throughout the excavation work activity.

Clean rock represent rock with a radioactive signature of less than 1.35 microsieverts per hour or less than 0.03 percent of uranium. This rock would be placed on the waste rock pad which is designed to accumulate a total of 286,000 tons of rock.

Although uranium mineralization is not expect to be encountered in the ramp construction, should it be encountered, this material will be designed as special waste and will be placed on the special waste pad which will be built with a liner and surrounded by a ditch also protected by a liner.

Management of water is an important aspect of the project. All water from the underground

development will be pumped to the surface and sent to the water treatment plant. The plant include two storage pond built on one basin, the treatment plant building, two settling pond and a control station at the final discharge location.

This facility is designed with mitigation and contingency measure in mind. For instance, the storage pond are built with a double liner with a leak-catcher system between liners. These ponds can accommodate the calculation probability maximum precipitation event. The storage pond, small in size, are built with (off mic) capacity is reached. The water can be returned underground, all pump are a backup and alarm system.

The commissioning of the plant will ensure that the treatment water meets all quality criteria established. The treatment surplus can be diverted back in case water does not meet the quality criteria.

The proposed power plant was designed to meet the needs of the project and comply with safety standard. There will be up to three 1,500-kilowatt generator that will operate simultaneously at the peak of the project. And if there a reduction in the demand, the 500-kilowatt generator will replace one of the 1,500-kilowatt generator. We have a 15-kilowatt generator --

1,500-kilowatt generator on standby in case one in operation malfunctions.

The generator are powered by fuel, storage at the fuel farm. The proposed fuel farm is designed to meet the construction code, safety code and the National Fire Protection Code. There are a total 19 reservoir of fuel and one reservoir of gasoline. All reservoir are double wall and are equipped with overfill valve and controllable system. The fuel farm is built on a liner and surrounded by a ditch also covered with a liner.

A powerful ventilation system of 210,000 CFM has been designed for the underground ramp. This system will progress through six phase as the ramp development. Ultimately, the final ventilation raise will serve as an exhaust system. Exhaust raise during the exploration drilling activity and the extraction of the 750 of minerals rock.

No diamond drilling of the uranium mineral zone will be carried out until the complete ventilation system has been installed and operation. The system will be equipped with a device that activate an alarm system in case of ventilation failure.

The design of the underground development was completed by Strateco and Scott Wilson, Roscoe Postle Associates. This commission will be performed by Tyson

Mining, an experienced uranium mine developer from Regina in Saskatchewan.

As previously mentioned, the entry of the underground ramp will be possible via a portal.

Fall zone has been identified where rock quality could be lower quality and Strateco has put in place a procedure for the excavation of the ramp while approaching such a zone.

Groundwater inflow will be grouted to avoid contaminating of clear water with excavation activities, and thus to avoid unnecessary water treatment. The proposed ramp will have two horizontal drifts located at 165 metres and 300 metres below the surface. A ventilation raise will go from the bottom of the ramp at level 300 to the surface.

As you can see on this angle, the ramp sits in raised rock or clear rock adjacent to the ore body. Radiation monitoring will be completed throughout the excavation activities. Strateco has established a radiation code of practice that specific measures need to be taken according to specific radiation levels. It is scheduled to excavate the exploration drift in mineral rock at the 165 level only when the final ventilation system is in place.

Strateco has prepared a radiation

protection program for the underground exploration program as required by the CNSC Radiation Protection Regulation and Uranium Mine and Mill Regulations. Our program ensures that contamination and radiation doses received are monitored, controlled and kept as low as reasonably achievable.

In other words, Strateco is committed to the ALARA principles. The proposed program includes the monitoring of radiation levels and radiation doses received by all workers.

Graph sampling and continuous radon gas and radon progeny monitoring will be performed on the surface and underground. Some workers will also be issued a personal alpha dosimeter. Contact with uranium mineralized rock is expected to be limited since the underground development sits in berms that is on-the-rise rock with a low radiation field.

Throughout the surface exploration activity, all potential exposed workers at the site have been carrying a thermal luminescent dosimeter. In addition to this instrument, direct-reading dosimeters will be used to monitor worker exposure in areas with elevated gamma field during underground activities.

Strateco has designed its health and safety program in order to meet the federal and the provincial

requirements. The objective is to eliminate the sources of danger that could affect the health and safety and physical integrity of the worker.

Safety is a priority for Strateco and it’s well understood by both the management and the workers, and that is why we are including a safety culture in our proposed management system. It is important to emphasize on the fact that under no circumstances the safety of the worker or the public will be put at risk.

Furthermore, suspension of the site activity will occur to ensure their safety is necessary. Strateco will have a Health and Safety Committee in place to ensure proper follow-up of health and safety documents and performance-type inspections.

Strateco has designed its environmental protection program in order to meet, to a minimum, the federal and provincial requirements. These objectives will be met by, among other things, conducting daily environmental inspections and controls and conducting an environmental monitoring program.

The effluent generated from the water treatment plant is the most significant emission from the site. However, it should be clear that no processed water will be generated at the site and the water entering the water treatment plant is solely composed of surface runoff

and underground dewatering water.

We, therefore, expect water of relative good quality even before it enters the plant.

As for the radiation protection, Strateco has elaborated a contamination water code of practice which will provide a margin of safety in order to avoid excess regulated limits. At any time, the final effluent discharge can be closed.

Proposed waste management is part of Strateco’s philosophy ever since the beginning of the surface exploration activity. Recycling and reusing is already well implemented. We have an elaborate waste management program that deals with all waste listed on this slide generated at the site. Our program presents how waste is managed, including the recording and reporting of volume and disposing, inspection and offsite disposal.

Domestic wastes include kitchen waste food. Strateco is composting all leftover food of any kind. The composting activity requires carbon input and therefore we collect all paper, hand towels and cardboard to incorporate into the composting recipient.

Water collected at the site includes domestic water generated at the camp, surface runoff water and industrial water generated by the drilling and

underground exploration activity. Water from the dry will be sent to the water treatment plant, along with the water generated by drilling and underground development activity.

Surface water runoff will be controlled by a drainage system and water will be sent to specific surface runoff ponds, where water will be analyzed and, if required, treated as a priority to discharge.

The Matoush Project sits on a Category 3 land in the James Bay territory. This implies that this project is subject to both federal and provincial environmental and socio assessments.

As the proposed activities are associated with uranium advanced exploration, the project also answers to federal authorities. Therefore, the guidelines for the preparation of the environmental impact assessment for the Matoush Project were co-written by the federal and the provincial authorities.

Strateco has filed its environmental impact assessment in October 2009 and we received an answer from the federal administrator in February 2012 stating that they authorize the advanced exploration project.

I will now turn the floor over to Jean-Pierre Lachance.

MR. LACHANCE: For the record, I'm Jean-

Pierre Lachance, Executive Vice-President Exploration and Community Relations for Strateco Resources.

Strateco recognizes the importance of making sure that the impacted communities are well informed on the Matoush Project and its underground exploration program.

We have been in dialogue and discussions with the communities closest to the proposed project; namely Mistissini, Chibougamau and Chapais since 2006.

As the project is on the Category 3 land which is used by trappers from the Cree community of Mistissini, it’s also essential to ensure that we inform the stakeholders properly and maintain good relations with them as well as the members of the community itself.

Public hearings held subsequently in Mistissini and Chibougamau in November 2010 were aimed at obtaining people’s impressions. At each session, the public was given the opportunity to ask questions and comment on the project.

Strateco received substantial support from organizations and companies, as well as from local and regional authorities like the Cree B.G. and from several Cree families. However, Strateco did not receive the support of the Cree Nation of Mistissini.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

MR. LACHANCE: It became clear to us that what we needed to enhance our relations with the Cree Nation of Mistissini in order to respond to its concerns in an appropriate manner and win its respect and support.

Strateco took many initiatives, including on December 23rd, 2011, after many months of discussion Strateco signed a four-year communication and information agreement with the Cree Nation of Mistissini on the communication procedure. That will be the cornerstone of relations between Strateco and the Cree Nation of Mistissini during the Matoush underground exploration program.

Since the signature of the communication and information agreement, the committee has met six times between February 9 and May 23rd, 2012, to implement the initiatives and measures agreed to in such an agreement.

The first step was the creation of the Communication and Information Committee in January 2012. This committee consists of the following representative of the Cree Nation of Mistissini and Strateco. For the Cree Nation of Mistissini, John S. Matoush, Deputy Chief; Elija Awashish, member of the community, and Guy Prud’homme, legal counsel.

From Strateco, Jean-Pierre Lachance, Executive Vice-President; Jean M. Gagné, partner in Fasken

Martineau DuMoulin and finally, Stéphane McKenzie, Community Relations Director.

As stipulated in the agreement, the following people were recruited and hired, a liaison officer employed by the community of Mistissini, Freddie Mianscum; an officer in charge of community relations employed by Strateco, Allan Matoush. Strateco assumes all costs to these positions.

On March 14, 2012 Strateco held a public information meeting with the Cree community of Mistissini that including a project update, as well as the presentation by Clarence Natomagan, a Cree from Saskatchewan who spoke about his experience with Saskatchewan uranium projects and addressed various matters raised by members of the Cree community of Mistissini following the presentations.

It should be noted that Strateco was also accompanied by Grant Feasby of the consulting firm of SENES, who has participated in numerous uranium industry studies.

On May 23rd, 2012 Strateco held a second public information meeting with the Cree community of Mistissini which included a project update and the presentation by Dr. Michel Plante (phon.), a public health expert with specific expertise in the uranium industry, a

review of the question and answer from March 14 meeting and a question for members to the community.

Also on May 23rd, prior to the public information meeting, a smaller meeting was held with the Chief of the Youth Council, Shawn Iserhoff, the president and some members of the Native Women’s Association and representative of the Elders.

This meeting took the form of an open discussion among these representatives, members of Strateco management and a number of experts, including Dr. Michel Plante (phon.) and Grant Feasby.

Overall, since the public hearing held in November 2010 and more particularly since the signature of the communication and information agreement on December 23rd, 2011, Strateco has made a considerable effort to inform the Cree community of Mistissini and address its concerns.

However, in addition to the agreement signed in December 2011 and despite Strateco’s efforts to implement the agreement since then, we note that it remains extremely difficult in the context of already polarized opinion with the Cree community of Mistissini to get stakeholders, including the leaders of the Cree community of Mistissini to adhere to the communication and information process outlined in the agreement.

That being said, Strateco will persist in this effort in collaboration with the leaders of the Cree community of Mistissini with the goal of transmitting full information and fostering informed opinion on the Matoush Project.

In this regard, in the context of various public information meetings held in the Cree community of Mistissini Strateco also noticed that many people in groups had the need for neutral objective and independent information on the various aspects and effects of the Matoush Project.

It was also evident that many negative perceptions had developed among members of the Cree community of Mistissini following the targeted intervention of certain influential players, including many resources from outside the community.

Our communications to date have also shown us that different considerable misinformation has been shown over the years. However, with transparent information and open, honest dialogue, this appears to be somewhat gradually dissipating.

We will continue to transmit and communicate information sought by the members of the community until they are satisfied and are able to apply sound judgment to all aspects of the Matoush Project.

Moreover, we would like to share you some conclusions and comments regarding the exchanges between Strateco and the community of Mistissini since the signature of the agreement in December 2011.

We note that the Cree community of Mistissini understands the scope of Strateco’s exploration project and the limits of its assessment and we agree that the concerns regarding the potential for the future development of a uranium mine are relevant and warranted.

However, we insist we will be able to address all the issues in collaboration with the Cree community of Mistissini and its members once we have taken a decision to proceed with the construction of such a mine, which will not happen for at least four years.

At the moment, as we have often said to the leaders of the Cree community, as well as its members, the various environmental review procedures will provide the members of the Cree community of Mistissini with many opportunities to ask questions and ensure that all their concerns are taken into account in relation to this potential project.

At this stage, it’s premature to try to settle all these aspects as no decisions have yet been taken on such things as the location of the mine or how it would be built or operated.

We also note that the Cree community of Mistissini considers reasonable Strateco's objective of better delineating the Matoush deposit so as to determine the geological characteristics of the site, the feasibility of a future mining operation, and the specifications of the official mine and its facilities.

However, what has been omitted and must be added is that the exploration ramp will also enable Strateco to conduct the water assessments requested by the Cree community of Mistissini in the communication and information agreement signed on December 23rd, 2011.

This important information will also address many of the concerns of the members of the community and help Strateco in any future mine planning and construction phase.

In terms of the aquatic baseline study, the perception of the Cree is to the effect that information appears to be non-existent. We once again underscore that on top of the numerous local studies completed since 2007 on the aquatic and terrestrial components, a regional aquatic study will be conducted.

This decision has been taken by Strateco in collaboration with the Cree community of Mistissini as part of the process and the communication agreement signed in December 2011.

The various activities undertaken during the course of the study, including the identification of study sites and data collection, will be carried out by teams that included members of the Cree community of Mistissini.

Taking all this into account, we believe that it’s possible to fulfil our social responsibility to the members of the Cree community of Mistissini through straightforward, honest and ongoing communication. This constitutes a favourable outreach that fosters strong, sincere and sustainable ties.

We feel that Strateco efforts to implement the overall communication and information process merits recognition. We will carry out the Matoush project with due respect for the values of the Cree community of Mistissini’s culture and traditional way of life. This has always been Strateco’s objective.

Now the conclusion; Strateco is determined to undertake the proposed project in such a way as to ensure the health and safety of workers and the public. We have adopted the ALARA principle so as to continuously seek new ways to minimize exposure to contaminants. The proposed facilities were all designed with a view to environmental protection, including appropriate mitigation measures, controls and monitoring programs.

Strateco wants to ensure that the communities involved, namely Mistissini, Chibougamau and Chapais are well-informed of the underground exploration project. As the project lies on Category 3 land used by trappers in the Cree community of Mistissini, it's all the more important to maintain good relations with the community.

With the communication and information agreement and the communication and information committee now in place, discussions between the company and the community of Mistissini shall be greatly facilitated.

We firmly believe that we have the expertise and qualifications required to undertake this project and to do so in compliance with the licence of the CNSC Licence Condition Handbook.

This concludes our presentation. We will now be pleased to answer any question you might have.

Thank you/Miigwech.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Before we get into questions, I'd like to hear from CNSC staff and I guess you'll make a presentation as outlined in CMD 12-H7.

And I understand that, Mr. Jamal, you'll make the presentation. Please proceed.

12-H7

Oral presentation by

CNSC staff

M. JAMMAL: Merci monsieur le président.

Good morning Mr. President and Members of the Commission. For the record, I am Executive Vice-President and Chief Regulatory Operations Officer for the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

Before I will start the presentation, I would like to thank Chief Richard Shecapio for his welcome, and that is on behalf of all of the CNSC staff.

Mr. President, we are before you to present to you a licensing request limited to the exploration and exploration purposes only. This licensing request is not a licence nor a permission to operate a uranium mine.

CNSC staff evaluation and their assessment are based on scientific facts and decades of experience in regulating uranium mines in the Province of Saskatchewan.

With me today Mr. Jean LeClair on my left, who is the Director of Uranium Mines and Mills Division. Next to him is Dr. Patsy Thompson, Director General of the Directorate of Environmental and Radiation Protection Assessment. Also present here, Mr. Denis Schryer, Project Officer of this project. And we are supported by our

specialists in geoscience, environmental assessment, communications and Aboriginal consultation. We're also being supported by staff from Ottawa.

As I previously mentioned, this presentation focuses on the Matoush Underground Exploration Project.

And I will now pass the presentation to Mr. LeClair.

MR. LeCLAIR: Good morning. For the record, my name is Jean LeClair, and I am the Director of the Uranium Mines and Mills Division.

The CNSC staff presentation this morning will begin with the review of the project information, its location, the current conditions at the site and the activities that require Commission approval.

I'll briefly go over the steps that were followed since Strateco applied for a licence. I'll then go over the environmental review of the project, the concerns that were considered in the review, the conclusions from these reviews and the decisions that were made. I'll talk about the other reviews we did on the licence application.

I believe it is important that we clearly communicate the decision to approve the project is not a blank cheque for Strateco to do what they want. The

licence we are proposing sets out requirements to be met and I'll briefly discuss how we will make sure that Strateco meets those requirements.

I'll also briefly talk about the licensing process for a project going forward if it proceeds past the exploration phase. I'll then end with staff conclusions.

The Matoush project is located near the centre of the Province of Quebec. It's about 210 kilometres north of here and about 275 kilometres north of the Town of Chibougamau.

There's a fair amount of exploration going on in the area of the Matoush site and around it. There are about 20 projects in the area that are looking for uranium not too far from the Matoush site. There are also companies looking for gold, copper, molybdenum and diamonds.

This slide shows a closer view of where the site is. The site is located in a region governed by the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, which is an agreement between the Cree and Inuit of the James Bay Northern Quebec region, the Canadian government and the Government of Quebec.

The site is located on Category 3 land, and as we understand the agreement, the land is to be used for

the benefit and use by everyone while allowing for continued traditional use such as trapping, fishing and hunting.

The trap lines of the area are managed by the Taliman. The Taliman are the people recognized by the community as responsible for the management of harvesting activities within a designated area defined as a trap line.

The Matoush site is in within the trap lines managed by Taliman Harry Kunchish (phon.) and Alfred Kooncom (phon.) as in close proximity to three other trap lines.

The Matoush exploration project area is currently about 0.5 square kilometres and the proposed underground exploration project is within this same area or footprint.

While uranium is found in many places; in 1980, people found that the area around the Matoush site had more uranium than in other places. Over the years different companies have been using equipment to measure for uranium near the surface and doing surface drilling which involve drilling down through the rock to collect rock samples called drill cores to measure for uranium.

As of September 2009, Strateco had determined that the Matoush uranium deposit contained

about 20 million pounds of uranium, an average grade of .57 percent. This means that 100 pounds of uranium ore or uranium rich rock would contain about a half a pound of uranium.

The picture you see on this slide is an aerial view of the current exploration site. The site includes a temporary camp for workers, waste storage areas, fuel storage areas, drill core storage and analysis buildings and other storage and maintenance buildings.

In September 2010 CNSC staff, including myself, visited the Matoush exploration site. We found the site was well kept and maintained. We examined their exploration activities. The site geologist that was working there had previous experience with exploration in Saskatchewan. We saw that the radiation protection practice that were being followed would meet our expectations and they were consistent with the best practices we have seen in Northern Saskatchewan.

Strateco is currently looking to do more exploration that involves going underground. Strateco’s proposed underground exploration project, that is the subject of today’s hearing and that requires the Commission’s approval, includes the following, expansion of existing facilities, such as expanding the camp to handle more workers and building of a bigger power plant

to run more equipment. It also involves building a pad to store the rock from the underground and building a plant to treat the water that comes from underground. It includes mining out tunnels or what we call drifts, to allow the company to go underground and do more exploration.

The project also involves excavation of no more than 750 tons of uranium ore to learn more about the ore body. This material will be stored underground except for small samples that may be taken to be sent to a laboratory for further analysis.

The proposed licence does not authorize the mining of milling of ore to produce uranium. This also means that the proposed licence does not allow Strateco to produce any tailings that would need to be managed.

Mining and milling the ore will require separate licence application and a very detailed review by the CNSC and other regulators.

This slide shows the federal review steps that were followed since Strateco applied for a licence back in late 2008. The process started with Strateco submitting an application for a licence as shown in the first blue box.

As shown in the top of the diagram, the proposed project was subject to an environmental review

that included two hearings to inform the public and get their input and a decision in February of this year. During this same time period, CNSC staff did a series of other reviews of Strateco's application.

We found that Strateco's application for a licence meets our regulatory requirements. We prepared a report for the Commission that explains what we looked at and what we found. Our report also includes a draft licence that sets out the requirements that Strateco will have to meet if the licence is issued.

We're holding this hearing today to discuss the details of the project with the Commission, to answer the Commission's questions and to provide people an opportunity to present other information to the Commission that will help them in making their decision.

If the Commission issues Strateco a licence then Strateco will be required to meet all the conditions of the licence, including meeting all the commitments it has made in its application. CNSC staff will be checking to make sure that Strateco is meeting those requirements.

Strateco's proposed underground exploration project was subject to federal and provincial environmental and social assessments under the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement* and the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission was part of the federal review process and made decisions under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. Two environmental assessment panels were appointed to oversee the review; one provincial panel, le Comité d'examen provincial, commonly referred to as the COMEX; and one federal panel, le Comité fédéral d'examen, commonly referred to as the COFEX or FRP-South.

Consultations, including Aboriginal consultations, were integrated into the panel processes. Both the COFEX and COMEX review panels have five members. Each panel had two of its members appointed by the Cree Regional Authority.

The Cree Regional Authority or CRA, was established under the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement*. As noted in Section 11A of the Agreement, the CRA is a public corporation under Quebec law with a Board of Directors and includes eight corporations, including the Corporation of Mistissini.

It is the administrative arm of the Cree government having responsibilities with respect to environmental protection, hunting, fishing and trapping regimes; and other matters as decided by the Board of Directors.

This slide shows the names of the original

five-person panel appointed to the COFEX panel by the Federal Government and the Cree Regional Authority.

This slide shows the names of the five members of the COMEX panel that were appointed by the Government of Quebec and the Cree Regional Authority.

As I said previously, Strateco's proposed underground exploration project was subject to a federal and provincial environmental and social assessment under the *James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement* and *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*.

While there are several steps in the review process, this slide highlights some of the key steps and dates. The assessment was launched in March 2009; Strateco was given direction by the regulators and Panel Members to complete environmental studies on the proposed project.

In November 2009, Strateco submitted their environmental review report for public and regulatory reviews. COFEX and COMEX conducted public hearings in May and November of 2010. The first hearing was to introduce the project while the second hearing was conducted to discuss the results of the reviews and to allow for additional public input.

The COFEX issued a report in July 2011 that was used by the CNSC to produce our own report. The CNSC

report was sent to the Federal Minister of Environment for his consideration. The CNSC report was posted for public review in August and September of 2011 as part of the Federal Ministry of Environment's decision-making process.

The Federal Minister of the Environment, the Federal Administrator and the CNSC made decisions with regards to the environmental assessment in February 2012.

During the environmental review of the project, the people of Mistissini, Chibougamau and elsewhere told the panels and the CNSC about the importance of protecting the people and the environment.

People raised concerns about the potential effects Strateco's project might have on the air, the water and the land, the plants, the fish and other animals, and traditional land use.

People also talked about radon gas and how it might affect them. And people said that they are concerned about the safety of people who might work at the Strateco project.

All of these concerns were carefully considered and reviewed by the federal and provincial panels and the CNSC. For the CNSC, the protection of the public, the environment and workers is our job. We have experts who understand the risks and effects from uranium mining and what needs to be done so it can be done safely.

As part of the environmental assessment, we reviewed the potential effects of the project on people and the environment. And as part of our licensing reviews, we looked at all the controls that Strateco must have in place in order to protect people and the environment.

The following diagram shows the typical components that we looked at during environmental reviews, as part of our licensing reviews. For the Matoush Underground Exploration Project, COFEX, COMEX and the CNSC looked at how the proposed project could affect the air, water and soil.

We looked at how this could then affect the plants, fish and other animals, in particular those that people might gather, fish, hunt or trap. We looked at how all these things could affect the people who could be near the proposed project.

The federal governmental assessment led by the COFEX and the CNSC concluded that with the right controls in place, the environment, workers and people will be protected. They also concluded that people will continue to be able to use the land as they are currently doing.

We have very strict requirements for protecting the water and fish, the land and its animals

and birds and the people that use it. The controls that are needed as part of the CNSC's licensing requirements are captured in the proposed licence.

We use the unit millisievert to measure exposure to radiation. Radiation and its health effects has been studied for many years. We know from these many studies that there are no measurable effects from being exposed to radiation below 100 millisieverts.

Natural radiation comes from everywhere, has been around forever. It comes from rocks and soil, it comes from radon that is in the air, it comes from cosmic radiation from the sun. Even our bodies and some of the food we eat contain small amounts of natural radiation.

On average people in Canada are exposed to about 2.4 millisieverts of radiation each year. This is quite small and well below the 100-millisievert level.

Included here is also an estimate of the highest radiation dose that the people who use the land could receive because the of the advanced exploration activities from the Matoush site, in addition to their natural radiation. As you can see, the amount is very low. People will be protected.

The environmental assessment and CNSC reviews also looked at radon. Health Canada and the CNSC have done a lot of work studying radon and its potential

effects. We know that too much radon can be bad for your health.

Recently, Health Canada put out guidelines for measuring radon in homes and what people should do if the radon level is too high. The Health Canada guideline recommends that you should take steps to reduce the radon in your home if the average level exceeds 200.

This slide shows the average concentration of radon in homes in Canada and in Quebec, at the bottom of the graph. For Canada, the average is about 45, and for Quebec it's about 35. The current maximum radon gas levels of the existing site is low. The potential increase in gas levels from the Matoush Project is also very low.

People going near the Project will be safe from radon. This slide shows the radiation the workers could receive at the Matoush Project.

The CNSC maximum annual limit for radiation exposure to worker is 50 millisieverts per year. However, we expect and require companies to keep this exposure well below this based on what we call the ALARA Principle, which is to keep the exposure as low as reasonably achievable.

Expected radiation dose to workers is about two millisieverts per year. We believe this estimate is

reasonable based on experience with uranium mines in Saskatchewan. We expect and will ensure the radiation exposure to workers will be well below limits. Workers will be safe.

A decision on the environmental assessment was made by the Minister of Environment and the CNSC under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act and concluded that the Project's not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects and the mitigation measures, or control measures and follow-up program described are appropriate. This basically means that with the right controls, people and the environment will be protected.

The federal administrator, under the JBNQA also issued a project authorization approving the Project with seven conditions. These seven conditions were included in the licence documents. The provincial administrator under the JBNQA is waiting for the information that will come from this hearing to help them with their decision.

The environmental reviews concluded that with the proper controls, the environment and people would be protected. In addition to the environmental reviews, CNSC staff reviewed Strateco's proposed controls. The CNSC reviewed the licence application to make sure Strateco would have the right controls in place, to make

sure they had the right people with the right training doing the right things.

Strateco provided us the details of what they would build and how they would operate and maintain the buildings, equipments, and structures. We reviewed these documents to make sure our requirements will be met.

CNSC staff also checked the application for what Strateco would do to measure and control the work they do so that workers are protected. Strateco also submitted its environmental program that will be used to measure and control releases to air and water so that the environment is protected. CNSC staff reviewed the proposed program to make sure we'll meet our requirements.

CNSC staff concluded that the proposed controls are appropriate for this project. We will continue to review the programs to make sure they address the conditions in environmental assessment authorization and CNSC requirements.

When looking at controls, CNSC looks at 14 different areas that are discussed in our commission member document that was submitted to the Commission for this hearing. One very important area is the environmental protection program. The CNSC expects Strateco to have a monitoring program to measure any releases of radioactive substances and metals to the

environment. These measurements will verify that the environmental controls, such as the water treatment plant, are working properly and effective in protecting the environment.

In addition, Strateco will be required to take samples and measurement of the surrounding environment such as the air, surface water, the vegetation, the fish and the animals, to provide evidence that the controls put in place are working.

CNSC et le Ministère du Développement durable, de l'Environnement et des Parcs have checked Strateco's proposed program and will continue to check the program and its implementation to make sure Strateco meets federal and provincial requirements. The proposed licence identifies what is expected of Strateco and what CNSC staff will be checking if the Project is allowed to proceed. If the Commission decides to give Strateco licence, they we'll be watching, checking, and taking action when necessary.

We will work with le Ministière du Développement durable, de l'Environnement et des Parcs and the Commission de santé et sécurité au travail to inspect the site, to observe and verify that Strateco is meeting provincial and federal requirements. This includes taking measurements and collecting our own samples to verify

Strateco's results.

The proposed licence also requires Strateco to submit reports on their activities and their monitoring results. CNSC staff will conduct desktop reviews to verify that the results are as expected or better. The results of our inspections will be made public as part of our annual reporting to the Commission. If a licence is issued, we will inspect and independently verify that Strateco is meeting our requirements.

This slide shows the possible timeline and stages associated with the Matoush Underground Exploration Project, a possible future uranium mining mill development and the involvement of the CNSC and the public. Today's hearing, as shown in the green circle, is a request for decision by the Commission on the Matoush Underground Exploration Project.

As I said previously, the proposed licence does not allow for the construction and operation of a uranium mining mill as shown in the second blue circle. If the Commission chooses to issue the licence for the current Project, and Strateco gets the necessary permits from the province, then Strateco can proceed with their Underground Exploration Project. Strateco will be expected to keep the public informed.

If at some time in the future, Strateco or

some other company decides that they want to construct and operate a uranium mining mill at the Matoush site, then we'll need to submit a new licence application and another detailed environmental assessment will be required. They will have to go through more hearings. No decision will be made without a thorough review and more public involvement.

At the completion of the mining project, Strateco must apply for a decommissioning licence to law for the removal of all the buildings and all the structures. This is shown as a blue circle on the right of this diagram. The licence hearing process again will provide for further public involvement.

In the very end, once the CNSC is satisfied that all the necessary work has been completed, environmental results shows that the site is stable, then the site will be released for general use. If the Matoush Underground Exploration Project proceeds, Strateco will be required to meet all our requirements. We will be involved up until the site has been released for general use. We will inspect the site to make sure our requirements are met.

The environmental assessment concluded that with appropriate controls, the environment, the workers, and the people will be protected. CNSC staff have

reviewed the controls proposed by Strateco, we believe they are appropriate and are setting them as requirements on the licence. If a licence is issued, CNSC staff will inspect and check that requirements are met and results are as predicted.

There are a number of people in the room today that depend on the quality and health of the fish in the local lakes, the animals and the birds on the land, and health of the people on the community. They are very concerned that this be protected.

CNSC staff in this room today, and in our office around the country, are also dedicating to making sure no harms comes to this important resource and to the people that use it. We would never recommend that the Commission issue a licence to a project that would not protect the public, workers, or the environment.

We have very strict requirements for protecting the water and fish, the land, its animals and birds and the people that use it. We've looked very closely at whether Strateco's able to meet those requirements. We believe that they can. And our independent inspections and reviews during the Project will make sure that Strateco meets requirements.

Taking all these matters into consideration, CNSC staff recommend the issuance of the

requested licence to Strateco resources for the Matoush Underground Exploration Project for a period of five years. This ends our presentation, we are now available to answer your questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay, colleagues, there's a lot of intervention yet to be heard from. So what I will propose we do is we do a quick one round of questions and then we'll take a short break. And then get to hear from the other intervention. So that's acceptable, I'd like to start with Dr. McDill.

DR. McDILL: Thank you. First to the community hosting us today and tomorrow and the day after, thank you Miguish (phon.) for your welcome this morning.

It's clear to me that actual uranium mining is some years away, if at all. So I would like to start my question with -- to staff, followed by Strateco -- at this level of an exploration project, what differences exist between this proposal and, let us say, any other mine proposal in the area? In terms of, first of all, construction of the ramp, the drift, the ventilation raise -- this is a big question, Mr. Chair -- the geological outcomes, for example, the waste rock, and then the environmental controls.

I realize this is a big question, but for me, if there is other -- if there are other mining

operations going on, it would be helpful for me to understand the differences in the geology for this mine and the others and the environmental controls here and the others, if that is possible.

So I'll start with staff and then move to the proponent, unless staff would like the proponent to start?

MR. JAMMAL: For the record, it's Ramzi Jammal. We will start and I will pass it on to our experts one by one.

So we'll start with Mr. Jean Leclair in order to address the difference between an exploration ramp and the mine activity.

MEMBER McDILL: Not so much an exploration ramp and a mine ramp; between two different kinds of mines that would exist in this area.

MR. LECLAIR: As an exploration project, fundamentally it's the same as an exploration project that one would have for any other kind of mine that involves an underground mine, whether that be gold or nickel or molybdenum.

So in terms of the construction activities, the construction of the ramp, the controls that need to be put in place to control the water that comes into the mine, the mechanisms that would be used in order to

control the water to come in, they're fundamentally the same.

Similarly, the water treatment, water handling is similar as well. The issue would be associated with any of the waste rock that might contain higher concentrations of uranium and, in particular, the test mining of the 750 tonnes of uranium ore where we would be starting to look at a bit more issues from a radiation protection point of view.

I'll pass the word over to Dr. Patsy Thompson who can provide some further details.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

To provide more information to respond to your question, Mr. Leclair talked about sort of different stages for development of a uranium mine. What I can provide in terms of information, what would happen, for example, in terms of differences if we were talking about a diamond mine, a gold mine and a uranium mine.

In terms of the quality of the effluent, so the metals and the radioactivity in the effluent from the mill, for example, in terms of the -- if this project would move to a uranium mine or at the exploration stage there will be treated effluent, between a uranium mine and a gold mine, there isn't a lot of difference in terms of

the quality of the effluent. Gold mines will also have metals such as arsenic and nickel. Gold mines also have radium-226, for example, and suspended solids and some of the same issues that we find in uranium mining.

And so the types of effluent treatment that would be found at those mine sites would be very similar.

In terms of the waste rock and tailings for gold and uranium mines, the tailings need to be managed in the long term. Both have metals and some radioactivity that would need to be dealt with over the long term.

In terms of diamond mines, the rock or the mine residue is more stable, and some cases can be potentially acid-generating, but this can be managed quite well.

So those would be the main similarities and differences, I would say. So in terms of impacts on the environment, gold and uranium could be comparable. In some cases, traditionally gold mines have been seen to be very poor environmental performers because of the use of cyanide, for example, in treatment.

In terms of the Environment Canada reports on the performance of metal mines in Canada, for several years uranium mines have been among the top performers of all base metal mines in Canada.

MR. JAMMAL: Dr. McDill, I will pass it to

MEMBER McDILL: And radon?

MR. JAMMAL: For ventilation I will ask Mr. Schryer to give a comparison.

MR. SCHRYER: For the record, my name is Denis Schryer.

On the ventilation side, the ventilation design would be exactly the same. At this particular stage of the project, the main consideration would be the control of the mining systems. So the mining equipment that’s used is the same.

So therefore we’re looking at diesel emission control, dust and blasting gases. So both systems we would design exactly the same.

Thank you.

MEMBER McDILL: Radon between the two?

DR. THOMPSON: Radon is naturally occurring in geological formations. So radon would need to be -- would be taken care of through the ventilation systems as it is for uranium mines, but there again the actual amount of radon that would be managed would depend on the geology. But in many mines radon is also an issue.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

I’ll ask the proponent to answer the same question, but if you could, in addition, answer how you

have -- how your experience has allowed you to do this in the past with other exploration mines?

MR. HÉBERT: For the record, my name is Guy Hébert.

I had experience with other kind of mines' ramp shaft, and with this project, the big difference we are viewing -- my people will explain more -- is really on the side of ventilation and water treatment plant.

For a normal gold mine or a base metal mine, a foreign exploration ramp, the water treatment is very, very limited, and in our case, it's really -- for us, it's not oversized, but the -- it's five times bigger than what we can expect.

So the maximum limit is really higher than the normal mine, and on the side of the ventilation, the difference between normal mines or exploration projects is we have to ventilate new air at each working place, which is not the case for a gold mine or a base metal mine. You re-circulate your air, which is not the case with our project, where you have to bring fresh air and exhaust the air at every working place.

So this, we view that as a difference with our project.

And for the uranium experience, I will pass the words to Pierre Terreault, our VP Engineering, and

with our consultant also.

MR. TERREAULT: For the record, I'm Pierre Terreault.

The basic design of the exploration ramp is the same as a gold mine. That's the same thing.

For the purpose, we need -- for the Quebec government, we need less permits compared to uranium mines. We need only a provincial permit for starting an exploration ramp, and the demand of the province is much less on the environmental part.

Yes, for ventilation we do have more, as Guy said, that we have -- for gold mines we could re-circulate part of it, about 20 to 25 percent of the air, which we cannot on uranium mines at all.

So the water treatment plan, most of the exploration part is less, but when you arrive at the mining part, it's about the same. So that's roughly the difference between the two.

The working procedures for health and safety will be exactly the same. It's as much as important in a gold mine than in a uranium mine, the safety of our people, and we are very -- we're willing to go as far and more with the ALARA system for the differences between the two.

The experience, what I've got, I've got 32

years of mining experience. I started in gold mining and I moved up the -- all parts of the mining activity from miner to general mine manager, so I'm quite able to manage a mine. And I have a -- I'm a professional mining engineer in Quebec, Ontario and Newfoundland. Plus, I have a Master's degree in project management.

So we -- for managing that project, we're quite able to do it; no problem either for uranium or for a gold mine.

And that's right, we use Tyson as a mining contractor because their experience in uranium mine is one of the best in Canada for that. And we already have a contract signed with a condition that if we receive the licence, they will come and do the work underground for us.

And we have, for the design of the water treatment plant -- the water treatment plant specialist from Saskatchewan, Melis Engineering, which have done several other -- in Saskatchewan on the design of uranium projects. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just to clarify what you just said. Did I get you right that uranium regulation or regulatory requirements are more strict in the uranium mining? And there is no dedicated regulator for gold or copper; is there, just like a regulator strictly looking

at uranium mining?

MR. TERREAULT: Pierre Terreault, for the file.

Yes, the uranium mine is much, much stricter compared to gold mine. It's regulation ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good thing I assume.

MR. TERREAULT: It's excellent, good, I've got no problem with that. It's very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to make sure.

MR. TERREAULT: Yes, it is very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Dr. McDill.

MEMBER McDILL: I think staff wanted to say something. And if I'm not speaking loud enough at the back, wave your hands please, and I'll try and raise my voice a bit.

MR. JAMMAL: For the record, Ramzi Jammal.

Dr. McDill, in conclusion of what you have heard, the CNSC has quite an extensive experience in regulating uranium mines for decades.

So, we have our specialists and our staffs are being seeked internationally by other countries for enhancing or establishing a regulatory regime for uranium mining.

So overall, what you heard is the

comparison of uranium mining against any other mineral mines. In addition, the regulatory requirements of the CNSC is clearly stated in our regulation. And the CNSC has acquired an extensive regulatory oversight to ensure that the safety of the public and the environment is protected at all times, and we have the powers to shut down any mine if they're not in our compliance.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll pass along to my colleagues.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Monsieur Harvey.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Merci, monsieur le président. I did appreciate your presentation. Your intentions are very clear and the same thing for your commitments.

But what you have presented is how things should be done. We can see in the conclusion of the staff and in the environmental assessment that the EA concluded that:

> "With appropriate controls, the environment, workers, and people would be protected."

We also see that "controls proposed by Strateco are appropriate requirements in the licence."

But my question is to what extent can we be

-- can we have some guarantee that things would be done that way? We don't know that operation -- implementation, operation, and monitoring is as important as design.

So I would like to have your -- that you elaborate on that because you're a small company and we are used to work with big companies that have all the resources to everything that could be asked for by the staff.

But in a small company, how can we have the guarantee that you will have the resources? For example, how many employees will be working on the site and how many will be devoted to all those tasks to protect the people, the health and the environment?

MR. GUY HEBERT: First of all -- Guy Hébert for the report.

We started on the project in 2006. And when we started in 2006, early 2006, the first core were very, very high grade for us, you know, above 2 or 3 percent grade, and some intersection with 5 and 7 percent grade.

So it was evident then something had to be done because, in Quebec, it was the first time that kind of intersection was yielding actually.

So immediately, we contacted the Research Centre -- in Saskatoon, and we have organized a protocol,

how to handle all the core for transportation. So we put that in place and -- people started to have dosimeters. So we started already the program in 2006 with the dosimeters. All the employees have one, the people exposed to radiation. And this follows really -- and everybody has their own file (phon.) and -- according to the regulations.

So we started already to apply that. And then we have a team -- all of us have experience with mining. We are not exploration people. We are more -- I put three mines into production, and two in Quebec form exploration, development, mill construction, operation. And so we went through all the process and we have an excellent track record.

So we hired a team of -- Caroline Hardy started with the environmental surveys; with Golders, people from Saskatoon, from Montreal. Then we have SENES with us.

And then we -- over the last four years, we are building our program, protocol. We have discussed a lot with the CNSC people because we started to work with the CNSC in 2008. It's almost four years now. And so all the protocols have been approved and managed.

And so we have a very, very strong team for an exploration company. We are junior but with very

strong people and strong consultants also.

So the idea here, when we met the CNSC in 2008, it was evident that we needed -- they asked us for more uranium experience. So we had no choice to go with Tyson. We selected Tyson. It can be another contractor, but Tyson has a very good reputation, and they have also a very good formation program. To this is part of the deal with Tyson, to get formation for our people.

But all the responsibility on site would be the Strateco people. We expect to have 90 employees at the time on the site. Contractors and Tyson would do almost all the job, the water treatment plant, but all the monitoring will be done by Strateco people. And we will have to build a team before we start.

We will have to build a team because we are waiting for the licence. You know, it's hard to get people actually, it's very hard. And we have to -- need people with uranium experience.

So we have an idea where to go to get them, but we don't -- can't go and hire them now for that -- a specialist in radiation, for example, without having the licence, you know. We cannot do that to someone and so -- so this is very important.

And also a thing we will put in place is the guarantee. We have a reclamation program in place.

If ever the decision is negative, we'll not get the licence for the mining development or mill construction, so we estimate about $6 million. So the bond will be in place before even we start to do any work on the place. So discussions are in place and we have an offer from our insurance company to get the bonds. It's about $6 million, but this bond will not be in place without the licence. You know, we're not -- it's expensive to get.

So this is all -- once we have the licence will give us about two or three months to put all -- complete the team and put the security in place and complete the financing. Our budget is $76 million for the next four years, which is about $20 million a year. It was our budget for the last -- every year. So financing of that kind of money is not a big deal.

And also, naturally, we have interests from other partners to join the company. But once again, nothing will happen without the licence, but you know discussions have been taking place.

So we are prepared. We know exactly where we are going. The programs are in place. They have all been presented to the CNSC staff. They have been discussed; a monitoring program, a safety, health and safety program with Gabriel Maurice who is here.

So we are ready to go. We are ready to go

but we will need probably two or three months to complete the team.

You can hire consultants but it's one of the conditions of the licence to -- the company, the employees have to be responsible.

You cannot pass the responsibility to a consultant. So that is really a condition of the licence.

The management has to be responsible of the entrepreneur. If the entrepreneur makes a mistake, it will be his mistake, but we'll be the guys in charge -- responsible for it.

So we recognize it and the Board recognizes it, and the financing for this next four years is not an issue for us, honestly, and we have big shoulders who support us since the beginning, you know.

As I said, we have invested $110 million in a very rough time, and mainly the delays we got the last -- we were expecting the licence around 2010, and we are in 2012 and the licence is not issued. So some of our shareholders lost patience, and also the market has been very tough mainly with the Fukushima and the general economy.

So we are ready to go, but as my people know, that will take a couple of months before really we start to excavate and blast the first blast. You know, we

have to put the bunks in place. We have to get additional people, and it's where we go.

I hope I'm answering your question. Maybe more detail?

MEMBER HARVEY: I think I will turn to the staff and just ask, as Mr. Hébert said, that they will build a team. They will forward a team when they will get the licence, but I suppose you are aware of the nature of the team, the type of people that will be working there, to say that they will be able to meet your requirements.

So I would like to have your position on that.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

If you allow me just to describe a little bit or to add to the fact that once the Commission issues a licence, the programs that are in support of issuing the licence become the integral part or the basis from which we, as staff, we will carry out the inspection and the licensee becomes responsible to ensure safe licensed activity, regardless by who they engage. A contractor or their own staff. So the licensee is responsible for controlling the licensed activity in accordance with the law.

And the law for the Commission is the Act, the Regulations and the licence conditions. The licence

conditions is site-specific, where we will inspect requirements under that licence to ensure that the licensee is ready to perform safe activity. We are on site verifying independently their actions. We are onsite interviewing their workers to ensure that the programs, as presented to us, are being implemented in the field. And they are required by several indicators in place to report to us on the progress of the work that’s being done.

And above and beyond all this, as the proponent mentioned, we have the reclamation or the financial guarantees with respect to any -- at any phase in the project. If there is any stoppage of the work, we ensure that the land and the site is put back to general use.

So I will add -- if you allow me, I can elaborate a bit more, but I will ask Mr. Jean Leclair to elaborate if there is anything else you would like us to go by.

The end point is, the conclusion here is, the licensee, the applicant, if becomes a licensee, they are accountable for and held to be in compliance with all regulatory requirements, regardless who they engage, contractor or worker, because the end point for the Commission and its staff is the protection of the environment and the licensed activity to be carried out

according to what the Commission approves.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. LECLAIR: Jean Leclair, for the record.

Perhaps if I can add an actual concrete example to give a bit of a sense of what this might look like. First and foremost, it’s not unusual for -- in the mining world to have contractors and hire contractors to do a fair portion of the work, in particular the actual underground mining.

Guy has mentioned the mining contractor, Tyson Mining. They do a lot of mining in northern Saskatchewan currently, so it’s not unusual.

As Mr. Jammal has already mentioned, however, the proponent, the licensee, still carries full responsibility and is accountable for ensuring the safety of workers and the environment.

To provide a real example, the Cigar Lake Project actually was a much larger project than this. It was actually the construction of a full mine. In this particular situation, that project went from 15 workers onsite to 450. So you can imagine the scale of the operation was massive. The amount of things that needed to be managed in order to make that happen was quite significant. This was with Cameco Corporation, which is a more experienced licensee.

But we were involved at the very beginning of the process in inspecting and verifying what they were doing. It’s important that we get involved very early on. We don’t wait until things are very advanced before we go in and look and see how things are progressing so that we can request corrections early on before they go too far.

In the case of Cigar Lake, actually, Denis Schryer, who is here with me today, and myself were involved in inspections of the Cigar Lake Mine and we found that the controls that were in place for the ventilation underground were not sufficient. We issued a number of actions as a result of that, followed it up with another inspection a few months later, and in the end, drafted an order that led to a shutdown of half the mine in order to make sure that they had sufficient ventilation to ventilate the mine.

So all this is to say that the Applicant is responsible, is accountable, and must ensure safety. At the same time, as part of our verification activities, we will go in and check and if we’re not satisfied that there’s enough people or that the measures that are being taken are not sufficient and we believe that the risks are becoming unacceptable, we will take action as far as even shutting down the operation if we’re not satisfied that requirements are met, workers are protected and the

environment is protected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. This is something that I need clarification ---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (off mic).

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that for us or for everybody?

Okay. Please raise your hand if you can't hear again.

It's a really important point. So the moment you give a licence does not -- when you inspect as to how they -- as they're proceeding to bulk up and hire more people and develop programs, training programs, you know, et cetera, any time that our inspectors, your inspectors are coming in and they're not satisfied, they can shut down the mine. They can stop operation. I just want to make sure that I understand that just to give a licence does not mean that you stop monitoring what's going on?

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

Mr. President, the staff's Commission have the power independently to shut down any operations once our inspectors feel that there is non-compliance activity that is posing risk to the health, to the public, the workers and the environment.

Independently, any inspectors -- that is at the Commission -- can shut down the operation.

I would like to reemphasize two things, that a licence is not a carte blanche that the licensee go away and do what they wish to do. We do pre-licensing visits which we carried out in 2010. We do post-licensing visits, and especially for an upcoming company -- I'm pretty sure the proponent is not going to like what he hears, but it is our practice -- is there is focused inspections at both levels, what we call Type 2 and Type 1.

Type 2 inspections are done by a dedicated team of inspectors who are looking at focused inspection, and then we do -- carry out Type 1 inspections, which is a full-blown audit that will encompass multiple either jurisdictions, provincial, federal and multiple specialists from the CNSC.

So the licensing here does not isolate the applicant, nor does not isolate the CNSC from cooperating with the provincial authority to be part of our inspections.

So we have multiple levels of inspections, and I would like to remind everybody that our mandate is safety. We understand at times there are harsh economic factors. However, it's not an excuse to compromise

safety. So our existence is safety. Our mandate is safety, and we will apply safety.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Monsieur Harvey.

MEMBER HARVEY: Just to complete, what is the experience of the staff with a small project like this?

MR. JAMMAL: It’s Ramzi Jammal for the record.

Without defining a small project, staff has quite a bit of experience with multiple applicants or new licensees. The expansions of mines, let it be in Saskatchewan, the restart of mines or exploration of mines, so the CNSC in general, we receive quite a bit of applications from mining exploration to small operators. And we apply the same principle as the first, the programs of the licensee or the applicant -- sorry -- the programs of the applicant before they become licensee must meet all of the regulatory requirements and the law.

And we have quite a vast experience from operations of one person operating as a licensee, to a company like Strateco with respect to future and licensed activity under the CNSC.

I mean -- I'm not being specific, but we can give examples of -- we have a current activity that’s taking place in Northern Canada and existing and future

explorations and expansion to mines.

MEMBER HARVEY: So you are confident that despite the small numbers that they'll be enough employees devoted to comply with your requirements?

MR. JAMMAL: I am confident that we will carry out our -- sorry, for the record, Ramzi Jammal.

I'm confident that we will not compromise safety, that we will carry out our regulatory activity without any compromise to safety. And it's up to the licensee to provide us with the confidence that they are carrying out their activity according to the law, act, regulation and licence conditions.

But to go back to your question about our experience, what we're experiencing at this stage of this licence application is what the CNSC -- at the time was Atomic Energy Control Board, the AECB -- experienced in the ‘80s and ‘90s of new licences for the existing uranium mine.

And the CNSC -- we have every right to brag, and I brag on behalf of our staff -- that we are actually sought after by the other countries who want to establish regulatory oversight and put in place enhancement in existing regulatory oversight.

As a matter of fact, Canada is to-date the only country that has a specific outlined unique

regulations with respect to mines. And we have an extensive compliance program dedicated only for uranium mines and mills.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

Do you want to add something?

Otherwise I'm finished.

MR. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert for the record.

Actually, we have about 40 employees on our payroll, which isn’t small, you know, it's not small. It's not big; but it's not small for that kind of project, you know, it's still an exploration project. And we expect probably to add another 15, a lot on the monitoring, the radiation.

Because the next four years will be almost a dry run for the mine because we have to put in place the same program -- the next four years will be 280 -- about 286,000 tons of waste, real waste, you know. And we don’t expect to get any intersection with ore. It can happen; it's the reason why we have the special waste pad, but that will be waste.

But everything have to be -- the water treatment plan will work, collect every drop of water as it was in the ore, okay. And the same thing for the ventilation, the same thing for the monitoring, you know. The people will carry their instruments, we will have

fixed instruments to monitor radon and those will come almost empty -- negative that early.

But the people will be formed and we expect to have -- with the Cree of Mistissini, if they want to participate, formation for the youth, the technician collecting different kind of samples and monitoring the air.

In Saskatchewan, the Rabbit Lake mine is very, very similar operation then we expect to get there as a mine, the Rabbit Lake. And some people here in Mistissini visit the installation last year and we have a visit scheduled for next few months, if they want to participate.

But some went there last year and they had -- it's all local people who are doing the monitoring and they have five person per shift, you know, only for monitoring. You don’t see that in normal gold mine and we'll have the same thing for this project.

So really we'll be operate as a real uranium project but without uranium until the end of it because it will be 750 ton of mineralized -- not ore because it's not ore -- it's mineralized rock and the -- 286,000, so really, really at the end when all the ventilation raise will be in place and we will have access to the ore.

So that will be ready, you know, in three years, four years from now, we'll be ready and people will be formed and then we'll see, you know, how it's coming, the output of it, you know.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you. When I say small project, it's not “péjoratif”.

MR. HÉBERT: No, no.

MEMBER HARVEY: I mean a small project compared to other. Okay?

MR. HÉBERT: I'm not insulted.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Merci beaucoup. We have to move on.

Dr. Barriault?

MEMBRE BARRIAULT: Merci, Monsieur le président.

Just a few brief questions. I notice that you haven’t in place camps for employees, are you using all those camps for your 40 employees that you have now?

MR. HÉBERT: Actually -- Guy Hébert, for the record.

We have one rig working actually, one drill rig, because we come to the exploration. But last year -- we always had three to four rigs, you know, so a lot of drillers, it's exploration, surface exploration, okay. And we were not expecting also the construction of the

road. When we planned, we got the permit to build the air strip. We were not expecting the connection would be the highway 167 so we built a big air strip, you know, for that and we have all the maintenance for that.

Now it's used also by the people who built the consortium, was building the 167 for transportation. The Minister of Transport also use it and -- or can use it.

But actually we have about 30 employees, which is low, because it's for the drilling and monitoring of air. We continue all the monitoring, you know, we put in place program to monitor the water, the fish, the air, the dust. So we do that on a daily basis, so we have technicians doing that and the water treatment.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Interesting.

It brings to my next question really is with that amount of employees that you have at the site; what's been your experience of rating with accidents, loss time injuries, because we haven’t seen anything dealing with this?

MR. TERREAULT: For the record, I'm Pierre Terreault; I will pass it to our Health and Safety Director, Gabriel Maurice, to answer that question.

MR. MAURICE: Thank you. Gabriel Maurice, I will do mine in French.

Mon experience en -- my experience for health and security in the work is since 1979, I started with Noranda and I was 28 years there. And I was in gold mines with Century Mining and I continued with Westdome at the Kiena mine. And I'm very familiar with the Quebec regulations and with the management of emergency measures and health and safety in the workplace.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: With respect to health and safety in the workplace -- yes, the question that I wanted to ask, what -- have there been accidents, any loss of work time and this -- since 2006 you've been involved in this research and the exploration, can you give me any data there, because I didn’t find anything in the documents?

MR. MAURICE: I will just get to my documents to be able to answer.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Briefly. Do you have any alcohol in the camp?

MR. MAURICE: It's a dry camp, no tolerance for drugs.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So you have a drug testing program?

MR. MAURICE: We do physical searches. We don’t do blood test but we always have a nurse on site -- full time nurse -- who is working on a 14/14 rotation

basis. And there are a lot of training programs that have been set up for health and safety, evacuation exercises and also we use the base camp for any accidents. We have a lot of requests for support. There have been tourists or trappers that have needed help and so we have been able to offer local assistance. And we have more than 20 employees, staff, and we are very well equipped with our programs that are in place.

Thank you very much.

MR. MAURICE: To come back to statistics, I don't have the frequency but in 2010, we had one principal injury, and we also had one -- this year, we haven't had any such event. We have had two people, two workers who were transferred to hospital for an exam, but they were able to come back to work.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: And so do you do your transfers by air?

MR. MAURICE: The transfer is done by air, yes, to Chibougamau.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: And how long does that take?

MR. MAURICE: One hour and 20 minutes.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: No -- what about weather conditions; no problems there?

MR. MAURICE: It can happen that there may

be some delays because of the weather. However, as Mr. Hébert has mentioned, we have a coordinator on the site that manages the situation and we don't transfer a person until they're stabilized medically. So there are no delays in that sense.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's time to have a little break. We will take 10 minutes, which will bring us back to a quarter to 12 -- 20 to 12.

--- Upon recessing at 11:27 a.m./
La séance est suspendue à 11h27
--- Upon resuming at 11:47 a.m.
La séance est reprise à 11h47

THE CHAIRMAN: We are back. And before we move to the intervention, I'd like to remind everybody we have lots of people to hear from. And what we would like to do is to be engaged in a discussion.

So we have allocated 10 minutes for the intervenors. We have read whatever material you gave us, we've read with great attention to the details, and we would like to discuss some of those details.

So I would like to start with the first oral presentation from Ms. Coonishish -- I hope I pronounce it properly. Please proceed.

12-H7.2

Oral presentation by

Sophie Coonishish

MS. COONISHISH: Thank you very much. My name is Sophie Coonishish-Connor. I had submitted something online that I wish to discuss.

I want to refrain -- I'm going to try and refrain from talking from my language, the Cree, because of time limits.

Like I said, my name is Sophie Coonishish-Conner. I am married to Mathew George Conner, who is a skilled and experienced hunter and trapper. This was the life that he was taught by his late father. In our culture, the son is usually the one that inherits his father's hunting territory.

So my husband was taken out from the educational system to be trained by his father, to live and survive in the traditional lands. Our trap line is situated downstream from the Matoush territory.

My father-in-law, who has passed on in 2001, was a strong and respected hunter and trapper who, I must say, taught his son well on the traditional life and culture of a Cree. I can say that my husband is a skilled

hunter because I'm a little chubby, that's why.

(LAUGHTER/RIRES)

MS. COONISHISH: That's proof of how well he can hunt.

I am a proud mother of two and a grandmother of boys who are the future hunters and trappers of our traditional lands. My first grandson is already a big game hunter and the community knows this. He killed his first moose when he was eight years old. My grandson is taught to respect the land, the water, and the animals. And he made a statement before with an environmental panel. It touched my heart; and forgive me if I take a pause sometimes because what I'm talking about is from my heart.

My grandson wanted to ask a panel of environment specialists a question, but he was afraid. My grandson is in Montreal with his mother right now, and I asked them, "What do you want to ask them?" And he said, "You teach us to respect the land, the water, and the animals. Why do people want to come and do the opposite and disrespect the land and the animals that we live off?"

I didn't have an answer for him. So I asked the question to the panel that was there at the youth centre. Nobody could directly answer my grandson, but one of our leaders came over to him after and told

him, "We will do our best to protect the land and the animals." That's what he told my grandson.

Our people who hunt and trap in our land are skilled and trained to provide for their families by what the land has to offer. I'm only speaking this from my heart. I'm not gathering information from the outside. I'm not talking to people from the outside. I'm not influenced by anybody. I speak when I have to speak.

We are skilled and trained and licensed to kill to put food on the table for our families. It is also our Cree right to hunt and trap. I want my children and grandchildren and future generations to enjoy our lands, waters, and the rich culture of our people.

I want future generations to enjoy what we have today, not what we're going to have 25 years from now if this mine goes through. I want them to live the traditional life as a Cree person.

The government has passed many Acts, the *Indian Act*, the *Mining Act*. They all have their flaws and things that need to be changed. They tell me that there are two types of land rights and ownership, surface rights and mining rights.

If the traditional Cree has surface rights to the land, then if we say you are not allowed to come and set foot on my surface rights that means, to me

anyway, that you can't come and touch anything underground in our lands.

We have a right to protect the surface, the land, the water, and the air. This we have to do for the animals and our people.

We are here today, I am here today to protect the traditional properties, individual rights as Crees, the environment. We are aware of the serious health and environment damages if this Matoush Project goes through.

I have concerns about the radioactive waste that will be dumped into manmade ponds, and I do not believe that man-made ponds will protect the lands and waters that are rightfully ours.

As for restoring the land to its original state after, when it’s all done, I do not believe that is possible or realistic. Man did not create this world, so man cannot restore it to its original state. Only the original Creator who is God can do this.

This morning, when I woke up, I cried. My grandson was sleeping beside me and all I could do was cry because I had a special request today to make. What I’m asking today -- I’m directing this to our Cree leadership who say they have a right to approach the government whenever they can -- I’m asking for a moratorium on this

project. I'm asking the panel to deny the request for the licence to start this project.

I'm asking today because this licence will grant them to kill our land and waters. If they kill the land and waters, they kill our culture. If you kill our culture, you will kill us as people.

Please forgive me. If this licence is granted, they will be licensed to kill us and our future generations.

Like Queen Esther in her time, I am taking a stand today for my people and future generations to be spared by this project.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I'll open the floor. Anybody wants to ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Would you have the same concerns about any other type of mine that could be undertaken on the territory, or is it very specific to the uranium mine, and why?

MS. COONISHISH: I can't really hear you. You're too far from your mic.

MEMBER HARVEY: I'm sorry. I just want to ask you, would you have the same concerns for any other type of mines, gold, diamond, any other type? Would you have the same concerns and, if not, why?

MS. COONISHISH: I would have some concerns about any other mine, but I have a higher concern for this one, and my fear for it is higher because I believe the risks are higher with this type of mining.

MEMBER HARVEY: You talked about the surface resources, the land, the animals. What is your thinking about the underground resources? Should they be explored, used, put in value?

MS. COONISHISH: I do not know, but the important thing that I wanted to stress is we live off the land. Like, my husband, who was trained to live off the land by his father, that's the only training he ever had. He never went to school. If that's taken away from him, how is he to provide for his family, and not only him, but all the other hunters and trappers of our community?

I would be devastated if someone came and took away what I trained for to be in the workforce, what I went to school for. This is a way for me to make a living for myself. If that's at risk, I would be devastated, and so is my husband.

MEMBER HARVEY: So you don't -- despite all

that has been said by the CNSC people and the Strateco people that there should not be any modification to the way of life with that project and the health would be protected, so you don't believe that it is possible?

MS. COONISHISH: I am still not convinced that it is safe to do this. I'm more concerned about what will happen to the land and our people.

MEMBER HARVEY: Is it because you don't have enough information or you cannot see any additional information that could convince you?

MS. COONISHISH: I think I have enough information. I think I know where I stand. And even all the other sessions that were held in our community, questions asked by our people were never directly answered, or if you're told "We're going to look into it," that's not an answer. You have not calmed my fear in this situation.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I respect your feelings about the land -- I really do -- and your thoughts about the future for living off the land.

One of the questions that I guess needs

answering for me is the impact of the new Highway 167 on the traditional trapping lands of the Cree. How do you feel about that?

MS. COONISHISH: The impacts of that road?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: A new road?

MS. COONISHISH: There are some benefits to it that some people can reach their trap lines easier now if that road goes through, but there's also the increase of traffic and activity across southern territories, and I do have a concern about that because there will be an increase of poaching, and not just people going through the road that are disrespecting the environment. So I do have concerns about it, but there are some benefits that people can now reach their trap line by ground instead of always by air, which is more expensive.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Yes.

So there's value added I guess is what I'm hearing then. You have mixed feelings about this road. You're happy to see it come. On the other hand, you're also concerned about it.

Do you have the same feeling about mining in the area?

MS. COONISHISH: Mining? I didn't get all your question.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: What I'm saying is that

you've got mixed feelings about the new road. You have concerns that it's going to open up the land to poaching ---

MS. COONISHISH: Yes.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: --- to whatever. Are these the same concerns that you also bring to the mining industry, that you have concern that they're opening up the land, but also, having said that, is that they're going to contaminate the land or ---

MS. COONISHISH: Yes, and I was part of the group that had the road blockade a few months back. That's how strong I am in trying to protect the land.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sorry, but I didn't understand. But you're not opposing the roads and you're not opposing the diamond mine that I think is being discussed right now? I'm just trying to understand your position. You're not opposing it?

MS. COONISHISH: No, I'm more against the uranium mining.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it's purely uranium.

Are you familiar with the uranium mines that are going on in Saskatchewan? There's five uranium mines operating right now for many, many years in

Saskatchewan. They still allow the people living near the community to hunt and trap and fish without any problems.

Have you had any occasion to talk to them?

MS. COONISHISH: I think that's the group of chiefs that came to our community at one time. I'm not really sure if that's ---

THE CHAIRMAN: So they don't talk about killing the land. So what's your reaction to that?

MS. COONISHISH: I didn't believe everything they said.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any reason?

MS. COONISHISH: By what I -- the other information that I have read, that's why.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anybody else? No. Okay.

Thank you very much. Much appreciated.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: The next submission is an oral presentation by the Mistissini Youth Council, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.87. And I understand that Mr. Iserhoff, the Youth Chief, will make this presentation. And I understand that -- well you'll tell us what you're going to present.

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Iserhoff, not Eserhoff.

THE CHAIRMAN: Iserhoff, I'm sorry.

MR. S. ISERHOFF: For the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, Iserhoff, Mr. Iserhoff, please proceed.

12-H7.87

Oral presentation by the Mistissini Youth Council

MR. S. ISERHOFF: (Native language) Good day ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests.

I'd like to thank the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission for giving the Mistissini Council the opportunity to speak here today.

I am the current Youth Chief of Mistissini. In order to establish the position as Mistissini Youth Council on April 19th 2012, the Mistissini Youth Council met with the youth population with regards to the Matoush Project. During this meeting, the Mistissini Youth Council introduced a survey entitled the “Mistissini Youth Council Survey, the Cree Nation of Mistissini and Uranium Development.”

This survey was conducted to document and better understand the youths’ opinion concerning advanced uranium exploration and uranium mining development in the territory. The survey was conducted between April 19th

and May 15th, 2012. A total of 382 survey responses were collected.

After review the results of this survey, the majority of the youth do not support the project. More than 70 percent of the youth want a ban on the project. Approximately 8 percent want a moratorium and approximately 11 percent support the project and would like to partner with Strateco and work with them.

There are reasons as to why the youth do not support the project. The youth have indicated that Strateco has not provided enough information with regards to the Matoush Project. It is important that clear and transparent information is provided to our members. Many youth question the information Strateco is proving to the community with regards to this project.

The youth have many concerns with respect to the potential impacts this project will have on the environment. The youth believe this project will negatively affect the land, water, and wildlife, or traditional use of our people.

Our culture and society are deeply rooted to the environment, the youth want to protect and preserve the land for our future generations.

The main watershed for the region originates from the Otish Mountains; this area is sacred

to the Cree. These waters provide nourishment for our people, the wildlife, and environment.

Both the CNSC and Federal Review Panel have to recognize gaps in the baseline data compiled by the Proponent with regards to the environment, specifically water. With this being acknowledged by the CNSC and the Federal Review Panel-South, how can the Proponent properly guarantee the environment will remain safe?

If there's no guarantee, this goes against the guiding values and principles that have been with the Cree for generations.

Our youth recognize some of the employment opportunities of this project. However, the long-term impacts this project could possibly impose on the environment is the main concern of the youth.

The Albanel-Témiscamie-Otish Park is currently in the works and the Mistissini youth believe this project will pose a direct threat to long-term economic opportunities like tourism and outfitting that would showcase the culture, traditions, and Cree way of life.

How will this project affect the tourism industry for the Cree? The Mistissini youth clearly do not support the project and I indicated that uranium development is not a solution to the economic and social

needs of the community.

The Mistissini Youth Council strongly recommends that the CNSC not grant the licence to Strateco Resources for its advanced exploration phase.

(Native language) Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

Could I ask staff to elaborate a little on the gap and how the gap is to be addressed?

MS. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

When CNSC staff and other agencies reviewed information provided by Strateco during the environmental assessment process and their EIS and technical support information, we found there were gaps in the quality and quantity of the environmental information that describes the state of water, air, the biological communities in the area of the project.

And what we also indicated is that for the stage at which the project was, which was an environmental assessment for an exploration -- advanced exploration project, that there was enough information to be able to do the risk assessments and make conclusions in terms of the level of environmental effects.

We also said that the baseline information was not sufficient to be able to design a monitoring program when -- if the Commission grants a licence, we need to develop a monitoring program to be able to describe effects.

And to be able to do that and have a chance of having a good quality monitoring program, we have to have a good understanding of the variability, for example, in the concentrations of radon in air, for example, over periods of time. The water quality indicators, like metals and radionuclides, how they vary over time and seasons.

We also have -- needed information in terms of the baseline information in terms of the quality of fish currently. Some issues were raised with mercury, for example, in fish.

And so all of that information needs to be developed by the Proponent to be able to move forward with an environmental monitoring program that would be robust enough to give us good information, and be able to validate the environmental assessment predictions that Strateco has made.

And with that information, then the CNSC staff can take actions if the predictions from the environmental assessments, for example, were not being

met. If the impacts would be higher than expected, then that would allow the CNSC staff to take action.

But that baseline information is very critical for that period.

Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Perhaps what I could add is that because of those gaps, there was a requirement for Strateco to propose a baseline monitoring program which CNSC staff has reviewed and accepted. And it's one of the conditions of the licence, that Strateco will conduct a baseline monitoring program.

MEMBER McDILL: How long would it take for the first gaps, if we like, to be filled with the baseline monitoring program? Would it be a year, or would it be two years? You need metals over a couple of years, but -- is this -- it would be fully complete by the end of the exploration licence period?

MS. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

There is some information that -- some gaps that can be closed fairly quickly, that would allow us to do proper monitoring of the advanced exploration project.

If Strateco were to decide to go further and seek a mining licence, at that time the amount of baseline information would need to be collected over the

four-year period.

With the existing information and the four-year monitoring period, we believe we would have sufficient information for an environmental assessment for a mining project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco, you wanted to add something?

MS. HARDY: Caroline Hardy, for the record.

I just want to add that for -- since we actually filed the EIS, we kept on monitoring at the site, so collecting additional baseline data.

And regarding the gap in the baseline, we heard that concern when we actually filed that EIA, we actually proposed an additional program to collect additional baseline data. And we have put in place that program and we currently keep on monitoring at the site for air, for surface water, groundwater, as well as fish and vegetation.

So we will have sufficient data for the advance project -- exploration advance project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I jump in on this one?

Talk to me about this. This is a huge risk. What if, you know, what I don't try to understand is do you need to do the exploratory ramp absolutely to get all this data, to do the full environmental

assessment?

But what happens if you, you know, after all these efforts, after all this four-year investment, you come up with a data and it's not good?

I mean, is there no other way of doing the environmental assessment without doing the ramp and the digging and all that? I'd like staff to answer on this facets, if it's logical to talk about that. Isn’t it not a huge risk for you guys?

MR. HÉBERT: This is our business to take this kind of risk, but two things help us. We -- this project is not only to get additional information; it is a very important part of it, but also, we have to finance the balance of projects to get, we call it bankable, for this study.

We have to prove, from the underground, a lot of conditions. We have to prove from underground, first of all the quantity or quality of water. We cannot get that from surface. We have to, also, test the mining method, you know, we have to test the mining method, if the structure is done, then we have to go to it and test the mining method.

And also, we have to do definition drilling. The ore body starts at 200 meters under the surface. The first part, the first land, we call AM-15 is

well defined because we have one oil delivery about 10 meters, but under, deeper, starting at 400 meters, the holes are too long, you know, to have precision. We have one hole every 40 or 50 meters apart. So the grid is not sufficient to turn our resources in reserve, you know. We have to go underground to do that.

And the risk is to invest an additional $75 million, you know, to do it. But, because of the quality of the ore, because of the value of the ore, it's worth the risk. The value -- if it was marginal ore, if we were running at low grade ore, maybe the risk would be not worth it, but it's high grade for us and it's good grade and it's economical even with the current price of uranium.

So, it's worth the risk. The Board decided to go forward and they have no other way to get that kind of information on the water quantity/quality, on the radon, on the Radiation Program System, the control of the radiation for mining systems, and the fault. You know, it's a structure, so we have to go it and see it. And then, we call that a bankable feasibility study.

But we are gathering also an amount of data and it's the only way; it's to go underground. We have spent $100 million and we will add another 75.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Staff?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

Mr. President, there is a couple of things to add to Dr. McDill's question. For the record, on page 30 of 60, in the Licence Condition Handbook, we put licence condition on the proponent, so that they cannot go any further without providing reports to the staff starting within 90 days. And so on and so forth, and a yearly review.

In addition, it was stated by the proponent, they cannot release any effluent before a modeling is being put in place, that they carry on the investigation for the scope of the project before the Commission. There is adequate information in order to allow them to do the exploration. Otherwise, we would not be recommending a licence.

So, if I may read the paragraph:

> "Environmental monitoring results must be submitted to the CSNC for review within 90 days of the end of the quarter in which they were collected."

So, there are very much controlled requirements that are in place for the proponent in order to monitor and evaluate the progress. And then, staff expectation is clearly stated:

> “That's expected, additional aquatic baseline data will be collected prior to the discharge of the final treated effluent to the environmental.”

And that's what I started my comments with.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDill: Thank you. Two more questions. One for Mrs. Coonishish and one for Mr. Iserhoff.

Mrs. Coonishish, do you trust that the Commission would shut something down if it were releasing contaminants to the environment that were at unsafe levels for the fish and the land? Do you have in you the trust for this regulatory body?

MRS. COONISHISH: I guess I can say I have some trust there, but the concern I have would be how soon can they find that something is going to the air and the water? And what will be done after all that goes in the water and in the air? The damage will already be there, right?

MEMBER McDill: I'll ask staff to answer that in a moment.

But, I'll ask the next question to the Mr. Iserhoff.

If the youth of the community are engaged in the environmental monitoring, will they not be able to see if some of these contaminants are being released and will they not be in a position to raise the concerns to the elders and to the regulatory body?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: For that question, I think you will have to ask the youth directly.

MEMBER McDill: You commented that some could see the employment opportunities.

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Yes.

MEMBER McDill: And I'm asking a broader question; if the employment opportunities can be seen, can not the protection of the environment as a cultural feature also be seen?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Perhaps. Yes, perhaps.

MEMBER McDill: And to staff, the question was raised, how quickly would it be known? And what would be done, if?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

There is a couple of things we would like to provide information. Number one, is there is the safe level, which is a regulatory level, and as part of the approval of our recommendations to the Commission, there are what you call action levels and administrative levels. Those levels are in place to establish indicators and, in

the case of there is a release of some sort – we have to keep in mind that the regulatory oversight and the approval. That the levels are way within safe limits.

So, we have within 24 hours, we will act on this information. We have inspectors on site, they will go on site, they will take the measurement independently and verify.

But, there is one thing I would like to reiterate is: the controls in place have enough safety margins built into it so that we're not dealing with above and beyond the limits, the regulatory limits, even though we are still within the safe levels. So, it's a fraction of the regulatory release limits.

Those are the indicators in place. We have the capacity, we have an independent laboratory, we have competent inspectors, we have experiences from other mines in Saskatchewan, that these measures and control levels in place have been adequate for the protection of the environment in case of releases, and we have the indicators in place to act on them.

MEMBER McDill: Thank you.

One more question to the staff. Perhaps it would be a benefit to the community to know how -- not how often, but -- the staff's Commission in shutting down, or stopping, or giving an order when these kinds of events

have occurred, and maybe you could give an example that would be appropriate.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

I will start with other type of licensees with the respect to what the Commission has regulatory oversight over; we have shut down hospitals; we have shut down research laboratories addressing patient care; we have shut down mining operations, radiography operations, all kinds of testing.

With respect to the existing mines, I will pass it along to Mr. LeClair to be specific. As he mentioned, we, as a matter of fact, without passing it to him, I'll pass it to Dr. Thompson or Mr. LeClair.

We did shut down an operation in Saskatchewan based on toxic potential, toxicity levels, and this is where I have to make it very, very clear that when we find out that there is potential toxicity level or there was no adequate programs in place, we acted on it immediately.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

I'll give two examples. The example in Northern Saskatchewan was with findings that the effluent from a mill was causing potential toxicity to the receiving environment, so to aquatic organisms like fish

and small micro invertebrates.

We requested and required that the licensee do a whole series of toxicity tests; none of the traditional contaminants we could identify as being a problem. We found that something in their process, chemical and organic, was being entrained abnormally and we required that they do new toxicity tests that we forced them to put in place that they could do online -- almost online toxicity measurements, and they were required to do that, demonstrate that the effluent was not toxic before it was allowed to be released. And if the effluent was toxic, they could not release it to the environment. They had to keep it in holding ponds.

That’s one case. We’ve also requested, and the Commission was involved in putting licence conditions and requirements for additional treatment to deal with chemicals that had not been identified during environmental assessment as having a potential impact on fish, and the licensee had to invest many millions of dollars to implement new treatment to protect the fish populations downstream of the mill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Dr. Barriault.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Iserhoff on the survey you've done. And there's one thing that really amazed me, because 81 percent of the youth did not have enough information from Strateco to make an informed decision. And I'm guessing, you know, how did this happen? How did it reach that point, that the youth did not have enough information to know what this is all about?

I can see two groups doing that. I can see certainly Strateco, but I can also see CNSC being involved in this and providing the information.

Is there a mechanism whereby this information can be given to the Youth Council?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Only recently has Strateco tried to engage in a relationship with the Youth Council, but as noted, they've been here since 2006. So it's, you know, six years, and only just recently in the past few months have they tried to engage with us.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Is that helping at all?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: We haven't -- they haven't met with the youth as of yet.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Okay. Thank you.

CNSC, have you had any involvement at all with the Youth Council?

MR. LECLAIR: We haven't had specific

involvement directly with the Youth Council. We've come out for a number of activities and consultations that we did back in 2010. I was personally here in 2010, September 2010 at a radio talk show and a community meeting where there was a number of questions that were asked by the community.

Recently, we've had further correspondence with the Band Council, offering that we would be prepared to provide further information at their request, and we continue to extend that offer. We're certainly here and we're available. We'd be more than willing to provide further information if asked.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: In reading the submissions, there seems to be a common thread that there's a lack of information getting out there to the people about what's involved, and this question deals specifically to Strateco, I realize that, but having said that, I think it is also a function for the CNSC to provide education really in this area.

And if you can see it clearly, maybe something could be organized with the Youth Council to do this.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

Dr. Barriault, we commit to serve and we exist to serve the public, and we commit to communicate

and provide any information that is requested. And above and beyond, we'll be more than happy to communicate and contact the Youth Council in order to establish any relationship they want.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So there's your open door, Mr. Iserhoff; go after them.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that particular survey, which I found really useful, I'm trying to get a clarification on your Question 3, that more than 88 percent of youth have indicated the exploration in mining would harm the land and water.

Is that a general comment on all mines or is it purely on the particular project?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: It's purely on the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: But what about the youth kind of views on other mines in other developments?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Oh, we haven't questioned them on other mines, like the diamond mine. We haven't questioned them on those mines as of yet, but ---

THE CHAIRMAN: So you have not taken a position yet on the diamond mine?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Just one question. Have you ever done that kind of survey for other projects?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: It's the first time. Well, I've started in September and it's the first time we have a survey like this done.

MEMBER HARVEY: So we cannot compare with others?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: No.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Okay.

Thank you very much. Very useful. Thank you.

I guess the next presentation is still you, Mr. Iserhoff. Go ahead, please continue.

MR. S. ISERHOFF: I think we were supposed to get Paul Robinson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's where -- let's see if technology works.

Mr. Robinson, are you with us?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, I am, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Paul, you really are with us. Try again; say something to us.

MR. ROBINSON: My name is William Paul Robinson. I'm a Research Director at Southwest Research

and Information Centre in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a very -- I'm having very great difficulty in making out what you're saying. Maybe that will help?

MR. ROBINSON: Is that better? Is that improved?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Go ahead, please.

12-H7.88

Oral presentation by

Paul Robinson

MR. ROBINSON: Thank you very much. I value the opportunity to participate very highly and apologize for not being able to be there in person, but it was a Customs issue that couldn't be avoided.

I have -- just to briefly summarize, I have been retained by the Cree Youth Council as well as SISUR and InnuPower to review and comment on the licence that's before the body today.

And I've worked on a wide variety of other Canadian uranium projects, including some of the reclamation work in the Elliott Lake area, some of the licensing in the Athabasca area, as well as a number of other mines and uranium processing facilities as a

technical analyst and, as you know, have prepared a statement for you today and will briefly summarize that given the limitation on time that’s provided.

The first area of comment relates to the condition in the licence, 1.3, about whether the licensee is qualified to carry on the activity authorized.

The licence review staff, the application review staff precluded that the applicant was qualified, but identified no criteria that it applied in any systematic or informal manner to determine what might be a necessary or appropriate qualities that might lead for that determination.

I think it’s important to note, as I said in my statement, that the Strateco Board does not identify any experience in uranium mining or advanced uranium exploration. Only one staff member is identified as having worked in a uranium project, having been involved in core sampling. And most of the other staff, as is typical with mining juniors, have worked in a variety of different kinds of projects but not identifying their long-term mining experience.

Regarding that, we heard some statements this morning that several of the Strateco staff have been involved in mining over many decades. None of the mines they worked at were mentioned. None of the environmental

performance records at those mines, either during operations or during reclamation have been presented, and it’s that ability to demonstrate performance that’s necessary in order to address questions about the quality of a company’s operations.

The company does much more marketing than demonstrating its environmental record of the staff or operations they've worked at. And that environmental record should be reviewed before the licence is issued.

The company has not demonstrated the financial capacity to construct the project. Their current market capitalization is under $50 -- $50 million dollars for the whole value of the company. Indeed, the price of the share is at its lowest level in five years, under $0.35 a share today.

And that demonstrates that there isn't the financial support that was asserted earlier. Otherwise, that stock price would reflect a different trend than the steep drop in trend of the price over the last year and a half, a much steeper drop than has been the price for uranium, the commodity the company is seeking to mine or find a company to buy its properties to mine.

And thirdly, the company lacks the social licence from the indigenous community, its traditional lands it seeks to occupy. And even though it's been

working on that for some time.

And so those are three reasons whereby Strateco has lacked qualifications or in the case of its actual mining experience of its staff, provided a balance record of its environmental performance to see whether it's been successful at minimizing and eliminating risks to the environment and the cultures of the communities that are impacted by their operations.

Again, moving quickly, there is an important concern at this site related to the -- whether this site -- this operation is somehow needed or meets some national security or other international obligations. The concept of maintenance of national security measure and measures required to implement international obligations is the obligation for the CNSC in addition to the protection of the environment and the health and safety of persons.

There's no one who has offered to buy this uranium. There's no international agreement for this uranium. And so those kinds of considerations which might mitigate against the maximum environmental protection don't appear to be warranted as considerations.

The uranium based on the companies who made its summary of its resource evaluation shows that the uranium wouldn't be viable in the market until the price

reaches $80 a pound or more. We're something like 60 percent of that price. That price is not likely to be reached for some time.

Thirdly, I was very concerned that the licence was supposed to be issued without a detailed decommissioning plan being provided. There is a preliminary decommissioning plan that was provided and served as the basis for the CNSC staff recommendations that the licence be issued. But preliminary decommissioning plan is not a complete document. It's not sufficient for guaranteeing that all projected activities would occur.

It might be appropriate to defer the actual allocation of the financial guarantee until the company has demonstrated -- it's met the financial test and the money is put in place before the licensee is allowed to operate.

But the question of whether there is a detailed decommissioning plan that should be part of the review before the licence is issued. And as I recommended, the licence should be denied or further reviewed, deferred until a detailed decommissioning plan, fully acceptable to the licensing agencies and perhaps to the surface owners as well, be subject to review.

A preliminary plan for a project that's

going to be spending $80 million over four years is a very inappropriate detail. And comprehensive should be the characteristics of a decommissioning plan, not preliminary.

In addition, the licence recommends review of that decommissioning plan every five years. Five years is an inappropriately long period and it would be after the completion of the project as proposed in any case. An annual review of a decommissioning plan is much more appropriate certainly given the volatile financial markets that uranium companies as well as any borrower currently faces.

Five years ago, with respect to Strateco, the price of uranium was $130 a pound, and the financial markets were very strong. The financial downturn in 2008 would not have been reflected. In a review, there was a five-year gap between reviews of the adequacy of the financial assurance and decommissioning had the licence condition as proposed been implemented.

So a detailed decommissioning plan accepted as complete as well as an annual review seem to be fundamental to effective licensing and guarantees at the backend of the project.

The fourth point I raise related to transparency with the local community. I think that most

recent dialogue where the company is only beginning to engage some of the youth leaders is a measure of how slow they are to invest their time in the community. Even though they didn't have any trouble investing in exploration over the last three or four years, continuing to generate impact in that area resulting from exploration activities, the company appears to rely very heavily on advocates for its position as opposed to independent scientists and educators. And it may be that looking for more independent voices, not company consultants who are paid by the people they're describing the activities for. That might build a little more confidence in some of the community institutions and individuals who see damage on the horizon from the exploration activities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please summarize and finish?

MR. ROBINSON: Yes. The company had some environmental baseline point. I think it's very important. A baseline should be done before permits are issued not while activities are occurring. The last three years' exploration with noise, light, vibration, other kinds of activities, those have impacted not only the trappers and the direct area but those along access routes.

The water inflows problem at the mine

associated with the fault zone is a very difficult challenge. It caused major delays at the Cigar Lake site and was -- is not addressed in a very thorough detail in the application. There's no description of the hydrologic characteristics of the fault zone, its physical dimensions, all of which should be available from the drilling records of the boreholes that went through that particular zone.

It would be appropriate to have that fault zone more fully characterized. The risk of ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please wind up? We have read your submission in detail.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay, yes, I can.

And the last point I think I would make is the cumulative impact point where all the trappers in the area. They're already feeling the effects of more than a dozen different activities related to uranium exploration.

And so those cumulative impacts have already begun to occur, and this particular project is being addressed in isolation, even though that native economic activity is affected by all of them.

And so the lack of a comprehensive baseline, the lack of a cumulative impact assessment, the lack of a social licence, and the lack of a full assessment of the hydrologic conditions in the fault zone,

which presents a physical risk, not a radiation risk, those are all reasons for the licence to be denied or deferred until modifications are made.

Again, thank you very much for your time. It’s an honour to appear before you; I wish I was there. Thank you to the Cree for allowing me to participate, and I look forward to any questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(**APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)**

THE CHAIR: Who wants to start? Okay, let me start then.

Can we get this decommissioning story straightened out, please? Is there a decommissioning plan? Is it detailed enough? Staff.

MR. LECLAIR: Jean Leclair, for the record.

Perhaps first thing we should do is clarify the difference between a preliminary decommissioning plan and a detailed decommissioning plan.

A detailed decommissioning plan is a plan you need to submit just before you start decommissioning.

The reason why it’s called a detailed decommissioning plan is it takes into account all the things that happened during the activities that were happening under the licence. You can’t get all the details because you won’t have them because they come

during the actual activities themselves.

The preliminary decommissioning plan is a requirement. We've looked at it; we believe it's sufficient. The value that's been put forward is $5.5 million so that's the value of the financial guarantee. We believe it's sufficient based on our review of the preliminary decommissioning plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is sufficient for the exploratory one only?

MR. LECLAIR: Yes, sufficient for the scope of the activities that are currently being proposed, which is the advanced exploration project.

THE CHAIRMAN: And how did you come about this particular 5.5 million?

MR. LECLAIR: It's based on a review of the activities that would be necessary to return the site back to the conditions that actually existed before they even occur in exploration. So it's the removal of the buildings that are currently there.

THE CHAIRMAN: And where is the money?

MR. LECLAIR: Pardon me?

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is that money? Is it available no matter what happens to Strateco?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

The financial guarantee is an instrument

that the Proponent or the licensee cannot touch, they will have no access to, except the Commission who has the power to invoke this financial guarantee.

In other words, they will put financial guarantee instruments in place for the purpose of cleaning up, decommissioning, according to the review, the technical review of the decommissioning plan.

I would like to go back and clarify a couple of things. There is a playing with words here that are -- preliminary decommissioning plan is to establish the financial guarantees according to the scope of the project. Once there is a decommissioning, then that is the take off point, and the detailed commissioning plan is when the licensee is required to submit a decommissioning licence application, hence that’s the detailed decommissioning plan.

So the pre-decommissioning plan is required at every level. The review of the financial guarantee at minimum is five years and we would review the financial guarantee, especially on a start-up company, on a yearly basis to ensure that the financial guarantee is always aligned with the scope that is approved by the Commission or licensed by the Commission. So it’s not written in stone and the Commission and staff can review it at the frequency that we believe is required in order to ensure

that there is adequate financial guarantee in place to align with the scope of the licensed activity.

THE CHAIRMAN: All I was interested in is if Strateco goes -- if they get a licence and they go bankrupt, the money is still available?

MR. JAMMAL: Before they are even allowed to operate, they will have to put the financial guarantee in place. And to answer the latter part of your question, the answer is yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: I just want to understand because the presentation is under your name but has been done and prepared by Mr. Robinson. So could you explain how it works? Has it been prepared following your demand?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Actually yes. I was asked if there was anybody able to do this and, yes, it was Paul Robinson.

MEMBER HARVEY: So you agree with ---

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Yes, with Paul.

MEMBER HARVEY: --- as been sent by Mr. Robinson?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: Yes.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

MR. S. ISERHOFF: I just have one question.

Yes, you have questions about the environmental aspects, but what about social acceptability? I haven't heard any questions regarding that in terms of the community stance. Are you going to take that into consideration?

THE CHAIRMAN: Obviously with social acceptability, things are a lot easier and simpler and that's the Proponent kind of -- should be the Proponent's aim and target and I hope that they will get some social acceptability. Our mandate, however, is to ascertain the safety and the impact on the environment. So we're not going to get accused of killing the land. Our intention is to make sure that nothing that this mine does is injurious to the environment really, and to the people, et cetera.

So we're trying to assess this particular project acceptability in terms of environmental and safety impact.

MR. S. ISERHOFF: But what about the opinions of the people?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this is not based on a popular kind of vote. This is based -- we make a recommendation about the safety issue. And just to -- I know a lot of people are campaigning now for a moratorium

in Quebec-wide on uranium. The Government of Quebec will have to make that policy decision, not us. So we don't get involved -- we don't get involved in economics. The Proponent -- Mr. Robinson talked a lot about the uranium prices and uranium economics. That's not our mandate either. We're not in economic assessment; we are purely on safety and impact on the environment. Just so you understand our mandate.

Anybody? Mr. Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Maybe we should add that the final decision has to be made by Quebec; I mean, the authorization to go along with the project.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Quebec will have to make a -- Quebec has to make a final decision on that particular project also. As you know, this is economics result, they will have to decide and they'll decide when they decide.

So we are doing what we need to do, nobody can operate the uranium mine without our licence. But you also need the provincial permit in this particular case.

And by the way, in Saskatchewan it's the same thing. We do the licensing on safety and health, the Saskatchewan government decides about whether to permit.

So to actually -- if I had to summarize our mandate, we don't decide who builds it, but if you build

it, we'll try to make sure it's safe, that's really our mandate.

So I don't know if I am satisfying you but that's all I can tell you right now.

Anybody else want to add to this?

Well, thank you. Thank you very much.

One more thing on Mr. Robinson which I can not let go. If I understood correctly about international obligation, there are some people who still believe that this uranium mine ends up in weapons and the sole advocate. I want you to understand that Canada signed a peaceful use of uranium. We will never allow uranium material to be used for anything but peaceful application.

So dream on, whatever, get some other kind of a thing. China will sign a protocol with Canada about peaceful application. They are building a lot of power plants. They need all the uranium that Canada can produce.

Staff, do you want to add to this?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

In addition to what you mentioned, Mr. President, is the Safeguard International Obligation. I believe the Proponent or the intervenor has mentioned that he's asking the question, who can purchase this uranium? The answer is no one can purchase this uranium without

the, as you mentioned, being done through the Safeguard International Obligation Agreement and there has been a discussion about China. As a matter of fact, all -- as you mentioned, Canada's policy for the peaceful use, every micro spec of a gram of uranium is tracked. No licensee is allowed to ship nor sell uranium unless the recipient is under the safeguard agreement where there are inspections, accountability in place to include China where the elements of uranium is being used for peaceful use.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Anybody else?

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Okay. The next submission is an oral presentation from Mr. Taylor as outlined in CMD 12-H7.3.

Mr. Taylor, please proceed.

12-H7.3

Oral presentation by

Len Taylor

MR. TAYLOR: Good morning. My name is Len Taylor. I'm a youth pastor here in the community. I'm one of the representatives for the community-based Mistissini Coalition Against Uranium Exploration and

Mining.

First of all, I would like to say that under the format which we are given to speak at a public meeting, where we have to register our names, address and phone numbers, et cetera, and then submit a written outline of what I am going to speak, and then only given 10 minutes to speak at this public meeting, I find this format highly unusual and quite unorthodox from any public meeting I ever attended or any public meeting I've ever seen video cast on TV, on news reports. I've never seen such a format in this manner.

I have never in my life attended a public meeting where I'm given information about what I'm going to speak beforehand, written in form and sent to some agency to scrutinize beforehand so that they can prepare their statement. I feel that this goes against my right to privacy and my freedom of speech, which are guaranteed under the *Charter of Freedom and Rights*, which are protected under the *Constitution of Canada*.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: The said company, Strateco Resources Inc., has presented an EIS which has been reviewed by COMEX and COFEX, Federal Review Panel, whom would review their statement and assess as to whether they should or shouldn't give a licence of approval to Strateco

to proceed with their exploration stage of their project.

As you know, I have been a leading opponent against this exploratory stage and I'm against the mining and the milling of uranium since you've come to our community of Mistissini.

Now, it is my understanding that the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is here to work for the public. Well, I wish that you would work for us now by not -- and also to you also by not giving any licence to the said Proponent Strateco for the following reasons.

The Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1990 Edition, defines the word "integrity" as follows:

> "*Integrity:* an unimpaired condition; soundness; firm adherence to a code of especially moral and artistic values; incorruptibility; the quality or state of being completely undivided; completeness; synonym: see honesty."

Honesty, one, it says "chastity"; second, it says:

> "...a fairness and straightforwardness of conduct; b) adherence to the facts; sincerity; 3) any of the genius lunaria, an European plant of the

> mustard family which coordinates, leaves and broad cyclic."

Then it says, "synonym":

> "Honesty; honour; integrity; probidity. Means uprightness of character or action."

Honesty implies a refusal to lie, steal or deceive in any way. Honour suggests an activity, an active or anxious regard for the standard of one's profession, calling or position. Integrity implies trustworthiness and incorruptibility to a degree that one is incapable of being false to a trust, responsibility or a pledge. Probidity implies tried and proven, honest or integrity.

Since Strateco has come to our community and they have talked to us, I believe that they have not been truthful and a lot of our people believe that they have not been truthful in what they have said to us.

I believe we have been constantly lied to by the Proponent to us. When they first came in, they said radon gas disappears into thin air. Then radon gas dissipates. Then radon gas is seven times heavier than air.

The truth is radon gas 222 turns into polonium-218. Honesty implies the refusal to lie, steal,

or deceive in any way.

In their communication in Boucherville, Quebec, November 26, 2010, Strateco Resources Inc.:

> "Strateco is pleased to announce that it received strong support at the public hearings held in Mistissini and Chibougamau on November 23rd and 25th in relation to the underground exploration phase of the Matoush Project. Nearly 50 people, organizations, companies and local regional authorities confirmed their support for the project in letters, briefs, and presentations."

Yet here in the meeting that we had here in this very room, 15 or so people spoke up that night, and not one person spoke in favour of the project.

Yet in your communiqué you have strong support. In the crowd that night, there were over 300 Cree who opposed the project.

He, Mr. Guy Hébert, outright lied here in his communiqué to Boucherville.

So integrity implies trustworthiness and incorruptibility and an incapable degree that is incapable of being false or to a trust, responsibility or pledge.

He hasn’t shown that; nor has his company.

A while back, when Strateco brought in their radon specialist, he mentioned that when you dig eight feet in the ground, you build a foundation for a house; you will encounter radon gas.

Yet when Mr. Guy Hébert, the President of Strateco, got up that same afternoon and said that they were going to go dig 300 metres into the ground to start this ramp, and he denied emphatically that no radon gas was going to escape or be released.

Who is lying to me? Do I believe their radon specialist or do I believe Mr. Guy Hébert? Because they are both saying different things. Who is lying to us? I tend to believe their radon specialist who came to speak on the subject.

Integrity: firm adherence to a code of especially moral and artistic value; incorruptibility.

In The Nation, our Cree newspaper, Mr. Guy Hébert, CEO of Strateco, said that as a company, Strateco -- and please forgive my language -- Strateco doesn’t give two shits about what the community thinks or wants and that Strateco will leave the Crees behind.

From this statement in The Nation, we see here the true colours of Strateco, that they don’t care what we think or what we want.

And if they don’t care what we think or what we want as Cree, then in my opinion, they surely won’t care about the devastation that they will create in the environment, the rivers, the land, or the animals and eventually us as human beings; nor will they care about the damage inflicted upon us as human beings caused by carcinogenic radioactive tailings that will be left behind.

How do I know this? Just look at the lies that Strateco has told us since they’ve come into this community, trying to convince us that uranium is safe.

My question is how can you build trust when one party is constantly lying to you?

I have a question to the CNSC and also to the Panel. Would you trust and want to work with any mining company or any person where they are constantly lying to you? Would you want to work with them, yes or no? Give me an answer, please.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: I have proven above that Strateco and its employees have no integrity. By their actions, by their words, they have shown that they don’t fulfill the definition of having integrity or honesty, which I have proven by their constant lying to us.

Because of this important factor, I ask

that you give not Strateco a licence to move ahead.

Point 5, Dr. Gordon Edwards of the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility showed that Strateco failed to meet the basic fundamental requirements of an ESI as required by the CNSC.

Given the nature of the project, the impact statement must discuss, in a satisfactory manner, the environmental issues associated with uranium exploration and the outlined impacts related to the future phases of the project to bring a uranium mine into production.

This is one of their directives from the CNSC.

The four volume laid out in the Environmental Assessment Study for the underground exploration program for the Matoush Project published by Strateco Resources in October 2009 does not meet the fundamental requirements, as laid out in the directives, for informing the concerned communities of the basic concepts about radioactivity and the resulting environmental issues.

In addition, the rationale for the project is not discussed in an open and frank manner. The first part of this critique focuses on the Proponent's complete failure to communicate the basic facts about radioactivity, radioactive materials, and exposures as

required by the directives.

Although this data collected may be used for further planning, the EIS as such is entirely unacceptable, as it does not even attempt to satisfy the directives when it comes to the treatment of radioactivity.

Special attention must be given to aspects of the project that are associated with radioactivity. Given the specific nature of the project, the impact statement must describe the radioactivity related aspect that makes this project different from other types of mining activities. This is their directive, again, from the CNSC.

Another directive. Special attention should be given to the treatment of elements that may be associated with uranium based on the mineralogy and the history of uranium mining, a directive from the CNSC.

Fundamentally, physical terms such as, radioactivity, radioactive decay, ionizing radiation, Becquerel, half-life, decay products, decay chains, secular equilibrium, alpha particles, gamma ray, isotopes, and radionuclides are undefined or unexplained and, in many cases, hardly mentioned at all.

When I was in high school, in order for me to move ahead to the next grade level, I had to show that

I knew and understood my subjects before -- I understood my subjects well before they would allow me to advance. I don't know -- if I didn't know the subject well, then I would have to repeat the grade all over again.

Here, Dr. Gordon Edwards shows you and I that Strateco has failed to show us the basic fundamental requirements as required by the directives of CNSC. Yet, they, Strateco, are allowed to proceed.

Yet, you are giving them a licence to proceed. Why is that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you please wind up, please?

MR. TAYLOR: Let me finish reading.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: Why are they not held back from proceeding? They should go back to the drawing board and redo the ESI all over again until they can give us the basic of what's required in the directives.

Also, the CNSC should have given us, the people, a copy of the directives so we could know what was expected to be in a ESI -- EIS, excuse me -- because I didn't know what a directive was until Dr. Gordon Edwards mentioned it in his report.

This would have been more helpful to me in knowing what is expected in a EIS.

Six, Strateco wants us to accept their word that uranium exploration mining will have no impact on the environment and on our health as a people. They want us to believe that it is safe. I have studied uranium for the past three years and have read over hundreds of articles and documents that show the opposite of what Strateco has presented to us, showing how exploration and mining of uranium is dangerous to the water, to the land, to the birds, to the fish, the moose, the beaver, the zooplankton, the phytoplankton, and humans as well.

We don't believe Strateco. They have lied too many times to us. Example; at the last meeting which was -- at the last meeting I was at with Strateco, a youth of Mistissini came in meeting with -- and signed 150 youth signatures declaring their rejection of the project. One of the youth asked them:

> "If there was a major spill of a tailing pond, how many years would it take for the earth to recover?"

Strateco's own environmental specialist told the crowd gathered that it would take 10 years. The youth then mentioned that according to the information that he had researched, that it would take 100,000 years. And Strateco's own environmental specialist agreed with our youth and said, "Yes, he's right."

Then one of the youth in the back asked the question, "Why did you just lie to us?" They received no answer.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: I invite any person wishing to learn more about the dangers of uranium mining and nuclear technology to Google the health cost of nuclear technology, to check out the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility, Mining Watch Canada, or Professor Jim Harding's Coalition for a Clean Green Saskatchewan. And you'll find information, which they say is outdated but it's proven that it's relevant for -- special issues have shown that it is true.

In the last session, Strateco ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you -- listen, we've got a long list of people. Can you please wind up? You're way, way over time.

MR. TAYLOR: I still have four pages. Let me finish my four pages.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not going to let you finish four pages.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Some -- we are quite -- because are you interested in a dialogue or you want to hear yourself talk?

THE CROWD: Let him finish!

THE CHAIRMAN: You just don't want us to discuss, right? You just want to give us a little speech and that's it?

MR. TAYLOR: This is what I've written and let me read it, please.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're just taking time from your colleagues here, et cetera, sitting patiently and waiting for their turn.

THE CROWD: We have all night! We have all week! Democracy takes time!

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, community.

In the last session with Strateco, they had an environmental specialist who mentioned that uranium's sole purpose was to heat the earth. If you take that uranium under the ground, are you not contributing to the destruction of the planet by mining this mineral out of the ground?

If it's there to heat the earth, you're taking -- in your presentation here, it says 20 million. The last time Strateco was here, they said 29 million tonnes of uranium taken out.

In one of the first sessions, which was held in a public meeting, I mentioned an old Indian legend. There is a big snake that lives under the ground.

If you leave it alone where it lives, then it won't harm you. If you disturb it and violate its home, it will bite you and harm you. That snake is uranium.

By allowing Strateco, Cameco, Areva or any other mining company to mine uranium, according to the legend, they will get bitten.

In my campaign against uranium mining from exploration to milling, I have constantly asked this question. What is safe about being exposed to carcinogenic, radioactive cancer-causing substances from uranium and its decay process and having to live with radioactive waste for millennium upon millennium from the residue of milling? And to this date, I have yet to receive an answer based on the knowledge I know.

In The Nation, our Cree news magazine, on December 17th, 2010, there was an interview with Ramsey Hart of the Miningwatch Canada, who attended both hearings here in Mistissini and in Chibougamau. I am going to repeat verbatim portions of that interview here:

> "This reaction came swiftly after Strateco made statements via its own press release that stipulated they had received strong support for the project, particularly from the Crees, though they did acknowledge Shecapio

and the community's rejection of it. Shecapio was quick to respond to Strateco's statements. 'Strong support is how it reads and I can only say that it was the total opposite. There was approximately 300 residents in the community who presented who overwhelmingly opposed the project and Strateco press release completely misrepresents this message.'

While the Mistissini meeting may have shown disapproval for the project, according to Miningwatch Canada, Ramsey Hart, who presented in Mistissini, he then attended the Chibougamau hearing and the climate of both meetings was dramatically different. Plus the information presented by Strateco CEO and President, Guy Hébert, was not the same that they presented here in Mistissini.

In his presentation, Hart pointed out that one of the major problems with the EIS was that it does not include

> information from an April 20, 2010 document which states that two million tons of tailings would be dumped into two nearby lakes. They said -- they told us that nothing was going to be dumped into any lake but they were going to take it through some cleaning machine."

Let me just read my -- according to Hart, another problem is that the tailing impounds in the nearby lake was the -- was told in a Chibougamau meeting Strateco wouldn't create tailing ponds because Quebec Mining Directive 019 and because of -- let me reread this, excuse me.

According to Hart, the other problem with the tailing impounds in nearby lakes was the -- according to Chibougamau, Strateco couldn't create tailing pounds because Quebec Mining Directive 019 and because of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission doesn't approve of them.

Hart said he would be submitting these discrepancies to the deciding panels to show that Strateco has been telling one story to the Crees and another story to the people of Chibougamau.

Why is this? Why are they saying one thing

to the Crees and another thing to the French? What are they hiding?

Because of this constant double talk and this outright lying, we implore the CNSC, COFEX and COMEX not to give Strateco the licence to proceed.

I have two other papers I want to read but I realize that because of the time, I won't be able to. But I just want to read -- I'll just say what they are. “The Uranium Mining Dotted Across Navajo Land, the -- and The Still Perilous Issues That Are There.” And another one I wanted to read which I don’t have time is called, “Echoes of the Atomic Age.”

And then at Point 10, after the last meeting with Strateco and the CNSC, our community in Mistissini held a referendum on what they wanted with the Matoush Project. Three hundred and fifty (350) homes wanted a ban on the entire uranium Matoush Project, 300 homes want a moratorium on the uranium Matoush Project, and about 15 homes were for the uranium Matoush Project.

There are people -- the people are against the uranium mine project, Mr. Guy Hébert said he has strong support from the community of Mistissini. Why is it that after -- at that meeting with 300 voice strong opposing the project and then after the meeting with their own referendum, 600 homes strong are against the project,

yet, in their news release, Strateco can say they have strong support Mistissini? Lying again.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: On top of that there's a strong push not just from the Crees, but also from the province at large for a ban or a moratorium on uranium exploration, mining, and milling, because it is well-documented facts of the toxic dangers from uranium and its decay by-products on the environment and especially to the health of human beings.

In relation to Point 6 -- Point 10 rather -- there’s a typo in my paper here -- the rights of the Cree Nations are not being respected. I urge the Cree Nation of Mistissini and the Cree Regional Authority to push the federal and provincial governments to uphold our Cree rights. Under the Constitution, the rights of First Nations are guaranteed in the Charter and the government has a right and an obligation to protect our rights.

I call on the Federal Government of Canada to uphold our rights as First Nations people. We, the First Nations of Mistissini, have spoken to Strateco and any other uranium mining company who wishes to destroy our land; we don’t want any part of it.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: We don’t want any part of

uranium exploration and/or mining in Eeyou Istchee or in the Province of Quebec.

I call on the Federal Government of Canada to overturn this decision if it's in favour -- because I heard it was in favour -- and ask Strateco and uranium mining companies to leave Eeyou Istchee because our rights as First Nations supersede that of the rights of the mining company. This is our land.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. TAYLOR: In the community of Bertsimis(phonetic) the federal government upheld their Aboriginal rights by forcing a mining company off their ancestral lands just last year. So we, the Cree Nations of Mistissini, are asking the federal government to do the same thing.

I wish to thank the CNSC and the Panel for listening to me for what I have to say and I hope that you seriously consider not giving the go ahead to Strateco or any other mining company for the health and safety and wellbeing of future generations of the Cree Nation.

Thank you and God bless you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Anybody wants to ask any particular question? Mr. Harvey.

MEMBER HARVEY: Well, I don’t have any specific question but I think I would ask Strateco if they got any comments because you have been -- have been touched by the presentation and if you have some answer to give -- I mean, you can ---

MR. HEBERT: The only comments I can make to Mr. Taylor is the -- he refer to the November 26th, 2010 press release. It was stated there -- because every time we are coming here making the same point and last time Jean-Pierre came he prepared the answer and he's really what he was -- at the public hearing in Mistissini, the Chief of the local community, Richard Shecapio, indicate that the community does not support the Matoush Project. Strateco intend to develop and deepen relation with the Mistissini Cree in order to respond appropriately to their concern, and eventually secure their support.

And then the title ---

MR. TAYLOR: You don’t have our support.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. HEBERT: The title was saying strong support for the project, referring to Chibougamau in general. But it was stating in the press that paragraph, then you're saying then we don’t have the support of Mistissini. But it’s clear, it's public and it's in -- it's public, it's really there, you know.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm quoting directly from your quote from that newsletter, sir.

MR. HEBERT: It's public, it's there, it's the press release.

But anyway, the -- all the other comment talking about the Nation or -- really, it's not there, you know, it's not there. I will appreciate if you show me that where we're saying -- you know, it's not there, it's not there.

MR. TAYLOR: You must forget your own interviews.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

MR. TAYLOR: Maybe it's old age, I don’t know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

I wanted to address your first comment first about the nature of the meeting. This is ---

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

MEMBER McDILL: This is -- I think it may be easier to think of as a hearing.

MR. TAYLOR: M'hm.

MEMBER McDILL: It's a ---

MR. TAYLOR: It's a public hearing; right?

MEMBER McDILL: It's a ---

MR. TAYLOR: I've lived in the south and I've lived here in the Cree community, and this is the first time I've ever seen anyone have to register for any public hearing or meeting in my life.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: I guess you have not been in front of quasi-judicial administrative tribunal, it's a mouthful, but it's like a court and you don’t walk in a court unannounced. So it's -- yes, it's a different tribunal, it's not like the normal tribunal or the environmental assessment hearing that you heard.

We have to come up with a written decision and that’s what this is -- that’s why this is a bit different and we got to give everybody who wants to be heard a chance to be heard.

That’s really why we are a bit different process.

MR. TAYLOR: I just stick by my comments.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

I am a little perplexed that you are so much against uranium.

By the way, we're an independent body.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I understand.

MEMBER McDILL: So I am an independent

person, I'm an independent member of this tribunal. I'm also a university professor, this is not my job. I take it seriously, it's not -- this is extra.

But why is the -– why is the strength of your arguments so much against one element – uranium - which is in the ground, as you say. It’s a beautiful town, it really is, yeah! But when you remind gold which could be your snake or diamond which could be your snake, they’re effluence and they’re bad and they’re monitored and they’re -- so the concern I have is trying – you’ve asked to listen and I am listening, I’m listening to the people and I am listening to your concern, we all are.

Your opinions matter and we want to hear them but it’s very hard when the strength of your argument is the way it is and yet we don’t hear or see that with respect to other mines.

I assume that you get dental X-rays?

MR. TAYLOR: M’hm.

MEMBER McDILL: And there’s other sources of radiation ---

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I know that.

MEMBER McDILL: --- I’m trying to understand.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I’ve been studying other mines too. Gold mines, copper mines or any kind of

mines and I've come to the conclusion that it doesn't matter what kind of mining that you do, there's going to be tailings that we're going -- that are going to be -- have to be dealt with.

But the thing with this particular kind of mine and I've -- in the research I've done, was that this particular kind of mining is the worst mining because of the fact that the radioactivity and the carcinogenic, cancer causing substances from the decay products that are released from the -- cause there's 16 different decay products in the decay process that are going to be releasing tactic radioactivity to the land, to the environment to our people, to the fishery, to the moose and the beaver and the bear.

We live off this land here. We eat this food daily and soon as they open up that mine and the thing about opening that mine also, is right in the heart of the water shed of all of Quebec.

And opening up a mine in the heart of the water shed of Quebec, it's going to poison all the streams, all the main rivers that go -- flow down from the -- mountains and we live off that land. That's how our ancestors have lived for millennium. We've been here for over 7 thousand years, our people and we haven't changed, hardly that much. We have changed a lot in the past few

years now that we have houses and everything but we still carry on our traditional way of life.

And, with this company coming in and any other company coming in, well, for uranium project, will ruin our way of life and especially our diets.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you're convinced ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

--- so you're convinced yourself that you cannot do your uranium mining safely. So the people of Saskatchewan by the way, some of they are Cree, be living there for years and years and years, absolutely don't care about the water shed, don't care about trapping, don't care about this. They've been mining for now 30 to 40 years ---

MR. TAYLOR: I have a book -- I have a book on the Saskatchewan, hum, it's a book written on the Saskatchewan mining and it shows the environmental damage that happens in the rivers, in the streams and I've actually presented it a few meetings back and that you are trying to say that it -- they were talking about the Saskatchewan mine, I brought that book to the hearing and I showed this is what scientific researches have shown on uranium mining in Saskatchewan.

So it's having an impact. It's having an impact on those people. And I have a -- one -- one paper I

couldn’t read that ---

THE CHAIRMAN: No but you believe -- look, there’s all kind of -- books for and against. All I’m trying to understand is, you believe that by us licensing Saskatchewan mines, we should not do that and yet, all the evidence, all the monitoring and stuff, I’d like you to tell me what kind of monitoring, what king of studies you have done on impact on -- in Saskatchewan about dropping water, air, hunting, all of the above.

Talk to me Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record. I will provide an overview of the environmental monitoring information that is collected in Northern Saskatchewan by not just the licensees but also by community groups that do take part in the monitoring programs.

In terms of – I just heard somebody talk about Hatchet Lake, the CNSC, when we were the Atomic Energy Control Board, worked with the University of Saskatchewan –- dietician worked with the Hatchet Lake community to understand their traditional diet and it is base on the information collected in the Hatchet Lake community with elders through to -- essentially year round to understand the food consumption patterns year round, that we’ve develop the risk assessment methods that we

use, that are focused on the traditional aboriginal diet in northern Saskatchewan.

The monitoring includes all the radio nuclides, radon, radium, uranium, polonium, lead 210 in that is released to Heron water from the mines.

We monitor fish, we monitor sediments, we monitor blueberries. There’s monitoring information on radon and that monitoring is done close to the mine sites and in areas where we, in the 1990’s, expected that if there were cumulative environmental impacts from the numerous mines in Saskatchewan, those impacts would be detectable.

That monitoring was conducted by the province of Saskatchewan and the community -- with community involvement and no cumulative impacts have ever been detected.

The levels of radiation and metals are the same as they were during baseline so before the uranium mining project came in. There the same as areas are very remote from the mining sectors.

All the studies have shown that there is no contamination of food. Trappers have been able to live on the mine site, continue with their activities. No one has had to change their traditional diet because of the mining activities in northern Saskatchewan and this would not

happen in Quebec either.

If the CNSC were to license a uranium exploration project or uranium mine project, this would be done safely. The monitoring information on effluent quality, all the effluents for example, radium, uranium and others, the concentrations and effluent are lower than the Canadian drinking water standards, the standards that are used for drinking water in people's homes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Last word Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: I would like to ask both this Panel here and the CNSC to really consider the lies that Strateco has told our people and because of these lies that they have told our people to not give the license to them. Because you can't -- if they're willing to lie to us like I said in my presentation, I'm sure they are willing to lie about other things, 'cause they have shown -- have shown me that they have -- they don't have the integrity through their lies to deserve a license. Thank you.

THE CHAIMAN: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

Mr. Matoush, I think you're next but I'm going to ask you a question. Would you come back after lunch or would you absolutely insist in doing it now?

MEMBER MATOUSH: Thank you very much. I was going to ask that I can come back after lunch.

THE CHAIRMAN: Come back after lunch? Okay. You got yourself a deal!

Okay, we will reconvene at 2:30.

Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 1:34 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 1h34

--- Upon resuming at 2:36 p.m.

La séance est reprise à 14h36

12-H7.4

Oral Presentation by

Allen Matoush

MR. MATOUSH: Thank you very much. (Cree language spoken)

My name is Allen Matoush. I am a Cree member of Mistissini Band. I just want to make additions to my written submission. Very briefly for the public, I had made a written submission to indicate my support to the project based on several readings from the Federal Review reports and the studies that were submitted to public. And furthermore, based on extensive reading but

to understand how the other agreements function because the Northern Quebec agreement and also the mining policy.

Based on those readings, I was confident that I am well informed of the project. So from the written submissions, I had indicated to Commission that I support the project.

Now, just to add information to my written submission, this information is about the territory where the project is situated. I want to indicate this is very important to me and I value it, that I am one of those people, that generation that was born in the oldest mountain. I have deep roots into that area; my counsel were my father and my late brother. I had to get back to the roots and, most importantly, it was never really the land that we spoke about but more of the human heart.

It saddens my heart to hear the shouts and the cheers that they indicate a disrespect in this public hearing. One of the Council's values, Cree values, is to have an open mind and continue to show respect. Those values I want to mention in this hearing.

Concerning that land where the project is; I have walked there, I have hunted there, I have trapped there, and I have fished there. Concerning the formation of that landscape, without the walks with my Dad, without his stories, I wouldn't know very much about that land.

I checked out the situation where this camp is. It just amazes me how nature itself is shaped. The waters in that area are very small. For the community to have a perception of it or an image of it, it would be just like right in front of the lake, all the way up to a perch. That's the size of the area, as you see the water. And again, how the land is formed, it's not going east and west. The land is formed north and south. And the water is, of course, very precious. I cherish that too, I value those.

And in the midst of what I hear from Strateco and from other agencies, they all have responsibility. I am not an expert in any uranium or any signs related to it, but I am mature enough to understand the information that is given to Cree people.

When we speak about the land, our land, we need to know what we are talking about. That area where the project is, I have -- I belong, belong in this. I have a really deep sense of belonging in this. Even though I am from this community, my first home is in the Ottish mountains and I know that it would not be same as the way my parents live.

So one of the instructions -- they were not elaborate instructions; one is to treat everybody with openness and respect.

Since the project started, the Strateco people, I met them 2007. They walked with me, they talked to me about that area, what is it that they want to do.

I was curious, I wanted to find out, what is it for, uranium. Cree people in their heart wants to share, and if you can just look beyond the project, that this project with all the regulations and the agreements that we have, if you look at them, they're all allowable, whether if it's uranium too. Within that scope it's allowable and it's doable. We hear the management and the control systems that are presented. I for one have great confidence that this can be done.

And the purpose of the uranium, what is it used for? Every Cree person will pass on that torch of flame to warm up your tent or your tepee. If you can just look at it that way, enough fire to keep you warm will give you comfort and safety, and too much of it will obviously have risks on it.

And I think the same way with the uranium. If you look at the world, the world is not concerned about uranium. They're concerned about the global warming, and the world together are trying to do something about that.

If there are resources on the Cree territory, then let Crees be open to be able to contribute. Even though we're unable to finance this

project, let’s open up.

My dad also advised me fear will never take you anywhere. You have to have courage. And I will not mention all the values, but here’s one of the things that we need to have is courage in this project.

Not very long ago there was an ice storm, and Cree people were proud to be able to act together, work together, stand together and contribute, cut wood and send it up north for people to get warmed up. It is the same way with energy. Uranium is transportable, and yet human beings are accountable.

The Crees don’t have the expertise right now, but eventually our children will have a vision to be able to become scientists and to be able to know how all this environment works, these resources work.

I have no doubt that uranium is in the oldest mountains. I have no doubt its beauty, the nature, but yet we Crees have accountability too.

I have tried to define what is social acceptability of the project. Will loudness define it? Will great opposition define it?

Just to share a very brief story, here are men with courage, with their resources. They come to the land of Mistissini to do their activity. They were permitted. They didn’t just come here at their own

interests. They had to apply to the governments to be able to do their exploration.

And that is the same thing like it. When I go and look for game, when I look for the beaver to help harvest, I go to those areas to make an assessment of the environment. And then I come back to my camp and I tell them; exactly what these people are doing.

I have concerns. I have many questions. I have a lot of respect to governments and their administrations, and I respect the Cree leaderships too of Mistissini. I regret to say I have been invited more from outside communities to ask me what my concerns are about the project than within my own community.

And today I just want to come before you to be able to express and to acknowledge that Strateco has the resources and the skill to know what needs to be done in their project.

And today I have respect for CNSC. CNSC helps us to understand the scope of the project. Nobody is doing their own thing here.

I never truly understood what my dad told me. He was a respected Elder in the community. He told me, “Son, you’re going to take responsibility of that area, the trap line.” He didn’t explain to me how it’s going to happen, but that time will come when you will be

able to know.

I just want my fellow Crees and my fellow Aboriginal people to demonstrate openness and respect. In spite of how dangerous this product may be, this resource, we can shape the attitudes and the values of other cultures when we begin to open and work with them.

Now I'm going to tell you a joke.

Now, I haven't started yet and I hear some people laughing.

Sir, thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. MATOUSH: I wanted to say a few words.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Monsieur Harvey?

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MEMBRE HARVEY: Merci, monsieur le Président.

After what has been said this morning and the feeling that we could have at that time in hearing you, do you feel your point of view is shared by a certain number of people in your community or you feel to be alone on that track?

MR. MATOUSH: Well, with the people that I spoke with -- I didn't count how many -- I spoke with the immediate family members around that project, and after

hearing and listening to them, no, I don’t feel alone.

THE CHAIRMAN: So how do you explain what we heard this morning from the Youth Council and Mr. Taylor? Do they not -- according to them, they represent the community.

MR. MATOUSH: I respect their opinions, but I would like them to talk to me. I would like them to open up to me. When Crees talk with Crees, they begin to understand each other. When we begin to rely too much on the expertise from outside, then our own Cree thoughts, our own Cree values, how we do things, how we share things, you know, they get mixed up.

With the young people there, I definitely want to talk with them, explain to them about land. I hear them about our land.

And with Mr. Taylor too -- I know where he’s from -- to be able to understand the Cree world.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, one last question.

Do you -- have you had experience with other mines in terms of being opened to suggestions, roads, development in general?

MR. MATOUSH: I have no experience in mine operations. I had five seasons experience in the uranium exploration back in the 1970s with a German company called the Uranez. So that’s the experience I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, thank -- oh, Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Just another question. What is the nature of the benefits, or are there any benefits coming to the community if such a project is undertaken or advantages?

MR. MATOUSH: The project is undertaken, definitely, there is educational benefits in terms on how you work in that specific kind of operation and of course there’s the environment. And then you want to -- this company to be able to understand the Cree perspectives, how it can be integrated and the way they do things in those programs.

But education is far and all the main thing, the benefit of it. And we know this project has a life. It may have only 10-year life but that education, that knowledge and understanding exceeds 10 years. And you’ll be able to respond more – with more experience and expertise to other projects as they come along.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

In your community, how do the children progress through the educational system? This is Quebec but it’s Cree, it’s Chibougamau and Mistissini.

So there are wonderful listening in the

audience, I think that’s great, we haven’t had that many very young children before. I think it’s – so how are these children going to make it through this project and over the next few years? They go to elementary school, high school, college, how does this happen?

MR. MATOUSH: All these children, Cree children, learn by observation, so the community at large has to model that education whether it’s social development or specific language or computer knowledge.

Right now we have a school system here that can aid the children to be able to integrate, you know, the science’s concept within the aboriginal understanding. Biology, you just – you talk to the kids about biology. They will not be interested but take them in a setting where you would have to dissect a beaver, that’s eatable for us, it’s piece from about that biology, they are just sampling from that; and the same thing with the minerals, how they are processed and -- so those are the systems that we have.

Not only does the Cree School Board have it but there is training centres in the community. I think that all of the children and the young people need to have to that vision to excel and all of them understanding to be able to do whatever field of work they want to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

If I understood correctly you mentioned that you ran a trap line; is there negative impact from these mining activities on trap lines and the traditional way of life?

MR. MATOUCH: Any projects, even the Matoush Uranium Project, has an impact. As I indicated, on trap line 17, I have some leer with it. You have to be specific on it, if it’s beaver harvesting or berry gathering or fishes, then the location where the project is there’s scarcity. If I want to collect berries I don’t go there. If I want to fish, I don’t go there.

I have been warned of that area of my dad not to go alone because the weather changes really fast. It can be blue sky one day and the next thing is north storm. So it’s really on a high altitude.

When I want to go moose hunting, I don’t go there for moose hunting. So there’s areas I am familiar with the territory. And when it comes to adventure to see the nature now it’s easier for me because it’s accessible, there’s a road connected to that camp whereas before, it had to be the rivers that are leading up to that area.

So in terms of harvesting there is scarcity. Cree Nation people should know that. It’s not plentiful; it’s scarce. And those that had that did that

life of harvesting, they know it’s not plentiful, there is enough to survive.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one specific question. In your submission, you mentioned that you were convinced that the Communication and Information Agreement signed by the Cree Nation demonstrated a desire to build a relationship.

Is there –- is this agreement available to everybody? Is it public? Does anybody know if the agreement – is the agreement available? Has everybody seen the agreement and read it? I know a lot of people talked about this?

But -- it’s not a public document?

So did you see – I mean what I am trying to understand is then if it’s not a public document how people know what’s in it?

MR. GUY: It’s a request of the parties to get the document confidential. It’s public for the authorities, legal and if the authority requests it, you know we can send it. It’s a request from the parties, the Nation Cree and Strateco.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it’s the Cree who asked for it to be confidential?

MR. GUY: Excuse me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the Chief, I assume it’s the Chief who signed the agreement?

MR. GUY: Yes, the Chief has signed the agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: So did he ask for it to be confidential?

MR. GUY: I think it’s part of the way they do business, you know, all their agreements are confidential and they asked for this one to be confidential.

THE CHAIRMAN: I’m just struck by it because everybody keeps talking about this agreement and I’m just surprised that it’s not a public document.

Okay. Thank you.

Thank you very much for this.

We will move on to the next submission which is an oral presentation for Mr. Sandy Coon-Come as outlined in CMD-1287.15.

Mr. Sandy Coon-Come, the floor is yours.

12-H7.15

Oral presentation by

Matthew Sandy Coon-Come

MR. COON-COME: (Interpreted from Cree to English).

My name is Matthew. We all have the documents to understand what people are saying when they speak. The Matoush -- the uranium mine that they want to start, that’s where my mother was from. I hunted there and go hunting once in a while there such as the winter, in the fall I would fly there.

It’s true that they will be destroying the water and the animal and where the animals feed, the feeding grounds. When we go hunting there -- we don’t get our animals from farms when we hunt, they are not domesticated. We have to hunt them; we have to pursue them to kill them.

Like the Rupert River, I worked there too. In the last days of the work, they just -- they just -- they didn’t really do it with care in the finalization of the product. That I am requesting that you end the project with care. I know that you will not do -- wrap the project up carefully. I’m certain of it.

I have my own hunting territory. It’s on the north side of that area.

My father’s name was Jimmy. He handed down the territory to me. My children and my grandchildren and their children will want to hunt on this land, and then I

hear how severe the effects are from this kind of project. From what I've been told, it will affect generations down after me.

At first I thought I'll agree to it because if I approve, then I will be hired. I will be taken, but I am against this. I oppose this. I do not surrender my land for this to be done to it. It will fare much better if it is left to be as is.

You can go and clean it if you want. You can go clean up the camp that's there if you want. When the mine is completed and their jobs are finished and everything is done, then there's the underground effects of the mine. There's the underground mine.

When that water fills up that underground mine, what's going to happen to that water? It's going to go into the river. It will come down to the lake. It will go along the coast too. It will affect those that live along the coast. Everybody will be affected. It's right in the middle, in the centre, and that's where all the water comes from.

That's what I wanted to say.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

LE PRÉSIDENT: Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBRE HARVEY: Merci, monsieur le Président.

You mentioned that they -- just an example at the end of your speech -- that the underground water would be polluted. At the beginning you said that the project will be detrimental to the water and animals and everything.

So I just want to -- because what we hear from the staff and from Strateco is quite different of your fears. So I would like to know where your information comes from? I mean, you got information from the staff, from Strateco and from other people, but what makes you fear so much about that project?

MR. COON-COME: (Interpreted from Cree to English)

I am not afraid of it. There is no fear. I'm afraid of the white man who will come and destroy our lands. That is their duty. It's what they do. All they do is destroy land. They don't bother with the land around them.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. COON-COME: (Interpreted from Cree to English)

We love to hunt. Many of my friends go hunting and they love it. They love to do so. And that's what we live off of. That's what we survive from. It's not just chicken and cow that we survive off of. We get

our livelihood and our sustenance from it, from the land, the heartland.

You have your own hunting grounds. I don't know where you guys go hunting. You should go look for your uranium in your areas, on your hunting grounds.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MEMBER HARVEY: Is your position very specific to the uranium mines or you've got the same apprehension towards the other projects, other mining projects because it's mostly the same people working on those projects?

MR. COON-COME: (Interpreted from Cree to English)

I don't know how to answer that because I don't have documents. I didn't write up documents to answer this. We haven't yet felt the effects of these other mines. We aren't aware of them, but uranium, it hasn't been opened yet. There's two potentials that you have that haven't been opened.

So why are you stressing so much the opening of this mine, from this deposit? Do you understand me?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but do you understand us?

So what we would like to know is whether --

so they're going to build a brand new road for diamond mining. Do you have any problem with that?

That's also going to be built by a lot of white men. Do you have any problem with that?

Or do you still -- that's the question; are you still only against uranium mining, no other development?

MR. COON-COME: (Interpreted from Cree to English)

Diamonds don't kill. Uranium kills. I know that they want to sell the uranium. Quebec wants to sell it. They want to sell it to Canada and Canada wants to sell it to Americans.

What are we going to gain from it? Do we gain any finances from any of these sales, the handing off of these sales?

With diamonds, women love diamonds and so do girls.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Anybody else?

MEMBER McDILL: That's a tough one to follow.

I'm going to ask staff to address your last question, which was what happens at the end, when the

water in-fills the mine?

We’re nowhere near that. This is just exploration, but it’s a question; that’s a fair question. So I’m going to ask staff to explain when the mine floods -- was flooded at the end, how is the contamination dealt with?

MR. NGUYEN: I’m Son Nguyen, Geoscience Technical Specialist, for the record.

There is no definite plan yet for closing down this mine, but the common procedure would be to backfill the mine opening and the current plan also is the connections to the surface by the open boreholes would be grouted.

So the contaminants which might still be in the minerized zone, first of all, would be under very low hydra radiance when it’s underground, and the geochemical forces which can provoke leeching from the minerized zone would be much less.

Studies would be done to look at the contaminant migration in the groundwater. For this kind of particular setting, the projection would be that contaminant would slowly migrate but would not create a great impact to the surface waters.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

In the interest of dealing with three

different languages, maybe we can keep the terminology fairly simple, but I think Mr. Jammal wanted to respond to that as well.

MR. JAMMAL: Thank you, Dr. McDill. For the record, Ramzi Jammal.

You're quite correct. I will attempt to de-technically make words from that perspective, and I will pass on Dr. Thompson from that perspective.

The intent here is, studies have shown that you can isolate this water and eliminate any future chemical reactions within the mine. So hence, there should be no impact with respect to the environment and the studies have shown that you can isolate all of this chemical reactions that quote, unquote called "contaminant."

But I'll pass it on to Dr. Thompson.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Essentially, with mining, you take the ore out of the ground. It is exposed to oxygen, to air, and that exposure to air and water tends to leach or dissolve some contaminants that need to be treated.

At the end of the mine, the plan is for the waste rock and the material to be put back in the hole. The hole would be plugged with cement and that plug would

essentially stop the oxygen or the air to reach the ore and the material that's in the ground.

Currently, the uranium ore and other orebodies of other metals have been in the ground for millions of years, essentially, and the groundwater is not contaminated. And so by putting the material back in the underground and letting the groundwater touch it, because there's no oxygen, it would be like it is now. There's very little traces of contaminants from the orebody in the groundwater, and the little there is will move very slowly with groundwater.

MR. JAMMAL: In other words, Dr. McDill, it will return it to its original state as much as possible, to existing state as it started.

MEMBER McDILL: And do we have in Canada mines for which we can point for this?

MR. NGUYEN: We have what we call natural analogs, which are existing situations like the Cigar Lake Mine, for example, is a very highly mineralized orebody. And it has been created for roughly one billion years but, on the surface nobody could detect that there is any contamination originating from that orebody.

MEMBER McDILL: Sorry, I missed where it was at the beginning.

MR. NGUYEN: Okay. There is an existing

mine in Saskatchewan, the Cigar Lake deposit and that the ore at Cigar Lake is very -- has a very high grade of about 25 percent average.

Now, this orebody existed for almost one billion years but at the surface. And in the groundwater from the surface there is no detection possible of any contaminants, which has been ditched out of that orebody.

MEMBER McDILL: And the grade in that mine is 25 percent, as compared to this potential of 0.57?

MR. NGUYEN: Son Nguyen, for the record.

That's correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for this intervention.

The next submission, which is an oral presentation by the InnuPower -- let me see. Did I skip something? Where am I? Sorry, I'm ahead of myself here.

We'll move to the next submission, which is an oral presentation by Miningwatch Canada, as outlined in CMD H7.24. And I understand Mr. Hart will make the presentation. Please proceed.

12-H7.24

Oral Presentation by

MiningWatch Canada

MR. HART: (Cree language spoken). It's very good to be here in Mistissini again and thank you to the Cree people for welcoming me. And I'd like to acknowledge the Elders that are here today, as well as the leaders of Mistissini.

This is a difficult situation we're all in with this licensing hearing. Licensing hearings presumably are about dealing with smaller technical details of a proposed project and yet we are being faced with fundamental questions around social acceptability of this project.

For me, that leads me to conclude that previous steps in this process have failed. They have failed the people of Mistissini in terms of having their voices heard.

MiningWatch recommended to the CNSC when you wrote your comprehensive study report that you had underestimated opposition to this project and that given the lack of social licence, the CNSC, during its environmental assessment process, should not move forward with it. That recommendation was not considered and so now you find yourselves in a position to have to grapple with an attempt to deal with technical issues in a licensing hearing but being faced with fundamental questions around social acceptability.

I do not agree that the CNSC does not have a mandate to deal with social acceptability. The CNSC is a federal agency. The federal government has an obligation, under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to seek free, prior and informed consent before development is approved on indigenous territory.

The CNSC is a federal agency bound by the Constitution of Canada and Section 35, which affirms Aboriginal Rights.

The CNSC is a federal department, which is bound by the *James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement*, which, from what Cree leaders have told me, is about more than just establishing formal processes for review of projects. It's about finding ways to co-manage and share responsibility for decision-making.

The CNSC also has a mandate towards sustainable development and to evaluate the health effects of specific projects. Evaluating the health effects of a project should go beyond just measuring potential exposure to radionuclides but also look at the social impacts and the social determinants of health.

From our work on mining controversies around the world, MiningWatch has observed a number of social impacts from mining conflicts, the likes of which

you are pushing Mistissini towards should you provide further approvals to this project.

Further approval of this project could lead to legal action, and Canada has been sharply rebuked by organizations like the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination for relying on the courts to resolve disputes.

Further approval of this project would divert attention in the community to mobilizing and trying to make efforts to have their voices heard, diverting attention from other pressing social and community issues. It could increase social divisions and tensions, and I strongly believe it would also impact on the credibility of the CNSC, on the mining sector, and of the federal government.

So I do not accept that the CNSC cannot and should not examine social acceptability in your deliberation.

Moving on to another aspect, which clearly is within the mandate of the CNSC and which you acknowledge, is, is the question of water.

I cannot understand how the CNSC is recommending approval of this project, how the staff are recommending approval of this project when we have not yet seen a robust, hydroelectric model for this project. In

trying to explain this project to somebody who does not have a technical understanding of mining, but that it was a two and a half kilometre, five metre by five metre shaft into permeable sandstone. The person replied, “Oh, you mean they’re digging a well.” “Yes, pretty much.” That shaft will fill with water

And yet all we have is back of the envelope calculations about how much water will be extracted. We have no real rigorous review of the cone of depression or the effect that the ramp will have on surrounding groundwaters, springs and wetlands.

Much has been made about the success of uranium mining in Saskatchewan. Mining Watch is fairly familiar with the activities in Saskatchewan and to a degree there is a certain rigour of monitoring and oversight by the CNSC; however, the picture portrayed by the CNSC I find to be very one-sided and quite frankly inaccurate.

Is there not toxic elevated levels of uranium sediments in Hidden Bay, downstream of Rabbit Lake? Is the Key Lake Tailing's impalement not leeching contaminants into the surrounding groundwater? Are there not lakes that have been closed to fishing because of contamination?

Some of these impacts may be due to past

activities and some of the uranium company, well, there's only two uranium companies operating, but Cameco I know in particular, has gone to considerable measures to improve the affluent quality that's going into Hidden Bay. However, completely ignoring the fact that there's toxic uranium contamination in that bay, I find this very disingenuous and misleading. It also took some years of studies, and investment, and improvement to get to that point.

The idea that CNSC will walk in and lock down an operation that's found to be affecting the environment, I also find to be problematic. Yes, there is a requirement to do environmental effects monitoring of uranium mines, but if a problem is detected, what that does is it does not mean the operation will be shut down, it means there will be further studies.

And these studies have to examine the source of the contamination and what particular components in the affluent are causing the problems; the scope and magnitude of the problem have to be defined, and these studies can take several years before the problem may actually be addressed.

We've heard much today already about the fact that this is just an exploration project and that we're not talking about mining yet, but I view this

approval and previous approvals as a wedge to further push this project into implementation.

The more money that is invested, Strateco stated I believe $100 million have already been invested; many more millions will be invested should this approval go forward. The more money is invested the harder and harder it becomes to have an objective decision about this project not moving forward. The harder it will be for all levels of government to say, whoa, okay, maybe this wasn't such a good idea in the first place.

And so examining this proposal without the context of a full-blown potential uranium mine, one of what -- one the CNSC staff said was a potential 20 exploration projects in the area, to me is unconscionable.

To finish, I think there is an opportunity here for the CNSC, even if you don't see beyond your own version of your narrow mandate, to flag the controversy that exists within this community, the complete inability of Strateco to achieve a social license to operate here in the community, and to encourage, whether it be the Quebec government or the federal government to not proceed with this project.

I'd also like to clarify, perhaps accusation is too strong a word, but a statement made by Strateco that there's been significant resources put into

educating the community from outside sources. Sounds very dark and nefarious doesn't it? Outside sources trying to influence the opinion of the Cree.

If Mining Watch was being alluded to in that statement I can assure you that the resources we have at our exposal are extremely limited.

I've spent a total of maybe two weeks of my time reviewing documents, writing up a brief fact sheet, which we had photocopied on black and white paper and distributed during the last hearings. I know that a local community group got a mini grant, a mini, mini grant of $3,000 to do some of their own work.

So the outside resources coming into this community to influence opinion are miniscule compared to the resources that Strateco has in its efforts, accompanied with the CNSC and its efforts, to convince people that uranium mining is safe and would be in their best interest.

(Applause/Applaudisements)

I also think the Cree people have the ability to evaluate the information that's put forward to them and make up their own mind about uranium mining in their territory.

So I implore the Commission to acknowledge the controversy that's here, to acknowledge the lack of

social acceptability, to view your mandate in all of its fullness, and to not provide further approvals to this project so that we aren't continuing to discuss social acceptability of this project at the next step down the road.

Thank you very much for your time. I welcome your questions.

(Applause/Applaudisements)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Monsieur Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: Merci, Monsieur President. I would like the staff to comment on when Mr. Hart touched upon -- when talking of the Saskatchewan picture, and he mentioned the fact that we can find some contamination, some bay, he mentioned a bay, and some points where you can find something.

So I would like the staff to elaborate on that and maybe to give the exact picture of the -- that region.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal for the record.

Mr. Harvey, I would like to clarify one thing to the Commission member. The intervener is penalizing the fact that the work, what the CNSC staff has done by saying calculation on back of the envelope with respect to hydrology assessment, with respect to experience in Saskatchewan.

Before I pass it on to my colleague, as the executive vice president responsible for the credibility of staff and the credibility of the CNSC that is providing you recommendation, I would like to rebut such allegation that back of envelope calculations, misquoting experience we've gained from Saskatchewan. Picking on elements that probably I would say more of a fear mongering aspect than factual, it's much fictional.

So with respect to the saying the fact that as you're doing the analysis for this tunnel you are drilling a well that's going to flood. I will pass it on to our expert in order to provide that response.

However, as in any type of exploration, you will do the modeling and methodology first, so you know what you're getting into, and as you start to approach and exercise the work and do the work you will make assessments as the project is being done in order to get what we call "field observation" to adjust, fix, or amend with respect to the environment that the project is proceeding to, and adjusting to ensure safety at all times.

With respect to the Saskatchewan experience, we have decades of experience. The intervener is correct when he says there are some legacy issues. Times have changed, technology have changed, capacity of

treatment of effluent have changed, and as I mentioned before: As everything is weighed within the health limit without the impact on the environment.

Otherwise, I'll pass it on to Dr. Thompson in order to get the precision from that perspective.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

I'll address the uranium and sediment and the banning of fish consumption in lakes and those issues, and then I will ask Son Nguyen to talk about the hydrological conditions at the Matoush site and what type of modeling was done and what will be obtained in terms of data if the Commission issues a licence.

In terms of the lakes that are close to fishing because of uranium impact, there are no currently operating mines where there is a ban on fish consumption because of uranium mining.

The only lakes that there – aware of, where fish consumption is not recommended is on the decommissioned Beaverlodge site.

This is a site that was in operation up until 1982 where it was decommissioned, it was never licensed by AECB or the CNSC. It is essentially lakes that were filled with tailing,

This is a practice that is no longer

acceptable and CNSC staff has been, for a number of years, requiring that additional mitigation measures be put in place to stabilize the situation at Beaverlodge.

In terms of uranium in the settlement at Hidden Bay, CNSC staff and the Midnight East were the first environmental risk assessments specialists and scientists to require that environmental impact statements for uranium mining look at impacts to settlements.

The tradition had been to look at water concentration of contaminants and contaminants in fish, were well aware of the situation of uranium in the settlement at Hidden Bay. It is a very small spatial extent and the reason why we required, we recommended that the Commission put a licence condition on the Rabbit Lake licence, was to deal with the uranium in effluent situations.

The CNSC staff with Environment Canada did a very detailed assessment of the uranium impacts on mines in Saskatchewan. And the Rabbit Lake mine, at the time, was releasing a lot of uranium and we -- the Commission put a licence condition on the Rabbit Lake licence. A lot of work was done to implement new treatment technology and that problem is under control.

In terms of the environmental effects monitoring programs under the Metal Mining Effluent

Regulations, what the intervenor has not mentioned is that the CNSC implemented environmental effects monitoring programs along with the Province of Saskatchewan before they became a requirement of the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations.

When those regulations came into place, there were very detailed monitoring programs in place and the special studies that the intervenor talks about had been done.

And so, in many cases, and good examples are the selenium and molybdenum issues were dealt with as a result of environmental effects monitoring programs before there was a requirement to do this under the Metal Mining Effluent Regulations.

I will now ask Dr. Nguyen to talk about the hydrogeological conditions modeling and additional data will be gathered if the Commission issues a licence for exploration.

MR. NGUYEN: Son Nguyen, for the record.

With respect to the hydrogeological study around -- in the vicinity of the ramp, the proponent has performed campaign of hydrogeological investigations by performing four boreholes through the different formation that is going to -- that the ramp is going to cross.

So they measure permeability, they measure

water levels. And with this hydrogeological information, there was some preliminary calculations in order to calculate the possible, the maximum and the probable inflow that could occur into the crown openings, the ramp openings.

So that estimate was made. It is also recognized that those estimates are based on the best information at the time and it is also recognized that there might be higher inflow when the ramp's structure crosses structural features such as the Appalachian Fault and the contacts between the different geological units.

So there is a recognition that the estimate from the preliminary modelling could be exceeded at some structural features.

As for contingency, the Company proposed to -- the water -- to reduce the permeability of the formation when problematic hydrogeological conditions are encountered.

So, this would be performed by advancing prop hose before the ramp would be excavated when high inflow areas are detected by those prop hose, there would be contingency measures to reduce the inflow to the target level of 100 cubic meters per hour, which is predicted from the preliminary modeling.

So, those measures could include things

like injection of grout into grout cottons in order to reduce the permeability, storing the excess water, or increasing the pumping and the treatment capacity. But that might need another -- it might need some modifications. That would be the last resort that would need some modifications to the licence conditions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Monsieur Harvey?

MR. HART: Mr. President, may I respond?

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MR. HART: Thank you. I certainly did not mean to offend the scientific rigor or the credibility of the CNSC by my offending comment about back of the envelope calculations.

But in the original 100-meter cube estimate, there is nothing in any of the documentation that I reviewed that showed where that number actually came from. And I would submit -- I'm not a hydrogeologist, so I honestly don't know. But, for a 2.4-kilometer ramp, four boreholes and no real quantification of the influence of the fault features, it just doesn't sound like a rigorous application of science to me. I am a scientist, but I'm not a hydrogeologist.

Also, I failed to point out, it is in my written submission, but another estimate provided in the Company's own technical report from February 12th of this

year provides an estimate that's 45 times greater than the so-called most likely scenario of 40 meters cubes an hour.

I'm not a hydrogeologist; I can't evaluate those two discrepan -- those two numbers, but I am for the Commission and to put the resources you have at your disposal to more fully investigate that issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco?

MR. TERREAULT: For the record, Pierre H. Terreault.

The hundred cubic meters per hour was an estimation for the preliminary design of the water treatment plant and it was done as 80 cubic meters from underground and 20 meters from surface. That was based on estimation from other mines in Saskatchewan. And we could add it more -- Mr. Bruce Fielder could add more on this evaluation.

Why we went to 40 cubic meters an hour is the more realistic thing we did find for the development of the ramp itself. Presently, we don't have any water; we're losing water from the holes, so we expect no water really.

Yes, as the CNSC said, we had a procedure to -- we'll do boreholes when we will arrive from a critical point in the ramp, as the article fault. We already sent this procedure to the CNSC and they know

exactly what we'll do to make sure that we won't have any problem with the water underground.

The estimation of the mining contractor was, say, more than 12 cubic meters per hour. In the working area, everything will stop and we'll start to -- one of the thing will be grout, as your staff said. So, that's already in place with the mining contractor too.

So, I will pass the microphone to Bruce Fielder who can give more information about that 100 cubic meters an hour.

MR. FIELDER: This is Bruce Fielder, Principal Process Engineer from Saskatoon.

Had 31 years of experience in uranium mining. The 100 cubic meters is based upon what I estimated to be the likely amount of water coming in which was 20 cubic meters an hour, which in itself was based upon the inflow from the Cigar Lake mine when it was under care and maintenance.

I, essentially, multiplied by five the other safety factor and was also aware that there was going to be surface water to be treated.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Monsieur Harvey?

Anybody else?

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDill: Has CNSC staff run a proper numerical analysis with these numbers?

MR. NGUYEN: Son Nguyen, for the record.

CNSC staff did provide performance on preliminary calculation based on numerical quotes based on the element method. And we found that that number could be exceeded -- the 100 cubic meters per hour could be exceeded in some instances where you cross full formation where the permeability may be higher than the average permeability of the overall rock formation.

But the bottom line is with the contingency measures that are in place to reduce the inflow rate by doing grouting and this kind of thing and the companies committed to maintain that 100 cubic metres per hour. So that was the -- our assessment of the situation.

MEMBER McDILL: I know Mr. Jammal wants to add something, but is that analysis available to the people here, to the Cree?

It seems to me that that there’s a statement here that there is some confusion. CNSC analysis should be available, should it not?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record. We’ll make it available to anybody who would like to have it, and to review it. There is one thing I would like to summarize in non-technical terms, if I could, with respect

to, there has been discussion of 20 cubic metres, 40 cubic metres. As part of the design, assessment and the safety margin and the contingency plan in place, CNSC staff did the risk assessment at 100 cubic metres. So in other words, you are taking a factor of -- a factor of five if it’s based on 20 metres cubed, and that’s what we built the safety margin assessment on. And taking -- I’m trying to say here, it’s worst-case scenario, but what possibly can happen, what’s the worst case that it can happen and there is contingency plan in place that will even lead to leave the water as is without any -- taking any other measures from that perspective.

I’ll ask Mr. Jean Leclair if he’s got anything else to add.

MR. LECLAIR: Yeah, I think -- Jean Leclair, for the record.

One thing worth perhaps emphasizing is the importance that when the ramp is being mined out, Strateco has made a commitment to do borehole drilling to verify the conditions as they advance in the ramp, and they have mentioned the ability to grout, to take actions.

This is, again, this is not something that’s unusual in mine development, that if you have areas where you have a higher potential for water inflow is to seal it off so that the water doesn’t come in.

Strateco has made a commitment and the basis of their -- of their licence application is based on a 100 cubic metres per hour. So it's CNSC staff's expectation they'll do what actions are necessary; mitigation measures, grouting, pressure grouting, grout curtains, whatever physical works need to be done to ensure that the water flow that comes in down into the ramp doesn't exceed the design capacity of the 100 cubic metres per hour.

MEMBER McDILL: Mr. Hart, would you like to see that analysis?

MR. HART: Absolutely. I'm not sure that me reading it would be all that helpful, but I'd certainly like to have someone with more technical background have a look at it. I did find, in my research, a report done for a proposed niobium mine outside of Oka, Quebec, in an area with ground hydrologic condivities similar to the Matouch Project and, again, the estimated volumes were considerably greater than any that have been discussed here today.

Also, there was a two-kilometre depression in the surface groundwater estimated of about three metres and I haven't heard anyone mention an analysis of the groundwater drawdown. If that's been done, I haven't been able to find it.

MEMBER McDILL: So question to the Proponent, how fast will you advance in the drift or in the ramp on a daily basis?

MR. TERREAULT: Pierre Terreault, for the record.

We're estimating between two and three round per day which will be roughly about 24 to 36 feet per day.

MEMBER McDILL: So let's say 10 metres per day?

MR. TERREAULT: Roughly, yes.

MEMBER McDILL: And at each day, how often will you be drilling for tests?

MR. TERREAULT: Well, we won't be every day, we'll do two holes for a 100 or 200 metres long or 300 metres long, and then we'll know exactly if we've got any problems with water, then we'll stop drilling. And then we'll start the development again.

But as the sequence will go, will go like that. Not -- we won't be every day, we'll do one pass alone or diamond drill and then we'll do the development as we know the consequence or if we got water or not. We'll know it then.

MEMBER McDILL: And, staff, is that advance fairly traditional, and could you answer the depression

question as well?

MR. NGUYEN: With respect to the cone of drawdown or the -- I think the concern is the lowering of the water level in these surface water bodies. So with the contingency plan in place, when the inflow is limited to 100 cubic metres per hour, that should limit the amount of drawdown, but we haven't done any specific calculation to quantify that drawdown yet.

MR. LECLAIR: Jean Leclair, for the record.

With regards to the advanced drilling, because of the fact they're saying they're drilling a 100 metres, they're actually then assessing and analysing over 100 metre length. So that would suggest you could go 10 rounds so 10 10-metre advancements before you would get to now a new zone, at which point in time, you then drill again.

So the idea is that -- if I'm understanding Mr. Terreault correctly, is that the intent would be to drill long lengths to assess over a longer length of development prior to doing the actual development.

You could do it shorter, you could do it longer. Either way would work.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, anybody else? No?

I got one question. Now, with a bit of hindsight, you kept talking about Strateco not doing the

right thing to get social acceptability. By the way, with -- there is no -- people using the word social licence, it's not a licence, we're not in the licensing award, but social acceptability we have a concern about. What would -- advice could they ever gather the social acceptability on this project? What would they have to do?

MR. HART: The term "social licence" is widely used in the mining sector, so I use it -- equivalent term is "social acceptability," I'm well aware that there's no piece of paper to be issued. And, it's a complex question. How do you define it? How do you obtain it?

Many of us, myself included, have fundamental concerns about uranium mining from both the mining aspect, but also through the entire nuclear fuel chain.

I know that the CNSC, de facto, doesn't share those concerns, but many people do. And there are many people that you will never be able to convince that uranium mining is the right thing to do.

On the other hand, there are some people that are willing to accept the trade-offs. That needs a broad public debate, and the people of Quebec have been asking for that debate. They haven't necessarily gotten it.

The people of Mistissini have been trying to do it on their own over the last two years, I would say, really since the November 2010 meeting. And so far it seems that they have fundamental concerns about uranium mining. Not necessarily about the ramp, although there is some concerns around that as well. I'm not going to try to speak to all of their concerns, they can do that better than I can.

So I guess the short answer is I'm not sure that Strateco will ever get the social acceptability of social licence to pursue this project in the Cree territory. Other mining projects that have achieved social licence for less concerning minerals, gold, base metals, what have you, respect and open communications have been crucial. Humility, willingness to slow down and to take a step back when there's concerns and oppositions being put forward rather than trying to push things ahead on your own agenda are some of the characteristics that responsible mining companies have used to obtain social licence or acceptability.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I'm just trying to understand the Miningwatch Canada you -- Miningwatch Canada will really, if I understood what you just said, will never really go -- get behind the uranium mine, no matter what happens.

MR. HART: Correct. For Miningwatch Canada, uranium, along with asbestos are two minerals that we feel are probably best left in the ground. But Miningwatch Canada doesn't really get to have a say in this decision, aside from making comments at hearing like this, or, you know, writing things up on our Web site. I don't pretend to be a key decision-maker in this process, unlike the Cree of Mistissini who are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

The next submission is an oral presentation by the InnuPower and Sept-Îles sans uranium as outlined in CMD 12-H7.26. ...

C'était Monsieur Fafard?

M. FAFARD: Oui, bonjour, Monsieur le Président.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Alors on a écouté déjà Monsieur Robinson.

C'était Monsieur Fafard?

M. FAFARD: Oui, bonjour, Monsieur le Président.

LE PRÉSIDENT: Alors on a écouté déjà M. Robinson.

M. FAFARD: Effectivement, il devrait être en ligne.

THE CHAIRMAN: We heard from him already. Est-ce qu'on va avoir une autre ronde? Non?

MR. FAFARD: The Commission said he was on, but I don't hear anything.

MR. ROBINSON: Yes, I'm here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I hope you're not going to repeat what you said about a couple of hours ago and give us something new in here. So hello.

12-H7.26
Oral presentation by
InnuPower and *Sept-Iles*
***sans uranium* (SISUR)**

MR. FAFARD: That was the point. I'll go in first and explain a little bit how we were doing this.

Sept-Îles sans uranium or SISUR is a citizen-formed based group that was formed in 2008 when exploration companies were starting to talk about exploring on the North Shore, in Magany, in Sept-Iles, in Gaspésie and, of course, in Mistissini.

We have a fair bit of experience and knowledge and information about uranium mining that we've

gathered over those four years. We've been in Saskatchewan. We've been represented and partnered with all kinds of groups and helped different regions and regional groups setting up so that they can put up a good fight with this industry, and as Mining Watch Canada, I guess nobody will convince us that uranium mining is necessary and a good thing for the territory.

We have hired, this time, Paul Robinson, and partnered up with InnuPower. My friend Innu just went to relax and sleep. This is tiring to hear on the translation and everything all day long, so he's not present right now, Roger Michel, he's back to the bus, and we decided to separate the presentation in two because there was too much to be asked for the Cree people aspect of the project and more global Quebec, North Shore and the whole province type of aspects that SISUR wants to put forward.

So Mr. Robinson did the work as a complete one set of notes, but there's enough material so that we can both use that. So I'll let Mr. Paul Robinson talk in a few seconds, but I wanted to talk about Saskatchewan.

Mr. Binder, you earlier said the impacts are not noticeable. I was, last fall, in Hatchet Lake and there was a group that was invited who wanted to be treated -- or the Natives there, the Dene, wanted to treat

us to some caribou, and for the occasion they had to take a twin otter plane and fly out for about $25,000 so that they could reach the caribou and bring it back to the party on the reserve because the caribou doesn't go as close to the reserve as it used to do before the mining was there.

So that's a real social impact. The mining activity pushed away the caribou, even though it didn't make it sick or disappear, but for the Natives right there on the spot, it's an expensive and non-accessible way of doing their hunting. So for the record.

So, Mr. Robinson, I will let you the speaker.

MR. ROBINSON: Bonjour.

MR. FAFARD: Hello. So you can start, Paul.

MR. ROBINSON: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

I've listened with great interest to the last series of statements, and many of them related to comments that I made earlier, and what I've heard provided an opportunity to expand on.

The questions from the Commission have included many questions that recognize the cumulative effects facing the Cree, involving the road and other

mining activities that are going on.

This forum provides an opportunity to discuss the impacts of the single project and the supporting environmental statements and other Commission review documents do not address this cumulative impact that all Cree now face.

So hopefully the Commission realizes that this raises questions about these other issues that aren’t on the table regarding today’s licence, that those are sources of impact in the communities, and when the time comes for opinion, there may be some opinions formed, but it’s quite clear that the Commission recognizes that there’s many impacts beside just this one uranium project that’s proposed.

I was particularly disturbed to hear the CNSC staff say that there isn’t a closure plan in place for the exploration added -- the exploration ramp in response to the Commissioner’s questions. And they thought, as I understood the statement, that they might propose backfill.

That exploration ramp is part of the proposal that the Commission is being asked to consider, and having a closure plan should be part of the decommissioning at the time of licensing.

The preliminary decommissioning plan, if

it’s going to include a whole range of proposed activities, should address the exploration ramp.

So I’m clear from what the Commission staff said whether the closure by backfill is fully funded if the financial guarantee is established at the 5.5 million, and it should be as a matter of licence issuance, in my opinion.

There also was not an answer to the Commission question, “Is there an example of this in place?” There weren’t examples of backfilled uranium mines that have been fully decommissioned with no long-term impact. That’s the proposal staff said was the likely closure scenario. “Proposed”, I believe, was the term used. There are no examples that work, that can be shown to work, and will the full financial assurance be in place for that particular part of the plan at this stage?

I don’t believe that’s the case. The licence calls for a -- Strateco has committed to ensuring the procedures for advancing through any potential fault or developed and implemented prior to advancing the ramp. Those procedures should be in place prior to getting the licence, because the licence approves the ramp.

This lack of detail on the fault is maybe not as humorous as the joke Mr. Matoush had in mind, but when I look at page 43 of the 2012 Matoush Technical

Report, I see that the ore is focused on the fault zone and that that is where they're going to be trying to approach the resource that they've identified.

So knowing about that fault as a hydrologic and rock mass is fundamental to the work that's been done so far. The ability to use the four boreholes and other information to demonstrate the modelling that's been used, that should be part of the application prior to licensing with respect to the hydrologic concerns.

Cigar Lake is also the example of the worst mine inflow problem in Canadian uranium mining history and in the world's uranium mining industry, and the inflows that have occurred at Cigar Lake were not projected. There were two massive inflows that shut down the activities of the mine and required major re-planning of what would be the largest uranium mine in Canadian history.

So the CNSC and uranium miners all know about this major problem of mine water inflow, and here we have a proposal for a mine that's in sandstone, that's under lakes, and there is not the level of preparation that should be in place for recognizing that example. There's lots to be learned from Cigar Lake, and having a fuller hydrologic assessment at the time of licensing is, I think, fundamentally important and overdue.

There’s a bulking factor when it comes to storing mined material back in the hole. So there’s typically a 50 percent bulking factor. So at least half the material removed is going to need a permanent repository. So there will be permanent waste sites even if the exploration ramp project is as far as the facility goes. So there will be need for permanent monitoring and maintenance of that portion of the waste piles.

The alternative shaft-sinking models, where grouting while shaft sinking or other methods were not proposed. They're only being proposed as remedies in case the initial method is not successful. And so those contingencies should be identified and planned for so that the grounding equipment is in place if shaft inflow exceeds the expectations.

I thought I heard the CNSC staff say that they found that the 100 cubic metres per hour could be exceeded even though it was more than five times the model used. And so identifying that calculation, evaluating it and determining what the factor of safety should be about that so the Whitney wastewater treatment capacity exceeds the need as a margin of safety.

That, I found a very revealing statement. And I think that the experience up in Saskatchewan and in Elliot Lake are very important experiences for the Cree

since those are First Nations who had their lives changed by mining, the impacts not only with respect to health risks, the social impacts and the change in cultural practices. Attempting to moose hunt or trap beaver in an area where there's 20 uranium exploration projects and five or 10 drill wigs per project, that makes for a much more difficult challenge than just having one little project of three to five holes per year. And that's what the Cree hunters face.

So the scale of impact is quite large and isolating the Matoush Project of Strateco doesn't give a fair representation of the range of insults to culture and land that are affecting the Otish Mountains at this time.

Again, thank you very much for the opportunity to make a statement to the Commission and still I am available for questions if there are any.

MR. FAFARD: Thank you Paul. I will follow up with a series of questions that are more citizen type of language questions. But that were asked, that I bring forward and put to the audience jury.

The first one is: Is the rock -- the natural rock in Saskatchewan -- how does it compare to in the Arthabasca Basin to the rock structure in the Otish Basin?

Second question: When you talk about

ventilating the ramp and the mining shaft, does the radon and the micro-particles, are they being taken out of this air before the air is ejected out into the nature?

Other question: What is the quantity of radon total that will be emitted by the drilling mining activity, and the residue of sterile piles over this proposed mining project -- or pilot mining project?

Next question: In terms of guarantee, we heard talks this morning about $5 million, $6 million for reclamation; what was -- can we have more explanation on what will be done to do this reclamation with the $5 million?

Next question: Purpose of drilling this big ramp, this morning it was said by the Commission that this drilling of a ramp is purposely done to study the hydro-geological formation or the water will give us data on the actual water situation within this rock. Such a big hole for -- I think it's kind of a bad excuse so I want more information on why we have to drill such a big ramp to get information on rock qualities and characterizations.

Next question: The licensing obligations to the company Strateco in terms of characterizing some more to get database on different lacking data that were not in the “étude d'impact” that was proposed to be done in the next year or in the 12-month period. They've got such a

nice camp and they're so well installed, why can't this work be done right now and be supplied to, as an addendum to the documents that were sent to the federal COMEX and COFEX? That's one more question.

About the COMEX, why is it not available, the federal government part or the COFEX has made public their report from their set of audiences, the Québec provincial side has not made it public. I think this is an important issue for the people of the province to be aware of what their government is thinking. And I think it's also the responsibility of the Commission to make sure that all the parties do their part on making sure that the parties inform well the citizens. That's basically why you are there, so that the information circulates. So why isn't the COMEX available?

Next question would be ---

THE CHAIRMAN: How many question do you have, when you think of an answer there ---

MR. FAFARD: There's 12 or 13. There's three or four more left. I talk for quite a big group on the north shore so there's ---

THE CHAIRMAN: That -- we're talking about this project, not the north shore.

MR. FAFARD: Exact, they're all about this project. And to tell you, Mr. Binder, the Project is 40

kilometres from the watershed of the Lac St-Jean, which is the first watershed that flows to the north shore. So in terms of distances, the dust and the radon is not that far from the Lac St-Jean watershed and the north shore, 40 kilometres, okay.

Storage facilities, the pit, I heard Mr. Seinwind (phon.) tell us in Sept-Îles that all the facilities that residue vesol (phon.) or pits leak. Does this mean that we have a guarantee of contamination with this project since it's got lined pit and it's above ground and the experience in Canada is now -- even the pilot project in Saskatchewan with the open mine pit system is leaking and that technically all pits do leak; so how much do we expect contamination after five years?

And then, as I would like to end this presentation on saying that I am so pleased to see the Cree people so well organized and filling this room right here and taking part of these audiences to make sure that their point of view is brought forward.

I'm a little bit depressed on seeing how less attraction or how much -- how little media attention and how little information was sent south to the rest of the province of Québec since, as the employees of the Commission have mentioned in their report, it's the first uranium mine, or mining, in Québec. There should be more

of a debate over is -- does Québec really want to become an uranium producer and especially a manager of radioactive uranium mining waste?

I'd also like to say that there's already 325 municipalities in Québec that have -- that put forward resolutions saying that they want no uranium mining in Québec. So 325 towns have already technically sent out resolutions to the government. Are you aware that there is this big debate in Québec that's kind of under the lid of the industry and the present government that we're having? But I think it's your responsibility as the Canadian federal representative in terms of safety for nuclear matters to make sure that the province of Québec becomes informed and takes, or really have a chance, the citizens of Québec have a real chance of participating in this whole history moment, which will be the embarking of the Québec province into this nuclear industry and uranium business.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. FAFARD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'll go to staff and try to do quick, quick, quick answers.

MR. JAMMAL: Mr. Jammal for the record. We'll pass on the Radon question to Mr. Schryer.

MR. SCHRYER: Dennis Schryer, for the

record.

The -- I calculated a number of about 1,000 to 1,500 bequerels per cubic metre. That would be the point source of the exhaust coming out of the mine. That reflects a six air change per hour rate for the ventilation system, that's full ventilation operation.

The radon gas typically is not filtered, it's an inert gas and it diffuses so you can't filter the radon gas. However, the dust will be likely controlled at the source with use of water. And there are -- I just might add as well there will these particulates because of the use of these engines and blasting gases underground.

Also, I guess that pretty much answers the -- sorry, the radon question for you. Thank you.

MR. JAMMAL: Just for the record, as we did an oral presentation, what does this mean from Mr. Schryer’s technical perspective? As we did an oral presentation by CNSC staff that the average radon concentration in Canadian homes versus what is on site, the Matoush site, I’m just going to have to go by memory, it’s around 17 to 19 becquerels per metre cube whereas as the average radon concentration in the homes of Canada is around 40 to 45.

So that is, to answer the intervenor’s question, with respect to the radon on site, is a fraction

of what we find normally occurring in homes and it's almost half what is occurring, natural occurring in the houses in Quebec.

With respect to the rock structure, I will pass it on to Dr. Nguyen.

MR. FAFARD: Can I make a comment?

THE CHAIRMAN: Let him answer all the questions, then we can go back again, do another round.

MR. FAFARD: It would be fine to deal with the comment on the question and finish it right now, like the radon one.

THE CHAIRMAN: We didn't answer it. Let them finish what they are on.

Go.

DR. NGUYEN: Son Nguyen, for the record.

With respect to the rock mass, mechanical properties, there is no direct comparison possible between the Matoush situation and I guess it's the Cigar Lake situation that the intervenor was referring to. It is obvious that the mineralization is always a component with fracturing of the rock, which is a conduit for the mineral to form in the first place.

So the more -- the higher the crate, the more fracturing you would get. So Cigar Lake is to staff's opinion is a much less competent type of rock as

compared to the Matoush sandstone where the ramp is going to be excavated, so that would be for the –- and the two mechanical analysis that the proponent has performed has shown that the strength of the sandstone is good, very good, and there shouldn’t be any major structural stability problem by excavating the ramp from that formation except when it crosses features, like fault zones and discontinuities where stabilization measure could be port, like mashing, bolting and the use of crowd cables.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, again quickly, what about the decommission in 5.5 and the Comex report?

MR. LECLAIR: I’ll correct from previous statements that were made. The preliminary decommissioning plan includes all activities, including the decommissioning of the ramp, which includes backfilling of the ramp, letting the waste rock down into the ramp. So that’s all included in the preliminary decommissioning plan that was part of the review that was done.

Perhaps Strateco themselves can provide further details with regards to the plan itself but it is included and that is covered within the overall preliminary decommissionary plan and the financial guarantees that go with it.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

There was a question about the Comex report and essentially the process that was followed under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement was that the project required an assessment under the provincial authorities, the Comex, and the federal authorities, the Cofex.

The Cofex report has been finalized. The federal administrator has made a decision. CNSC staff were informed that the provincial administrator was going to take into consideration the outcome and findings and information from the CNSC hearings on the licence before making the decision to make sure that all the information that needed to be taken into consideration by the provincial administrator would be taken into consideration.

MEMBER HARVEY: Just to follow that, how come the report from the Comex is not public? Is it always like this or is the –- is it made public when the decision has been made? What’s the process?

THE CHAIRMAN: The decision by Comex has not been made.

MEMBER HARVEY: No, not the decision, the report.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the

record.

I’m not sure I’m able to answer that question appropriately. My understanding is that the Comex makes recommendations to the provincial administrator. How those recommendations are made and in what form, I don’t think I could answer that. There will be somebody from the -- le MDDEP -- when we’re in Chibougamau and perhaps that person would be able to provide a better answer to that question.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Monsieur Fafard, now is your rebuttal.

MR. FAFARD: About the radon, we are all aware of the concentration factors and numbers. My question was more of the quantity over the time of this permit or licence for say the radon becomes lead 210. So how many kilos of lead 210 are we going to spread in the area? That’s pushing the radon towards what it really is. It won’t just disappear and go away as smoke.

It becomes lead and it will eventually fall on the ground and the question is how much, how many kilograms of lead 210 are we going to have spread around? And from the residue pile also, I didn’t think we got the numbers. You brought out the quantities for the evacuation on the vents but for the residue piles and the

sterile piles, do we have a calculation of those numbers? It’s fairly important.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

In terms of the waste rock piles, perhaps Mr. Schryer has the information but I wanted to provide some context to the questions that are being asked.

Essentially the questions are being asked to have very, very, very huge numbers in terms of thousands of becquerels that are being put out in the air giving the impression that a significant portion of the region will be covered in radioactive dust. That is science fiction. It has nothing to do with reality.

The concentrations of radon around active mine sites in regions where there are several uranium mines have levels of radon that are similar to the rest of Canada where no uranium mining is occurring.

We have monitoring in place to monitor radioactive dust, lead 210, polonium 210 around mine sites, in vegetation, on blueberries, on dust collectors and essentially the concentrations are generally not detectable.

So becquerels is a huge number but in terms of the actual quantity, the quantities are small and they are being dispersed in a way that there is no radioactive

contamination of a territory by radioactive dust.

MR. FAFARD: That’s the same argument we were hearing from the tobacco companies when they were saying –- and they went exactly the opposite way than Mrs. Thompson is doing right now.

They were saying the radon from the phosphorous “angrais” the -- l’angrais chimique qui est mis dans le fond de la terre -- contains some of the decays that become radon and they are very small, small quantities but we’ve studied and we’ve seen the effects and proven in the States that they are direct links for cancer, for lung cancer, from smoking but from very, very small quantities and these quantities do have an impact on the tobacco of cigarettes.

So imagine what the impact is on the lichen and the animals that are eating that and making that available to the food chains source. And small numbers in terms of grams of lead 210 which is radioactive, I still didn’t get an answer.

Madame Thompson brought us back to concentration of radon and particles around piles but there are studies from the University of Saskatchewan that do just that characterization and they come out with quite fair numbers that are appreciable.

And we saw in France, “la crérade” (phon.)

measuring for lead 210 to find the traces of radon and they're fairly measurable and they're not mini quantities coming from the Star Trek theatre of the story there on the side. I don't think that's a reasonable answer that I got from the Commission.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson.

If I could clarify. In terms of the -- around the Matoush site for exposure to someone who would spend a considerable amount of time, either people working on the camp or trapping around the site, the doses from radioactive dust, so contamination varies wildlife, et cetera is .000 something millisievert, so it is very small. It can be modeled but in terms of being able to measure it, it is very difficult to measure because it is so low.

In terms of Polonium 210 and caribou, it's a very well-known phenomenon; lichens across the North, in the Arctic, have high levels of polonium because the radon naturally comes out of the ground.

Caribou are known to have very high levels of -- and very high doses from polonium. It's a natural phenomenon; it is not linked to uranium mining.

MR. FAFARD: How much more, is the question, again, are we going to put in circulation in consequences of this mining activity? We know it's there

naturally, but how much, in terms of grams, of polonium-210 is going to be set out or distributed as salt or pepper in the environment? And we need to have a number; that’s a fairly important factor if we -- we want to have a mine, but some of the negatives impact; one of them is that we’re going to spread around radioactive material and we’re not able to get the amount that we are going to purposely do spread around by having the mine. This is not stuff that we can manage and keep contained. This is stuff that we are sending into the atmosphere so my question is -- so we can decide if we want to do this or not -- what is the quantity.

A picogram of polonium is enough to kill you and if we look at secondary smoking -- smokes -- or secondary smoke, we saw Canada did everything it could because there’s minute chances that you will get cancer from secondary smoke, but you have to go 9 metres outside the door so you can smoke in respect with the law right now in Canada. The chances were so fine they were 1 in 000 -- in billions, but we still have that recommendation on. This is the same thing; we’re going to be spreading out polonium-210 which will become permanent lead-210 which is half-life is 22 years and that will be sitting -- that’s extra stuff we’re bringing to the environment and that’s a big part of the decision-making, the plus and the

negative, and that’s a -- is it a big negative? Can we get a number?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay ---

MR. FAFARD: I’m sure everybody can calculate that ---

THE CHAIRMAN: --- let’s not -- let’s not go in circles here. Last word, maybe, talk about the actual health impact ---

MR. FAFARD: Not health impact, a number, Mr. Binder.

THE CHAIRMAN: **---** of – of -- et cetera.

MR. FAFARD: Quantity of kilograms.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, could you please answer that?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record. There’s a couple of things. There’s the myth with respect to the dispersion and the addition of the Po or Pollonium-210 with respect to the outside and I will ask Mr. Schryer, actually, to give the modelling aspect. We don’t have the picograms; we can get it. However, at -- at -- within a few hundred metres or a few tens of metres from this site, it’s no different than background; it’s no different from -- , from health perspective, and from quantity measurable in mass perspective.

I’ll pass you on to Mr. Schryer.

MR. SCHRYER: Denis Schryer, for the record. Just to complete the -- the calculation here, we -- I mentioned that we'd be looking at about a thousand to fifteen hundred becquerels per cubic metre; that's at the point source of the exhaust raise. That's assuming 2 millisieverts exposure that we showed this morning on our slide, which is a radiation unit of 0.03 working levels. The dispersion modelling will show that that 1,000 to 1,500 hundred would become -- be in the range of 10 to 20 becquerels per cubic metre at approximately 10 metres from the source. Thank you.

MR. FAFARD: There's -- there's one question that wasn't answered about all the pits leaking. Mr. Son never made comments about how much can we expect that we'll be leaking from that particular pit over five years or those three pits. And, afterwards, if the project doesn't go forward, they will be just buried as is. So how much can we expect of the material that is inside that can leak?

MR. NGUYEN: Can you clarify to me what you mean by pit; are you talking about the waste rock piles?

MR. FAFARD: Yes, I'm talking about the residue lined pit on -- above ground.

MR. NGUYEN: So that's -- that's no tailings pit from -- from this project, in particular.

There is a waste rock pile that was for the clean rock and then there’s a special waste rock pile for the -- the special waste which contains some contaminants. So the waste -- the special waste would be on HDPE liner, a high -- high density polyethylene liner, which has a longevity of about a hundred fifty years and which has a permeability which is almost zero -- practically zero. So we don’t expect any contamination seeping from that waste pile into the groundwater.

In addition to the -- the liner, there would be diverting ditches around the waste rock piles which are going to intercept precipitation and freshwater from contacting that -- that special waste.

MR. FAFARD: So it’ll be covered and lined then forever which is a hundred and fifty years, we know, at least it won’t be leaking?

MR. NGUYEN: The current plan -- Son Nguyen, again, for the record. The current plan for decommissioning of that special waste pile, if the project doesn’t go ahead, is to backfill all this special waste into the underground works.

MR. FAFARD: So that would be just the fine milled stuff and not -- which was a commercial value mineral and the rest of it which is radioactive; there’s no tailings, it’s all of it then?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, I think that's -- I think we've exhausted this particular subject. Thank you very much.

MR. FAFARD: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think I'm going to try to squeeze one more presentation before a break, if you can bear with us, and I -- I think the next presentation is an oral presentation by Sydon Consulting or Sydon Consulting as outlined in CMD 12-H7.50 and I understand Mr. Natomagan is going to make the presentation. Please proceed.

12-H7.50
Oral presentation by
Sydon Consulting Inc.

MR. NATOMAGAN: Thank you. For the -- for the record, my name is Clarence Natomagan and I'm -- and I'm an independent consultant out of Saskatchewan; business name is Sydon Consulting. And I'm originally from Pinehouse Lake, Saskatchewan, which is a 210 kilometres from the nearest mine site of Key Lake.

I was invited here by a couple members of the community to provide a general overview of my experience in Northern Saskatchewan and also the experience with the -- the industry in Saskatchewan.

I've been in the -- in the uranium mining industry since 1989. I garnered an entry level position cleaning trucks and cleaning facilities at the site. I'm working -- I worked my way up into the crushing facilities, processing facilities, packaging, all the way to water treatment.

And I also was a radiation safety officer, a health and safety officer at the -- at the sites in Northern Saskatchewan before I joined the CNSC as an Environmental Inspector and then shortly thereafter, I got promoted to a Project Officer at the Rabbit Lake operation and also was the Project Officer for the decommissioning of the Cluff Lake facility.

My academic background is environmental -- Radiation and Environmental Sciences, also a university education in Health and Safety.

I was first introduced to the -- the Cree Mineral Exploration Board, the CMEB, whose mandate is to provide information to people as it relates to mineral exploration. As a result, was formerly engaged to assist in providing information to the Cree of Mistissini about the Matoush Project.

My first visited the community was in October 2011. Mr. Allen Matoush, who also worked for the CMEB, at the time, introduced me to many of the community

members. My first visit -- visit, I spent eight days just talking with people. My visit was informal. I was here to listen to what the people were saying and I was here to listen to what Chief-in-council also had to say.

The point of my first visit was to let the community know that I was here to provide information on the Saskatchewan experience if they wanted it. I was trying also to obtain a sense of where people were at with the Matoush Project so that I may use that information in developing a communication strategy on behalf of the CMEB.

I drafted the communication strategy and submitted it to the CMEB. It included objectives to provide information about uranium mining and its regulation. The report included how we would address objectives through mechanisms such as radio-talk shows and information-centre discussions, debates, workshops, and through whatever means the people suggested. I didn’t get a chance to execute my work as it was impacted by a signed agreement in December 23rd at 2011. This agreement, I don’t believe, invalidates any future opportunities for the same work to be done. I continue to present myself to the community, Chief-in-council, Mr. Freddy Measkom (phon.), the community liaison to provide an open discussion on uranium matters. The new communication agreement gave me the tool to help us achieve those

objectives.

People know that mining can have an impact on health and safety; they will have an impact on our lands. The gold mine west of here and even further northwest of here have or will have impacts. New developments such as diamond mining will have an impact.

But I believe that is nothing as catastrophic as what it would be portrayed in the community. It certainly doesn’t mean our children and our future children will look the pictures depicted in the community I've seen here in the current visit. And it doesn’t mean that our animals, fish and berries are going to be ruined.

The uranium mining started in 1960 near my home, we too heard of the same atrocities, the same horror stories as I hear here. People from the south and people from the east scared us into rallying against development. As a result, we lost a lot of time in developing relationship with industry.

The people of Mistissini know how to work with development and its proponents. You can see it in their community, you can see it the DVS (phon.) presented in their 1971 fight against the provincial government. Back home we have come a long way but not as far as the Crees of northern Quebec.

Like I mentioned earlier, I worked in the uranium mining industry since 1989. I see or hear of no people or children ruined by the uranium industry in my community. I still am on our lands, I teach my children to hunt and fish and harvest in those same lands. My friends still hunt in those same lands. My aunt Mary still picks hundreds and hundreds of berries every year, hundreds and hundreds of pounds of berries every year from the same roads leading up to all those mine sites, and she's not all that energetic anymore.

In closing, what I'd like to say is that we have people, either project officers and the technical scientific staff within the CNSC, we have federal and provincial legislation, we have stakeholders such as the people of this land that ensures that mining companies will do what is required and what is right.

My Saskatchewan work experience has shown me that. In today's regulatory world, mining companies or companies do not have the luxury of doing what they want to do.

My recent business trip I took to Latsokinen (phon.) over the last month, I saw a poster of a young girl wearing a traditional mukluk on one foot and a high end brand name shoe on the other, and the poster read: “Learn to walk in both worlds.” To me that means we

continue to enjoy our land, teach our children our ways while living in a society that continues to change and advance.

I believe Mistissini's Communication Agreements and their previous experience will allow them to make an informed decision on whether or not they choose to live in both worlds.

Thank you.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, it's open, Mr. Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Merci, Monsieur le président.

You have been there several times and talking with people and talking of your experience. And hearing what we heard this morning, do you think your -- how don’t know many people heard what you said -- but you think your message hasn’t -- has not been correctly catched by people or you think it takes time before such message get through the way of thinking of a community?

MR. NATOMAGAN: The scope of my work was to collect information and develop a communication strategy to define what needed to be done in the community to hear the people and what they were saying, what they wanted to know about the industry. In doing that, I did submit my draft communication strategy. As I said, I didn’t have

the opportunity to implement the objectives within that communication strategy.

The point of that was to provide -- to help and assist the industry and the community in understanding what the Saskatchewan experience is and hearing it from a fellow aboriginal from northern Saskatchewan.

My goal was to provide neutral or general information about the industry. I wasn’t here to convince the community about what's good for them. It was merely provide the information that I felt that they should hear also, from both sides of the fence, and for them to make their own decision on whether or not they support industry in coming in to develop the lands in northern Quebec.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

The Cree Mineral Exploration Board, does it apply only to uranium or to all mining in the area?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I'm not entirely sure about the specifics of their mandate. All I know is that they represent I believe the nine community as part of the James Bay Agreement, that they provide information -- disseminate information as it relates to mineral exploration.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: So it's not just uranium

then? It's probably all metals explorations?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I would assume so.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: Roughly, how many members of the community have you spoken to?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I have a good listing of individuals and the homes and whether or not it is -- like the senior's home here, and radio -- the people at the radio station. I have a listing of that in my written submission.

I will mention though that I didn’t have an opportunity to sit down with members of the Youth Council, but I knew of their position. I also knew of the position of the other groups, the coalition groups here, the NWA, I knew of their positions with regard to their opposition to the uranium mining.

Now, when we talk about workshops and debates or discussion, the intent of that communication strategy was to try and set up those meetings with particular groups who wanted to hear what I had to say about the industry in northern Saskatchewan.

And now I don’t know whether or not we would have been successful in doing that, but the opportunities were there.

MEMBER McDILL: So I think I'm going to ask a tough question. Is it your sense that those in the community who may be neutral or possibly even slightly in favour are feeling pressured by those in the community who may be on the other side of neutral?

I realize there's a very broad spectrum between totally for and totally against, but is it your sense -- and I'm asking a big opinion of you -- that those who might be on the positive side are feeling a huge amount of pressure from those that are on the other side or vice-versa?

MR. NATOMAGAN: Can you clarify that in terms of whether or not the proponents of the industry or the people who are in opposition are trying to convince the proponents? And I'm not talking about Strateco, I'm talking ---

MEMBER McDILL: No, I'm not talking about Strateco at all.

The community that’s sitting here and is working today and driving, some that are probably out on the land. Is there community pressure one way or the other?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I was, you know, disappointed and shocked to see some of the pictures at a gas station showing the message -- or conveying the

message -- that this is what the industry does to you. And I added that as part of my oral presentation because the driving force right now I see in the community -- a lot of it I see is from out of town, I don’t know from what direction or from what community or from what city, but they're certainly a high level of impact on the perception of the industry.

And are they being swayed? I'm sure they're having some success is swaying people's opinion or their position on the industry. And I only speak of my own experience back home, because we saw the same pictures and we had to think about our kids. We weren't thinking about our jobs because at the time, back in the early eighties, people still had a huge dependence on living off the land. And we had, you know, very minute supplies in our stores, if we had one. We had a very small store so people still depended on the land.

Now, Pinehouse has grown considerably and we have a lot of outside influence. That said, we, as a community in Pinehouse, had the same issues or the same things to deal with and they were scary. So how do you make a decision, you know? My -- our decision was, you know, to remain status quo. And, you know, it cost us in terms of renewing that relationship with industry and trying to walk in both worlds.

MEMBER McDill: Thank you.

If you'll allow me, Mr. President, there are lots of kids in the room who, I think, probably are getting very twitchy in their chairs, but I would like to compliment all of the children here. It is truly amazing. You're better behaved than most university classes, and I think it speaks highly of your community and your parents that you are here and that you are listening and that you are not trying to get out the door. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: I hate to follow this with a question but, while I got you here, why wasn't your plan implemented? And do you still think that you can have this debate with the community and have this -- or whether you believe minds are already set?

MR. NATOMAGAN: I think there's still a significant opportunity to achieve the objectives set out in the -- even in the communication strategy that I developed at the onset of my visits.

In terms of what Strateco has developed or drafted with the community and Chief-in-Council, whatever they find for objectives in terms of communication, working together, defining objectives on how you work with the coalition groups, the NWA, or anybody else in the

community, whether it be workshops or information centres, I still think that that can be done and I still believe it will be welcome at some point in time. I don't know when and, as I mentioned, I still avail myself and I still keep in touch with Chief-in-Council and the community liaison to see where things are at and if there's opportunities there in the future, to bring my experience, my educational background, my CNSC experience, the regulatory experience, to bring that to the door and, if you have questions, let's just sit down informally and I'll provide those answers, to the best of my ability.

That's what I'm looking forward to and that's what I hope the community works towards because closing the door is not always the answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: So my final question to Strateco; do you still believe that bringing some experience into -- true stories from Saskatchewan to this community would be useful? Or you still think that minds are already made up?

MR. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert, for the record.

No, we will take all the help, you know, and as the gentleman said, he came here, he started to know a little bit about the community, and he made a proposal. Then, we made the agreement in December with the Cree Nation and the -- so a large part of the

agreement provides that, you know, provides how we will work over a four-year period, the committees, a lot of work has been done already in the last four, five months, and we started.

But all the help, you know, because you have the experience, you went through that experience. So for sure we will welcome help from Saskatchewan or anywhere because the only place, they have experience, and long-time experience and they went through also all the change in the industry for the best.

And also they know people. I know the last time he came here, he was with the Elders and the youth and they were here -- I don't know which presentation it was, on May 14th? May 14th?

THE CHAIRMAN: March.

MR. HÉBERT: March 14. So he brings people here with him, you know, and the Elders, talk to Elders and youth get there, but there are few youth around, and so, it's a -- but we try, you know, and -- but, for sure it’s welcome. It was very welcome.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much.

We’re going to take a break now for -- until five o'clock.

Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 4:49 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 16h49

--- Upon resuming at 5:08 p.m./

L'audience est reprise à 17h08

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we are ready to continue. Everybody sit down.

So the next submission is an oral presentation from Mr. Matthew Iserhoff, Sr., as outlined in CMD 12-H7.29.

Mr. Iserhoff, the floor is yours.

12-H7.29

Oral Presentation by

Matthew Iserhoff

MR. M. ISERHOFF: Thank you.

(Interpreted from Cree to English) What I would like to say is I'd like to thank the Commission to give me the opportunity to speak. What I would be talking about, it is very difficult what I have to say. I didn't think that I would be hurting anyone with what I have to say, but what I will be saying, I'll be talking about a gentleman who I have seen, who was resting in a hospital

just before he was deceased.

I'm speaking here about Étienne Matoush. While we were in university from 1975 to 1977, I took lessons at university. And while they were caring for him in the hospital, they told him he had a disease that was very serious.

He came often to our home to visit; we lived in Lafontaine Park, in Montreal. And between 1970 and 1980 my wife and my first child, Ashley, we heard that our friend was very ill at the moment and at that time, it was a break for the teachers.

He was being treated at the Montreal General Hospital, and at that morning, I was thinking to go and see him.

And I was making my visit entering the Montreal General Hospital. I came from the motel from where we had slept. It wasn't far, you probably know the Sherbrooke Street. It's about ten-minute walk.

And I was -- as I was entering the room where he was being treated, one of the nurses stopped me from entering, told me that I could not just enter into the room, that I must wear special clothing before you enter the room, and you will also be wearing gloves on your hands, and you will be also asked to wear this mask, she told me.

And as I was entering, I was already hearing him lying on the bed, that he was having heavy respiratory problems. He looked like he was very, very ill. He was looking at me standing in front of him, alongside his bed.

Yes, he did recognize me at that moment, but he tried to speak to me. He uttered some words and he had a difficult time to speak.

He spoke about his children, his wife. That he was expecting all his children and his wife to finish school. And as I was standing beside his bed, I was very surprised to see what was -- how he was being treated.

On the bed that he was lying, it was concealed completely. I saw him lying there. He had -- he was not wearing any clothing, and as I was looking at his chest there was some unusual exposures on his skin, on his chest. It looked like some of the stuff you put on ice cream, the peanuts. It looked like it was all over his chest. I was very surprised at what he looked like.

I spent approximately 15 minutes with him, and then I told him that I had to leave, and it was very difficult for me to see him lying there. And then he proceeded to tell me, and he asked me how is Annie and Ashley and then I told him, they are waiting for me at the

room where we are staying.

When I told him that I was leaving now, and that I had told him that Annie and Ashley were waiting for me, he thanked me for coming to see him and for coming to visit him at the hospital. He thanked me very much, even though I spent very little time with him because I was not allowed to spend a lot of time because it was too difficult for me.

And as I was proceeding to leave, he asks me can you return tomorrow to come and visit me again. It was not possible, it didn't happen for me to go and see him the next day because I had a very difficult time when I saw him, and later on in the morning, we went to Quebec City that morning. I thought after making a few calls to Mistassini, it was then that I heard that he had passed away.

It was then again that this heaviness reached me again, and it was very difficult later on that evening, as we were proceeding to go to bed, I couldn't sleep immediately. I was thinking about him that I could not visit him again as he had requested.

And that evening I had a dream. I dreamt about him. I dreamt about him where he had stayed, where they kept the patients near Lafontaine Park is where he was residing at one time. He had come to visit us and had

shared supper.

I dreamt about him all of that following night when he was deceased. I went to McGill University on Sherbrooke. It's a pretty fair straight street. I saw him. I dreamt that I saw him coming towards me. And you probably remember him, that he really liked wearing black leather jackets.

He looked very, very calm. He -- upon meeting him, he spoke to me, and I said to him, and I told him you're not sick anymore? He told me, no, I am doing very well. God had shown me what direction he went.

You all may be wondering why I'm telling this story. I know that he worked in the Otish Mountains in the mining in the early '70s.

I remember one gentleman that I went to school with at McGill University. He was a geologist working also at that mine. He named a few of the people who lived there. He named Alan Max. We know how he had passed away. That he had involved in an airplane -- helicopter crash. And then Mr. Kumsis (phon.), the one that we call Mr. Kumsis (phon.) he had named him also, and one of the last things that I would say to Strateco, I know that they eagerly want to start.

Everyone here knows that uranium is the most deadly rock. In our language we call this rock the

most dangerous rock and we want to say to Strateco that the land will always be here. The land is there forever if it is not destroyed.

But Strateco, they're very determined to start the project. For me, I totally disagree.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. M. ISERHOFF: And the only thing they're after is profit and greed.

And we know that as soon as jobs are available there'll be all kinds of wheeling and dealing going on. Some people are there for profit, so that's why I say no to your uranium mine.

Thank you for listening to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just -- I have one -- what kind of uranium mining was going on in the Otish Mountains in the early '70s, any of you remember? You want ---

MR. M. ISERHOFF: Well, I can answer that question. I know there was a lot of prospecting going on. I even had a chance to chat -- a former football -- as I was -- I used to be a -- I played football at McGill University and there was a student there who was studying to be a geologist. As a matter of fact, this individual is still alive. I heard it through another friend playing hockey in Chibougamau and I was amazed. He's in Ottawa. His name was Thorne Madden, and in fact when the tragic

event happened, when Alan -- the late Alan Matoush lost his life in a helicopter accident, he knew the guy. He came here during the funeral and he also knew Istchee. So he did a lot of prospecting for sure, but I don't know how many years he worked there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

MR. M. ISERHOFF: But the question at the end was the most important question I would like to have an answer to is why I told that story where I said you all might be wondering why I'm telling you this story. Is it possible that this man's life was cut short due to exposure to radiation while he was working at the Otish Mountains in the '70s? Because they were collecting rocks and I don't know what kind of rocks they collected.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, you want to venture -- we -- very difficult to tell on one case, particularly when we don't have the medical situation. But did -- are we aware of any -- is anybody aware of any medical study?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

It's -- not knowing the actual activities that were taking place in the '70s, the information that we have on it in terms of exposures during exploration work and the information we have, for example, from studies that were done on workers working in uranium

mines, all the information we have from workers in uranium mines was that the -- during exploration they take samples of rock out of the ground and store them, and send them for analysis. And so the type of radiation is gamma radiation.

So it's a radiation that exposes you from the outside of your body. For miners, so people who work a lot of time within the mines exposed to a lot more gamma radiation, we've never seen health effects due to gamma radiation in uranium mine workers. When miners in uranium mines in the early decades, '30s, '40s, and '50s, we had studies showing lung cancer from radon exposure. There's no radon exposure during exploration and handling rocks and material like this.

So it's unlikely that there would have been exposure to radiation causing this man to develop cancer or other people to develop cancer.

MR. M. ISERHOFF: I have another question. Why then this man's body was completely sealed on his bed, all the way around and tumors coming out of his chest?

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure we are not competent here at this particular time to, you know, tell you medical assessment of what -- of something that we don't see, don't know, et cetera. We don't know. I don't know the answer to that.

MR. M. ISERHOFF: Is it possible that his body was, you know, radiation? Why would they seal it completely?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Just briefly, if I may, really, from the story it sounds as if this gentleman was in isolation. Isolation works both ways. It can be to protect him from bacterias. For example, if the white count is very low, if you have a blood problem, or it could be to protect you from whatever bacteria he may have had at the time.

It sounds from the history, and it’s coming out of his chest, would be what we would call a metastatic cancer of one form or another. Now, that’s just supposition on my part. But if that were the case, then this is probably what killed him. The exposure to radiation, I really don’t know. I have no evidence of that really.

But this is what the story sounds like, that he was being isolated either from the environment, from people around him so that you don’t bring bacterias into the patient, or the reverse, because he would have some bacterias, for example, medicine-resistant staph or bacteria that’s resistant to almost everything. People are isolated from those patients. So that’s what it sounds like. But that’s as much as I can say.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. M. ISERHOFF: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next submission is an oral presentation from Mrs. Annie Neeposh Iserhoff as outlined in CMD H7.31. Mrs. Iserhoff, the floor is yours.

12-H7.31

Oral presentation by

Annie Neeposh Iserhoff

MS. A.P. ISERHOFF: Thank you. My name is Annie Neeposh Iserhoff. I just wanted to repeat what you said. I have an honorary Ph.D on the traditional way of life. Honorary meaning I earned it later on in life. I also have tried to practise the traditional way of life as much as possible even though I have been in school and in the workforce most of my life.

On a serious note, I'd like to give my respects to all who are here, the CNSC, the panel, and the people who are listening to this hearing.

There were a few questions that cropped up in my mind after listening to Strateco during their open house on the uranium exploration, and when the special guest, Gordon Edwards, did a presentation at the Voyager

Memorial School and on the radio informing us about uranium mining, its uses and its effects.

Why was the Cree Nation of Mistissini the only one being consulted and informed about the exploration and the possibility of a uranium mine? Shouldn’t we have involved the other Cree communities as was expressed on the radio show on the evening of May 15, 2012 by members of the coastal communities? The minute I heard that there was a chance that a uranium mine might open, my antennas went up.

I did a bit of surfing on the net for information. The information was mostly negative.

Should a uranium mine open, not only will it affect the Taliman and their family members but many people, as radon toxic wastes will be left behind.

Who will monitor the wastes that will be left behind when the mine closes? These wastes will be exposed to the environment for hundreds and thousands of years. The rivers, streams, and underground watershed flow from the Otish Mountains.

If this exploration goes to the next phase, that is if Strateco gets its licence, won't this type of mine affect most Quebecers, as this area has the largest fresh water?

It's ironical as it will not only affect us

in the long run, but it will affect the world due to a shortage of water that is predicted by scientists.

I have heard from people who have traveled to Europe that fresh water is scarce over there. As we all know, plants, fish, fowl, animals, mammals, and mankind need water to survive. Should we not fight to conserve the fresh waters that are on our traditional lands, as it will be needed elsewhere in the future?

We are willing to share our resources but not to help destroy them, for this type of mining will produce negative impacts on all living things.

What about natural disasters? There is no guarantee that no natural disaster will occur in our area, such as tornadoes, earthquakes, floods, et cetera. We've already felt tremors in this area a few times since the last couple of generations plus strong powerful whirlwinds, and we've seen and felt the tail of hurricanes.

During my lifetime, I've seen 12-footer canoes literally being lifted up and landing 100 metres or more away. Just this spring, we've had a warning -- a tornado warning from the Weather Network.

Should a uranium open and if a natural disaster should occur, the tailings, radioactive wastes will be exposed and distributed to the environment

immediately. This will greatly impact the area for hundreds of kilometres surrounding the uranium mine if it should exist.

Along the same line, I would like to iterate that we would be contributors to the manmade disasters as well, should this exploration for an uranium mine go to the next level.

Can we trust other countries to keep their word that it will not be used for missiles, et cetera? If a country or countries are bombed in the future, will we be able to live with ourselves knowing that we may have helped to destroy lives? Do we want that to be on our conscience?

I, for one, don't want to be a part of such a devastating and tragic event.

Some of us in this community have seen the documentary on "When the Dust Settles". There it shows how members of families living near the uranium mines had health issues. It affects people who have low immune systems, pregnant women, children, and elderly people. People, especially those directly exposed to uranium, had all kinds of health issues that befell them while and after working in uranium mines. And this happened in Australia.

There are other similar documents and

movies recorded in America and around the world to tell the story of the effects of uranium mining. It is not what is needed anywhere in this world. Like the saying, "A little of something is good for you but too much of anything is not good for you."

Science has proven that manmade disturbances of radioactivity, namely tailings, have devastating effects. It's more deadly than when it's left at its natural state.

History too shows that when the properties of uranium are changed, that too is deadly as this happened in places that I'll be mentioning in a couple of paragraphs from here.

Why are we against uranium mining in particular? The uranium metal leaves the most potent spent fuel behind; the radioactive wastes, tailings. What it affects? It will affect the ecosystems from the atom, plants, bucks, all the way to us, to our children, grandchildren, and the future generations.

Should we not be proactive against such mining that can be deadly to the health of all living things? We have heard many negative impacts concerning uranium mining over the last century in Canada, the south-western, U.S.A., in Australia, in Europe, namely Chernobyl, Austria, U.S.S.R. and most recently in Japan,

the Fukushima fallout, the nuclear power plant. To this day, these people are still impacted by this disaster.

We have heard many negative impacts concerning uranium mining -- sorry, I'm reading the same thing.

During the visit of Gordon Edwards, Ph.D, President of the Canadian Coalition of Nuclear Responsibility, I put forth a question. Quite a few people may have heard about the Hiroshima disaster during World War II. That is an actual event that happened as an atomic bomb was set off. The atomic bomb is made from the processing of uranium.

I asked "Why doesn't it affect the people in that area to this day?" The answer I recall from that time was that it exploded into the atmosphere. Therefore, most of the deadly radioactivity was absorbed into the air and into space. History tells us that the Hiroshima bombing had a devastating effect on the people who lived in that area for generations.

Even as recently as the 21st Century, a test shaft was constructed somewhere in the Precambrian Shield to contain the radioactive wastes and in the end was not approved by the Manitoba government because there are no guarantees that a natural disaster or an accident could occur to jeopardize the radioactive waste’s

containment.

The Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility informed us that some of the reasons uranium is mined are to produce nuclear power plants and for medical uses, but the main reasons uranium is mined to this day is mainly to produce bombs.

I ask each and every one of you again who are not convinced of the negative impacts of uranium mining, do we want to take part in this type of mining?

In spite of what has been shown to our community to persuade us that Strateco will be extremely careful on how it operates the mine and that it will do its utmost to prevent any accidents from occurring, I will not be moved. The CCNR experts that we researched into have confirmed our fears concerning the uranium mining.

Therefore, I plead with all the people of the world who are against uranium mining to join us in our fight as it will affect the world if the project is not stopped in the long run.

There is no guarantee that to open an uranium mine is safe, as Strateco has tried to make us believe. Like many parents and all the people who are speaking out, I stand with the Cree youth whom I'm very proud of because they let the way to try and stop the uranium mining, and I say bad uranium mining in the

Istchee (phon.), or for that matter, from the rest of Quebec.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, question? Dr. Barriault.

DR. BARRIAULT: Thank you for your presentation. You made reference to natural disaster. Could CNSC personal let us know to what level of protection that buildings are built really on mining sites?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal for the record. A couple points I would like to make. The intervener's mention about “tremblement de terre” or earthquakes, or vibrations in the earth, as part of the site assessment, it has been assessed with respect to the seismic activity of the site, it is in a location where there is very low seismic hazard in Canada. It is in a location which is a low seismic hazard in Canada.

So the evaluation based on the NRCan and the independent consultant, as indicated, it is in very low seismic activity according to the structure and the fault lines. And reviewed up to 2,000 years with respect to recording history. So making a very long story short, the site was valid for seismic activity. And the building codes and requirements against external hazards, that it

be tornado, earthquake, is designed to withstand the worst-case scenario that could ever happen.

One thing I would like to make it very clear though, in a mine -- again we're not talking of mine, but in general -- I must say because of the post-Fukushima review that we conducted, the CNSC conducted, you have to make sure that -- and I want to re-confirm the fact, there will be no nuclear activity associated with any events, external or not. So the contamination, you are not looking at what you call technical criticality. So there is no nuclear reactions occurring at all.

So the building code is adequate. The design of the facility has considered seismic activity. And it's built to a factor of -- I mean, it's an exponential safety factor, I really don't want to get into the numbers, but at high magnitude on Richter's scale, that is way protective.

DR. BARRIAULT: Thank you. I guess the next question is, there was mention of uranium being processed eventually in the mine and sent for weapon production. Could you explain the level of control that we have over where the uranium goes?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal for the record. The sale and the exportation of uranium from mine in Canada is strictly controlled. Controlled by safeguard

agreements as the Government of Canada put in place and the CNSC administers. And the Government of Canada has a policy. No export of uranium mine will be used towards an arsenal or weapon.

Having said that, there is the international regulatory body, it's called the IAEA, that has a whole safeguard inspectors. Canadian uranium mines are tracked, inspected by international inspectors. The facility that receive uranium mine around the world, and it's Canada's policy that those -- this facility, this specific facility that receives uranium mines from Canada are open for international verifications. And there is a tracking of the uranium mine in order to ensure and assure it's being used for the purpose of peaceful use.

DR. BARRIAULT: Does that answer some of your concerns?

MS. A. ISERHOFF: Yes, but I still, the question that I'd like to put forth again is like what happens if this exploration and if they get their licence, what happens once they close the mine after having it operate for 25 years and the monitoring that's going to be happening? How many years into the future are they going to monitor this mining site if it should exist?

As it's -- I mean it can deteriorate. There could, after hundreds of years, there could be

cracks like what's happening in Montreal. Like there's cracks in the asphalt, whatever, things like that can happen there too because they're man-made products that are trying to contain these wastes.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal for the record. We share the concerns of the intervener and her question with respect to long-term waste management. The long-term waste management is part of the overall regulations of the CNSC. Our experience in Canada has been quite extensive with respect to long-term waste management from the mines.

As long as -- I'm just trying to phrase it in a diplomatic manner. So in other words, as long as we exist and the Government of Canada exists and the CNSC exists and the regulatory bodies exist, the long-term waste management will be monitored to a level where the contaminant is equal to background. But one thing we'd like to ensure the public and the waste management, again, is being done at levels way below any health effect. So there is always continuous monitoring. And the waste management is monitored at multi-level, provincially and federally for the long-term.

And as long as there is a government, as long as there is a country, that oversight will be in place. And I will ask Dr. Thompson if you like to hear a specific element with respect to long-term waste

management.

There is pictures, don't have anything, you don't have?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we got the message. Want to move on to a different question, you've got another question? Mr. Harvey?

MR. HARVEY: Yes, as you -- in your conclusion, you said that in fact you want to ban uranium, not only mines, but use ---

MS. A. ISERHOFF: I didn't say mines, I said uranium.

MR. HARVEY: Uses, yeah, uranium in general. But do you see any benefits in the use of uranium? Because there has been a certain number of people in countries that in fact thought that there were some benefits. So what is your thinking about that?

MS. A. ISERHOFF: There are uses for -- there are uses medical-wise, there are uses for energy. I'm aware of that. But it far outweighs the -- it far outweighs what the radioactivity that it causes for the people who are in the area where the mine is. And that's what I'm worried about.

And we've had uranium mines all over the world in different places. We have a lot of uranium already that has been mined. So why have more uranium

being mined? I don't know why we need more.

MR. HARVEY: Well I will just turn it to the staff. Why we need to have mines and more uranium?

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal for the record. I'm not going to answer the question why do we need uranium mines or not. There are definite beneficial uses of and for energy in general, from medical purposes to power generation. And our mandate is safety. Regardless if there is more or less or expansions, every licenced activity, we will ensure that it is safe. Economic, as our president mentioned, economic -- our mandate is not economics. Our mandate is safety. We'll continue to ensure safety.

With respect to why is there an increase for mining, why is there expansions? Well, the world market demands with respect to uranium fuel to be used in reactors is existing. So there is reactor expansions in China. There are expansions in India. There are new built in France, there are new built in Finland.

Those facilities require fuel, fuel fabrication, and the uranium is the main element for the fuel in those reactors, but safety is paramount.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: One question -- one quick question. I keep hearing it all the time about workers in

uranium mines is not healthy. Anybody working near uranium mines is not healthy.

Can you give us the latest medical evidence about that?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

There are a number of studies that have been published in the scientific peer review literature over the last 10 years and more that clearly indicates that uranium mine workers who were exposed in early days of uranium mining had an increased risk of lung cancer.

The studies that the CNSC has done in collaboration with other government agencies in northern Saskatchewan for the current mines, the modern mines have shown that current exposures to radiation of workers currently employed in uranium mines have very low doses of radiation. Their exposures are well controlled and there are no cases of lung cancer or other diseases.

In terms of communities living around mills and uranium processing facilities, I'm aware that a number of studies have been mentioned by a number of intervenors. Many of those studies have not stood up to rigorous analysis. Some of them have been misrepresented or misinterpreted, and the work we have reviewed indicates that there have been dozens of studies done by research

scientists, reputable research scientists in many countries, indicating that there are no sick children, no sick women, no communities with health effects living around mining communities or uranium mills and processing facilities.

Mrs. Annie Neeposh Iserhoff, your last words? You don't have to say anything. You can just say whatever you want.

MS. A.N. ISERHOFF: I'd just like to say thank you for listening to me, and I hope you will really think about not giving the licence to Strateco concerning the uranium mine.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: The next presentation is an oral presentation from Mr. Andrew Mianscum.

MR. MIANSCUM: Yeah, Mianscum.

THE CHAIRMAN: I got it. Okay. Thank you.

As outlined in CMD 12-H7.16. Sir, the floor is yours.

12-H7.16

Oral presentation by

Andrew J.W. Mianscum

MR. MIANSCUM: Hi. My name is Andrew Mianscum, for those of you that don't know me.

First of all, I would like to thank God for what he has done for us. Whatever happens, whatever the outcome of what will happen, good or bad, we should always give God all the honour and glory because he makes no mistakes.

I just wanted to say that I am a hunter. I am a seasonal hunter. I go into the traditional territories to do my hunting. Every year, fall, spring, and I do my traditional goose prey hunt, but it costs money to go in the bush and I am not the -- I don't hunt yearly.

I just wanted to say today that I do agree that uranium is very bad to the environment. And I'm not saying that uranium is good, but what I do know is that every uranium mine project, they are very careful on how they work around the environment. There's laws and regulations for how they work around the environment.

How I know this is I have been working at the Matoush site for about three years now. Every fuel spill or oil spill they have, they stop the machine or whatever work is being done. They clean it up. Then they put the contaminated soil in a container, and then they

ship it. Every fuel tank and fuel drum that are there are all placed under membranes so they don't leak. If there's any leak, it won't go down to the earth.

The uranium there, they say, is the third highest grade of uranium in the world. The grade of it is .49 percent, so which means they say that there won't be much waste in the rock.

And how I know these facts is they are there in their reports and I ask questions at work, a lot of questions, actually, because I am concerned also, as the rest of the Cree people.

And the rock -- the waste in the rock, there's three rocks in the waste once they extract. How I know, that's what is -- we've been seeing in the reports, is there are three rocks in the waste. And in their reports, they only see traces of these three rocks.

They say that the Matoush Projects is one of the cleanest deposits of uranium in the world. Again, I'm not saying uranium is good -- is a good thing -- but the facts are there for these things. So all other companies see these facts, reports, and if Strateco can't do what they want to do, there will be other companies coming in, trying to do what Strateco is trying to do, and the companies won't stop until they extract the rock.

There's already companies close by the

Matoush site. One of them is Cameco. Cameco already has a couple of uranium mines in Saskatchewan. They are located less than nine kilometres from the Matoush site. That's what I think. That's my opinion.

What if another company comes in here and gets what they want to do, do what they want to do and leaves out the Crees and ask other white companies to do the work there? Then the Crees will be left out of the job opportunities that are there.

Again, I'm not saying that I'm with the uranium projects, but it's what I think. Like everyone else, they have their opinions, and I respect all of your opinions, and everyone else, I respect all of you. God bless all of you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Questions? Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: You have been working there for three years. As an employee, do you find that Strateco places an importance on hiring local residents?

MR. MIANSCUM: Can you repeat that?

MEMBER HARVEY: I mean, do you feel that Strateco is placing a certain importance to hire local residents to work at the mine, at the project?

MR. MIANSCUM: Yes.

MEMBER HARVEY: How many local residents are working now with Strateco? Maybe I should ask the question to Mr. Hébert.

M. MAURICE: Le nombre de membres de la communauté de Mistissini qui travaille au site est d'environ huit personnes. Ces employés-là sont des travailleurs aussi de ESCAN, de Connishish Contracting Services et de Strateco.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Un ou l'autre?

M. MAURICE: C'est l'ensemble.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Ensemble, il y en a huit, c'est ça?

M. MAURICE: Oui.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Sur combien d'employés sur le site, une quarantaine?

M. MAURICE: C'est entre 35 et 40.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Quels sont vos plans pour le futur? Si le projet devait aller de l'avant, vous parliez d'avoir combien d'employés sur le site? Une quarantaine?

M. GABRIEL: C'est entre 35 et 40.

MEMBRE HARVEY: Quels sont vos plans pour le futur? Si le projet devait aller de l'avant, vous parliez d'avoir à un moment donné 90, si je me rappelle bien, 90 personnes. Quel serait, un peu, le portrait

global et la possibilité d'emploi pour les gens – pour les gens de Mistissini ou de la région?

M. GABRIEL: Pour la phase, la phase d'exploration, on aimerait avoir entre 15 et 20 pour cent, on aimerait avoir dans le 20 pour cent. Autant d'employés qu'on pourrait avoir de la région ce serait –- sorry I can speak in English ---

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. You can speak in ---

MR. GABRIEL: --- it's just that it's starting to be hard a little bit. And yes we are looking for the underground exploration program for between 15 and 20 persons and we will hire as much as we can, you know, and give formation also.

And unfortunately in 2010 when we were expecting to get the licence project nearby, Trolus shut down and we were hoping to be able to hire people but actually it's hard to hire mining people in the area you know you've got so many programs –- projects going on. But, you know, we will not limit the amount, the maximum amount in the -- so 15 percent would be the minimum.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just saw an announcement yesterday, well no, maybe a couple of weeks ago, I can't remember anymore, that the diamond company here entered into a benefit agreement. They're telling me that a lot of companies enter into a benefit agreement.

Have you done something like this, considered something like this into the future? What's your plan?

MR. GABRIEL: Our plan is to have one for sure. But for us we have to -- again it's an exploration project; it's really an exploration. The diamond project is a mine with revenue, you know, within the near future.

So this is a big difference, you know, it's -- and so the Cree Nation was not ready to talk about it because we don't have enough information on the economic of the project.

So our goals we have fixed at 15 persons, 15-20, as minimum but is too early again, you know, we have the exploration phase to go through because it's uranium. It was a standard gold mine with that kind of grading the amount of money we have spent probably will, probably very close of the production with the same amount of money but is uranium so it's taking a lot longer.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason I'm raising it Mr. Mianscum just raised this issue of jobs. And he believed that, you know, jobs is value or benefit to the community. And I assume this is something that eventually, you know, one is to discuss if you move on to the next phase.

MR. GABRIEL: It's part also of the

Communication Information Agreement to have a committee for employment and formation part of it in the agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN: M'hm.

Monsieur Harvey?

Anybody else?

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Okay. Just bear with us, there has been a change in speaker here.

Okay. I'm looking for another Mianscum, a Charlie Mianscum?

Sorry for the confusion, somebody skipped out and we are just trying to rearrange the agenda here.

Please, anytime you're ready.

MR. C. MIANSCUM: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

And also I'd like to express appreciation also to the CNSC and the panel and Strateco and the others that are here that you made this -- you set-up this arbitrary for us to express our views.

I'll say first of all that I do acknowledge that there are benefits, there are potential benefits indeed if the uranium mining should go ahead, things that have been already mentioned like the road access, employment, some benefits to the community in terms of employment. But one of my major objections has already been pointed out but I'd like to reiterate it again.

And that is the area of the Ottish Mountains is a major area of watersheds where some major rivers have their source and from what I've heard in a presentation including -- Dr. Edward's presentations both, at least two or three directions both northwest which is where the East Maine River is, starts, and also especially the ones towards the south like our friend earlier mentioned about, only about 40 miles from the proposed area is where the watersheds Mistissini and Mistassabi rivers, to name a couple, which start –- why I make that point is the potential for toxic and poisonous material from this uranium project that could seep into those rivers.

And while I would respect the technical abilities and equipment that I'm sure are in place, would in place to prevent such leakage or whatever, I question very much the reliability of those measures that would be put in place.

And when I made the point about certain benefits but we can ask the question 'but at what cost?', 'what potential cost could it be?' Because, as alluded to earlier, it could be a potentially permanent environmentally damaging undertaking.

And, I only have two or three main points left.

I was there when the, our fellow natives from the Saskatchewan Uranium Mining Projects were here. And with all due respect to our fellow natives and the Chiefs that came with them, I kind of sense at that time how realistic their presentations were. I do not question all of it, some of it I accept it. But the thing about the limited or no environmental damages were not questioned very much and the -- possible on the -- especially on the water and that.

Because the most that we’re the most afraid of, that we’re most concerned about is that the poisonous, toxic materials can be exposed and remain for centuries.

And another question I had, another thing I wonder about is why is it that happens sometimes that there are already steps that have been taken to this having already having an airport, already having a camp when there is no real indication of -- you know, to go ahead on behalf of all parties concerned as far as agreeing to it goes.

To me that's very questionable. To me that almost seems like jumping to a conclusion. That well, we're going to go ahead, but that's why I would consider -- that's what I ask -- that's why I would ask that you people would seriously consider the people's points of view and the objections that have been raised.

And that is the sum of my presentation. Thank you for listening.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, I think I'd like to jump in. We keep hearing about this possible potential contamination of watershed. Can somebody one more time explain what's your -- from staff and from Strateco, again, what's the science behind this? Strateco?

MR. MIANSCUM: Perhaps may I clarify that a bit? Not only potential, but I think there is some real actual possibility that it will -- that there will be a -- that's why I mentioned about the watersheds and that in the river.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me say as a regulator we would never allow that to happen. Okay? We would never allow -- knowingly allow this to happen. We would not license something that could potentially contaminate the watershed. That's our mandate.

Can you go ahead?

MS. HARDY: Thank you. For the record, Caroline Hardy.

So just as you mentioned, the final effluent will be discharged with -- respecting for minimum the criteria allowable. We will be way below the

acceptable criteria.

We have a risk study that was done based on that, and I will pass that on to SENES to explain a little more on the risk assessment and potential impacts to the water.

MS. FERNANDES: Hi, my name is Stacey Fernandes.

And we did do a look of -- an assessment of the impact of the release of water on the downstream environment. The quality of the water from the exploration plant is quite good, and so that there is very little impact on the environment from those releases.

There are -- we did report, I believe it's part of the submission, and if there's any other detailed questions I'd be happy to answer them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

As Strateco and their consultants have mentioned, the assessment that was done was based on 100 cubic metres per hour with the provisions that if there is more water than the treatment plant capacity that water would not -- would remain underground.

Having said that, at the exploration stage the type of environmental disasters that have been alluded

to, or at the mining stage where there's an active mill, are not realistic scenarios of having so much contaminants and effluent that you would have 30, 100 or 200 kilometres of rivers being contaminated.

A lot of those contaminants don't stay in water very long, they will go to sediment, and so there will be a deposition in sediment, but you're not going to get, you know, hundreds of kilometres of water being contaminated.

When there have been environmental disasters, or what people call environmental disasters, it has been when failing -- dams have failed, and the CNSC with our new regulatory document, RD/GD-370, have put in place very tight requirements for designing tailings facilities so that this type of scenario is not feasible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Just to see. Suppose you've got extreme conditions and, well, tornadoes, I don't know if we'll get tornadoes around here, but any tornadoes, wind and rain, and the basins are destroyed, completely destroyed. What would be the effect in the rivers and lakes?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

Assuming that the ponds would get flushed,

essentially, you would have a short-term spike in contamination, but it would not last over the long-term.

The amount of material in the ponds is not that high, and the pond, essentially at this stage, it's groundwater being brought to the surface with a little bit of activities, and so the water is quite clean.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you. Are we going in the same order?

Okay. The next submission is an oral presentation for Mr. Johnny Loon as outlined in CMD H7.33. Mr. Loon, the floor is yours.

MR. LOON: Thank you.

12-H7.33

Oral Presentation by

Johnny Loon

MR. LOON: Okay, like, these guys usually say, for the record, my name is Johnny, Johnny Loon.

And I'm actually, I would say, and I won't hide that I don't have any master’s degrees or any in that science field, you know. Like I said before, on May 23 I believe, I'm not a scientist, but I can read, which is good.

Anyway, but I have a bachelor's in hunting and trapping.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LOON: In hunting live, traditional, you know, but my dad has a masters. My father, Willie, has a master's. You should respect him.

Anyway, when I last talked in the hearing -- on May 23rd you said?

THE CHAIRMAN: Twenty-third (23rd).

MR. LOON: Yeah, 23. I had a question there, you know, before that would -- for me that would be the end of my question, this one appearance. But then I had a heart for my family, my wife and my kids, because they were the ones to push me, telling me, "Dad, you have to speak. What about our future?" They were thinking about their future, you know.

And I thought about, and I told them, "Okay, I'll talk." I'll speak in the hearing just for them and my people and our Elders.

And so I'm sorry to the Elders right now because I'm pretty sure a lot of people want to hear English, right, like in French, "Henglish."

(LAUGHTER/RIRES)

MR. LOON: Okay, I'm still waiting for a good answer for my question on May 23rd, which was in your

EIS, the report you guys made, Environmental Impact Assessment Report or Study, you know, there's some gaps there. A lot of gaps that are very, very important to put in there, especially for us because for us, if we didn't look at this, we wouldn't know anything about it. We'd say, “Oh well, they made a 30,000 page report, they must be doing okay.” That's what we would say.

But then I looked it up and now I checked everything on the -- even when what's his name there, I had -- Dr. -- what's his name there I had -- what's his name there? Gordon Edwards, Gordon Edwards. I checked out his report and I tried to figure what's going on here, you know.

And I checked on this report there. He talks about the -- just one aspect, okay. On the decay -- decay chain of uranium, the half-life, they call it. On the report, yes, it mentions the half lifes, but only the ones that have the most insignificant life, but not the ones that are going to stay for a long -- generations of times. And the ones that are very deadly like radon, for instance.

I don’t know, some of these people from the reports, they -- Michel Plante, M.D., I don’t know who that is. And -- but anyway, as I came in here I checked out everything and -- Canada Nuclear Regulator, Radon and

Health. And if you check everything up, compare everything, radon is -- it says here, “Radon-222 from the decay of uranium-238” as part of the series of transformers he referred.

And radon -- this one, they say it's not deadly, right? But then if I look at this, the other -- what's her name here, or Mr. I don’t know who -- Michel Plante, something like that, “Some elements are more unstable than others.”

There's a report here from -- where I got it was when I came in. Highly radioactive radon-222 is right there. Then why does it say that -- why does it say here that every time in their -- in the report that it's not -- it's not that dangerous, everything will be okay?

And when I was in high school, I had a teacher who was very intelligent; we used to call him “The Terminator”. I don’t know; a lot of people at my age knew him, you know. He said that atoms -- right? Everything is made out of atoms. Everything, even us, even this, everything. So an atom, we don’t see it, right? We cannot see it.

And in this report, it also says that the radon comes from the atom which is smaller than the atom, the nucleus. So -- and then you can calculate that. A rock like this, how -- how much radiation is that? The

palm of your hand like this. So that’s one thing that’s kind of -- for us to try to understand, you know.

My buddy here, this guy right here, talked to me about transparency at the last meeting they were here. You know, I almost missed that meeting because they didn’t announce it. Last minute on the radio I heard that announcement it was there, but there no posters, you know.

And in the directives 0.19, right, you have all the directives that needed to be stated in this document, so there's a lot of gaps, a lot of things -- and I'm kind of shocked to hear that from -- I got a lot of papers here, you know. I don’t have a secretary, so you have to be calm with me and listen, at least. Listen to it very carefully. Stop looking at your laptops or cell phones, please.

This is very important because this -- for me, when I woke up this morning, it was so beautiful outside. Did you see it? Did you see the sunrise? Man, you don’t know how it felt for me as a Cree to understand the earth on the land we live in. And try to be transparent with that; it's really hard.

Anyway, to Mr. -- I found this in a -- anyway, in the -- Canada, something like that -- Quebec forms -- President Guy Hébert, I don’t know which one it is. It's you? All right.

It says here that I am happy to tell you that you guys have a green light to go, you know, but it has to -- please note that the decision does not exempt you from obtaining and conforming to the requirements of all other authorizations required by all the laws and regulations which the permit required by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission under Section 24 of the *Nuclear Safety and Control*.

So you have to abide with that; right? Right?

MR. HEBERT: I don’t know which -- which letter you're talking about.

MR. LOON: Well, you should know because you guys -- you guys wrote this; right? This is -- Strateco. This is not my report. How do I know? I just read it. Because you guys -- you guys are supposed to know everything you guys wrote down, you know. You have to back up your information, you know.

Because the way I saw it -- then after I have -- after I had that question, I went back to my office when you guys cut me off right there because I had these kind of questions and you couldn’t answer them. And then you said, “Okay, break.” Then after I came back again, then you said, “Okay, it's adjourned.”

But we were supposed to be done at 9:00.

You guys adjourned at 8h30. So I was not pleased with that. But still I respect you guys and I respect these guys, you know. Excuse me just a second.

And I'll ask you to respect me, too, so -- meaning not to cut me off until I'm done because I respect you guys.

Anyway, when I went back to my office, I wanted to have all the document of the environmental impact study, but I couldn’t. Before I did. Why?

That thing was not made public any more. Why was that? Because public would know a lot about it. That’s what I noticed. Because I tried and tried, and any computer I tried to get the information out, I couldn’t. I couldn’t print it out. And why? Why wasn’t it made public to us? How come we cannot access the reports?

So that’s something that if you guys are talking about the signing of -- when was this -- in December, agreement on -- talking with each other with the Cree Nation. And to me, then that means I have -- you're already breaking that because I cannot even access to that place any more. That’s your website, Strateco's website. You don’t understand because you're trying not to understand that.

Anyway, there's a lot of -- so the only thing I got was -- the answer what I got was from what's

his name there -- Mr. Matoush -- brought me something, a little piece of information. They said that they couldn’t answer my question right there; they had to answer my question privately. Why?

You know, everybody has the right to know. Everybody was really interested in that question I had. Very interesting; right?

And the thing is -- and it's right in here:

> “Uranium-235 and thorium-232 series are irrelevant to Matoush because not present or in significant concentration. We looked -- we then look at U-238, which is uranium-238 series which is the one we have in the ore body at Matoush. We only have to analyze the four radionuclides, T-230, radium [or is it radon-226]. I think it's radium, Pb-210 and Po-210 because the other radionuclides...”

I don’t know how to really pronounce those, but anyway, you know what I mean:

> “...have a too short life to be analyzed. There is nothing else in the decay chain of 238 that a lab could possibly analyze.”

And I thought to myself, "That was not the question I had", you know. They didn't actually answer the question I had in the beginning when I asked how come there is a lot of gaps here, especially on the decay chain because life is very important, right? You're a life form, I'm a life form, the world, the earth, water, everything in it is a life form. It never stops growing, never. The earth grows, everything moves, it never stops.

And I hear that you guys can stop the contamination. No. Nobody can stop that. You cannot stop time, right? Time, time, time again, it's going to get erosion and then -- you know what I mean. It's going to get waste and spills. Because it won't stop moving. Right now, it doesn’t move because we're not touching it. Here, I'm talking about the uranium. And if we touch it, the chain reaction starts, the decay chain starts. It has to go through all the steps of life of uranium.

Like us; we became babies, right, we were born. We have to know how to feed, to talk, to walk, we cannot skip any of those. That's why we're still here today. If you skipped your teenage years, then you would be gone, you know. So, uranium, we cannot skip any decay chain. No. It's not possible because life goes on and it moves.

And the other thing about that I had tried

to -- contain tailings in a pond, that's not possible. Because everything moves, right? Rain, water, condensation, and all that stuff, it recycles all the time, it moves all the time. Water, one thing never stops moving since the beginning of time. Never. You won't see water that doesn't move. You see, this water is still moving even if I just move a little. If it stays still for a long time, it's going to grow stale.

So that's something you have to understand, you know. I have a lot of commonsense by telling you all these because I read it, and I know about the human life, how you can relate to that, and that's transparency.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LOON: No, no, no, no. Like I said, you have to respect ---

THE CHAIRMAN: There's a long lineup of people here. We're not going to be here the whole night?

MR. LOON: Yes, I know, but ---

THE CHAIRMAN: So you have to respect some other time. People actually budget their time to be here to talk to us to have a dialogue ---

MR. LOON: What's your name again?

THE CHAIRMAN: Never mind what's my name. We ask -- we came here and we respectfully gave you more than double everybody else's time, so please wind it up so

we can engage in some discussion.

MR. LOON: Okay, sir, but what's your name? What's your name? I didn't get your name in the beginning. You have to give me your name.

THE CHAIRMAN: Way at the beginning when we introduced the panel?

MR. LOON: I was kind of late.

THE CHAIRMAN: I introduced panel here, introduced all the members. My name is Michael Binder.

MR. LOON: All right. Great. Thanks, man.

Anyway, if this is a panel like a hearing, almost like a justice, right?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a quasi-judicial tribunal, if you'd listened before, you would know about that by now.

MR. LOON: Anyway. Well, to be -- if it's about me trying to balance the decision here, in our world, it will not work because it's out of balance already. The way you're talking to me, now I have to really talk to you. It's really out of balance.

In the reports, you can see in every report, and the maps. The first thing you see, there is Chibougamau, Chibougamau, Chibougamau, Chapais. In the maps, I don't see Mistissini. I don't see Mistissini on the reports. It’s just like we're a minority. And this

is our backyard. Come on! You have to include us in there.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LOON: And you always say it's just not a lot of people here. This is our backyard. What would you do if I come over to your home and your backyard and try to dig up uranium there? Would you be concerned? And I say, “Okay. It's somebody else's backyard.” You know, and I don't mention your name too. That's like very disrespectful actually, right there.

Anyway, that's one of the questions I had right there and I'll try to get up there at the end now.

And also on the directives, there has to be a general health right there. And on the EIS, to me, I read it, it's in the first part, but I couldn't get the other parts because I was locked out, like I said, you know. To me, it was like copy and paste only. It only talked about the old issues we used to have, the drinking, the diabetes; yes, it affected us. The things that affected us the project before the hydro plants. But now, we're recovering.

Now, we have to face another big project which will ruin a lot of stuff. Not just us. To tell you the truth, we're not shellfish. I'm sorry and I really hurt when I heard people say that, you know, “We don't

understand it.” It's just like one side. But for the Cree, myself, what I know in my heart, and my parents, they're not here right now but what their concern was, the life.

So you have to acknowledge what I have to say here, you know. So it's kind of hard to -- there’s another thing that's coming our way, which is the uranium, right? And we're trying to stop it because we know. You haven't given us anything to prepare for it. What's going to happen in the future? How we're going to do this? Any accident, you can never prevent. You cannot be ready for any accident. No way. Even if you have everything, you won't be prepared for an accident that's going to happen.

That's what I've known in life. You can never -- anyway, the thing about that, you cannot prepare and the health factor here ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think we understand.

MR. LOON: The rules -- the rules are not ---

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we understand quite well your position.

MR. LOON: Why, yes. You know about my position, but the argument, you have to understand too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you going to plan to

finish here or not?

MR. LOON: Yes, I am trying to finish, but you're starting -- interrupting me and you're trying to -- when you keep talking like that, it makes it longer for me. Because I'll have more points if you have to interrupt me.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LOON: The answer to your question for Len Taylor this morning was about why are you against the uranium and -- only not gold? Why? Because we think about people around us, not just the Cree. Our neighbours, Chibougamau, Jamiesions (phonetic), the people out in Lac-St-Jean, even the Montagnais, all those people all over Quebec and globally, we think about them. What is going to happen if we touch that?

Yes, you might say that nothing will happen, but what's going to happen to the people that buy it? Like Fukushima, and Chernobyl? Yes, those are history, but what about the future? What is going to happen if there's going to be a spill with other people?

And this is our land and that's our property right there that is going to be dug up and then put it in somebody's place. It's going to be a very -- like a guilty conscience to us, you know, because we are responsible to say no. And right now, I say no to it.

It's ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. LOON: If this is like a hearing, if I was there in your shoes and I was to judge, I'd throw this case out right now because there's no balance, because there's no proper information in the documents. And us, we say no, how come people cannot understand that? And it still goes on and on and on. That's the question I had, the last thing.

So if you want me to be quiet you have to say you love me.

(LAUGHTER/RIRES)

MR. LOON: It's not hard to say it. Thanks, Ma’am, thanks. Anyway so are you going to give to Strateco?

Oh yeah, I don’t know you guys. Which side are you guys on? What’s that?

MR. JAMMAL: If you’ll allow me, Mr. President?

We are on nobody’s side. We are on the side of everyone that presents the facts. We are on your side.

MR. LOON: Okay. So then you shouldn’t consider the licence then.

MR. JAMMAL: We will recommend based on

scientific facts to the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we open it up for discussion? Anybody has anything they want to ask? Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Just one brief question, and I guess to CNSC. How popular is the mining area to hunters and trappers? Do you have any information on that, or Strateco, any information on that? Because you mentioned that you're a hunter and trapper and this is very important to you, this area. Is that what you meant?

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

Just a couple of things. We don't have that information. We know it's a trap lines area. There is one thing, though, to keep in mind -- regardless of what I'm going to say -- the fact that that individual is in that area, the individuals are either passing through or living in that vicinity.

So all of these evaluations did take place indicating the worst-case scenario for any individual being in that area is a fraction of the dose limit, and it's way below any health effect. So regardless of what we call occupancy factor for whatever purpose it's being used, especially for the trap lines, especially for individuals on the vicinity of the site, they have no dose

of any significance.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

Does that answer your question with regards to trapping in the area?

MR. LOON: Like I said, I -- with common sense, right? Of course you won't find any significance, because it's right now. But in a few years time or in the long term you'll find it for sure.

MR. JAMMAL: Sorry, you've got to bear with me. It's -- we're not used to directly -- we go through the Commission to answer the questions.

MR. LOON: Okay. Look at me then.

MR. JAMMAL: Okay. I'll -- you're a great man.

So over time is the -- we always take in consideration the fact that it is not just now. It's now and continues until the end of time or the end of humanity, whatever it's going to be then. As long as there is a regulator, as long as there is an oversight, those limits are not going to change.

MR. LOON: Okay.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Thank you.

MR. LOON: Then I guess -- okay, next case. Anyway, I'm still concerned about the decay chain because we didn't even touch on that, right? Uranium-238, then it

goes 4.5 billion years, then it goes down to thorium-234; in 24 days it evaporates, then protactinium-238, one minute, then uranium-234 for 245,000 years; thorium-230 for 76,000 years; radium-226, 1,600 years; radon-222, 3.8 days.

And I'm only halfway there, and radon is the deadliest.

So like I said, even though we won't see it right now until the future, even if you keep doing that, I'm pretty sure that you'll stop some day by checking everything out. Because I'll pass away; you'll pass away. I don't know what the regulations will be in the future. Yes, we have a lot of new technologies right now. It's a webcam. Hello Youtube.

Anyway, we have everything so great, you know? But technology is great when you use it wisely, but technology can break up a lot of things. That's one fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's a good note to end on. Thank you. Thank you very much for your presentation.

MR. LOON: So who's going to answer my question on the -- I'm still waiting. Like I said, I need the answers of the missing particles here.

THE CHAIRMAN: You'll have to wait until our decision comes up.

MR. LOON: So I won't have the answer then. There's going to be a licence. Is that what you're saying?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not now, you won't.

MR. LOON: It's going to be hard to take, man.

MEMBER McDILL: Let's see if we can try something. Mr. Jammal?

MR. JAMMAL: It's -- are you -- sorry. Are you referring to the EIS report from Strateco and your not having access to it?

MR. LOON: Yeah, the only -- this is the only one I had access. That was before I had that question there on the same question I'm having right now, you know?

MR. JAMMAL: Okay.

MR. LOON: Why is there missing particles in there? And when I went after that question, I went back to my office, tried to print out the other documents from that website from Strateco. I couldn't access anything.

MR. JAMMAL: Okay. I'm going to offer, anything pertaining to Strateco evaluation that we've done, from the environmental impact statement staff has done, we will be more than happy to provide it to you.

There is -- give us a list of the things you want as it pertains to it, we'll provide it to you.

Again, even though it's Strateco's document, we will make it available for you.

MR. LOON: I wish it was made public though because I'd like to ---

MR. JAMMAL: It is public.

MR. LOON: --- have people to hear it.

MR. JAMMAL: It is public. That's what I'm trying to say. It is public so ---

MR. LOON: But when you give my -- give me my answer, that's what I mean.

MR. JAMMAL: Okay. Well, we can provide you with links to the Canadian Environmental Agency website. We can provide you to links. We can even -- I'll give you a personal commitment. We can even print it out and mail it to you. Just give us the contacts and we'll provide it to you.

MR. LOON: All right.

And like these guys, the last time I met you guys you told me you'll have the answer by when we meet here again. Now I told you my full name, Johnny Loon.

MR. JAMMAL: We sent you an answer, Johnny.

MR. LOON: Yes, that's what I was referring

to, but it doesn’t answer my actual question. So there we have something that does not have ---

MEMBER McDILL: I think Mr. Jammal has something here.

MR. JAMMAL: This is the listing of everything. So if you go to this website here, this is all the documents. So that’s yours to keep.

MR. LOON: Yeah, this one I went to -- through. But it doesn’t have the -- what I wanted in here. It doesn’t have that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We’ve got to move on. We have Mr. Debassige who is the ---

MR. LOON: All right then. We’ll meet again then.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The next oral presentation is from Mr. Justice Debassige.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Debassige.

THE CHAIRMAN: Debassige, sorry, as outlined in CMD 12-H7.35. Please proceed.

12-H7.35

Oral presentation by

Justice Debassige

MR. DEBASSIGE: First thing, I would like to invite the youth to come stand behind me. So if you can, guys, come, to show that we are against this uranium mine.

First off, I would like to quote an Elder who had spoken to me, saying there are two sides of a coin. Strateco has their side and we have our side. You all came to listen and please listen to us.

My name is Justice Debassige and I am a student activist at Voyager Memorial School. I am in Secondary V and I am the firstborn son of Roger and Cindy Blacksmith.

I would first like to talk to my community members about Strateco’s uranium project being located in the Otish Mountains.

After my speech, I would then like to ask Strateco some important questions.

As you know, the project is called the Matoush Project. The Matoush Project might be good for the development of our community, but not good for the wellness of our land.

For the development, the Band would receive money from the project and there might be more job opportunities for the people of Mistissini. But how many jobs and how much money would we receive? These are the

questions we must try to answer.

When I went to an information session given by Strateco Uranium Mining Corporation I learned that there would be 180 jobs available for the five-year exploration phase and 300 jobs during the lifetime of the mine. But who is qualified for these jobs? Will these jobs be for us or experienced workers from other places? That might benefit 6 percent of Mistissini's population and their families. That is not very much for this proposed development that has so many potential risks.

I would like to outline what some of these scientifically proven risks are. First, uranium mining leaves decaying elements such as radium, radon and polonium. These elements contaminate the environment, wildlife, and the human body more than uranium would. These uranium decay products, the things that are left behind in the waste rock and mill tailings, is the problem, not so much the uranium itself.

The radiation coming off these decay products lasts for more than 100,000 years. This contamination seeps into the ground and poisons the aquifer, the water underground. Radiation causes many different cancers, diseases and sicknesses.

I am going to ask you all a tricky question. Are these jobs and maybe a few million dollars

more important than our land?

Before we explore the answer to these questions I will tell you more about uranium mining and its history. Most of this information I did not know and I was surprised by its history and its uses.

Uranium is an easily oxidized radioactive toxic metallic element. And where is uranium found? Concentrated deposits of uranium are not found in very many places but the Otish Mountains are one of those places. For those who don’t know where the Otish Mountains are, they are located approximately 210 kilometres northeast of Mistissini.

Another big place for uranium, Saskatchewan. In fact, in the past 15 years Saskatchewan has become the uranium capital around the globe. Probably none of you know this, but the uranium industry started in Canada because of the development of the nuclear bomb. Sadly, uranium from Canada was used in the atomic bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan at the end of World War II. Using uranium for atomic bombs was made illegal in 1965.

Today uranium is mostly used for nuclear reactors. There are many places in Canada that are completely against uranium mining. In British Columbia it is banned. In Nova Scotia it is illegal. In the Town of

Sept-Îles, Quebec the doctors and medical workers all threatened to leave if uranium mining was brought into their town.

A nuclear reactor generates heat which is then used to produce power such as electricity. Nuclear reactors are a cleaner source of energy than coal, that is why a lot of people support it. However, there are many risks involved. To keep a reactor going for just one year they need to produce 25,000 tonnes of uranium fuel. This means they have to take half a million tonnes of waste rock, which also creates 100,000 tonnes of mill tailings. These are toxic for hundreds of thousands of years.

Will tailings affect the animals and the land? Yes, because mill tailings are extremely radioactive and dangerous to the environment. According to David Thorpe from the Guardian Newspaper, contamination of local water supplies around uranium mines and processing plants have been documented in Brazil, Colorado, Texas, Australia, Namibia and many other sites.

In Australia a new uranium mine 25 kilometres south of Alice Springs had 15,000 litres of acid uranium solution leak in the year 2002. They have had problems with leakages since then.

This brings us back to my original question; is the potential of 300 jobs and millions of

dollars more important than our land? In my opinion, our land is priceless and it holds our past, present and future. Our ancestors have hunted and fished and lived off these lands for thousands and thousands of years.

Like the ancient Aboriginal proverb says, we do not inherit the earth from our ancestors we borrow it from our children. It tells us that we must take of our lands for the future generations that lie ahead.

How will be remembered if our land is left to ruin? Think about it. This is our land. This is -- the land is in our blood. If we allow this to happen we are only poisoning ourselves.

So please listen to our land, our ancestors and our future generations and leave uranium in the ground.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you for this presentation.

Who wants -- Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you for your presentation.

I just want to see to what extent -- you have been here for a part of the day. I don’t know when you came in. But there has been a lot of questions that have received a response. And you are basing -- you are

-- I would say, you've got, I suppose, many documents to support your presentation. But to what extent you trust the people, the specialists, which are here in front of you?

Because on one side you can say it's dangerous, there will be -- our land will change our way of life and everything. But we receive another message that it's not the case, it wouldn't be the case, and there will be monitoring. So what is your thinking about that?

MR. BEBASSIGE: My thinking -- sorry, can you repeat that?

MEMBER HARVEY: Well, I will just ask simply, do you trust the answers that are given here when the staff say, for example, there will be monitoring for years and years and there won't be any important impact on the lands, on water, on air and on health? So do you trust those answers or you are convinced that your position can change?

MR. DEBASSIGE: I'm still not convinced by the experts in here, but ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, let me try to do this.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: So we heard some person from Saskatchewan who also live beside a uranium mine, lived for many, many years who say it's safe, et cetera. You

hear technical staff who are saying you can actually build a uranium mine and not interfere with your way of life, your culture, your trapping, your fishing. You don't believe any of that? That's what the question is.

MR. DEBASSIGE: I don't believe in that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MR. DEBASSIGE: Because all the research I have done and all the -- one of my history teachers told me about the uranium and all that, and I asked my science teacher and he said it's still a bad thing, and I've known them for quite a while and I trust them. And I did my own research and I trust what people are saying out there too about the negative effects of uranium and how it can affect us as Cree, as Aboriginal.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it doesn't matter what CNSC staff would say and do, they'll never convince you that they can actually make sure that it's done properly?

MR. DEBASSIGE: They may be able to convince me but I would like to have hard facts, hard evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN: But they're arguing -- again I don't want to speak on their behalf, but they're arguing that Saskatchewan is a prime example of you got -- I'm talking about the recent Saskatchewan, not the old history that you just articulated over there. That right now

they're running pretty safe mines.

And that's -- what I'm trying to understand is have you been listening to them? Have you been believing in them?

Somebody actually said here that they did not believe their stories.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Well, if any of the locals from any community that live near and a hearing in mind, if they told us their experience and people from all over the place who live near the mines, I would listen. The locals, not specialists, I would listen to their opinions or how they -- what they experienced under -- they wouldn't work under any corporation at all, just them.

I would like to listen to their opinion, not any people working for any corporations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you -- did you do the study for other ---

(Applause/Applaudissements)

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that probably should be arranged.

Did you do this study, this nice study for other mines or just uranium?

MR. DEBASSIGE: Other mines and uranium.

THE CHAIRMAN: What did you find about other mines? Are you okay with diamonds, gold, copper?

MR. DEBASSIGE: What I had learned is that throughout all uranium mines that have been -- well mined, like in the entire world, only one uranium mine was clean. Only one, and the rest were just left with their mess.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

MR. DEBASSIGE: I would like to ask Strateco some questions too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

THE CHAIRMAN: You say in your website that the project will have negligible impact on workers, the local populations and the environment. After listening to my speech I am very curious as how you define negligible impact.

MR. TERREAULT: Pierre Terreault, for the record.

Well, the negligible impact is we met all the regulation, federal and provincial so -- on our study and by that we -- our consultant who did the study has conclude the situation regarding those different situations we'll have in the mine.

The health and safety program we have in place presently and will -- the next one, when we're going to go underground, it's very high and the procedure we put in place are -- everything has been sent to the CNSC and

the sumil bidup (phonetic)

Modification will be added as we go, but they've been accepted by the CNSC, so the health and safety will have on site and the environmental study we did, everything showed that we have a negligent impact on those subject.

MR. DEBASSIGE: I don't quite understand. Can you put it simply, please, a simple answer, please?

MR. TERREAULT: Well, the study we did for the environmental, it's below the criteria. They were -- been asked for so that's why we say we had negligent effect on the environmental part.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Okay. My second question; in your mission statement you say it's your mission to inform the public of uranium-related issues. I have yet to hear a Strateco representative speak directly to the issues I have talked about in my speech.

Can you explain why you have been avoiding these very sensitive issues?

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

Well, I guess we did engage dialogue with the Crees, with the community of Mistissini and also with the youth.

We've -- recently we had a meeting with --

we hoped there were more youth; was on this Shawn Iserhoff, it was during our last two open sessions. We did answer some of the questions; on the last one I don't believe you were attending on the May 23rd. We did give all the answers for questions, some of them will remain unanswered or not totally answered. So we did provide the answers.

So unfortunately, I believe perhaps yourself or others of your colleagues were not present at this session. But we do -- it's a priority for us to communicate with the community, with the youth, especially the youth, and the Native Women Association. So we are engaged into this.

So that's what we -- that's what we are doing and plan to keep on doing.

MR. DEBASSIGE: But there are some -- there are some things I'm curious about though. What I'm curious is that how -- like how would you want to engage with the youth? How would you want to explain, like, the impacts of uranium to us; putting them simply or like being honest with us about the negative impacts?

Because all the information I have read, this is -- you guys are not informing us about the negative impacts.

MR. LACHANCE: Jean-Pierre Lachance, for

the record.

We'll be so pleased for the youth who open their doors to the Strateco team, some experts we have, and sit down and have this open dialogue and communication.

And I think then you could have -- get more answers to your questions. That's what we're looking for.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Okay. Next time -- next time you want to try to meet with the youth, we want 100 percent negative impacts and 100 percent good impacts on uranium; everything, even the worst kind of -- the worst kind of environmental impacts, the -- anything that -- like any technology that you might have to ensure that the mine could be safe.

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

Yes indeed, definitely, we will do our best, and for any answer we won't have, let's say specifically on today, while the next time we would meet on a working group, we'll have the answers.

It's a long-term process for yourself to be able to -- for us to be able to answer to you all your concerns.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Okay. Onto my third question; on your website you say that your professional

team introduces adequate essential measures to protect fauna, flora, water, and air.

I would like to know who this team is; who’s it made up of, workers of Strateco or objective professionals?

I would also like to hear that -- what these measures are and whether or not we the members of this community would agree with those measures.

MS. HARDY: Caroline Hardy, for the record.

We have people onsite ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Please.

MS. HARDY: Yes. We have people onsite, people from the community, as well as people from Strateco who has already carried out -- carrying out monitoring at the site.

We have consultant that we -- that we have if -- for additional expertise; let’s say the risk assessment, SENES has been working with us, Golder has been working with us.

So -- that’s about it.

MR. DEBASSIGE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you, how many questions you got?

MR. DEBASSIGE: I have like three more questions left. Three.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you ask -- ask all of them together and we'll try to get some answer in there?

MR. DEBASSIGE: Okay.

If Strateco moves ahead with this mine what is your plan and budget for closing it and leaving it clean and environmentally sound?

There have been estimations that calculate closing the mine responsibly can cost up to a billion dollars; do you have this kind of budget in mind?

Question -- my next question, how will it affect our tourism rates? Right now Mistissini Lake is rated as one of the top 10 best fishing destinations in Canada. I highly doubt people will be interested in fishing here when they know they know that there's a uranium mine next door.

My next question, Mistissini Lake is one of the lifelines of fresh water in all of Quebec, how will you protect it and what would you do if it gets contaminated? Fresh water is in high demand worldwide and yet you are willing to place this big body of water at risk.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MS. HARDY: Caroline Hardy, for the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MS. HARDY: Caroline Hardy, for the record

again.

We'll have the water treatment plants on site that can actually get the water to very, very low concentration; the water will be clean, we'll respect all criteria and we'll be well below applicable criteria.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff, could you comment one more time on what's the probability of contamination of Mistissini Lake?

DR. THOMPSON: Essentially, the probability that the Lake Mistissini would be contaminated is none. The amount of water that will be handled during the advance exploration project, the quality of the water that will be treated and the treated affluent is so good that the likelihood that Mistissini Lake will be impacted is -- there's no likelihood.

So there's the -- Lake Mistissini will not be affected.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the last -- the question again, the one billion dollars to clean, to decommission -- somebody please answer that.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson, for the record.

We were checking our notes to remember the name of the site and so when people quote that huge number, it's a site in the States I believe, where the

footprint of contamination was huge. There was contamination in municipalities; there was a processing, enrichment. So it was a number of plants on a very large surface area that was contaminated.

It has nothing to do with a facility like the Strateco Advance Exploration with decommissioning where I believe the figure is 5.5 million.

THE CHAIRMAN: Last word to you ---

MEMBER McDILL: Actually, can I ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: The question is for the use -- you realize that before they can actually mine, there has to be another licence granted, there has to be a lot more work done.

This is -- this particular step -- and it's a long set of steps -- this particular step is exploration. It's proportionately small and we, or someone like us, will be around if -- and that’s a big if I guess -- if there's a licence to mine. This is not a licence to mine that we're talking about today. I want to make sure you understand that.

Do you understand that? That’s it's not a licence to mine, not as we think of mining traditionally.

You know, you're not going to have 50 scoop trams running up and down this drift, you -- how many

scoop trams or haul up vehicles are we going about?

MR. TERREAULT: Pierre Terreault, for the record.

The contractor is planning to have two scoop on the ground for one -- because we're going to have at a time one phase only.

MEMBER McDILL: I saw more than that on the road outside the hearing today. You know, it's -- I'm not saying it's small potatoes in terms of uranium; I'm saying that this is a small step, it goes bigger.

We're not -- this is not mining yet. And there will be more proceedings before there's a mine. And they'll be another -- yay -- they'll be another environmental assessment before there's a mine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco?

MR. HÉBERT: Guy Hébert, for the record.

I just want to make a point. This ore body actually has 2.5 million tons roughly, 2.5 million tons in total of ore mineralization rock. We are not talking hundred of thousand ton as your reeling in, for example, in Africa or Australia, big, big, open pits where they are mining 20 and 50,000 tons per day.

We are talking of -- if ever we go in operation, we are talking 750 tons a day, which is the scoping study, 750 tons a day. It's a very, very, very

small operation and this is -- ever -- if ever we go into production. We are not talking -- we're not -- I hear very, very often, you are talking hundred of thousand tons of waste.

We will mine 2.5 million tons. We hope to find a little bit more. But, you know, this is high-grade mine, for us it's nothing upwards of Cigar Lake. But it's only 2.5 million tons in total. And that’s going into a hole of 200 metres by about 200 metres by 20 metres.

If ever we do a quarry to put the tailings at the end of the mine, you know, for all the tailings, that is very, very, very small opening. So when -- a lot of people are taking comparison for -- picture a very, very large open pit, large impact, we are talking .5 kilometres for this exploration phase. And if ever we do a tailing, this is very, very small opening.

So this - just make the point -- then it's only 2.5 million tons we have now.

THE CHAIRMAN: There’s obviously the room to explain that because ---

MR. HÉBERT: I hope so.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- obviously a lot of people still have -- don’t know the whole picture, don’t understand the picture here.

Time goes on, we need to break.

Is any last word you want to leave with us?

MR. DEBASSIGE: We are the youth, even if we do consider it we would not risk our land and we will stand against this uranium and I do not agree to visit this project. And so the youth ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. DEBASSIGE: --- will stand and we'll ask -- we'll peacefully and respectfully say no to this mine, to this project.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your presentation.

We are going to break now for an hour. What? How long do you need? I'm trying to allow for all the intervenors to have their time here.

One hour? Okay. So that makes it 8h20.

Thank you.

--- Upon recessing at 7:20 p.m./

L'audience est suspendue à 19h20

--- Upon resuming at 8:25 p.m./

L'audience est reprise 20h25

MR. LEBLANC: Sorry for it to go that late.

The -- just in terms of logistics, we will

now hear from Chief Richard Shecapio. He will be followed by Deputy Grand Chief Iserhoff and then we will have an Elder that will be speaking to us.

And time allowing, we will then resume based on the order of the interventions and we will not go beyond 10:30 tonight. So that’s the latest that we can stay for technical reasons, the equipment and the crew -- many people have to go back to Chibougamau tonight and then come back tomorrow so we want them to go back safely.

And those that we have not been able to hear today, we will start with them tomorrow and verify their availability to try to accommodate them.

So thank you for understanding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, just to repeat, we would have stayed here all night if need be, but technical consideration prevent us from doing this.

So we are bound by this agenda that Marc has just written and it's a great pleasure to welcome you, Chief, one more time and please, the floor is yours.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

12-H7.45

Oral presentation by the

Council of the Cree Nation

of Mistissini

CHIEF SHECAPIO: (Interpreted from Cree to English). Hello, everybody. Before I start I will start in Cree, I'll speak in Cree when I speak to the Cree people here, the Cree Mistissini people.

I want to tell you that how we're viewing and what we're hearing today at these hearings that we can show -- that we can give the company a chance to tell us elaborately what they want to do.

Even though we do not stand with them with what they want to do, that we should still -- that we can listen to them with what they want to share with us, what they're presenting us.

And I can say that we listen to them too. We listen to the Mistissini people, and we looked at, you know, it's been two years that we've started this works, and today I see a lot of opposition to this.

It's very obvious that our people disagree with many of the presentations and the information that's been given us today, and we're speaking today, and us as leaders of this community.

So we want to say that we do not want this. We do not approve of this. We do not want what this company is requesting for.

Even though today they sit here, and they

listen to us, and they're facing us, they have their own roles and their purpose and what is expected of them in their responsibilities. They're listening to our people; they listen to us, all the comments. They want to tell you that even after this meeting, as far as we can go as leaders, that we will fight this, that there is no license granted.

First of all, I would like to thank our Elder, Mr. Sampit Wadnu (phonetic) for doing the opening prayer this morning.

I would also like to welcome all the people participating in this hearing, and those who are here with us tonight, as well as those who participated throughout the day.

These people are the reason we are here tonight as a First Nation collectively. They are the guardians of the land and of our distinct identity.

As the chief of the Cree Nation of Mistissini, I am the spokesperson of my community. I assume my responsibilities with respect to our traditional values and our way of life.

In that regard, I would like to express my sincere regards to the talisman, present, and thank them for their important input on this project.

Members of the Commission, I would also

like to thank you for being here to hear from my people with regard to Strateco Resources' request for a license for advanced uranium exploration on our traditional land.

I know your day has been long, and I hope you still have some strength to listen to my statement because it is one of great importance.

Ce soir je me fais le porte-parole de la communauté pour vous présenter notre position concernant le projet de Strateco de manière générale sur l’exploitation de l’uranium sur notre territoire.

I'd like to talk to you today about the concerns that we have with this project and with uranium mining in general, and the impacts it will have on our relation with the land and our traditional way of life.

The Crees have lived the traditional way of life of hunting, fishing, trapping and harvesting for centuries and have passed it on from one generation to another. This tradition is still strong and carried out to this day.

Eeowishgee(phonetic) which translates as the land of the Cree, ou la terre de Cris, has been home to the James Bay Cree's since stories have been told.

This land is a school of its own. The resources of the land, our materials and supplies we teach with. Cree trap lines are the classrooms. We teach our

youth the Cree way of living, a way of living that is in harmony with nature, which has guaranteed our survival as people.

Any education that leads to survival is a high standard of education. Our traditional education is what teaches us to be humble, respectful, responsible, disciplined, independent and compassionate.

The licensing of Strateco's project opens the door for uranium mining on our traditional lands, and represents the first step toward a uranium boom in this region.

As said during the CNSC's presentation this morning, there are over 20 active uranium exploration projects in the region. The Cree Nation of Mistissini has also compiled a map showing many uranium claims in the Otish Mountains that touch Mistissini traditional territory as well as neighbouring trap lines.

We believe that many of these claims could also become active exploration projects and possibly mines in the future if Strateco receives a license from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

The Cree Nation of Mistissini therefore feels that the most important question we need to answer is not whether we accept an exploration ramp on our traditional lands, but whether we accept uranium mining at

all.

Community members have expressed a great deal of concern about the location of Strateco's project for two main reasons. First, the project is located in the Otish Mountain drainage basin, and second, it is in close proximity to the Albanel-Timiscamie-Otish Park.

The Otish Mountains are the source of the water that supports our people. It is a sacred place for the Cree. To protect the water we drink we need to be very careful about the kind of development we are willing to allow in these mountains.

To protect these mountains for future generations we are working with the provincial government to open the Albanel-Timiscamie-Otish Park. This park will be negatively impacted by this project, as will ecotourism and the revenue it could generate for our community.

The bottom line is that uranium development and the ATO Park cannot co-exist.

We would like to make it clear that the Cree Nation Mistissini is not opposed to mineral exploration and mining. We have recently signed an Impact and Benefits Agreement with a mining company and have had a positive long-term relationship with another mining company in the past.

The Cree Nation of Mistissini, however,

does not believe that uranium development is an activity that is consistent with our role as responsible stewards of this land.

In November 2010, the Cree Nation of Mistissini said that this project did not have the support of the community. We confirmed this position again in 2011.

Today nothing has changed and our position remains unchanged.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

In 1970s, we signed the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement in order to ensure that our way of life and values can continue on our traditional lands. Section 22 of the Agreement guarantees the protection of Cree people continue on our traditional lands.

Section 22 of the Agreement guarantees the protection of Cree people, their society, communities, way of life and economy in the face of development.

Representatives from our main social institutions have chosen to participate in these hearings to oppose Strateco’s licensing due to concerns that these rights are threatened by the project.

Throughout the course of these hearings you have heard or will hear various entities talking about the long-term health risks associated with radiation,

contamination of waterways and the guarantee of Cree harvesting rights.

Because my people are still active on the land, hunting, trapping, consuming the animals, we are concerned that traditional foods may become contaminated with radionuclides; posing a threat to those who eat them.

High-levels of radionuclides in moose and caribou tissue have been reported in animals near uranium mines. This indirect exposure can lead to serious health issues for those people who eat contaminated animals.

As stewards of this land we are also concerned with the impact the resources of our land have on the world. We do not believe that nuclear energy, which is the primary use for uranium in Canada, is a sustainable form of energy.

We do not want to see a resource extracted from our land. Be responsible for causing pollution and waste in the world. We do not want this to be our impact on the world.

The Cree have already sacrificed a great deal of source of clean and abundant renewable energy in hydroelectricity.

The CNSC, along with Canadian Environment Agency have concluded that this project presents low risk to environment and human health. This however has not

been effectively demonstrated to my people.

It is important for the Tribunal to understand that. If this project goes ahead my people's perception of contamination it will cause -- will permanently impact our relationship with, and the use of the land for hunting, fishing and trapping.

We have heard what the experts have to say and we still believe that harm will be caused.

British Columbia and Nova Scotia have legislated moratoria on uranium exploration and mining in communities across Quebec are rejecting the uranium industry because of concerns around the inability of Canadian agencies to effectively identify and address cumulative impacts of uranium exploration, mining and milling. Why would we accept it here?

We do not agree with the CNSC conclusion that Aboriginal consultation has been sufficient and meets the needs of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*. We signed a communication and information agreement with Strateco in December in good faith, in order to give them another opportunity to do what they should have been doing since 2006 to address my people's concerns with this project.

Nothing, however, has changed since the signing of the agreement. Strateco does not have, and has

never had our support for the Matoush Project, despite what they may have announced to their investors.

Furthermore, the Council of Mistissini, with the support of the Grand Council of the Crees has issued a resolution calling for a moratorium on uranium development on our traditional territory.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

CHIEF SHECAPIO: This is the most conclusive -- this the most conclusive evidence possible of lack of social acceptability for this project here in Mistissini.

In light of the lack of social acceptability, cultural incompatibility, and the lack of clear understanding of health and environmental impacts of uranium mining, it would be reckless for us as people to move forward and support the licensing of Strateco’s Advanced Exploration Project.

Regardless of the final decision this Tribunal will have, our role as stewards of this land obliges us to restate our objective of obtaining a moratorium on uranium mining and exploration on our traditional lands, as well as in the Province of Quebec.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

CHIEF SHECAPIO: Mistissini est clairement contre ce projet. Nous demandons un moratoire sur

l’exploration d’uranium sur nos terres ancestrales et ailleurs au Québec.

In Quebec more and more communities and First Nations are rejecting uranium mining as unsustainable and dangerous activity, including the Métis community of Gaspé, the Innu of Uashat Mak Mani-Utenam, and over 325 municipalities in this province who support a moratorium on uranium mining.

We are calling on all communities in Quebec who view uranium mining as an unsustainable and harmful activity to join forces in the call for a moratorium on uranium mining and exploration in this province.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

CHIEF SHECAPIO: Finally, I am here today to serve notice that the Cree Nation of Mistissini will do whatever it takes to stop uranium development on our traditional lands.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

CHIEF SHECAPIO: We hope for the recognition and respect of our communities concerns and position by the Commission Tribunal in making its final decision on the issuance of a licence to Strateco Resources.

Thank you very much. Meegwetch.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, the floor is open.

Thank you, Chief, for this.

Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you, Chief. And I think your opposition is very clear. The only question I will ask is, you seem not to trust -- I think you mentioned that right at the beginning that despite the answers that have been given today, you don't believe that there will not have significant impacts on the lands, on the health, everything.

So it's clear that you don't accept the answers that have been given today.

CHIEF SHECAPIO: The focus to the -- by the Commission, also by CNSC, by the Proponent, have focussed solely on the exploration, the Advanced Exploration Program.

We look at it -- it's not just an exploration program, we look at the long-term potential impacts that it could have should this project proceed at the next stage that will lead to mining exploitation.

Despite the -- all the responses or statements that were made and also the recommendations from the review panel -- from the federal review panel, perhaps this project, the Exploration Program may pose a low-risk at this point but we cannot ignore the long-term

potential impacts that will have on our land.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Chief. Thank you.

Thank you for this presentation.

CHIEF SHECAPIO: Maybe can I just ask two questions?

THE CHAIRMAN: By all means.

CHIEF SHECAPIO: I mentioned in my speech that my people want to talk about more than just an exploration ramp. I have two questions here to Strateco.

What would be or what are the next steps that a company would take to move towards an operating mine? That's question one.

To the CNSC, how many more steps from a regulatory perspective does this project need to go through until they have a permit to operate a mine?

Also in your experience, what percentage of a project that are granted an advance exploration permit end up as active mining projects?

THE CHAIRMAN: Strateco, do you want to start?

MR. HÉBERT: Yes, Guy Hébert.

Thank you, Chief. Next step for us, you know, for sure we will have to wait for the decision of the CNSC and then wait for the decision of Quebec. And

then, if you are talking for the next step after that, you know, I cannot go further than that. It's -- we were expecting to put in place the communication agreement. We can discuss about that not here, and the -- but eventually, you know, if we are getting the licence and the okay of Quebec, we will continue to develop.

We have a plan, which has been proposed for the licence and we want to -- if ever we get it, we will continue to develop in the next four years and restart again all the process for the environmental impact study for the next step, if it's a green light. There are many things to come before that.

But for tonight, it's what I can say. I don't know the decision of the CNSC. I don't know the decision from Quebec. But if ever it's positive, then we expect to continue to work with the Cree community and we'll see in four years from now, starting again all the process.

THE CHAIRMAN: Staff.

MR. JAMMAL: This is Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

The Chief asked the question as how many more steps are required in order to have a full operating licence. In our presentation, we mentioned this is the first phase, first point. For them to go any further,

they will have to – are required to carry out a full environmental assessment that incorporate and encompass public input.

Second, after the environmental assessment, then the process begins in parallel for a licence to construct and operate. And that licence will be, again, through a public hearing process as under the Rules of Procedure of the Commission. So there will be another full hearing and full licensing process.

You asked the question with respect to advance exploration. I just consulted with my colleagues. It seems that one -- most explorations or advance explorations or testing explorations that's been carried out, almost all of them did become a -- well, they continue to become an operating mine, but they had to follow the regulatory process of the CNSC, and the CNSC is the regulatory body. If they were not safe, there would not be authorized to operate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. McDill, you had a question?

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

May I ask, even if the science, as we understand today, shows the risk is low and the risk that does exist can be mitigated, the position you have is that however small, it is not a risk your community wishes to

take. Did I say that correctly?

CHIEF SHECAPIO: I think we can go back to the time when Mistissini began its process to review the impact, the environmental impact statement that was submitted by the Proponent in 2010. Throughout the process, our community participated in the participant funding by CEAA. And we undertook to provide whatever we can to our people and also used some experts to come.

All throughout this stage, the Proponent has had an opportunity to address and/or to respond to questions or concerns that the people are raising. Even today, we see it. There are still outstanding concerns and questions that have not been addressed as we speak.

So therefore, the lack of social acceptability, the social acceptance part of that, we cannot proceed with this project.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MEMBER McDILL: I am wondering if you have an Elder grandmother who might come for a word at some point in this. We have a lot of -- because I'm hearing very much from -- you'll forgive me, I'm a woman, and I've seen many men and I would like, if this is an issue of social acceptability as opposed to science, let us say, or includes that aspect, we've heard from many youths. Maybe tomorrow if there is a grandmother, it would be good to

hear from the grandmothers, if that's possible.

CHIEF SHECAPIO: At this point, I guess, it's really up to the Commission Tribunal who control the ---

MEMBER McDILL: I stand corrected, we did hear from a grandmother. Okay.

I'll withdraw the request.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you, Chief. This is a hypothetical question. You came to the conclusion that uranium is unacceptable whereas many other mines are okay. Even though the science, as we heard from staff, it tells you there are practically the same kinds of issues in practically every mine, the very same as the uranium.

Thus the question is, hypothetically, it doesn't matter what Strateco would have done, they would have never got a social acceptability? That's the hypothetical question. It's a tough question.

CHIEF SHECAPIO: I think, you know, we look at the experiences that we had also with the Proponent going back to the hearings. In November 2010, when we first mentioned our position with regards to this project, nothing happened in 2011, no communication.

An agreement, however, was reached with the Cree Mineral Exploration Board that provided assistance to Strateco to kind of provide information to the community.

Out of that process within a year, only once the representatives came to the Council meeting to do a short presentation on the progress of that. Still today, I haven't seen the report on what exactly the outcome of that arrangement.

In December 2011, when we signed the CIA agreement, we gave them a second chance to come in, what they're supposed to be and what they should have done right from the onset.

We were open to allow the company to come in. Social acceptability is a big question.

In our letter to the federal authority, the federal administrator, we have also indicated what we want in order to allow this Communication and Information Agreement to be implemented. We had requested specifically that we give -- we be given at least six months to see the implementation of this.

I don’t know what happened to that letter, to our request, perhaps, it might have been put on a shelf or was just completely ignored.

Following the signing of that, federal authorities announced that they had -- practically had an agreement with the community. This agreement no way endorses or supports Strateco and also it doesn’t change the position that we took.

I asked the question today, I look at the presentations, the slides that Strateco presented this morning. From 2006 to December 2011 there's not a lot of things there that they could report.

But if you look at the timeline, from January to where we are today, they indicate the dates and what they've done. As you can see, the CIA is at its implementation stage, and we're here today going for a licensing hearing.

Strateco had six years -- six years to consult, to attain that social acceptance from that -- from our community members and today Strateco does not have the social acceptance from our community.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much for that.

We're going to move on to the next submission which is an oral presentation from the Deputy Grand Chief, Mr. Ashley Iserhoff, as outlined in CMD 7.27A.

Mr. Iserhoff, the floor is yours.

12-H7.27 / 12-H7.27A

Oral presentation

by Ashley Iserhoff

MR. A. ISERHOFF: I'm grateful to be here to speak to you, all of you. I'm very happy to be here this evening, to be present for this.

(Speaking in native language - no translation)

I'm very honoured to be here this evening. Good evening. Before I speak, my presentation has the support of Grand Chief Matthew Coon-Come, who unfortunately could not be here today.

My name is Ashley Iserhoff and I am the Deputy Grand Chief, Vice Chairman of the Grand Council of the Crees of the Eeyou Istchee Cree Regional Authority.

I would like to welcome the Commission Tribunal, the CNSC staff, and the representatives of Strateco, and all guests to Eeyou Istchee.

I wish to offer my appreciation to Chief Richard Shecapio and the Council of the Cree Nations of Mistissini for welcoming everyone, and I would like to thank all participants for coming to the CNSC public hearings.

I know it's been a long day for everyone but this schedule is the result of your participation in large numbers, which is significant and is a very good reason.

The number of submissions sent to the CNSC staff to present your position on the project based on your needs and values is impressive, and demonstrates the great interests you have concerning the future developments of your traditional territories, especially about uranium development.

I know that to speak in front of a large assembly, as today, takes courage and determination. And the efforts taken by all of you to come forward and to present your view to the Commission Tribunal are recognized. It demonstrates the vitality and good health of the community of Mistissini, which is its strength.

For many weeks now you have raised your concerns and spoken on this project at various forums. I want to assure you that the Grand Council of the Crees of Eeyou Istchee have heard you. Today it is the Commission Tribunal’s turn to hear your voice. I wish to thank all who submitted briefings to the hearings.

For the benefit of the Commission, I will do my presentation in English.

This presentation is on behalf of the Grand Council of the Crees of Eeyou Istchee Cree Regional Authority’s position on the application for a uranium mine site preparation and construction licence by Strateco Resources Incorporated.

There are more than 18,000 Cree. We call ourselves Eeyou Innu, residing in 10 communities on our traditional territory and call our homeland Eeyou Istchee.

The Grand Council of the Crees is the political body representing the Cree Nation. The Grand Council has 20 members, Grand Chief, and a Deputy Grand Chief, elected at large by the Eeyou.

The Chiefs elected by each of the nine Cree First Nation communities and one other representative from each community. A tenth community is also in the process of being established.

On behalf of the Grand Council of the Crees, I wish to present to the Commission Tribunal the reasons we support the Cree Nation of Mistissini's position against uranium development on their traditional lands.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. A. ISERHOFF: My presentation today consists on the following sections; the first section will address the scope of the project and its justification.

Second, I will raise the health, safety and environmental impacts and risks of this project.

Third, I will end my presentation with a comment on the Communication and Information Agreement between the Cree Nation of Mistissini and Strateco

Resource and the position taken by the Cree Nation of Mistissini.

The members of the community of Mistissini are concerned with the potential impacts of the proposed license for the Matoush Advanced Exploration, Matoush Project. The concerns are not related -- not only to the advanced exploration stage, but also with the mining exploitation stage, field processing and production, as well as with waste management.

The life circle impacts of the clear nuclear field give rise to serious concerns among the Crees that their environments and health will be subjected to severe repercussions for both this and future generations. There exists a long history of mining in Eeyou Istchee, but not with uranium mining.

It is of crucial importance to take into account the fact that this type of mineral development would be a first in Quebec.

Strateco Resources is not only the only uranium exploration company in the area, and people believe this project will open the door to greater uranium mining developments.

The cumulative impacts of mining, especially uranium mining, are a great concern for the Cree Nation.

We believe a life circle approach to evaluate the impacts and the risks, as well as the costs and benefits would be more appropriate and would determine the cumulative impacts of uranium development more clearly. To limit the review to the exploration stage in the matters of regulatory interest does not allow our people to address all of their concerns.

The importance of informing and involving the people as early as possible before a project's development is fully determined is an internationally recognized principle.

Why are the Cree and the population of Quebec unable to benefit from a comprehensive overview of the major health, safety, and environmental impacts and risks associated with each stage of the nuclear energy field?

The Cree Nation of Mistissini must be given the opportunity to give or withhold their free, prior, and informed consent to the uranium development. They need to know in manner -- in what manner their traditional territories and natural resources will be affected.

The Cree should be well informed on the comprehensive overview of the impacts before any development is taken. This would allow them to form a clear decision on whether or not they accept or refuse any

development project. Any project of this type must have the support of the Cree Nation.

Following our reading of the CNSC Commission Member Document, we understand that the CNSC staff concludes that the Matoush project poses low overall risk to health, safety and the environment. The CNSC staff explains that the proposed activities and related risks are similar to the ones encountered in conventional mining activities because the mining development would be, for the most part, through clear rock.

The CNSC staff concludes that the Commission should accept its assessment and conclusion and approve the issuance of the uranium mine site preparation and construction licence.

In the last decades, our people have gone through many rapid changes that have affected our culture and traditions. People have seen the pristine environment modified by various types of contaminants stemming from cumulative impacts of various development projects.

Although the CNSC staff and the proponent have tried to explain scientifically to the Cree people that the proposed project shows low risks, they still feel threatened by the new type of contaminants and impacts resulting from uranium exploration and exploitation.

Whether or not the impacts are low or high,

the Cree remain mistrustful, and this lack of trust will transform their behaviour and relationship with the land. The nourishing land will become a threat and weaken our traditional way of life to the land.

The historical perspective is relevant to illustrate the impact a contaminant can have on the Cree way of life. Since the late 1970s, resource development has had a direct impact on the traditional Cree way of life resulting in a very rapid rate of cultural change.

The shockwaves of development on the quality of life are complex, difficult to measure and very challenging to manage adequately. Nevertheless, these are collectively non-sufficient reasons to ignore these serious social and cultural issues.

The continuous effects on our culture need to be addressed because we need to lessen the threat, both the perceived and physical impact on our traditional way of life brought about uranium exploration and exploitation development on our lands.

During previous hearings or forums on the Matoush project, many persons mentioned the pristine environment and the concern that bush food and waters coming from the Otish Mountains would be contaminated. This project is located in the Otish Mountains, an area very much valued by the Cree Nation, in particular because

it is the head of an important watershed. Waters coming from the Otish Mountains flow down to Lake Mistassini and are vital to the wellbeing of our traditional territory, which we call Eeyou Istchee.

The safeguard and quality and integrity of waters in the Otish Mountains and its resources is highly valued. Serious concerns exist regarding ionizing radiation, future atmospheric releases of radon gas, the contamination of groundwater and surface water by radionuclide, heavy metals and other contaminants and, of course, the potential contamination of the wildlife and vegetation.

A large part of our land could be affected, not just by the physical impacts themselves of the project, but by the perceptions and reactions of our people in relation to the impacts of the project and others like it.

Despite the requirement to comply with Canadian standards and practices, we do not believe that it will alleviate the legitimate concerns among the people regarding the impacts and risks related to this project and other potential projects of a similar nature for which this project will open the doors.

In view of the problems that we have experienced with mercury, we can only express serious

doubts of the CNSC staff's conclusion that the project will have low risk overall on health.

Up to now, the Crees are not confident that the Proponent's environmental risk management system will effectively deal with the potential physical impacts and the community's negative perception and concerns regarding the project. It appears evident that the conventional health and safety program to manage the workplace safety is insufficient in dealing with all of the impacts that this project may cause on health even if it meets the regulatory requirements under the *Nuclear Safety and Control Act*.

The scientific explanations given to the Mistissini population have -- for the most part have not been accepted. We believe the Commission Tribunal needs to take into consideration the impact that the concerns and perceptions of the population of Mistissini will have on their traditional way of life.

The concerns of the Cree Nation of Mistissini regarding this project are not facile or frivolous. It should be noted that the Cree Nation has supported and continues to support mining developments and economic opportunities that it presents.

We have partnerships with mining companies in which we seek to address employment challenges in our

communities.

In spite of these benefits of mining developments, in the case of radioactive minerals, certain other concerns arise relating to our way of life and to our wellbeing. In order to have a better understanding of the community's opinion of the proposed Matoush project, the Cree Nation of Mistissini held in 2011 a number of information sessions, work group meetings and a survey regarding the advanced uranium exploration and uranium mining in Mistissini traditional territory.

The survey pointed out that the community members were predominantly opposed to the project. We understand that, in view of the foregoing, the Cree Nation of Mistissini has taken a position to oppose uranium mining in Mistissini, on Mistissini traditional territory.

Moreover, it has requested a moratorium on Strateco's advanced exploration project on Mistissini traditional territory.

A Communication and Information Agreement, a CIA, was signed on -- in December 2011 between Strateco Resources and the Cree Nation of Mistissini. The CIA set out a framework with various undertakings for both parties to allow for the communication of relevant and useful information on the Matoush project.

The CIA has just started to be implemented,

and the Grand Council believes that it would be premature to make any assumptions as to the success of its implementation.

We understand that the Cree Nation of Mistissini considers the information presented by the project Proponent to date have not materially improved the community's perception of the project or met with the community's expectations.

The Council of the Cree Nation of Mistissini has, therefore, requested that the licensing of the project remain on hold until the implementation of the CIA satisfies the Cree Nation of Mistissini.

We also understand that, in view of the foregoing, the Cree Nation of Mistissini continues to reject the Proponent's advanced uranium exploration project on the Matoush site and will request the Canadian Nuclear Commission not to grant the Proponent a licence to proceed.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. ISERHOFF: In conclusion, the Cree Nation of Mistissini will continue to take lead on this as will have the greatest impact on its people.

The Grand Council of the Crees has already stated its support to the Cree Nation of Mistissini for its position regarding the project. The Grand Council of

the Crees, the Cree Nation, offer their support to the Cree Nation of Mistissini's position. It has not changed, and we wish now to reiterate our support to Mistissini.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Thank you, Chief.

Question?

Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBRE HARVEY: Merci, monsieur le président.

Deputy Chief, you mentioned in your presentation that the -- there would be a need for a comprehensive global impact assessment on uranium mining. Were you thinking about that specific project or on -- in general on uranium mining?

MR. ISHERHOFF: I believe it's uranium mining in general.

MEMBER HARVEY: In general, yes.

MR. ISHERHOFF: Uranium mining.

MEMBER HARVEY: Not for the -- that specific project.

MR. ISHERHOFF: That as well.

MEMBER HARVEY: Because suppose there is another impact assessment. In the view that the -- this will conduct a mine, even with the comprehensive

assessment, do you think that your position could change?

Even if the -- that new comprehensive assessment, suppose that the conclusion would be in the same -- in the same -- well, area that the actual impact assessment. I mean do you think -- simply, do you think any other assessment would change your position?

MR. ISERHOFF: I'll take you back; although I was born in 1974, way back in the early '70s when our people decided to stand together as one, it always has been the community initiative, the communities were the ones to take lead in any discussion, and any position regarding any project of development that comes to our territories.

Whatever the position of Mistissini is, the Grand Council will support that.

THE CHAIRMAN: So does the Grand Council -- is any secretarial research facilities to help all those communities?

MR. ISERHOFF: Yes, we do. We have an environmental department within the CRA and we have support staff that supports all the Cree communities.

THE CHAIRMAN: So did you -- did you visit Saskatchewan? I'm using Saskatchewan because that's the only operating mines we have now in Canada and they're experienced.

Again, the Territories has a lot of -- you know -- Cree in fact in it and so I'm just curious as to whether -- if the people here are very suspicious of government and scientists and experts; why not go actually talk to real people living and working in real mines? Have you guys done that?

MR. ISERHOFF: From my end -- for my office, I have not personally visited any uranium mine sites in Canada. But I can tell you that I'm pretty sure that in previous leadership, in the past, I'm sure they have visited these mine sites.

THE CHAIRMAN: So there was no kind of a -- you know, again we're looking for some documented evidence where one reaches conclusion like that, that it's totally unacceptable, against the value of the community, et cetera, et cetera.

MR. ISERHOFF: As I indicated before, the Grand Council of the Cree is a political organization that represents the interests of all the Cree Nation Eeyou Istchee. There's over 18,000 of us.

And whenever projects, development of nature, the community is the one that takes lead; they're the ones that discuss with the Proponent and in the end it comes to the Grand Council of the Cree for support.

The direction usually comes from the people

of Eeyou Istchee, individual communities, whatever direction the Chief-in-Council -- local Chief-in-Councils are given those are -- that's what we support as the Grand Council of the Crees. And I believe that initiatives have taken place already -- visits have taken locally here to the mine sites out west.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Monsieur Harvey?

Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: If I wrote your words down correctly -- you have your words in front of you so you can probably find where I'm looking for.

I believe you said the licence should be put on hold until the CIA becomes fully effective. It was towards the end.

Can you clarify that? Is it this licence only or a broader?

MR. ISERHOFF: I'm just reading right now.

Can you repeat your question?

MEMBER McDILL: Well first I wanted you to repeat the sentence so I made sure I understood it correctly.

What I wrote as you spoke was "The licence should go or be on hold until the CIA and" -- my interpretation after that was goes into effect as being

used as fully functional.

MR. ISERHOFF: I believe that's maybe -- the position of the Grand Council now is to support Mistissini's position and I believe Chief Richard Shecapio has already stated their position.

MEMBER McDILL: It was your words though.

MR. ISERHOFF: I might have not -- might have forgotten to scratch it out. There are some changes that have to be made.

MEMBER McDILL: That's why I wanted to clarify. So that is not -- have you found the line in crossing it out?

So the people doing the transcription can make sure they get that.

Is there, in your view, any point of compromise in this?

MR. ISERHOFF: In?

MEMBER McDILL: This licence, any point of compromise between Sibi (phon.) Cree? I presume there may be some other groups who are more in favour, I think when we get to Chibougamau, we'll have another audience with another set of opinions perhaps.

But in your -- in your sense of where we stand today, is there any point of compromise where the social acceptability can be found, can be worked towards?

MR. ISERHOFF: Well, that’s a very tough question to answer. But I can tell you right now that Mistissini has taken the position -- the Cree Nation, when they stand together and support a community, we stand stronger when we’re together.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MR. ISERHOFF: I just want to reiterate, I guess today, the Grand Council’s support to the community of Mistissini and the Cree Nation stands alongside with us.

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

There was a voice.

Chief, you were -- you wanted to add something to that or to comment on that?

CHIEF SHECAPIO: With regards to your comments about compromising; social acceptability of this project; this is going back to the CIA Agreement when we signed in -- recently in 2011.

That was the whole intent of the CIA, was to give the Proponent another opportunity.

Furthermore, we had also wanted that everything be put on hold, this would include the decision from the federal government, the process to begin the licensing hearing, but that did not happen.

We reached this stage today where our

demands were not even looked at or were ignored, I don’t know. And I say today, it’s too late.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

MEMBER McDILL: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else?

Okay. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

MR. ISERHOFF: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am told that an Elder, Mr. Thomas Coon would like to make a statement.

Mr. Coon?

Welcome.

Welcome, Mr. Coon. Anytime you’re ready.

MR. COON: Honourable Members of the Panel, and CNSC staff, Strateco, welcome.

First of all, I must say I really appreciate the opportunity to speak. As you can see -- maybe I have -- and I apologize for violating your policy. I did not register as a presenter because I knew there'll be many presenters. And I really want to thank the Panel for giving me -- hopefully two minutes.

The youth have stated that there are two sides to every story and it's no different with the uranium story. If Strateco, the CNSC staff, it's one side of the story. But I really appreciate the Commission for

coming to Mistissini and have the courage to listen to the Cree side of the story on uranium.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

MR. COON: I am very pleased to the Members that they have chosen the community of Mistissini as a place of hearing on such an important -- an important issue like uranium.

I am also very pleased that you have given us the opportunity to educate you about our way of life, to educate you about our culture.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

MR. COON: And to educate you about the importance of the land to the Cree people. I want to thank you, thank you for giving us that opportunity to educate you. And I want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to hear the Cree side of the story on uranium. There's always two sides to every coin and there's two sides to every story. I want to thank you for hearing both sides of the story on uranium.

I do not want to take too much time, I do not, I know we're pressed of time, it's running late, it's 9:30, it's past my bedtime.

(Laughter/Rires)

MR. COON: But the relationship between the land and the Cree is so unique and I'm pleased that you

have come to listen to that. The Crees believe the Creator gave them the land as a gift, a land they can use and roam and harvest. And the Creator delegated the Cree Nation as stewards and guardians and the protectors the beauty of his creation. What do we call the land? Istchee, The land of the Cree people.

And I hope that CNSC and the Commission will be partners with the Crees in protecting -- in protecting the land, our homeland together.

Thank you.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

MR. COON: Thank you so much for that opportunity.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

MR. COON: And do not grant that licence, reject that licence.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, thank you very much.

Le prochain mémoire est de docteur Isabelle Gingras, the auteur-médecin tel qu'indiqué au document 12-H-7.9. Docteur Gingras, vous avez la parole.

12-H7.9

Oral presentation by

Dr. Isabelle Gingras and

other physicians

DRE GINGRAS: Good evening. So I'm here on the behalf of many physicians. The short submission that you got was written by me; Dr. Bruno Imbreau is a ophthalmologist; Éric Notebeart, which is an intensive care unit doctor and also an emergency physician who is part of the Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, also a physician for Global Survival, he's a member of that and he's a member of the Scientific Circle of the Foundation of David Suzuki; Jacques Levasseur, also a physician; Jean Zigby, physician and president of Canadian Association of Physician for the Environment; and Michael Dworkin, also a physician and member of CAPE and a physician for Global Survival.

I also gave you the memoire that we wrote, 60 doctors that we signed that memoire that you also have with you.

So this morning Strateco mentioned that they got the opinion of a physician called Dr. Plante, which is one physician. Dr. Plante is an employee of Hydro-Quebec that owns nuclear power plant.

Like I told you, I co-wrote a 53-page memoire with many of my colleagues and that was signed by

over 60 independent physicians from all over the province, 60 independent physicians who are opposed to uranium activities.

So you have 60 independent physicians and you have one physician that works for a company that owns a nuclear power plant.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

DRE GINGRAS: So what opinion would you trust?

Question: can you accept “no” as an answer? Can you accept “no” as an answer that is informed? It's not only consent that can be informed.

I'm very disappointed with some of the attitude that I saw today when individuals say no, he or she is asked if that person has enough information to make that statement. The same question was never asked to the individuals that came here that were in favour of the project.

(Applause/Applaudissements)

DRE GINGRAS: I heard Mr. Jammal say that as long as the CNSC exists, that there wouldn’t be any dangers. I don’t know about you guys, but I don’t recognize my country right now and the province in which I live in.

With Harper in place and all the cuts are

going on right now regarding environmental monitoring, it's scary. We don’t know which form CNSC will have in a few years and what impact CNSC is going to have to protect us.

Strateco on his website says that it's in favour of sustainable development; sustainable development is based on 16 principles.

And the question that I would ask Strateco right now is on the 16 principles, how many do you think you’re violating with your project? How many, on the 16? No answer?

I’ll give you some answers.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

DRE GINGRAS: I just want to clarify something. I modified my presentation throughout the day. It was like a more subtle and polite presentation, but I’m kind of mirroring the attitude -- a lot of frustration that I’ve accumulated during the day.

So basically, one of the principles that -- the first one is health and quality of life. You’ve heard that the Crees are opposed to this project to protect the Cree way of life.

The conflict and atmosphere of uncertainty surrounding such projects interferes with the quality of life of affected populations. It generates stress,

anxiety, and sometimes distress. And that is an impact on health. It’s not only physical. We have to consider mental health.

Unfortunately, I don’t know where Patsy Thompson gets her studies, but there are a few studies that exist which address the impact of uranium mines on populations.

However, we know that children that live close to a nuclear power plant are more affected by leukemia.

Before going too far in this process, it’s imperative that all impacts throughout the lifecycle of uranium be taken into account.

So we know that radon gases is the key product of uranium. That is the first cause of lung cancer in non-smokers, and there is no safe dose of radioactivity.

Furthermore, right now there’s a committee evaluating the health risks of the uranium project of the North Shore with the Institute of National Public Health of Quebec whose mandate is to analyze the risks for all steps in the process of producing uranium and has not completed its work. And by the way, I’m part of that committee.

The next principle that is not respected is

social equity and solidarity. Mines and nuclear power plants will produce waste which is perpetually radioactive.

Presently, we have other options for the production of renewable energy. Do we really want to live this environmental death, to be paid by future generations?

Another principle, protection of the environment. There have been accidental spills in Canada like in Key Lake, a nuclear accident like Fukushima that have released dangerous radioactive substances in the surrounding environments.

And by the way, we never got the information from CNSC on what were the impacts of the nuclear fallouts from Fukushima. We're still waiting for that.

Question to the CNSC. How many inspectors are available in Quebec to make sure that the mining companies respect rules and regulations? I'll give you an answer. According to the Syndicat de la Fonction publique du Québec, few or no inspectors are assigned on sites to ensure that the environment is really being protected.

Precaution, that's another principle. In 2010, CNSC reminded companies that they must be aware that the scientific uncertainty with regard to the management

of radioactive waste, which requires long-term management, and long term is centuries.

Furthermore, no containment structures can be depended on beyond 100-150 years. We recognize significant weaknesses in civil engineering structures even before then. We see it in Montreal a lot of times lately.

Protection of cultural heritage is another principle. The future mine is on trapping territory. It will affect a way of life and the transmission of a rich culture to future generations. In the view of the population, the project might go against the Cree way of life. There is a risk of contamination of water and living organisms.

Respect for ecosystems supports capacity. On its internal sites, Strateco is proud to say that it’s making contributions to an energy which produces no greenhouse gases.

Actually, in reality, in Canada in 2003, it was calculated for the whole cycle that it has produced greenhouse gases equivalent to that of 71,000 cars travelling 15,000 kilometres per year. So you can have the references in our big document.

Responsible production and consumption. Since uranium is a non-renewable substrate for the

production of energy, its use is not in respect of this principle. Energy efficiency programs, the use of biomass, solar energy, wind energy would actually respect this principle, and these produce less greenhouse gases.

The polluter pays. That’s another principle. Who will pay in 200 years when a spill occurs on this site?

Internalization of costs, so we have to take into account the whole cost from A to Z. So actually, it costs about a million dollars a tonne to store permanently nuclear waste from a nuclear plant. So right now, in Gentilly-2 here in Quebec, there’s about 2,500 tonnes of radioactive waste that’s going to cost $2.5 billion to store on a permanent basis. And actually, in Canada there are no storage sites available.

Conclusion: Considering that the mission of the CNSC is to protect the public, and protecting the public is, like I said, a large mandate, so you have to take into consideration what it might cost. If you grant the licence, you might cause a social crisis.

Considering that this project is very much so incompatible with principles of sustainable development, considering the uncertainty surrounding the long-term management of residues and radioactive wastes, considering the absence of social acceptance, considering

that the Committee, in public health on the uranium issue, has not yet filed its report, refusal to issue a permit to Strateco is the only responsible option for the common good.

Thank you.

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

It's open. Dr. Barriault.

DRE GINGRAS: I could add one more thing, and it was to you, Doctor. The first thing we learned in medical school was "do no harm". So I think it's -- you're going to have to ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I couldn't agree more.

DRE. GINGRAS: Exactly.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I'm looking at your presentation "en français" and do the same thing in English, and you're saying that the Syndicat de la Fonction publique du Québec does not have any inspectors or very little inspectors ---

DRE GINGRAS: There's certain regions where there's no inspectors available.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Is this for uranium mines or is this for mines in general?

DRE GINGRAS: It's for mines in general. I'm talking about MDDP.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I just wanted to clarify that point because ---

DRE GINGRAS: Yes.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: --- here you're talking about uranium mines and all of a sudden you come out with that statement. I just wanted to clarify it, that's all.

DRE GINGRAS: But there is a shared responsibility ---

MEMBER BARRIAULT: No harm.

DRE GINGRAS: Yeah. But like I said, on this file -- on the slide presentation this morning, it was a shared responsibility between CNSC and the Ministère de l'environnement et du développement durable. And from that part, there is no such -- we're missing some people to actually go and check out if the rules and regulations are followed.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I understand. I just wanted to clarify at this point, and I'm not going one way or the other.

DRE GINGRAS: Yeah.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: But I just wanted to make sure that we had the right information.

DRE GINGRAS: Yes.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Can the CNSC comment on inspectors for mines?

DRE GINGRAS: And I asked this question to Patsy Thompson in a debate and she could never answer the question how many people were actually available to go on site and the frequency.

MR. JAMMAL: It’s Ramzi Jammal for the record.

A couple of things. To clarify, we work in collaboration with the provincial authorities. That’s number one.

Number two, we have a Laval office in Montreal that is staffed on a full-time basis by CNSC-qualified inspectors, full-time inspectors that are actually in the Laval office. On average, we have five individuals -- we have seven positions.

In addition to the Laval office inspectors who are qualified to inspect mines -- as a matter of fact, they assist in nuclear power plants inspections -- are supported by Ottawa office, who are providing our specialist group with support to the inspections.

In addition to the Ottawa office, we have the Saskatoon office, which comprises, of course, all of the mining experts, even though we have them all over the place.

So the CNSC has multiple site offices that we work in a horizontal fashion, and we have dedicated

inspectors, enough resources in order to inspect every licenced activity in Canada.

MEMBRE BARRIAULT: Est-ce que ça répond à votre question?

DRE GINGRAS: And then what would be the role of the inspectors from the NDBP?

MR. JAMMAL: The role of the inspectors, as I mentioned -- sorry, Ramzi Jammal for the record.

We have a collaboration, like I mentioned, with the provincial authority. We do two things: We provide the training, number one. Number two, collaboration to ensure that the provincial requirements are being addressed in a single inspection.

THE CHAIRMAN: But let me get it straight. There is no uranium mining in Quebec now. So why would they have an inspector to inspect uranium mines? Once the Quebec government decides, if they decide, to allow for a uranium mine to operate, presumably they'll have to allocate inspectors to their function.

MR. JAMMAL: But we lead, regardless of who it is. It's -- the CNSC is the lead authority for all the inspections, regardless of any licensed activity.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that's like in Saskatchewan, there's a minister of Environment ---

MR. JAMMAL: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: --- in Saskatchewan that does their own inspection. It comes from the Saskatchewan government. Did I get this right?

MR. JAMMAL: Correct, but the point here is the CNSC does have resources if the licence is issued.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Barriault?

MEMBER BARRIAULT: Non, c'est tout.

You were asking for information from Dr. Thompson. What information did you want form Dr. Thompson?

DRE GINGRAS: I asked her that same question, and she could never answer that question. How many people from CNSC would be in Quebec to inspect a future mine? And she could never answer the question. And you can see, it's a televised show.

MEMBER BARRIAULT: I understand. Thank you.

C'est tout, monsieur le président.

THE CHAIRMAN: But there is a question she should answer, and I hear this often and am quite familiar with your writing and this. I want to hear it one more time about the impact on health of people who live near nuclear power plants.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

If I could before answering that question, Dr. Binder. Dr. Gingras did ask the question about the number of inspectors during an event organized by the ACFAS. She also asked the question when Son Nguyen and I went to Sept-Îles to meet with the committee that the Public Health Agency has put together to study the effects of uranium mining and exploration. And at that time, we did provide an answer. And Son Nguyen and I actually made a presentation that lasted for most of the day where we presented a lot of information on the environmental performance, the performance or waste management facilities for existing uranium mines. And that information was provided to all committee members, including Dr. Gingras.

DRE GINGRAS: I disagree.

DR. THOMPSON: In terms of the studies that are in the interventions -- in the report at the end of the interventions, there are a number of studies that are quoted in that report that have been criticized by the scientific community as not being appropriate and having gaps in experimental approach.

For example, there is a study where -- it's called a metanalysis that -- the intervention states that -- demonstrates that children living close to nuclear facilities have higher rates of cancer.

That study has been criticized because of the 37 studies that were identified by the authors of the study, the 17 studies with zero risk to children were excluded from that analysis. So the analysis retained essentially the studies where some indication of risk had been seen, and the authors of that study have no radiation measurement whatsoever.

In terms of the KIKK study that has often been quoted as demonstrating that children living near nuclear facilities have higher risks of leukemia, again that study has been looked at by many authorities because as nuclear regulatory agencies, we want to make sure that if studies indicate a potential risk, that we look at that very carefully because the last thing we want is to have regulations that are not protective of people.

That work has shown that the KIKK study had indications of leukemia clusters essentially in areas where there are more leukemia cases than we would expect. That same type of finding is found in many areas in the world where there are no nuclear facilities whatsoever. And the authors of that study have clearly stated that there is no evidence that this is caused by radiation.

The intervention also talks about a study of Aboriginal children done in the southern U.S. where the study says that Aboriginal children have higher rates of -

- I think it's reproductive organ cancers. When you actually read that report from cover to cover, the study actually shows that the Aboriginal children have lower risks of cancer than white children or non-Aboriginal children.

And when we looked at that study and looked at the intervention prepared by Dr. Gingras, we saw that the tables and the information was misquoted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

DRE GINGRAS: I would like to have the references to whom has made these critical analyses. I would like to get these references please.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any problem with that?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

No, absolutely not. Those references are in the open scientific literature.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Monsieur Harvey?

MEMBER HARVEY: Merci, monsieur le président.

I would like to have -- comments on page 9 of ---

DRE GINGRAS: On n'entend pas bien.

MEMBER HARVEY: I'm sorry. I would like to have the comments of the staff, on page 9, of Dr. Gingras'

written submission about les emissions de SO2 de NOX, there's some big figures in that paragraph. Could you comment those figures and maybe compare it to something? Because you see some -- like right at the bottom, for example, that's “71,000 voitures et 15,000 kilomètres”.

So if you don't compare it with something else, it's difficult to get the essence of that.

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

Our staff have looked at the information presented in terms of the generation of greenhouse gasses and the reference to the Pimbina Institute, and what we found is that the information provided in the Pimbina Institute Report seems to be accurate.

And there is a requirement for all Canadian industries generating substances like these to report to the National Pollutant Release Inventory. So Environment Canada has a database where if an industry is going to release above a certain level of those contaminants, they have to report to the NPRI, and the information from the Pimbina Institute seems to be accurate.

And should the Commission issue a licence to Strateco, and Strateco emits those substances above the trigger, they have to report to the Environment Canada National Pollutant Release Inventory database. It's a

legal requirement.

MEMBER HARVEY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think the point being made here is trying to compare a nuclear emission with respect to wind and solar and coal and other, if I understood correctly.

So it's not the list emitter but where is it in the range of ---

MEMBER HARVEY: The second sentence in that paragraph:

> "Pour chaque tonne d'uranium produite, il y avait 12.1 tonnes de CO2 étaient libérée. Si l'énergie fournie aux mines avait été d'origine fossile, elles auraient généré 20.7 tonnes de CO2."

Is that correct?

DR. THOMPSON: Patsy Thompson for the record.

It's what's called a life cycle assessment. So they take information per unit production and do some calculations. And so when we verified, the calculations seemed to have been well done.

Generally, internationally when studies are done to compare greenhouse gas emissions from nuclear --

from different ways of producing electricity, if we include the whole life cycle, uranium is -- or nuclear power is usually lower than coal, gas and others and higher than some others like wind or solar, so it's relative. But the calculations that are provided in the (inaudible) seem to be fairly well done and pretty standard for this type of life cycle assessment.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay, that's difficult to hear you. I mean ---

DRE GINGRAS: Can I add something to that?

It's better than fossil fuel and coal. That's pretty much the only -- it's better than these two. But the rest is doing a lot better than nuclear energy.

MEMBER HARVEY: So the purpose of having that there for you is to say that nuclear energy is not so clean?

DRE GINGRAS: Here in Quebec we have lots of other options that is cleaner.

MEMBER HARVEY: How certain are those options? Not all the options?

DRE GINGRAS: A lot of the other options; biomass, energy efficiency, solar, hydroelectricity, wind power.

MEMBER HARVEY: That's true for Quebec, yeah, I agree.

Another question. At the end of the presentation, on page 11 at the bottom, it's about the waste generated at Gentilly. So could you just say something about that? Ask that to the staff.

MR. JAMMAL: Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

There are a couple of things. There is a bit of a myth with respect to long-term measurement of fuel waste in Canada. There are, as we speak, there is an existing -- as a matter of fact, the Government of Canada has put money with respect to the long-term management of radioactive -- of the burnt fuel from reactors, generally right across Canada, and currently it's under the adaptive phase management and there is a national office called the Nuclear Waste Management Office, NWMO. And that's looking for the long-term storage and safe storage of spent fuel or nuclear fuel cycle.

With respect to G-2, or G2, there are on-site -- they have adequate capacity for the waste management for the long term for -- at two levels. First in the pool, which is the freshly burnt fuel, and they have a dry storage where they transfer the burnt fuel or the "combustible" that been used as already been put through the reactor.

So in other words, the long-term management of the fuel on-site is safe, is adequate, there is more

than enough area, more than enough structure in place, and the waste management is always reviewed as part of the operation of the facility. And like I mentioned, it's the transfer of the fuel from the cooling pools to the dry storage that is effective. As a matter of fact, Canada leads the world with respect to -- the intervener mentioned Fukushima events and post-Fukushima is the -- Canada has the only standard in place that the fuel is moved from the spent fuel -- from the cooling pools to the dry storage.

So, in other words, everything is in place. Everything is safe. Long-term management is adequate, and there is sufficient funds to manage the spent fuels for a long period of time.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay, just to go a little farther. But I think that Dr. Gingras when he's talking of permanente, it's not the same long term. I mean, this is the difference. So what do you mean by long term?

MR. JAMMAL: Well, as I mentioned -- it's Ramzi Jammal, for the record.

The long term is the -- as long as there is enough site capacity, and as mentioned before, as Dr. Gingras already mentioned, as long as we exist, we'll keep monitoring to ensure the safety of whatever methodology is being used. Now under the Nuclear Waste Management

Office, there is a long-term aspect of the storage where the fuel will be buried, based on the best available methodology in order to maintain integrity. And as the fuel is stored, there is a heat decay and the radioactivity of the fuel. And there's another myth always presented. It is truly radioactive, but it reaches a point where the radioactivity is very negligible and the packaging of the fuel, the storage of the fuel ensure adequate protection for the public and the environment.

MEMBER HARVEY: But -- last one. That figure of 2.5, 2.5 milliard -- 2.5 billions –- J'ai seulement la version française, at page 11 of the French version, is that figure a good indication on what could be ---

M. JAMMAL: Je ne peux pas vous donner de commentaires concernant le coût. Je dois vérifier sur ce que c'est, je ne sais pas c'est quoi.

Regardless of what the cost is, we will have to ensure that long-term measurement of the fuel and the spent fuel is adequate and safe for however long term. We can have a debate what is long term; to 100 years, 500 years, or 30,000 years.

MEMBER HARVEY: Where does this come from, that figure, the 2.5 million -- billion?

DRE GINGRAS: You can look -- by heart I

can’t remember but it’s in the Annex, in the big document. You’ll find ---

MEMBER HARVEY: Find the reference?

DRE GINGRAS: Yeah, the reference is in there. But actually if you read that paragraph, if it’s so negligible, the quantity of radioactivity, why does a country like Finland is investing in excavating a tunnel to a depth of 300 metres in the rock in order to store it permanently, if it’s so safe stored on land.

MEMBER HARVEY: Mr. Jammal?

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

There are a couple of things and a major difference. Canada’s reactors and the CANDU technology, as a matter of fact, burns natural uranium. All other reactors in the world some of them other than the Canadian technology or CANDU technology, do burn enriched fuel; hence, the enrichment is a factor in the burning of the fuel, in the production of the fuel, pre-burning and post-burning the fuel in the reactor itself. So the -- Canada’s natural uranium for -- in 24 hours in a pool dissipates over 95 percent of its heat and criticality is not an issue.

So it’s a long answer with respect to end with two things; the other technologies and specific in

Europe uses enriched uranium, in Canada we use natural uranium.

MEMBER HARVEY: Merci. Merci, monsieur le président.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

DRE GINGRAS: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? Dr. McDill?

MEMBER McDILL: There is a difference, is there not also, in Finland and Sweden in the length of time the fuel is in the pool?

MR. JAMMAL: For the record, yes, that is correct.

MEMBER McDILL: And can you remind me of the difference?

MR. JAMMAL: An average?

MEMBER McDILL: Yeah.

MR. JAMMAL: Okay, in Canada we move it roughly every 10 years. And in Finland it’s a little bit longer. They have a longer storage for the spent fuel.

If I might try, Mr. President, if Ottawa’s still online, we can ask our waste experts because last week or the week before, there was the international convention on waste management and there was discussion on the transfer of fuel from ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Again, I think we are a bit

digressing off topic here in terms of we’re now talking about nuclear fuel waste management, that is a whole different process.

DRE GINGRAS: But you cannot dissociate the thing. It’s like if I was -- for example, with my husband said, let’s get pregnant and then when I’m nine months pregnant, we’ll decide if we have the baby or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Along ---

DRE GINGRAS: We have to like consider the whole cycle. But I would like to have my answers from Strateco.

Are you agreeing with me that there are problems in the different principles of sustainable development?

MR. HÉBERT: I don't have the website with me, so I don't know what you are talking about, so I cannot answer tonight.

DRE GINGRAS: It says that you're in -- that you're respecting sustainable development. So it's very scary that you don't know what's on your website.

MR. HÉBERT: I'm sorry about that, but I didn't understand the question. I thought you were asking about the 16 different points, you know. Yes, yes, we subscribe. Yes, we subscribe, is what is said there.

DRE GINGRAS: You subscribe to what I say?

MR. HÉBERT: No, we subscribe to what we wrote on the website.

DRE GINGRAS: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think ---

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. Just a question for you, Dre Gingras. Do we have to comply with all those points to say that we are working towards sustainable development?

DRE GINGRAS: Yes, you need the 16 principles in order to say that it's sustainable development.

MEMBER HARVEY: It's difficult to obtain.

DRE GINGRAS: Yeah. That's ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. This is ---

MEMBER HARVEY: It does mention some activities ---

DRE GINGRAS: --- the concept.

MEMBER HARVEY: Okay. That's a concept. Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. The technicians are telling us that they're going to cut us off, so this ends ---

(APPLAUSE/APPLAUDISSEMENTS)

THE CHAIRMAN: This, I believe, is going to end tonight’s proceedings, and I'm sorry, sir, you will

have to come tomorrow. Hopefully you will be able to come tomorrow and we start with you, if that's the process that we're going to go through.

So go ahead, Marc. What's the procedure from here on?

MR. LEBLANC: No, exactly, we're going to continue where we left off tonight tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. sharp, and we're going to start with Mr. William Mianscum. And we're going to follow the order as provided.

A few intervenors have indicated that they were asking us to substitute oral presentations to written, but there's just a few and we'll adjust tomorrow and I'll inform you.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

--- Upon adjourning at 10:09 p.m./

L'audience est levée à 22h09