FEDERAL REVIEW PANEL (COFEX) AND

PROVINCIAL REVIEW PANEL (COMEX)

INFORMATION SESSION PRESIDED BY :

Chief John Longchap

Mr. Benoit Taillon

Mr. Pierre Mercier

MATOUSH URANIUM PROJECT

INFORMATION SESSION

held in Mistissini (Quebec)

May 25, 2010

RD-5400-A

RIOPEL, GAGNON, LAROSE & ASSOCIÉS
215, rue Saint-Jacques
bureau 1020
Montréal (Québec)
H2Y 1M6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND AND TEN (2010), this twenty-fifth (25th) day of May:

CHIEF JOHN LONGCHAP:

... languages, I think there is French translation, English translation, and Cree translation. (in Cree) So, before I do my opening welcome address, I'll ask Peter, Peter Coonishish will do the opening prayer. (in Cree) Okay? Peter? Peter Coonishish?

OPENING PRAYER

Mr. PETER COONISHISH:

(in Cree)

OPENING REMARKS

CHIEF JOHN LONGCHAP:

Thank you Peter. Amen. (in Cree) So I'd like to welcome, first of all, the people of Mistissini. As we all know, that it's in our territories that, you know, that work may take place, of this nature.

So, welcome also to everyone in attendance, thank you for coming, thank you for coming to show your interest and participating at this information session regarding the Strateco proposed project.

I'd like to welcome everyone, whether you're from the community or visiting from outside, or if you are here on behalf of a particular

organization. So, welcome, and thank you for coming here. (in Cree)

There are different... First of all, this is an information session. It's not a consultation process. The consultation will happen later, if it comes to that. Okay? We don't know yet, it's not there yet, but this is an information session. An opportunity to... for the panels that are up here, in front, to hear your questions, your concerns, your comments about uranium, the Uranium Matoush Mine Project.

(in Cree)

THE INTERPRETER:

He's translating into Cree what was already said in English and French.

CHIEF JOHN LONGCHAP:

(in Cree) So, up in front here, we have various committees, a couple of committees on different panels. I'd like to introduce them now. (in Cree)

First of all, before I introduce the different committees and guests here with us today, I'd like to first welcome the people, the Committee sitting on COMEX. That's the Review Panel for the Quebec Government, and then we also have COFEX, which is the Federal Review Panel, on behalf of the Canadian

Government.

We also have people from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, the CNSC are also here. We also have a member from the Health Canada. (in Cree) We also have, in front, the proponent of the project, which is Strateco Resources. (in Cree) We have the president here, Mr. Mercier, and also the president of (in Cree) the Federal Review Panel, the COFEX-South, Mr. Benoit Taillon, who is also here, and they will, these gentlemen will also be addressing the crowd, after I do my introduction.

We also... (in Cree) We also have Strateco Resources, as I said. (in Cree) So, in the back table here, we have the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission people, and one of the gentlemen, you might recognize, the guy with the nice gray hair. So he was here before, at one of the information sessions, so welcome. Welcome to everyone. (in Cree)

Thank you once again to everyone that's here. Thank you also to the people that organized the event, the information session, people from our office in, working with the people from the Grand Council and the Quebec Office. Thank you again. (in Cree)

So, I've done my little introduction, and welcome to everyone that's here, so without further ado... (in Cree) Benoit Taillon, (in Cree) the Federal Review Panel, or COFEX-South as they call it. So he's gonna talk to you guys first, and then Mr. Mercier will talk after, and then, probably, I think Philip will also speak after Mr. Mercier.

And then, you have a schedule, as you probably picked up on your way in, of the order of the meeting. (in Cree) Thank you very much. Benoit?

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Thank you, Chief Longchap. The Federal Review Panel is a body established by Section 22 of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement, as you know, that's comprised of five members. I would like to introduce them to you.

Philip Awashish is a member of the Federal Review Panel. Ginette Lajoie, member of the Federal Review Panel, both appointed by the Cree Regional Authority. Anne-Marie Gaudet and Claude Delisle are the two other members of the Panel. They're both appointed by Canada.

I would like to emphasize with, on what has said Chief Longchap. We're here to make sure that information is provided to you, it's an opportunity

to talk about the project, to talk about its effects. It's also an opportunity to ask questions about the regulatory system.

When we will invite you to come to the microphones and ask questions, feel free to ask questions, whether to the proponent, or to the member of the public authorities, or public administrations present here. Chief Longchap has identified two persons, two people from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Act, an expert from Health Canada. There is also an expert from the department of Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks, a department of the Government of Quebec.

We hope, during this session, to exchange with you. Do not... We will try, if we need more information on your own questions, to exchange with you, and I will invite the members of the Panel, if they do have some questions regarding your own questions, to talk to you and exchange, in order to have a better understanding of what you want, what you need, what are your concerns, but especially to make sure that the question you have is addressed in the coming weeks, so that, that information will be provided to you in due course.

Needless to say that this public meeting will

be a real success if we all show respect to each other. I would like to invite you to respect the opinions of people that have a different view, so that we have a fruitful and successful meeting.

Now, Mr. Chair of the COMEX, monsieur Mercier, will introduce you, will talk to you about the agenda for today.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Merci Benoit. First of all, I would like to thank Chief Longchap for having accepted to preside this meeting, this information meeting. And we appreciate very much, Chief, because we know that you have a lot of things to do in your community, and we appreciate that, by your presence, giving the example for your population, to demonstrate the importance of this kind of meeting concerning the information of, on this project specifically. [translation] So, on behalf of my colleagues, I'd like to thank Chief Longchap for having accepted to chair this information session. I'd also like to introduce the members who accompany me, the members of COMEX, the Provincial Review Committee.

We'll start on my far right, a citizen from Mistissini who probably many of you have met and known, Mr. Philip Awashish. He represents the CRA.

He's also accompanied by Brian Craik, who is also a representative of the CRA on COMEX, the Cree Regional Authority.

We have Robert Lemieux, who is a member... We have Robert Q. who is a member of this Committee for many years, who is bringing his experience, his vast Northern experience that he has accumulated over many years in the James Bay sector.

I'd also like to emphasize the contribution of our executive secretary, Michael O'Neil, and he is celebrating his birthday today, but he told me I couldn't mention his age. We also have Benoit Théberge, who is the executive secretary of COFEX.

I'd like to present Ms. Lucie Vallée, who is an analyst in the Ministry of Sustainable Development, who has coordinated the action of our project, of the Matoush Project, the Strateco Resources Project, with our Quebec Government partners, and different ministries and departments.

So, I would like to emphasize our appreciation towards my colleague, who is the president of COFEX, and the members of COFEX, for this welcome that will be fruitful, and this productive work. We've been together for the works, and this allows us to be here, together, at this information

session.

So, I also think that we mentioned that Chief Longchap, and Benoit Taillon mentioned it too, today is a meeting that is beneficial to all of us. For us, as representatives of the different committees, and you, from the community of Mistissini. We have a lot of information, but through your questions, you might be able to learn even more. Because I would also like to emphasize the delegation that is chaired by Mr. Hébert, who is the president of Strateco Resources, who came here with a group of experts to answer your questions.

So this is the ideal opportunity to ask questions and gain information, like Chief Longchap previously mentioned. We'll have the opportunity to come back to your community to hold public hearings in a few months.

This being said, I would just like to glance at my notes, because at my age...

We have the information part and the consultation part, that I wanted to say. It would be important, then, for you to take part by asking questions, and this will allow us to reach a vaster understanding of what the Strateco Project

involves.

I'd also like to specifically welcome the delegations that bring with COFEX-South. They come from the Ministry of Health and the federal group of experts on nuclear security or safety. So, we talk about COMEX, which is the Provincial Review Panel. I'm going to call on someone who is very wise, someone who started this review panel because he sat on all of the discussions that led to the signing. He was also the co-signer of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement.

Philip Awashish, who you know very well, has been involved in these circles for many years, and his actions have been emphasized in many ways. Last year, they were honoured by McMaster's University, they gave him an honorary Ph.D. as well. Which is quite an honour for our friend Philip Awashish, who is from Mistissini.

So, now I'll ask him to say a few words about COMEX.

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

Thank you. (in Cree)

THE INTERPRETER:

Je ne t'entends pas plus. (technical problems)

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:
(in Cree)
Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
[translation] Thank you Philip. So, I don't think... I couldn't tell you that I understood everything, unfortunately. The translation wasn't working.

This being said, I would like to ask the president of Strateco Resources, Mr. Guy Hébert, to continue with the presentation of the Strateco Project. Could we please ensure that the translation will function? Because we totally lost the translation of Mr. Awashish's presentation. And we would like to hear the people who will speak to us in the Cree language, so we can fully understand their questions. So, can we tell me if it's working or not, or show me a sign if it's working?
THE INTERPRETER:
Well, English to French is working fine, but anyways...
Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
[translation] So, then we'll take a short break, we'll take a few minutes and get this straightened out.

So then, if you allow us, we'll move on to Mr.

Hébert's presentation. And hopefully the problem will be changed. And now...

THE INTERPRETER:

Je t'entendais. Je t'entendais quand tu jouais avec le micro. Oui.

_____

PRESENTATION BY STRATECO RESOURCES

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

(in Cree). [translation] ... president of the Review Panel, Mr. Mercier, president of the Provincial Review Panel, and people from the CNSC, and the different other committees.

(himself) ... information session on the Matoush Uranium Project. Let you... Let me introduce myself. My name is Guy Hébert, I'm the president CEO of Strateco Resources, owner of the Matoush Project. I graduated as a geologist. During my thirty-seven (37) years of experience, I had the privilege of bringing three mines into production, two of which are in Quebec, and one in Costa Rica.

I would like to present to you my colleague, who will participate in today's presentation. Mr. Jean-Pierre Lachance, executive and exploration vice-president. Jean-Pierre is a geologist, he has more than thirty (30) years of experience in the

industry. We have been working together for over fifteen (15) years.

Since the start of the project, in two thousand and six (2006), Mr. Lachance is, among others, in charge of relations with the communities. Jean-Pierre will introduce to you members of his team. He will deal with this part of the study. Relations with the communities. For Strateco Management, community relations have been, are, and will always be an extremely important element in the preparation and accomplishment of our projects.

Mr. Pierre Terreault, vice-president operations and engineering. Pierre is a mining engineer. He has a master's degree in project management. He also cumulated over thirty (30) years of experience in the mining industry. Mr. Terreault is responsible for the preparation of the environmental impact study, and of the technical documentation concerning the license to obtain from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

Today, he will introduce to you the surface and underground installation, as well as the impact study characteristics and the extreme conservative criteria used with the context of the study.

Mrs. Caroline Hardy, geological engineer. Caroline is the director of the environmental department, and therefore the environmental impact study coordinator. She cumulates twelve (12) years of experience in the industry, seven (7) of which are in the environmental field. Mrs. Hardy will introduce to you the conclusion of the environmental impact study. As you will see, these impacts are negligible.

Also member of the Strateco team, Maude Hébert, public affairs analyst. She has prepared a brochure (inaudible) on the facts, the first in two thousand and seven (2007), and a new one in two thousand and ten (2010), based on the concerns raised to the public hearing in two thousand and eight (2008). You can get the brochure at the end of, on the table in the back.

She's also responsible, since December, of the website, and also the ad you saw in the Nation Magazine about the project, the radon and different subjects treated during the six issues.

And from Golder, at the table here, Ernest Becker, Mrs. Chantal Rossignol. They have participated in the study. And from SENES, Mr. Grant Feasby. Change slide... Oh! I just... Sorry.

Okay.

During the course of this presentation, which should last about fifty minutes (50 min), we will present the results of the environmental impact study on the advanced exploration phase of the Matoush Project. This study allows us to identify and assess the potential impact of work on the Matoush Project on the environmental and social environments. It responds to a joint directive by the ministère du Développement durable, de l'environnement et des parcs, MDDEP, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

It's enabled us to provide you with more information on the project, and to answer some of the questions people in the community asked us at the December two thousand and eight (2008) preconsultations.

Today, Strateco's presentation is divided in two parts. Part 1, a video presentation on the Matoush Project, underground exploration period and production period. And part 2, presentation of the environmental impact study. A question period will follow. I therefore ask you to keep your interventions for the end of the presentation.

We will then start with the video presentation. Since the filing of the environmental impact study in November two thousand and nine (2009), we have received an extensive list of questions. Several of these questions concern subjects not covered in the scope of the environmental impact study. Because they are aimed at the subsequent phase, the production phase.

The video is divided in two parts. Part 1 introduces the underground exploration program, and part 2 presents the production phase. Please keep in mind that the second part of the video is generic. The environmental studies related to this second phase are not underway, and will be partly based on the result obtained in the context of the phase that we propose to start during fall two thousand and ten (2010). So please, let roll the video. It's a nine minute (9 min) video, and it's pretty impressive. At least for me. It's not full screen? Can we have some sound? Sound please. No sound. I have to start again. If someone at the back can take care of the sound? No. Sorry about that.

PRESENTATION OF THE STRATECO VIDEO

Strateco Resources is proud to present the

Matoush Uranium Exploration Project. This project is considered one of the most uranium-rich projects in the world today. The uranium industry not only helps meet the world's continuously increasing demand for energy, it is essential to other industries as well, such as agriculture, food production and medicine.

The project is located in the Otish Mountains, northeast of Mistassini Lake, approximately two hundred and seventy-five kilometres (275 km) from Chibougamau. To ensure the protection of the environment and of human health, the project's proponent will scrupulously apply all of the applicable laws and regulations from the various levels of government. We want to stress that the regulations governing uranium mining and exploration are among the strictest.

The dominant winds on the Matoush property blow in a south easterly direction. The data from the environmental impact study show that the project will not affect the air quality of the future Albanel-Témiscamie-Otish National Park, which will be located about fifteen kilometres (15 km) to the east.

The site's effluents will be treated according

to the strictest standards before they reach the nearby water system, which leads to the Camie River. The regional water system is not expected to be affected.

The Route 167 extension, to be carried out by Transport Québec, will provide year-round access to the Matoush Project site. A landing strip will also provide access to the project. The Strateco property covers three hundred and twelve square kilometres (312 km5), and the Matoush Project will occupy a section of approximately zero point fifteen square kilometres (0.15 km5).

An analysis of boulder deposits from the last ice age confirmed the site's high concentrations of uranium. The project will take place in two major phases. Once the required authorizations and permits have been obtained, the first phase, the exploration phase, will take place over a twenty-four (24) month period. If the economic analysis stemming from this phase provides positive results, a new impact study will be conducted to receive the authorizations and permits necessary for the next phase. The second phase will consist of the actual mining of the site over a ten (10) year period.

Several facilities will need to be built for

the exploration phase, including a water treatment plant. The plant will treat the ground water from the ramp excavation, mining exploration and other activities. Daily monitoring of the water quality will be part of the procedures that are implemented.

A fuel depot and a power plant will also be built. The depot will comply with Quebec's building Code, to prevent any soil contamination. The power plant will supply the energy for the powerful ventilation system that will be installed. The site will also include the infrastructure to house ninety-six (96) workers. We note that local labour will make up fifteen percent (15%) of the total number of workers.

The dormitories, kitchen and comfort station will be housed in weather-haven type tents, with wooden floors and in trailers.

An organic matter storage area will be used to store the surface soil, until it is used to restore the site. The underground exploration phase will also require a ramp, five metres (5 m) wide by five metres (5 m) high, and approximately two thousand eight hundred metres (2 800 m) long for the trackless equipment that will be used in the

excavations. The ramp will be equipped with a ventilation system that complies with Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission standards. The system will evacuate used air from the underground galleries to the outside. Air quality will be continually monitored to ensure workers' safety.

Two (2) waste rock piles are the final installations required for the first phase. They will be able to hold two hundred and eighty-six thousand tons (286 000 t) of rock. The first pile, which will be one hundred metres (100 m) wide by one hundred and fifteen metres (115 m) long, will be used for clean waste rock. According to chemical and mineral analyses, this sterile rock is non-acid-generating and non-radioactive.

The second pile, sixty metres (60 m) by fifty metres (50 m), will be used for the special waste rock found during the ramp excavation, and whose uranium content is more than three hundred parts per million (300 ppm).

Finally, an estimated seven hundred and fifty tons (750 t) of uranium ore will be stored underground.

In the event that the project is not feasible, the entire site would undergo a full restoration

process. This process would include the dismantling of the buildings and equipment, and reforestation with indigenous species, as well as gray pine and alder.

When the mining phase begins, new infrastructures will be added. The camp will be expanded to serve one hundred and eighty (180) residents. The proportion of local labour will increase to twenty-five percent (25%).

The new facilities will include an ore-processing plant to process the uranium concentrate called yellowcake. A product with a low degree of radioactivity that poses a very low risk for health and the environment. The yellowcake will be transported according to the applicable regulations by a company that is certified by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

The mine tailings will be deposited at a specially designed twenty metre (20 m) deep open pit. Contrary to the waste from other mining operations, which is generally deposited and held in tailing ponds contained by dikes, uranium mine tailings are now stored in a way that will ensure their long-term stability that prevents the need for dikes.

At the same time, a wind farm will be erected near the site, to reduce hydrocarbon consumption. The actual mine operations will require the establishment of a network of new underground galleries going to a depth of six hundred and eighty-eight metres (688 m).

To compare, here is a land use example taken from an open pit mine in the same area. The Matoush Project will have a significantly smaller built-up area.

Once the mining phase is completed, all facilities will be fully dismantled in an orderly manner, and all the mine's surface openings will be filled in. Reforestation will be undertaken throughout the site, using local species such as black spruce, as well as using gray pine and alder.

The project prescribes strict environmental monitoring for the entire site and the for the duration of the exploration and mining phases. A surveillance system will ensure that the site is secure at all times. Strateco will ensure compliance with the strict rules set out by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission regarding the exploration and mining of the site, and its restoration. To this end, the Canadian Nuclear

Safety Commission requires an escrow deposit for one hundred percent (100%) of the site restoration cost prior to the beginning of each phase.

Strateco Resources would like to thank you for your attention.

END OF THE STRATECO VIDEO

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Thank you. Slide. Okay. We will proceed now with the second part, the presentation. Before we're going on, I would like to review the various steps involved in preparing an environmental impact study. You can see it on the slide. We will come back to these same points throughout the presentation.

First, we have to identify the various sources of impact, and each Pierre and Caroline and Jean-Pierre will go through each part of the presentation. So this slide will be repeated.

I think we have to talk a little bit about the uranium. As I said, they have a brochure which includes a lot of information about uranium, different points. Oops! I have to move. The use of uranium, concerns associated with uranium, Canadian standards and regulations, the upturn in the uranium market.

Uranium is used in many industries, mainly for generate the energy. I would say about ninety-eight percent (98%) of the uranium is used for energy, and also for medicine. Treatment of cancer, and detection of cancer. Agriculture, food. A lot of foods you are eating here have been irradiated, and that preserves the freshness. And drinking water supply. In Africa, a lot of water is coming from desalination from a nuclear plant. As I said, for more information, I invite you to see the pamphlet on uranium.

Uranium public concerns, relative undeveloped market in Quebec, causes a public concern on health, the environment, and the military industry. Because it's relatively undeveloped in Quebec, the uranium market raises legitimate questions and concerns for the public. By acting with transparency and sharing information based on scientific data, we hope to contribute to a better understanding of the nuclear industry and issues related to uranium exploration and mining.

Based on the knowledge of gain from fifty (50) years of uranium use, we can say that in Canada, the modern uranium industry is safe and secure for workers, the public and the environment. I think

some of your brothers from Saskatoon came from Rupert on March the first (1st), four (4) chiefs living nearby uranium mines, and have been living around uranium mines for over thirty (30) years, and they told you then it's safe, it's good for the community also. So, I think even if you don't trust a lot of white people in front of you, I think you should trust your brothers who have experience on uranium. Living nearby uranium mines.

Regarding the military industry, no Canadian producer can sell for military purposes without the risk of losing his license, and it's completely forbidden in Canada to sell to military industry. So for us, you know, there is no point, it's... It cannot be done.

Canadian standards and regulations. The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is a pretty tough regulator, and we have to follow the rules. At every step we do, we have to be qualified. We have got qualification to apply for the license, and at every step, we have to renew our application our qualification. And a mining license is good only for two (2) to five (5) years. So if we do a mistake, if we don't follow the rules, we cannot operate the mine. We will lose our license. And a

hundred percent (100%) of the money, we have to put the money a hundred percent (100%) before we start. I asked for, you will see the exploration project, we have, we estimate about six million dollars (6 M$) we have to put before we even can start, to be sure that if the project is not going forward, then we have the money, or at least they have the money in their hands to reclaim the site.

And as you saw also in the video, the impact is very very small compared to other projects. Without naming it, (inaudible) project you saw in the picture, the video, comparison with the (inaudible) project, the impact is very very small.

So the regulation standard is very strict, and we have to apply every time. It's nothing as a gold mine, where even there the rules are strict, you cannot lose your license, it's the case for us. We have to follow the rules. In Quebec, we are followed by the CSST, the Environmental Department, the Ministry of Energy, Transport, Industry Ministry, so a lot of regulation we have to follow.

There are a number of reasons why the Matoush Project is important. Uranium demand has been increasing since the turn of the twenty-first century, primarily because of the increased demand

for nuclear power. Given the fluctuation price for oil and other fossil, uranium is an energy source well-suited to economy and to the present and future needs. Some of the international criteria of (inaudible) our growing energy demand, particularly in countries like India and China, the need to reduce greenhouse gas emission, and the need for reliability and affordability.

The uranium industry must do more than meet global energy demand. It must also meet demand in other sectors like agriculture, food and medicine. Canada is among the largest uranium producers in the world. Our deposits are the richest on the planet outside Athabasca. This is why we are seeking the proliferation of uranium projects in Quebec and throughout Canada as a whole. So, once again, I would like to invite you to see the brochure.

And so now, I will ask to Pierre to take and explain the criteria used, the very severe criteria used, and he will also give you more detail on the surface and on the ground infrastructure. Pierre?

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Thank you Guy. I'm just gonna put it like that. Okay. Good day to everyone. I will now introduce

the study team and talk about, a bit about the legal and regulating framework in the mining industry. I will also discuss a very conservative working assumption that guides the study process as a whole.

Finally, I will look at various project elements which have a very small footprint, and the potential source and impact on the environmental and the social components.

At Strateco Resources, this study was led by my colleague Caroline Hardy and myself, with the cooperation of the Strateco employees. The study was prepared in close collaboration with the consultants whose name you see on the screen. The experts from Golder and SENES are with us today, and will be available during the question period.

We began collecting the data present in the document beginning in fall two thousand seven (2007). The study plan and specifications were designed to comply with federal and provincial legal requirements as they applied to the mining industry. They take into account the many laws, regulations and environmental policies. They also take into account the directive 019 for the mining industry, issued by the Quebec Ministry of

Sustainable Development, Environment and Parks.

To assess these impacts, Strateco consultants based themselves on extremely prudent working assumptions. What we mean by prudent assumptions is that all the impact assessments were performed on the basics of the worst-case scenario.

For each type of impact, the consultants exaggerated the possibility of negative consequences for the environmental and the human health. For instance, the impact on water, they overestimated the influence relative to the Matoush Lake and used simulated mine water. This water is not realistic because it was very high level of uranium.

To assess the impact on human health, they overestimated the exposure to radiological and non-radiological contaminants as thought as a person on site was exposed twenty-four hours (24 hr) a day over the life of the project, which is impossible.

To assess the human exposure to carcinogenic contaminants, they assumed an exposure period of a lifetime at the maximum concentration estimated for the production period. The addition concentration generated by the project are expected to be very low and virtually identical to the existing

conditions.

In each case, they are highly improbable scenarios. The global... The goal of this conservative approach is to prepare an environmental impact study with a significant safety barrier, to ensure that we never exceed the standard in the application of law and regulation.

This table and the next one show the working assumptions used. If you have any question, at the end our experts will answer it to you.

The consultants therefore used prudent, conservative assumptions to analyze the impact of human health, water, waste water treatment, et caetera. They also used safe conservative assumptions to assess the impact on plants, animal, air, water and animals. Already... Je pense que je l'ai dit deux (2) fois. En tout cas.

For the development of the exploration phase, the Matoush Project will require surface and underground facilities. On the next slide, I will show you what the surface installation will look like. This image shows all the surface installations as seen on the video presentation.

The waste pad. To build the underground decline, we will excavate in unmineralized rock

which does not contain uranium ore. This is what we call waste. The waste rock will be brought to surface and placed on the south pad of the two (2) pads, waste pads, they're all around, and are around, surrounded by a ditch.

The mineralized rock, which contains uranium ore, over three hundred (300) ppm, is what we call special waste. If we came across any special waste while we are driving the decline, we would bring it to surface and store on a separate stock pile. The north pad.

The water treatment plan and its pond, the contaminate water on the side, comes mainly from the ramp excavation and the diamond drilling program. This water will be sent to an underground settling pond before being pumped to surface. The plant will be inspected daily. Later, my colleague Caroline will present a diagram of the water treatment process.

The fuel farm. All the tanks in the fuel farm will be built with a membrane designed to prevent hydrocarbons from contaminating the soil in case of an accident spill. The fuel farm will be inspected daily. Any water that flows into the area will be collected and tested before being released into the

environment by a Strateco technician.

The power plant and ventilation. The power plant will power the ventilation system, the pumping, and all the surface installations. The ventilation system will evacuate the exhaust air to surface during the excavation and the drilling activity. This system will be equipped with an alarm system in case of ventilation system fail. No exploration activity will take place in the ore until the permanent ventilation system will be fully operative.

For the advanced exploration phase, the Matoush Project will also need the underground facility. On the image on the screen, you can see the 3-D section of the (inaudible) and the decline that will be built to go underground. These facilities will provide access to the minus three hundred metres (-300 m) level underground. Which is this one. This level will be used to carry out diamond drilling program, including definition and exploration program.

For the next two years, the Matoush site will be accessed by air, using our landing strip, by winter road along the Eastmain Road, and eventually by the Road 167 to the Otish Mountain Road.

Now that you have a rough idea on the legal and regulating framework as pertains to the mining industry, the conservative approach used to assess the impact in the main project elements, I would like to review the various steps involved in the preparating an environmental impact study.

These are the steps that Guy mentioned earlier. We will use this slide regularly during the presentation, so that you can track each step of the study. First, we have identify the various sources of impact. Then we analyze each impact. Point 2.a., the community's concerns.

In December two thousand eight (2008), we came to Mistissini and Chibougamau for the pre-consultation with the local community, to talk to them about the Matoush Project. These meetings allowed us to hear about the public concerns.

Then, the point 2.b., we identified the mitigation measurements, the residual impact. We must then assess the risk for the ecosystem and human health arising from the residual impact. That's point 4. The risk assessment is what tells us exactly what the actual effect of work in the Matoush exploration Project are on the human health and ecosystem.

Then, the point 5, where we are presenting additional mitigation measurements, and protection and monitoring programs to be implanted.

Let's now move to the actual results of the environmental impact study. I will present the various sources of impact identified, then my colleague Caroline will present points 2 to 5 of the study.

To do a full analysis, every mining exploration and construction activity that could potentially have an impact on physical, biological and human environment, was identified. The sources of impact that appear on the screen and on the next slide covers all the elements into consideration on the study. So we have stripping and clearing, waste rock excavation and management, construction of facilities, equipment used and traffic on site, waste management, storage of use of hazard substances. Here we mean the management of petroleum produced and exposed.

The treatment of contaminated water and release of effluents. Airborne emissions. Ongoing rehabilitation work as the job progresses. For example, the (inaudible) will be graded with soil and receded. Dismantle of the facilities. At the

end of the exploration phase, a decision will be made regarding the production. If the decision is negative and the project does not go into production, we will dismantle the surface and the underground facilities. In this case, we will also reseed and replant any clearance area, as you saw on the video. And finally, job and procurement.

I just presented the sources of impact and the very conservative assumption of the study. In additional, as you saw in the video, the surface infrastructures have a very small footprint on the environment. I will now the floor over to my colleague, Caroline Hardy, director of the environmental department, which will present the results of the impact assessment study. Caroline?

Mrs. CAROLINE HARDY:

Thank you Pierre. Good day everyone. So I'll present each of the next points in the study, starting with the impact analysis on the physical environment.

So, by physical environment, we mean the following elements. Hydrology, surface water and sediment quality, air quality, and hydrogeology, meaning the ground water.

So, starting with hydrology and water quality,

the main source of potential impact on surface water in the project area would relate to the quantity of water treated and released into the lake 5, which is Lake Matoush. The other potential impacts are the release of the treated water itself and the possibility of accidental spill.

So, when we talk about impact related to water, the table that you see here presents very important results. These tests are done on the simulated mine water that Pierre talked about. The simulated mine water contains much higher uranium concentrations than the water that will come out from the underground workings during ramp excavation and the site exploration phase.

On this table, on each side of the green column, you can see the concentrations of the substances in the simulated mine water and the concentrations of the substances in the lake water in its natural state.

In the center, in the green column, you can see Strateco's concentration objective for the effluent release. This means that the water that Strateco will use for underground exploration will later be treated in the water treatment plant before being discharged into Lake Matoush. For each

substance, Strateco will meet, at minimum, the release concentration in the green column. These are well under the current allowable limits which are shown in the two columns to the right.

For example, for uranium, the tests done on the simulated mine water showed uranium concentration of about two point eleven milligrams per litre (2.11 mg/l). The directive 019 criteria for this parameter is two milligrams per litre (2 mg/l). Strateco's release concentration objective is zero point one milligram per litre (0.1 mg/l). This is well below the directive 019 requirements.

So the image you see on the screen shows the various stages of the contaminated water treatment process. The water used for excavation and exploration activities is treated in several stages, until it meets Strateco's release concentration objectives. So, we see the following stages in the diagram.

So first, we have the removal of suspended solids in the water from the ground through the addition of flocculents that cause solids to coagulate and settle at the bottom of the sedimentation basin.

Follows the first treatment, involving the addition of regents at low pH to precipitate certain metals. The water then flows to the first settling pond, where metals precipitated in the first phase of treatment will settle at the bottom. The clarified water is then sent to a second treatment stage.

The second, and in theory the final treatment, involving the addition of regions at higher pH to precipitate the remaining metal that might still be present in the water. So, the water then flows to the final settling pond, where the remaining metals precipitated in the second phase will settle at the bottom of the basin. And finally, we have the release of the treated water into Lake Matoush.

So, multiple internal control sampling points are planned throughout the treatment process, to ensure that the system is working efficiently. If needed, the water can be returned to an earlier stage at any stage of the treatment. Water samples will be sent to an external lab on a weekly basis.

So here, you see a simplification of the watershed in which the Matoush site is located. You see the area drainage, meaning the route that the treated water will take once it has been returned

to Lake Matoush. So, the water will drain into a small eighteen kilometre (18 km) stream before flowing into the Camie and the Temiscamie River. It then flows into Lake Albanel, and then Lake Mistissini, and then continues its course towards the Rupert River, and finally James Bay.

So, according to the environmental impact study, no effects of the project are anticipated on the regional watershed. So now, let's look at the community's concerns in this regard.

So questions raised during the December two thousand and nine (2009) pre-consultation touched the points that you see on the screen. Water, and particularly the quality of the water around and at the Matoush site are issues that were raised repeatedly by the public.

As we have seen on the tables and images, Strateco will meet release concentrations that are well within the allowable limits. The contaminated water treatment process will follow strict stages with regular sampling, and the volume of effluent generated by Matoush Project will not have any negative effects on the natural shoreline of Lake Matoush or the waterways and lakes into which it flows.

As for air, the main source of potential impact on air quality relates to the dispersion of potential airborne contaminants. First, let's precise that there are no villages, towns or homes near the Matoush site. Furthermore, the maximum additional annual concentration of radon expected from the project activities are in the order of one Becquerel per cubic metre (1 Bq/m;) on site, and zero point zero five Becquerel per cubic metre (0.05 Bq/m;) at the edge of the future national park.

For your information, a Becquerel per cubic metre (1 Bq/m;) is the unit of measure used to indicate radon concentrations in the air. So in nature, radon concentrations in air at the site range between seven (7) to nineteen Becquerel per cubic metre (19 Bq/m;).

So the concentration limit of sixty Becquerel per cubic metre (60 Bq/m;) recommended by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission is therefore never exceeded, and the effect of the project on existing concentrations is negligible. As for airborne dust concentrations, they are minimal.

The map that I will show you in the next slide shows wind direction at the Matoush site. So at the

site, we see that the prevailing winds are aligned on a west-northwest southeast axis. The winds therefore do not blow towards the local communities of Mistissini, Chibougamau-Chapais or other inhabited areas.

Other questions were raised by residents regarding the potential presence of harmful dust or radon gas in the air. People are afraid that the substances released by underground development will contaminate the air and harm their health.

As we saw in the slides that I just presented, the allowable limits will never be exceeded, and the dust in the air will be minimal. Furthermore, the wind that blows across the site does not blow in the direction of the local communities. So now, let's look at mitigation measures.

Strateco will use a number of measures at the Matoush Project site to limit the effect of human activities on the physical environment. Here are some examples of the measures that will be used. So rain water will be diverted away from the site to sedimentation basins before being released. Air sampling stations will be set up at strategic locations, and water quality will be assessed in the catch basins and the mine water treatment

plant.

So now, let's look at the analysis of impact on the biological environment. So, by biological environment, we mean the following elements: soil and vegetation, fish and fish habitat, birds and wildlife. The main source of potential impact on the soil and vegetation around the site relates to the tree filling required to prepare the site and build the surface facilities. Vehicle and machinery traffic could potentially have an impact if they drive outside the permissible limits, or if they generate dust or cause oil or fuel leaks.

It should be noted that no rare or endangered plant species were found on site. And this area is not particularly valued by the Cree community in terms of gathering.

The potential impact on the fish of Lake Matoush is related to the change in the quality of their habitat due to the release of the treated water into the lake. It's also related to the possible increase in fishing activities, due to the number of workers at the Matoush site.

The potential impact on wildlife is essentially related to the loss or modification of their habitats due to the clearing of trees and the

impact of certain sensory disturbances, like increased noise, light or certain vibration. It's possible that individual birds or animals could be disturbed, but not the population as a whole.

Furthermore, the Matoush Project does not in any way prevent wildlife from moving to neighbouring habitats.

Finally, there is a possibility that collisions could occur between animals and vehicles on site. So now, let's look at the community's concerns in this regard.

During pre-consultation, questions touched on the points that you see on the screen. The preservation of fish and wildlife habitats, fishing and hunting emerged as issues, particularly for the members of the Cree Nation. So now, let's look at the mitigation measures.

So, Strateco will use a number of measures at the site to limit the effect of human activities on the biological environment. Here are some examples of the measures that will be used.

So, a procedure has been set up to deal with accidental spills of petroleum or chemical products, and recovery kits will be placed at strategic locations to allow a fast response to

this type of situation.

Non-aboriginal workers will be prohibited from fishing at the Matoush Project site. Clearing will be limited to a strict minimum to preserve wildlife habitat as much as possible. So now, let's look at the study of impacts on the human environment.

So, to conclude the impact assessment, the study looked at the human environment, and more precisely at the positive and negative impacts for the people living nearest the poverty, namely the Cree Nation of Mistissini and the residents of Chibougamau-Chapais.

So, when we talk about human environment, we mean the following elements: human health, quality of life and cultural context, economic benefits, land use, heritage and archeology. So now, let's look at the community's concerns and demands in this regard.

So during the pre-consultation, the questions raised touched on the points that you see on the screen. Concerns were raised in terms of health and safety of the public and the miners. Many people expressed their fear of contamination of radioactive accidents, the potential negative effects of radiation from uranium ore and available

protection measures, and the uranium transport safety criteria.

Residents also made certain demands. They wanted access to training and jobs. They also wanted business opportunities in relation to the project. And they expressed the desire to see an office opened locally. So now, let's look at the mitigation and improvement measures planned.

So, Strateco will use many measures at the Matoush site to limit the negative effects of the project which are really minimal in human terms. It will make a particular effort to maximize the positive spinoffs of the project for local communities.

The measures that will be used to limit the negative impacts are, for example, workers potentially exposed to radiation will be outfitted with safety equipment like the dosimeters that are supplied and analyzed by Health Canada in Ottawa.

Environmental monitoring and protection programs, as well as radioprotection and health and safety programs, will be set up. Air quality underground will be monitored continuously. Daily inspections will be done for all the potential sources of impact. Workers and contractors will be

trained. And a communication program for the employees and the community will be set up.

As for archeological heritage, we do not anticipate any impact, as the inventory of the Matoush Project site did not turn up any evidence of archeological sites.

Workers at the Matoush Project will acquire a professional expertise, which is a long-term benefit for the region and for Quebec as a whole. This will build Quebec's uranium expertise. Salaries of workers at the Matoush Project will improve the standard of living of the workers and their families. Here are a few examples of improvement measures.

Given equalibility and qualification, Strateco will hire Cree and local manpower first to work in the Matoush Project. Hiring will also take into account the workers' availability, skills and previous training, competition with various mining projects, and the workers' interest in taking necessary training.

The underground exploration phase will result in one hundred and eighty (180) jobs. Our objective is for the Cree to fill fifteen percent (15%) of these. If the project goes into production,

Strateco will need to hire an additional three hundred (300) workers or so. Our goal is for the Cree to fill twenty-five percent (25%) of these jobs.

We estimate that each direct job will generate two indirect jobs. Strateco already sourced goods and services from local businesses on a priority basis. So overall, the Matoush Project has a positive influence on the quality of life, cultural context and job creation in the local community. So now, let's look at the residual impacts.

So, of the twenty (20) or so physical, biological and human elements for which we assessed the residual impacts, seventeen (17) residual impacts were considered very minor or minor. The real risk is therefore really very limited, as the residual impacts result from very conservative working assumptions.

Three residual impacts are to be considered, but they're still overestimated because of the conservative assumptions. These three impacts involve the release of treated effluent into Lake Matoush, the risk of an accidental spill of oil or other product near a lake or a waterways on the site, the risk of disturbing fish communities by

overfishing. Finally, health and safety issues were clearly a source of concern for the communities.

So once the potential residual impacts were identified, the experts assessed the likelihood that these would have an effect on the ecosystem or human health.

So, the last step in the environmental impact study is the risk assessment for the residual impacts on the ecosystem and the human health. So the risk study concluded that radiological and non-radiological substances of interest would not have any undesirable effects on the environment or human health. Here is how the consultants went about assessing the risks.

First, they selected the substances present at the site that could have effects on elements of the ecosystem and human health. These are called the substances of interest. Then the valued elements on the ecosystem that could potentially be affected by these substances were selected. These include certain types of plants, wildlife and aquatic life.

In terms of human elements, the risk study looked at two profiles in particular. An adult member of the Cree Nation practicing traditional activities in the area of the site, and a cook

working at the site.

Finally, they assessed the possible interactions between the ecological and human elements and the substances of interest. Here, we mean ingestion, absorption or inhalation. For instance, human consumption of fish caught in the area, ingestion of water and plants by animals near the site, and so on.

The additional concentrations of the substances of interest, meaning those that would be added by the project activities, were assessed using models created by the consultants. Modelling was done for air, water and soil. These calculations generated an assessment of the additional concentrations for each ecological and human elements.

The objective here is to assess the risk of undesirable effects on the ecosystem and human health. We therefore compared the additional concentrations to the existing toxicity reference values.

So here are the conclusions, then, of the risk assessment on the ecosystem and the human health. Humans could be exposed to the substances of interest primarily through the consumption of food

exposed to these substances, and exposure to radiation. In terms of exposure to radiation, analyses show that all the estimated doses for our two receivers, namely the camp cook and a member of the Cree community, were far below the one thousand (1 000) microsievert per year criteria, and therefore, human are not at any risk of exposure to radiation on site.

The non-radiological substances of interest assessed for the study showed relatively high natural background concentrations. The additional concentrations from the project activities is generally minimal and lies within the existing natural range. We can therefore conclude that no potential undesirable effects on human health are to be expected.

As for the aquatic environment, the study conclusions show that the increase in radiological and non-radiological substances of interest due to the site activities would have very little to no potential undesirable effect on fish, plankton, benthic invertebrates and aquatic plants. The natural background concentrations are already relatively high, and the contribution from activities lies within the natural range seen on

site.

The same observations can be made for the land environment, meaning that in some cases, natural background concentrations were already very high, and the additional concentrations from future work are minimal. We can therefore conclude that the project will have very little to no potential undesirable effect on the land environment.

The last step in the environmental impact study involves the additional mitigation measures and the implementation of protection and monitoring programs. Here, I'll give you an overview of the additional measures that will be used to minimize the impacts on the environmental front, as well as to provide optimal health and safety conditions for workers and subcontractors involved in the project.

So for example, there will be an environment protection program, environmental monitoring and supervision program, health and safety program, permanent nursing staff at the site, setting up of emergency procedures for accidental spills, daily inspection of facilities like the fuel farm, the water treatment plant, the propane storage area, the pipes, ditches, containment basins, internal control water sampling, and many others. So the

complete list of these measures can be found in the environmental impact study.

So, in summary, our study has been conducted following strict guidelines, using very conservative working assumptions. The potential impacts identified are negligible, and the mitigation measures and monitoring programs will be in place throughout the duration of the project, to ensure the safety of people and the respect of the environment.

So, I will now turn things over to Jean-Pierre Lachance, our executive vice-president, who will talk to you about stakeholder relations. Jean-Pierre?

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Well, thank you. Thank you Caroline. I'm sure that everyone here appreciated the clarity of your allocation.

Chief, it's nice to be here in your community again. It's always a pleasure. Following the introduction of the presentation by Guy, the technical part by Pierre and the environmental section by Caroline, I'm here to talk to you about how important it is for us to maintain strong relations with the local communities, and

especially Mistissini.

But before going any further, I would like to introduce you two colleagues of mine who are helping me a lot to achieve our corporate goals. Well, first of all, we have Daniel Bergeron. Where is Daniel? Daniel is over there. Daniel is our director of community relations. He's a resident of Chibougamau, our relations for Chibougamau-Chapais and Mistissini. And Daniel is also assisted by Peter, Peter Coonishish over there. I guess Peter is very well-known, of course, from members of Mistissini. But also, for those who would not know Peter, Peter also, being more than a member of the Mistissini community, whose family has trap lines surrounding the Matoush Project.

So far, many presentations and meetings were held with the population at large to keep you informed of the advancing stages of the Matoush Project, and to reinforce the communications. Since the project began, in two thousand and six (2006), we have insisted on establish open and transparent relations with the local communities and the main participants in the Matoush Project.

A number of meetings and presentations took place in Chibougamau and Mistissini in order to

keep the participants regularly informed on the project's progress, as well as the results of the exploration work.

The Matoush Project was presented to local governments, business people, and the public at large. Two important meetings were also held at the Matoush Camp in February two thousand and eight (2008) and February two thousand and nine (2009), with families whose trap lines surround the project, once again to inform the families on the exploration activities underway, and to respond to questions and concerns.

It is essential for us that the Matoush Project and its goals are clear for residents of Mistissini and Chibougamau-Chapais, as desire the communities that are the closest to the project, and the most "lively" to benefit from it. Likely.

In order to increase communications with local communities, Strateco has now an office in Mistissini and another one in Chibougamau. As Caroline mentioned a little bit earlier, this was a request. This was a request in December two thousand and nine (2009)... two thousand and eight (2008), and we said yes, it will come. So there we are, now, with these offices, and that should

reinforce the communications quite a bit.

It's also important for us to keep the lines of communication open with the various local provincial and national governments, as well as with the shareholders of Strateco. But let's get back, here, to here in Mistissini and Chibougamau.

In December two thousand and eight (2008), we came to Mistissini and Chibougamau to present the Matoush underground exploration ramp project to the public at large, and to inform the public on uranium, particularly potential concerns, and the health and safety aspect. This presentation took the form of pre-consultations held in French and English in Mistissini.

We also organized discussion workshops with representatives of the Chibougamau-Chapais financial sector, including the mayor of Chibougamau, municipal counsellors, members of the Chamber of Commerce, members of the James Bay Action Committee and many others. Here, in Mistissini, discussion workshops were also organized with representatives, of course, of the Cree Nation people, including trappers, Cree living in the area of the Matoush Project, and elders.

These various information and discussion

sessions attracted over a hundred and fifty (150) participants. Well, perhaps some of you here were present.

These pre-consultations enabled us to gather many comments and questions in relation to the various aspects of the project. People also shared their concerns about health, the environment and the economic benefits of the Matoush Project for the residents of Chibougamau-Chapais, but mainly here, of course, for the Cree Nation of Mistissini.

The main thing to retain about these pre-consultations is that they clearly strengthened local communications with both Mistissini and Chibougamau. I hope the presentation today helped address these concerns and clarify what the advanced exploration phase of the project involves, by throwing some light on the very legitimate questions that a uranium mining project raises.

Most of all, I hope that the results of the environmental impact study allowed you to see that the negative effects of the Matoush Project on people's health and the environment will be negligible. And in a few moments, we will be very pleased to answer your questions.

Also, like Caroline mentioned, it's important

to reiterate that economic benefits for the local community will be substantial. I invite you all to read the environmental impact study that we presented and its key aspects. It's essential for us to ensure that we are addressing all of your questions. The French and English versions of this study can be found on the Internet and on the website of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency. You can also find publicly available copies of the study at the Mistissini Band Council, at the Chibougamau Municipal Library, and on request, in the council room of the Chapais Town Hall.

As you can see, the relations with the local communities, especially Mistissini and Chibougamau-Chapais, are a top priority for us, and we clearly intend to keep reinforcing the relationship between all parties.

After talking about the importance about... for communications within our company, I leave the floor to our president, Guy Hébert, for the conclusion. Guy?

CONCLUSION

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

As you have seen, either through the video or through my colleagues' presentations, the

environmental impact study on the Matoush Project has been performed very seriously by qualified people. The underground exploration project impact is truly negligible. Even if extreme criteria have been used.

The study answers the population's preoccupation on water, air, animal and vegetable life, and on the social environment. The study is well made. And I can assure you, by my many years of experience, that no exploration project in Quebec has been subject to such a study.

The information and communication efforts that we have made since two thousand and six (2006) allow us to estimate that our project is socially accepted. We'll answer questions received from various authorities during the next few weeks. But the study conclusion will not change. The Matoush Project is for us a vector of regional socio-economic development, in Quebec and in Canada, with a negligible environmental impact.

I thank you all for your attention throughout this presentation. I hope it will have been useful for each and everyone of you. I now invite you to share your comments and questions with us, and maybe pass the word to monsieur Benoit Taillon.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Merci monsieur Hébert. Avant que... [translation] Before... (himself) ... Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission to present some slides on the regulatory system, and after him, madame Karine Menezes, sorry, from Health Canada, will also present to you some slides, and after that we'll start with the questions.

PRESENTATION BY THE CNSC

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

Thank you. Thank you for giving us the opportunity here to speak a bit about the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission and the processes that we go through as part of a licensing project such as the Matoush Project. Some of you may recognize me, I was here last fall, provided a quick overview of who we are and what we do. So, for some of you who are here, you may be hearing a lot of the same information again. For those of you who haven't been here before, I hope you'll benefit from this.

Basically, I'll give you a quick overview of who we are, who is the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, how we regulate. I'll talk very quickly about environmental assessment, and I'll focus mostly on licensing, and what we do in the

licensing processes. And then a quick conclusion.

Just a quick context, you kind of heard a little bit about it from Strateco, uranium is fuel that's used for nuclear reactors. Nuclear reactors generate electricity. There is currently eighteen (18) operating nuclear reactors in Canada, and Canada is a major supplier of uranium around the world.

Another thing is that for Canada and other countries, nuclear is already part of the mix. Several countries around the world have nuclear power plants. There are some signs of potential growth and construction of new reactors around the world. Canada is a rich source of uranium, and there is a few things that have come out that might lead to some increasing demands for uranium. But perhaps what's most important from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission context is these are not our decisions to make. The CNSC does not decide on the nuclear mix, or the mix of energy. We are here to regulate and ensure that the facilities are safe when they are chosen to be constructed.

So what's our role? If governments and/or proponents take decisions to pursue nuclear

projects, what we do, our mandate is clear, we protect the health, safety and security of persons and the environment, and respect Canada's international commitments on the peaceful use of nuclear energy. We are not proponents for the industry, we are proponents for safety.

We are headed up by a Commission Tribunal, that's an independent, quasi-judicial administrative judicial, which there is seven independent members and a president. They are independent, they are even independent from us as staff, they make their decisions independently, taking into account the recommendations that we make, the information that's provided to them by the proponents, and taking in consideration the input that they receive from different members of the public interested groups.

We are a science-based organization, our hearings are public, they are open to the public, and they are also webcast on the Internet, for those who cannot be in attendance. We're supported by a secretariate, and we have independent legal services as well.

We're a fairly large organization, scientific, technical, professional staff, we're about eight

hundred and fifty (850) employees. We're responsible for implementing the decisions that are made by the Commission, and verifying that the proponents, the licensees are in compliance with the obligations, under the regulations and the licenses that they've been provided.

We are also involved in reviewing the license applications and environmental assessments, and engaging in the public throughout (inaudible) activities such as this one.

We are the principal federal regulator for uranium mining in Canada. We also work with other federal departments, human resources skills, Development Canada, Health Canada, Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans, Transport Canada in their roles, we work with them in harmony as much as possible. We also work with provincial local governments who may also have responsibilities for workers' safety, environment, protection and decommissioning. We really want to work with them, work together to make sure that things are effective.

We regulate a number of facilities and activities. We regulate the fuel cycle, so uranium mines and mills, uranium fuel fabrication and

processing facilities, nuclear power plants, facilities that are used for storing radioactive waste, facilities activities with regards to processing nuclear substances, use of the nuclear substances, whether it be medical uses or industrial uses, research facilities, research reactors, educational facilities, and finally import and export of nuclear substances, equipment and technology.

We are governed by the Nuclear Safety Control Act. It's a modern Act in two thousand (2000), fairly well-recognized internationally as a very modern Act with a lot of powers that are given to us. Under that, we have a number of regulations that are specifically applicable. We have general regulations, general nuclear safety and control regulations, we also have regulations that are specific to uranium mines and mills, and we have regulations specifically with regards to radiation protection.

What's important is licensees ultimately are responsible for ensuring the security, protection of health, safety, protecting the environment, respecting Canada's international commitments. Our responsibility is regulating them and assessing

that they're complying with the Act, the regulations and the international obligations.

A license from the CNSC is required for advanced exploration such as the Matoush Project, where underground uranium exploration activities are going to be conducted. Our licensing process basically comprises the receipt of an application from a proponent. We go through a number of reviews to determine the adequacy of the application. As well, in parallel, we can be doing an environmental assessment such as this one.

We conduct public hearings where applications are brought forward to the Commission, and considered for a decision. Licenses are multiple stages. So proponents, when they get involved with the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, get to see us many many times throughout the process.

An important component of our licensing is the requirement of financial guarantees. A financial guarantee, basically, what that is, is that at any time, if the proponent were to suddenly leave the site, we have to... They need to make sure that there is monies that have been set aside, so that we can take that money and use it in order to properly take care of the site. That's an important

requirement. This ensures that should, for whatever reason, the proponent choose to abandon the site, that there are provisions in place in order to take care of it. Throughout the process, there is ample opportunities for public involvement.

Moving on, under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, the main things under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act is to minimize or advise, or avoid adverse environmental effects before they occur, and to incorporate environmental factors into decision-making, including some requirements for environmental monitoring and follow-up work that might come out during the licensing phase.

With regards to the Matoush EA process, we are providing technical expertise to the COFEX EA process under the James Bay Northern Quebec Agreement. We are also a responsible authority under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, and we will continue to follow all the requirements under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.

With regards to license application, these are some of the things that we will look at in consideration for an application. We will look at all the detailed designs of the facilities and

equipment, look at the processes that are being proposed by the proponent, we will look at how the site will be managed, how it's organized, the type of people that they have, the qualifications of the people who will be working there, the training programs that are in place to ensure that their workers are properly trained, in order to properly exercise their duties and responsibilities.

We will look at the radiation protection programs, environmental protection. How they manage conventional health and safety, and how they deal in the event of an emergency.

With regards to protection of the environment, the things we look at is how they control the releases to the air, to surface water and to ground water. We look at how they measure the environmental releases, how they measure the effects in the receiving environment, and ensure that what actions, that they're prepared to take whatever actions are necessary when and if required.

With regards to the public, we look at measurements of radiation in the environment, calculating the maximum potential radiation exposure to a member of the public. In this, we are

conservative. We need to ensure that should someone want to be in proximity to the site, that they are protected as well. We look at additional exposures from the facilities to ensure that they don't exceed regulatory limits.

With regards to radiation protection of the workers, we look at how they've designed the facility in order to protect workers, again how they're managing the radiation protection, to ensure that adequate controls are in place, that radioactive materials are properly controlled, that the work is properly controlled, and that they're properly measuring the radiation, radiation exposures to the workers, to ensure that regulatory limits are not exceeded.

Once they've received their license, they're still not done with us. The compliance process, we verify, we do on-site inspections at operating facilities. We conduct these verifications, these inspections with a set frequency. We also look at events that may have occurred. They have a requirement to submit compliance reports to us that tell us how they perform. We review those reports as well.

When we do field inspections, we do these

reviews. If we're not satisfied that they're taking appropriate measures and that they've taken appropriate actions, we have a number of enforcement tools at our disposal. Anywhere from voluntary compliance, where we ask them to take action and they voluntarily do it. We can order them to take necessary actions if we're not satisfied by what they're doing. In a more severe scenario, the Commission may choose to amend their license or remove their license. And finally, one final case is we can propose and make recommendations for possible prosecution of the company, including its management.

We also promote safety culture, we want to ensure that safety is foremost in how they manage their activities.

We mentioned you have different opportunities for getting involved in licensing. We're in the middle of the application right now. We're going through the review. This is part of the process as well, where you have an opportunity to provide input. As well, when we go through the public hearings for licensing, we're currently looking at, depending on how the process goes through, when the public hearing takes place, we are currently

reviewing the possibility of holding a public hearing somewhere in the area here, to facilitate participation. Because most of our hearings are conducted in Ottawa. So, this is one thing that we're currently pursuing and looking into.

One very important point is that no licensing decision can be made until this particular process is completed. So while we're doing our reviews of the licensing application, no decisions will be made until the outcome of this process is known, and we know whether in fact we're proceeding or not to the next stage.

In conclusion, we are Canada's nuclear regulator, we're responsible for licensing, compliance and enforcement of the uranium mining industry in Canada, where the protection of workers, the public and the environment is our top priority. Transparency and public consultation are strongly valued, and we work cooperatively with other agencies to ensure that the industry is properly regulated. Thank you.

DISCUSSION

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Thank you very much, monsieur LeClair. Chief Longchap will say a few words before your

presentation, Karine.

CHIEF JOHN LONGCHAP:

(in Cree) So I just wanted to say that I have another function to go to, which was scheduled before this hearing, so I'll have to excuse myself. (in Cree) I think some refreshments will be brought in, some cold cuts will be brought in at six (18h00), five thirty (17h30), six (18h00), around six (18h00), or later on today, so... I also want to say that this forum is an opportunity for people to ask questions, comments, that's the purpose of this meeting. So take the opportunity to ask your questions and make your comments. So... (in Cree) Thank you.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Et maintenant, je remets la parole à Karine Menezes, l'experte de Santé Canada.

PRESENTATION BY HEALTH CANADA

Mrs. KARINE MENEZES:

... is Karine Menezes. I work for Health Canada, and my role is to make sure that every project we receive within Health Canada is seen by experts, by our experts, by the right experts, and those experts, we make sure that they can address issues, health issues and express their concerns about

those projects.

So, I'm the original environmental assessment coordinator, and today, I will talk to you a little bit about our mandate within the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.

So, Health Canada has no power to prohibit, we have no permit, we have no rules to enforce, so we have the power to recommend. And how do we... are we doing that, is by providing expertise when it is required. So, when the Act is triggered, the responsible federal authority, like, for this case, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, if they see, if they foresee impacts or issues of, for health, for human health, they ask us to provide some expertise, to look through the study.

So, this is a few examples of the expertise we provide. This is in general, so we then provide all those expertises for the Matoush Project.

For example, air quality, we could ask, our experts can ask for the baseline, the actual state of the environment. What the concentration at... What is the concentration now. And they will ask to be able to compare what will be the concentration of all chemicals, or all emissions with the project.

It's about the same for all experts in Health Canada, so, to be able to compare what's gonna be the state after a project is being started, we need to know what's the actual state, and what will be the adding of the project.

So, to give you a little bit more example, for contamination of country food, when we talk about country food we talk about local food resources, for subsistence or recreational activities, like fish, wild game and berries.

We can ask for a study for a consumption survey, for example, to know a little bit more about the consumption habits, the rate and types of species people are feeding with. Like for air quality, we like to know the baseline concentration and the future levels of potential contaminants.

For drinking water quality, we like to know about chemical and microbiological contaminants. We have also expertise on treatment requirements.

Noise effects, we'll go through the existing and predicted future daytime and nighttime sound levels to be able to assess or to evaluate the impact of the project.

For radiation, we assess human exposure to ionizing radiation, and we look the type of

radiation, like radon and radioactive isotopes for all medium.

And the last one I put there is a little bit special, is human health risk assessment. It's special because the expert has to understand and to take into account all the other aspects of the project. So, I thought it would be a good idea to talk to you about a little bit more of these human health risk assessments, and what our experts are looking for when they look, when they go through a human health risk assessment.

So, they ask themselves one question, one principal question: is there a risk? So, to be able to answer this question, they need three things. If one of those three... these three things are not there, they cannot assess the risk, and they can... Well, they just, it does, just doesn't have any risk.

So, the first things that we need to have in order to have a risk is hazards. So in this case, could be chemical. So, they will look at the chemical before the project and after. They will look at the type and concentration of all contaminants of potential concern. If there is no chemical or hazards in the area, there is no risk.

There just can't be any risk.

The second thing that we need in order to have a potential risk is the receptors. In our case, it's human receptors. So, it can be a man, a woman, children, workers, these are all kinds of receptors that are evaluated in a different way.

So, if there is no receptor, there is no risk. If there is no hazard, there is no risk. But we need one more thing in order to have a potential risk. We need an exposure pathway. So, we need something that will bring the hazard to the receptors in order to have a risk. The exposure pathways will link the receptor to the hazard. Well, the hazard to the receptors.

So, it can go through aerosol, water, food, or any consumer product. By ingestion, your receptor can ingest, so he will ingest food or water. He can be exposed by inhalation, by air or dust, or he can be exposed by skin absorption, by soil or water. So if you... Those three things, you might have a risk. You might have a potential risk.

So, in order to have this human health risk, you need information in all those three areas. And if you miss one of those areas, if you don't have, one of those is not there, you won't have any risk.

So, now that I talked to you a little bit about our mandate and our expertise, the way we will assess, or evaluate, or go through the Matoush Project, here is some of our contribution to the Matoush since October two thousand and eight (2008), the date we received the request from the COFEX.

So in... We contributed in defining the requirements. In our jargon, we call that the directives. What is... Some guidelines, some requirements that we need to be present, or need... Some information that we need to be evaluated or in the EA, in the study, in order to assess health impact, or to comment the study.

Since October two thousand and nine (2009), we reviewed the report, the first version of the report. We analyzed it, our experts went through it, and they asked some questions and comments. So, we addressed some issues, we are actually waiting for more information in order to be able to submit, or to analyze the report and tell, or give our final comments about the project.

So, this is a little bit fast. It was an overview of what we do, of our role. So, if you have questions after that, I will be happy to

answer. Thank you.

QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Alors nous allons procéder maintenant à la période de questions. Il serait peut-être bon que vous vous identifiiez... [translation] ... the question period. It would be good for you to identify yourselves, and also address your question to the person who made the presentation, or the person it's intended for.

So now, citizens of Mistissini, people, ask questions. It's your turn. (himself) ... specify which person you are, in your mind, to ask the question.

As we mentioned a few minutes ago, and Chief Longchap mentioned, he had to leave, and with your permission, I will ask to our colleague, Philip Awashish, to act as president of this meeting, and to take place between Benoit and I. Philip?

Now, who is starting the questions, the first question? Feel free, and...

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

Bonjour.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Bonjour.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
Oui. So, my name is Élène Hébert, I'm a teacher at VMS, I have a question for the lady at Health Canada. I would like to know what are your concerns, actually, about this project, that keep you from answering totally about this report?
Mrs. KARINE MENEZES:
We have a first review of the project, but we cannot tell right now what are our concerns, because we don't have all the information we need to, in order to make a final statement or a final... final comments. So, we'll... Our expert will continue our analysis or assessment with this project when we will receive the final version, and all the questions will be answered.
Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
So, this means that the project cannot start until those questions are answered?
Mrs. KARINE MENEZES:
We are not a regulatory institution. We are an expert on the situation. And our role within this process is to give our expertise as an expert. So, we give our expertise to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, we give it to the COFEX, and our concerns will be posted on the website, so the

public will be aware of it. But we cannot... We have no regulation to, for this process.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

Okay. Thank you. I have other questions to monsieur Hébert. You were talking, in an interview, that first, when you first started talking about this project, you were saying that there would be no leftover from the mine. A few months later, half of those would be left outside the mine, and half would be buried. And now, I've read lately, you said that the finer residue would be used as a glazing for the wall of the mine. Now, actually, this is supposed to be an exploration project. It sounds very much like a baby mine to me. But I don't know if, and this is another question, is it on a regular happening that a company that is doing exploration has actually to dig underneath, and test machinery, and different procedures for the produce that is coming out of the mine?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, it's a normal procedure to do two different phases. The phase we are talking here today is the exploration phase. We use assumptions to estimate the economic of the project, so we are asking the permission to go underground and test different

things. One is really the continuity of the ore body, so that means we do a drift, and we do definition drilling. We cannot perform from the surface because it's too deep.

Secondly, we asked also permission to extract seven hundred and fifty tons (750 t) of ore, mineralized ore we'll keep on the ground, and then, that means we are not processing. Normally, in an exploration program, they are doing a bulk sample. Here, we have specified they will have no bulk sample on the extracted seven hundred and fifty tons (750 t) we keep on the ground, and the reason for that is to estimate the water quantity, water quality. Secondly, to estimate the radon gas, the air ventilation system, is it sufficient or not for a mining operation, and also, we are mining to, or, the project is to, we call the Matoush Fault, and so we have to test the mining method we'll use, and the costs related to that.

So, this is a very very normal way to do an exploration program, to go and go there. And maybe the project will not be feasible, because not economic, too expensive, or the continuity of the realization will not be there. So then, we will stop and reclaim everything.

So, but if we, as we hope, honestly we hope that will be all economics and our assumptions are good, and then we'll go to the second phase. And then, that means we have to do another environmental impact study, coming back here, do an information session as we do, and then we will have public hearings, and, but we'll have the real question about the water quality, water quantity, the radon gas, about the ventilation, the dust, and it's the reason why we have to do that at that actual phase. We do, this is completely normal procedure.

Which is not normal, honestly, in Quebec, is do what we are doing for an exploration program. Because as I said, I put two mines into production in Quebec: one gold mine, one base metal mine, which has a big impact... A base metal mine, as you know, in the area here, you have a lot of base metal. This is a process we're doing, I never went through in thirty-five (35) years of experience. So, protection is there, and this is normal.

What I was saying about a mine, through the different asked questions in the past, you know, this is normal, the way we are acting, because, the video is done because it's a request from the COFEX

and COMEX to say what will be a real mine. You know, what will be a real mine. Because for us, today, we don't have the information.

The picture you saw through the video for phase 2, location of the camp, the plant location, the tailing location, we don't know. We have not started the study yet. Okay? That will be in two years, or the next twenty (20) months. There, we'll start to see where the tailings will be.

So, but the big, big, big impact here is the... We have only, we are talking one point six million tons (1.6 M t) of ore. One point six million tons (1.6 M t) of ore, and actually what we have, we hope to find more. We hope to find a lot more. And the...

But the one point six million ton (1.6 M t), if you compare what we have been mining Troilus or in other mines in the area, in the Chibougamau area, this is so small. This is so small. But it's very very (inaudible), so it's very rich. You know, it's very high value.

But the point is, the way we do actually, it's an exploration phase, and the license we'll get from the CNSC if ever we get it. As they explained, you know, we have a lot of steps to go through, and

the... So if we are getting it, then we'll do an exploration phase and start again for the production phase. But it's a small, small impact, you know? Point fifteen kilometre (.15 km) is small, small, is smaller than the village here. Compared to the, per example again, the video show you Troilus, five kilometres (5 km) long, the impact. This is underground, it's an open... You know, the hole in the ground is five metres by five metres (5 m X 5 m). And everything, they have no dike there, they have no, we call tailing ponds. So everything is under the surface, you know?

It will be excavated, and at the end it will be, we put "heart", earth... earth above, and put ground, you know? This is... We remove uranium from the area. And the area is covered of boulders. You know? The area is, we call a big block. You saw the picture of the big blocks. They have uranium all over the place. Including in the park. Never been tested. In the park, I guarantee they have uranium on the surface.

And that explains also why we find uranium in the fish, in the water, in the bones of the fish, in the flesh of the fish. We find uranium. It's not because us. This has been put there one billion

(1 G) years ago, and have been, last glaciation, six thousand five hundred (6 500) years ago, created blocks. The glaciers move, it creates... scratch the surface, and creates those blocks you see on the picture.

The property, everybody is going to their trap lines in the north. They see boulders, those blocks, all over the place. So for six thousand (6 000) years, the uranium in those blocks has been eroded by the wind, the ice, the water, and those particles of uranium went in the ground and the soil. And there is a reason why we find that amount of uranium.

So what we propose is really to take large high grade uranium out and move somewhere else, you know? It will be only more clean. It's a long answer...

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

This is a joke, I hope, Sir.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Ah, it's not a joke at all.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

I think that to say that you will remove uranium to have less radon coming off the ground is totally insane.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
Oh, radon is not the issue. No, no, no, it's insane... it's not insane.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
Yes, it is insane, and you haven't answered my question about the sterile. You were also talking about taking the sterile of the mine...
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
The what?
Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
Sterile of the mine.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
What is the sterile?
Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
The sterile, it is after the "mort-terrain", what you get out of the mine, and you said that you would do the road with that.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
What? I never...
Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
So you said it yourself. Okay...
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
Ah, the waste?
Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

The waste, that you're gonna take it to build the road. And I'm very surprised that this is just out. I say, you're saying that this mine is actually just prospective, so to speak, and I'm sure you're not the one who will be asking for the next review. It's gonna be, probably be Cameco or AREVA, because you're not a mining company, you're just a junior venture with experience, let's say.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

You know, in the past, I put three mines into production. This is... I started in nineteen eighty (1980), and I started from exploration projects, and one of the companies became Cambior, which is not a small company. But I started from scratch, and one of the other mines, in Rouyn-Noranda, called the Bouchard-Hébert Mine, and it's my name on the mine, and the... because I started from scratch. And the company is Audrey Resources, was Audrey, and Audrey is the name of one of my daughters.

So, our objective is really to bring this mine into production. Is someone as Cameco will come and buy us out, this is... You know, we are a public company, and the... We have shareholders. The shareholders will decide if we have an offer. But

we are not there yet. And is...

When you're talking, just coming back to your question I have not answered, regarding the waste. The waste has been from the rock. We call the waste the two hundred and eighty-six thousand tons (286 000 t) we will remove. That waste is completely sterile. There is no acid generator, they have no pyrite in it, they have no uranium in it, and this has been tested, you know, it's very clean waste. We can use to build roads.

I don't think we'll use it to build the surface plan, because it's possible, even from... But from the tailing, where we'll excavate a tailing, is very small. Two hundred by three hundred by twenty metres (200 X 300 X 20 m) roughly, for one point five million tons (1.5 M t). That rock, the waste, will be used to backfill the underground. We have to use backfill, because the mining method, for people who know about it, it's room and pillar, so that means we create a room, and then we backfill with waste. And the waste will come from the tailings. But can be used for a road construction, but this is not my decision. This is the Minister of Transportation's decision.

But the rock is meeting A-1 quality for road

construction. It's not me saying that, it's not a joke, it's reality. You have to learn a little bit more about the reality of that project. And since two thousand and seven (2007), we are doing all the studies required, and they... you asked questions to the health and safety, they have asked questions, we received ninety (90) questions and it's not finished, you know? They are asking questions, and we are answering the questions they are asking, and we have experts with us who help us to answer questions.

And, no, I think the... We can answer all your questions, and you are making your point. I will never convince you, Mrs. Hébert. But we can give you information, and the reality of the information, your brothers who came here on March the first (1st) can answer your questions. The people living nearby the uranium mine in Saskatchewan.

I've been thirty (30) years living there, and they have no problem with their caribou, they are doing commercial fishing in the lake nearby the mines over there. For sure they had problems fifty (50) years ago, but that has changed, you know? Regulation, the new Act in two thousand (2000),

they have a lot of regulation we have to follow. And, you know, you can trust me, not, yes or no, but your brothers are... They didn't come here to lie to you.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

Well, you're not my brother...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

No, no, we aren't related even if we have the same name, but...

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

But I'm sorry to say that in Saskatchewan, there are tailings that have been there for sixty (60) years, it's gonna cost billions of dollars to clean, and there is always a radon dome that forms ten kilometres (10 km) around radon tailings.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Do you want to have the real answer? We have an expert.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

And if there is a still wind, and it is proven by a toxicologist in the University of Saskatchewan. Thank you very much.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Thank you, Mrs. Hébert.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay madame. Thank you. Next question.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I love it.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

My name is Claudine Cholette. I would like to pursue upon radon gas. I work as, in the relocation business, and any home in the States that was, how could I say, insured by the company relocating an employee, would always require a radon inspection.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Hum, hum.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Now the thing was that they even went to the length of insuring for measure for that radon gas. In other words, a house that would have radon in it would lose...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Value.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Value.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

So why is it that in the States it's such a big

thing, and here it is not? It says here that according to Health Canada, with the data they have, is there anything we know about what's being done in the States? Moreover, it says in this that there is no risk for the miners, because the air ventilation will help them in that sense. However, that air ventilation, where is it going? To the surface?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, the air.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

So, if it goes in the surface, what's happening with it?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I will answer... Is the complete question?

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Almost, yes.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Okay. I will answer the first part, okay? In Montreal also, in St-Hilaire, in the south shore of Montreal and the north, they have a lot of radon in the house, okay? And you just install a small fan and the evacuate. Radon is a very very dangerous gas, you know, it's "cancerigene" and has to be taken...

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

I lost somebody to it.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Oh! Okay. I lost a lot of people at cigarette. Anyway. The... But the air, air in the mine, the ventilation... I prefer to, some expert here in the room about ventilation, Mr. Michel Parent, who are... Is he still here? Expert in the... Or Ernie? You can answer about the radon? Yes?

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:

Hi. My name is Ernie Becker. I have been working with uranium mines for many years, and yes, radon in people's homes is, I would, on average, the largest source of radiation exposure that people, in general, in the public, have. This is natural, it has nothing to do with any uranium mines.

There are also, there is also radon naturally in the air, everywhere, at quite low levels. The difference between the homes, the houses and the natural outdoor air is that the homes tend to trap the radon and keep it inside the home. Whereas the radon that's naturally in the air, everywhere, is at low levels and doesn't pose any sort of health risk.

The uranium mines, when they are ventilated,

they will give off radon, and at the large mines in Saskatchewan, they have measured the level of radon at, say a kilometre (1 km) from the mine site, and there is no measurable increase in the radon levels. The outdoor radon levels. At one kilometre (1 km) from the mine.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

In Saskatchewan, how far are the closest communities? A couple of hours plane?

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:

It would depend. It might be a hundred kilometres (100 km).

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Also, in here, on page 2, it states the life expectancy from uranium to radon to lead. This is assuming that all particles of uranium will be, will have had the same birth date. So in other words, there can be a part that, yes, will expire in so many days, but there will be other exposure. So in other words, this can become cumulative.

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:

The radon gas has a half-life of about four days. So it does not accumulate. As I said before, it is released from the mine, it disperses into the atmosphere, mixes with the radon that's already out

there everywhere, and at a distance, one kilometre (1 km), there is no measurable increase in radon from natural levels, and in fact, that's really the extreme case. If you look at how the mines are designed, they usually have the fresh air intake about thirty metres (30 m) from the exhaust, and again it has no impact on the radon levels, even on the mine site, for the workers.

So, we know the radon gas does not accumulate, because it does have a fairly short half-life. And it simply disperses into the atmosphere and mixes with the radon that's already everywhere.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

So, if I understand well, you're stating that there is no accumulation. But if we look at the air of the fourth day, okay, there will still be radon from day 1, day 2, day 3. From the ventilation system and others.

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:

The half-life is the time that it takes for half the radon atoms to decay. So after four days, you have half as much radon as you did at the beginning. After eight days you'll have a quarter, and it just keeps on decreasing by a half every four days. So it does... It does last longer than

four days, but it doesn't accumulate, simply because it just simply mixes and disperses, and it goes with the air everywhere.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:
So if it goes in the air, it can still be absorbed by lungs?
Mr. ERNEST BECKER:
Yes. Along with all the other naturally-occurring radon that's everywhere in the air. Yes.
Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:
Even though we say natural, it can still be harmful?
Mr. ERNEST BECKER:
That's right, except that when you look at the radon levels in the atmosphere, and there were some slides to that, you see that the radon levels in the atmosphere are really quite low, whereas for homes, this is a different story entirely, because the home traps the radon, and in homes, the radon levels can go much higher than you will find them in the normal atmosphere outdoors.
Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:
Excuse me, but we are assuming that all houses live with closed windows. Because it stays there. It's

in capture. But in regular houses, not everybody uses air conditioning.

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:

Yes, and normally you'll find that the radon levels are higher in a house in winter than they are in the summer.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

What about the States in California? Or elsewhere? Why is it so important for a relocation company to insure its clients against future radon claims for their own employees?

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:

Radon in homes is a complicates subject. Again, nothing to do with uranium mining. The highest radon levels in homes I've ever seen in Canada were in southern Saskatchewan, six hundred kilometres (600 km) or more from any uranium mine. Manitoba, some municipalities also have problems with radon. I think they tend to be somewhat lower in Ontario, although Elliot Lake also had radon issues, simply because of the ore that was close to the surface naturally.

It varies a lot. It depends on house construction, there is a lot of different parameters that control the level of radon in a

home.
Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:
As well as wind direction, concentration?

Mr. ERNEST BECKER:
The air has very low levels of radon in it. It comes into the house, it leaves again. There is no way that it can concentrate from the atmosphere. It's always coming up from the soil, through the basement or the foundations.
Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:
So there is a possibility that it travels?
Mr. ERNEST BECKER:
Yes.
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
Hello. Two and a half years... Two... A year and a half...
Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
Excuse me. Would you please give us your name?
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
Len. A year and a half ago, a year ago or maybe a year and a half ago, you people came up here, and in this very room, one of the CSN... the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission stated to me and the people that radon gas comes up from the ground and

dissipates in the air, and there is nothing to worry about.

I've done research on radon gas, and radon gas is seven times heavier than air. So, it floats low to the ground. One thing about the radon gas is that it emits alpha, beta and gamma radiation, and for our people here in Mistissini, alpha radiation, beta and gamma radiation is carcinogenic. Which means that it can cause cancer.

They said that it just comes up, floats in the air and disappears. When they told us that, they were actually lying to us, because I found out, like he just mentioned, that it has a half-life of three point eight two (3.82) days, and in total, it'll be around roughly about eight days, as he mentioned, give or take a few hours.

But my question is, why didn't the person who came here at that time say that to us then? Why did they lie to us and the people? Okay? And when I think about it, and I want to read a couple of things that I prepared for this event, but why did they lie to us and our people? Why didn't they just say that it lasts three point eight two (3.82) days?

If they're willing to lie to us about radon

gas and say that it'll float away, disappear in the air, what else are they willing to lie about?

Now, I just want to read some stuff here.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Excuse me, sir, would you like to have the... monsieur LeClair answer your question?

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

No. After... After I finish my presentation, she can answer whatever she wants, and then I'll make a rebuttal after.

Now, in my research that I've been doing, and I've read, I mean, I just got a small portion of the material that I've read, and for our people that live in this community, and others that don't live here, even this panel here, and all our respective guests, I did my research when... If you want to check it out, type into your Google, Google on the health cost of nuclear energy. And there is many different documents, some as long as three hundred (300), four hundred (400) pages long that I have read. That talk about the dangers of the whole nuclear industry.

Now, I'm just gonna read portions, and this is from the health, human health implications of

uranium mining and nuclear power generation. I'll give you the author in a few minutes. I was trying to find the author, but...

> *Ever since the discovery of radioactivity at the turn of the last century, it has been recognized that ionizing radiation has a deleterious impact on human health. Radiation damage can affect any part of the cell and can interfere with many cellular processes. Most importantly, damage to the genetic material of the cell can lead to cancer, birth defects and hereditary illness. It is generally accepted by the scientific community that there is no safe level of radiation exposure, and that any amount of exposure to ionizing radiation is harmful.*

Doctor Karl Z. Morgan, and I quoted this last time when your group came up here, has, and others like him, such as doctor Alice Stewart, doctor Ernest Sternglass and many others have shown the dangers of uranium and uranium mining, and the whole process of, you know, nuclear power

generation, and even the fact of atomic bombs, which is associated with the nuclear industry.

Uranium mining contaminates the air. Now, they said in their report that there is no contamination to human health. They said in their report there is no, or very little contamination to the environment. But I'm gonna show you otherwise.

Uranium mining contaminates the air, water and soil. Crushing tons of radioactive rocks produces dust, and leaves behind fine radioactive particles subject to wind and water erosion. Radon gas, a potent lung carcinogen, is released continuously from the tailings in perpetuity. Drilling and blasting disrupt and contaminate local aquifers. So the water underneath the ground, that we drink.

And I remember a colleague of mine showed me a map of the distribution of water from the Otish Mountains. And those waters flow down into the Temiscamie River, into Lake Mistissini, and they actually flow down into Lake St-Jean, and out into the Rupert River, affecting, and will affect all our people.

Okay, let me...

Radon gas, a potent lung carcinogen, is [...]

I already read it, excuse me.

> *Drilling and blasting disrupt and contaminate local aquifers. Water used to control dust and create slurries for uranium extraction becomes contaminated. Tailings contaminated can leak, leach or fail, releasing radioactive material into local waterways. Various organisms can transport radioactive material away from the contaminated sites. These sites remain radioactive for many thousands of years, and will be unsafe to use for most hunting purposes, for that long as well as being a source of continuing contamination for surrounding populations.*

In this report that I have here, it talks about at a four kilometre per hour (4 km/hr) wind, it can travel nine hundred kilometres (900 km) easy. We're only about a hundred and fifty (150), a hundred and seventy-five kilometres (175 km) away from that. And they say that we have a... They showed on their... the wind direction. That's only one way. We get the east wind in here, we get the south wind

in here, and we get... We get all four winds. And eventually, that radon gas will come into our community, affecting our people and our health.

Uranium refining and enriching facilities release radioactive contamination which can impinge on nearby populations. These processes also necessitate transporting many tons of radioactive material by rail or truck. This carries with it the risk of accidents or spills, with further risk of air, water and soil contamination.

In 1925, in recognition of the newly appreciated dangers of radioactivity, the first radiation exposure standard was introduced. It was set at 500 mSv/yr (milliSieverts/year; the Sievert is a unit of radiation effect), this being the dose which caused reddening of the hands. In 1934, the newly formed International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) set its first standard at 300 mSv/yr. This was reduced in 1950 to

150 mSv/yr. In 1956, the level was further reduced to 50 mSv/yr for workers in the nuclear industry and other occupations with known exposure, and 1 mSv/yr for the general public. In Canada, the current Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) exposure limit is set at 20 mSv/yr averaged over 5 yrs for workers, and 1.0 mSv/yr for the general public. These more recent limits are based on the observed incidence of fatal cancers. They do not take into account birth defects, lowered IQ from (inaudible) exposure or subtle genetic damage and multi-generational effects, hazards which we are only beginning to have the technology to investigate.

That's one aspect I want to...

Another aspect I'm gonna read, and this one might take a little bit longer, but...

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Listen, Sir. We suggested, at the beginning of this meeting, to leave fifteen minutes (15 min) to people to resume their comments. Then, with your

permission, if you want, on your first subject, to ask questions precisely, and after we'll permit other people to ask questions. If you... It will be possible for you to come back with the other subject, if you agree.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Do you people want that, or you want to hear more? People of Mistissini? You want to hear more?

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Well, excuse me...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

People of Mistissini, what do you want?

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Excuse me, sir. We just want... We just want to make sure that people have the ability...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Well, our tradition, sir, here, is that we're allowed to speak 'til we're through.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Yes.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

That should be the tradition. Not the fifteen minute (15 min) limit.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

It's not a question of fifteen (15) or ten minutes

(10 min). I just want to...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Well, let me finish, then.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

We just want to make... We just would like to suggest to you, if you would like to have (inaudible)...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

No. I prefer to have it with my people present.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Okay. You don't want answers to your questions.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

I do want answers to my questions, but when I'm finished.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Okay. Go on, Sir.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Now, these people come up here, saying to us that uranium mining is safe, is safe, it's safe, it's safe, it's safe. That's what they've been telling us ever since they've been coming up here.

But let me ask you this: what's safe of being exposed to *carcinic+ radiation? What's safe about being exposed to thyroid cancer? What's safe of

being exposed to leukemia? What's safe of being exposed to "genetical" defects? You know?

In my research that I've done, one of the things I found is the fact that they say there is... low level radiation is safe. That's what they've been telling us. There is not much that happens.

But what I found in this paper and other papers I've read, from nuclear physicists who worked for the Department of Energy in the United States, and particularly doctor Karl Z. Morgan and doctor Alice Stewart, showed that these things are dangerous.

Now, the nuclear fuel chain, uranium mining.

Uranium mining is the messiest and most contaminating stage of nuclear power generation. Yet, without it, the whole process cannot go ahead. The cost to the global environment, and to persons, of this stage must be factored into the cost of nuclear power generation.

Uranium mining, in particular open-pit mining, which is what is currently proposed in several locations in

southern Ontario, involves digging thousands [...]

I know they're talking about having a pit and it's different, but just with that ventilation system, all that... You know, he just talked about the exposure of radiation being just in the house, is dangerous. Well, when they pump out that radiation into the air, it's gonna travel. There is gonna be dust, there is gonna be the radon gas itself, and altogether, I think there is fourteen (14) different types of, in the decay process, four different types of radiation properties. Which emit alpha, beta and gamma radiation. Which is dangerous to us as a people. Okay. Let me look at... Where was I...

One of the things he said, I think a hundred and eighty-three tons (183 t) of, what you call, so-called waste, well, if a house that is excavated, a foundation for a house that is excavated, it produces radon gas, and it's dangerous, what's a hundred and eighty-three tons (183 t) gonna do? A hundred and eighty-three tons (183 t) of waste rock. It's surely gonna produce radon gas.

Because a house, you dig for a house, the

foundation, it produces radon gas, this gentleman just said so, Mr. Ernest Becker. And so you dig a hundred and eighty-three thousand... a hundred and... What is it, a hundred and eighty-three tons (183 t)? To a hundred and eighty-six tons (186 t). A thousand pounds (1 000 lb), okay, excuse me. Tons. Excuse me. Is it gonna produce radon? I think so.

Why no... Why yes in a house and no in that situation? Yes?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Excuse me. Because it's absolutely not the same rock. It's absolutely not the same rock at all. We are talking quartz. Quartz without minerals producing radiation, it's no radon gas at all. It's not radon all over the planet. It's certain places. In the States, maybe, maybe in...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Wherever there is...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

But not in (inaudible).

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

... uranium, there is... I mean, where there is uranium, there is radon gas.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, but not in the waste. In the ore. In the ore. Not in the waste. When we are talking waste, it's nothing. In that waste. Each project is different. But in our waste have been, (inaudible) have been done. We've done a lot of tests on it, and not only us, but different experts, in a lab, and the waste is not producing radon. The rock, the ore, the seven hundred and fifty tons (750 t) we are talking will produce radon. Is producing radon. But not the waste. Don't mix stuff, you know? You're supposed to be an expert. Don't mix stuff.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

I ain't an expert. I just do research.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Okay. Let's go. Let's go.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Anyways. I want to continue reading.

Uranium mining, in particular [...]

I read that.

The Rossing uranium mine in Namibia is 1 km wide, 3 km long and 1/3 km deep. Large quantities of this rock are dumped onto the earth's surface. The ore is then transported to a milling facility [...]

Which they show they're gonna do there,

[...] usually nearby, and crushed to a fine sand-like consistency, creating large amounts of radioactive dust and a huge volume of finely ground mill tailings. The uranium is separated out, usually with strong acids or alkalis. The sand-like tailings, containing about 85% of their original radioactivity, and often the chemicals used in the extraction process, are deposited in large tailings ponds or containments nearby.

Dust containing uranium and its progeny is produced in large quantities by rock-crushing operations. This particulate matter, containing long-lived radioactive isotopes, can leave the site on wind. Wind erosion of tailings piles can be significant as long as these remain exposed to weather. Radon gas is continuously produced by the decay of thorium 230, a radioactive product of uranium 238, through radium into radon

gas. Thorium 230 has a half-life of 76,000 years, and will produce radon gas unabated for millennia.

Seventy-six thousand (76 000) years that we're gonna have to be faced with carcinogenic radiation.

In undisturbed uranium deposits, most of the radon gas is trapped within rock formations until it decays into other radioactive by products. However, crushed tailings on or near the earth's surface allow considerable radon to escape. In a 10 km/hr breeze, it can travel 960 km within 4 days; much further in higher winds. Radon gas decays sequentially into several other solid radioactive isotopes of polonium, bismuth and lead, before finally becoming the non-radioactive lead 206. These radioactive progeny of radon settle onto crops, bodies of water and soil. Their patterns of accumulation in the biosphere, including our food species, are not well known. The three isotopes of polonium produced by radon, in

addition to being radioactive, are among the most toxic naturally occurring substances on earth. The toxicity of lead is well documented.

One of the things that our people need to know is that radon gas likes two particular places to go. One is into the leach, you know, the leach and the, that the moose eat, and the caribou eat? It concentrates in that. And it also has a high concentration in our blueberries which we eat. We eat the moose, we eat the caribou that radiation is, will get into them from low level exposure of radiation which will come from the mine, which will affect our fish, our water, our air, our animals which we eat, and eventually affect us.

So, you keep saying it's safe, you keep saying it's safe, yet there is much research that has shown that it's not safe. Why... Why the discrepancy? Why... Why do we have that? I'm just gonna read a little bit more.

Uranium in drinking water, at levels in excess of the safe drinking standard of .02 mg/L or 20 ppb, is principally toxic to the kidney, in particular the proximal tubules.

Uranium can affect fertility, fetal growth and postnatal visibility. It may cause malformations in fetuses and might be associated with reproductive cancers. It concentrates in bone and may interfere with the activity of osteoblasts, possibly contributing to bone cancers and osteoporosis.

My question to this whole group is: what is safe? You come up here, into my... our community, you tell me and my people that this uranium mining is safe, it's safe. My question is: what's safe about exposure to these radioactive nuclei? What is safe about it? Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Do you want to add some comments?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, (inaudible) Gunning?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:

Are you going to provide additional information, or, monsieur LeClair, are you going to provide additional information?

Mrs. CHERRY GUNNING:

I'd just like to respond, so (inaudible), 'cause I believe...

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
Who are you, first?
Mrs. CHERRY GUNNING:
My name is Cherry Gunning, and I work (inaudible) technician, and I worked in Saskatchewan, regulating uranium mines for fifteen (15) years, and then I moved to Ottawa and I worked as a radiation protection specialist for three years. And now I'm working on licensing new uranium mines and mills.

But basically, I believe that I am probably the person from the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission who is being accused of being a liar and lying to the people, and I really want you to understand that I understand very clearly that I work for the people. I don't work for the mining company. My job is to make sure that if they are going to mine uranium, that they're going to do it safely. And the people that I work for are you. And the most important people I work for are the workers that are working at the mine.

So, where I come from, it's not all right to call people liars. So it's... My mother wouldn't be too happy about this right now. So, I...
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Okay. You're the one that said that?

Mrs. CHERRY GUNNING:

I would just like to say one other thing. We seem to have a misunderstanding about the word "dissipate". Dissipate does not mean disappear. It means, yes, there is a lot of radon that's gonna come out of the mine, it's gonna come off rock piles, it's gonna come off tailings, and it just goes into the air. And that may seem wrong.

But the fact is, if you took a clear bucket of water and you dropped a little bit of blue ink in there, and you watched it, you would see it disappears. But it doesn't mean it's gone. It means there is so much air out there, it mixes with the air. And at the mines in Saskatchewan, they measure that air. And what people are telling you is true. If you make a measurement a kilometre (1 km) away from the mine, you can't see any difference. You can't measure that radon. Because it's been diluted. There is so much air that you're not seeing any higher level than if you were far away from the mine.

So... So that's what we're talking about. Nobody is saying that this radon is not going anywhere. It is going into the air, and it's

getting diluted.
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
That wasn't said when you first came here. You just said it came... it comes into the air and disappears. That's what you said.
Mrs. CHERRY GUNNING:
And I would say, if I said something like that, and you thought that I was lying, then, the correct thing to do is to say: "What did you mean by that, because I don't think that's right."
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
Well...
Mrs. CHERRY GUNNING:
And then, maybe I would have corrected myself.
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
I didn't know that...
Mrs. CHERRY GUNNING:
So, that's all I really want to say.
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
... at the time. I didn't know that at the time, about radon gas. I said I did my research into it after you guys left. That's when I found out that we were lied to. Because, I don't know if it was you. All I know, it was a lady who stood up over, where this gentleman at the end is sitting,

somewhere around that area, who stood up and said that it comes up from the air, from the ground, and disappears. That's what they said. They didn't say anything about the three point eight two (3.82) days, they didn't say any of the new things that you're adding today. That's why I believe that we were lied to.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Just... Just, and... Excuse me, Len. Just to talk about the video or the presentation we made and with the wind and everything, and with the concentration of point five (.5), not millisieverts but the becquerels, which is a measure of the radon gas, you can see the effect, you know? Then we have radon going out, but mixed with the air. At the end, the level at the... We were talking of the level at the park, fifteen kilometres (15 km) away. It's so low, lower than, which is the norm, which is sixty Becquerels (60 Bq). The limit, sixty (60). And we're adding point five (.5).

So, and the general... We are going all over the place. The normal is ten Becquerels (10 Bq). So we are adding point five (.5) to one (1). It's nothing, you know? It's... It's the reason why we say it's no danger at all. It's not dangerous.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

There is no danger. You keep telling that to us, our people, but in my research, I'm telling this to my people, in the research I've done, they keep telling us that a low level of radiation is not dangerous. But nuclear physicists from the United States have shown that it is dangerous. It's more dangerous, they said, than if, a high level radiation. And high level radiation is, if they dropped a bomb, like they did in Hiroshima, that's high level radiation. But the after-effect of the low level radiation in those cities in Japan, they're still living out the deadly consequences of that radiation.

And they come up here, they tell us that it's safe. They keep... I mean, they've been...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

It's really safe. It's...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

It's really safe. That's what you keep saying.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

It's really safe. And I keep saying that...

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

But other... I've read other reports that said it's not safe. Even this book from Saskatchewan has

shown it is not safe.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
Yes. There are some experts who think the earth is still flat. You know? You can read, people who think the earth is still flat. So...
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
I haven't heard that since Christopher Columbus.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
Yes, I read that, yes, from experts, so it's kind of... It's... You can read. You know, we know about that book. We know about that book, I've been reading it years ago. But anyway. Appreciate your comments anyway. Thanks.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:
If I could just have one...
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
Just...
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:
Sorry.
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
After you, sir, I just want to tell you that we're going to have a very short break. I think that some beverages will be delivered, and so we... And after maybe ten minutes (10 min), we'll resume this meeting. So, let's go. Carry on, sir. What is

your... What is your question?

Mr. HUBERT PETAWABANO:

Listen. Okay. My name is Hubert Petawabano, I'm a member of this community, I'm also the local environment administrator. I'll direct my two questions to the Review Panels here. COFEX and COMEX. I know it is an information session on the exploration of the Matoush uranium mining, but is this the only chance you want to have in hearing questions from the people, like, today, and the other one that's coming later in the summer or in the fall? Is this the two times we're gonna have opportunities to express our concerns, or... That's my first question.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

If I may, I will answer this. Indeed we have, both COMEX and COFEX have made the decision to have two meetings, one, the one we have today. The purpose of that meeting is to have the opportunity to have a presentation from the proponent as well as from the regulatory agencies, and to have the participants pose questions to the various bodies present here.

The second phase of the public consultation will be a moment where each and every organization,

people, families will be able to comment on the project, express their concerns, opposition or support to the project, or express certain requirements they understand would be required for the eventual licensing of the project.

Aside from that, we have a website, and on that website, you will see the names of the persons or individuals who are responsible, at the federal level, as well as with the provincial government, who can receive your additional questions and maybe provide you with some answers. So, there is a website.

We will have a poster, where the website address will be clearly presented, so that you can take notice of it and browse, see what are the... what is the information presently available and how to contact various people.

In addition to that, and I will pass on to you, there will be a... The work of the Nuclear Safety Commission itself. And I will leave Jean, or the Nuclear Safety Commission representative, to explain to you the steps, and how you can intervene.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

So, after the environmental assessment is

completed, and assuming that the project was going to proceed, we'd still have to go through a license hearing, which is another public hearing opportunity where the Commission now makes a decision whether they actually give a license or not to proceed with the project.

So, even once the EA is done, the environmental assessment is completed, and again assuming that the outcome of that is the project can proceed, the Commission still needs to render a decision whether they're gonna give them a license or not. There is another public hearing for that as well, where people have an opportunity to provide input.

The other thing I should mention is that the... Today we're talking about process, to try to help people understand the process. The next meeting that will be occurring with regards to the EA, we will have with us experts, radiation protection and environmental protection experts. In fact, some of the RP experts, I wouldn't be surprised, they've probably worked on some of the reports that are being quoted, so that they can... They certainly will have an in-depth understanding to be able to speak to the specific issues with

regards to health (inaudible).

Mr. HUBERT PETAWABANO:

All right, thank you. One additional question to, directed to the Review Panels again. I know any exploration work in that area, we need to... I mean, I assume the companies will need an all-winter road. So, I know there is... We've been hearing this road the last few years, and mining companies are doing their exploration work, same with Strateco, so I guess my question is, are you anticipating a similar process with the all-winter road that's proposed? Are you gonna have an environmental impact assessment? Do you foresee that in the near future?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

With your permission, I would ask to my colleague Daniel Berrouard, responsible...

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Okay. I'm not sure if I can answer to your question. But what I would say, I would say that if you are talking about the permanent road, yes, of course, we will have to review this project in the, with the COMEX process. So we will have to see if we will have to come back for a public consultation, but we have to review this project

like we do here today for the Strateco Project.

Mr. HUBERT PETAWABANO:

Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay, other questions? Or comments? From...

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Just a quick question. I would like to know how much it costs for insurance, regarding the operation of mining.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Actually, we have a protection, maybe Pierre can answer that. We have, we are talking exploration program here, okay?

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

No. Insurance.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, but for the exploration phase. We are not a mining company, we're in exploration phase.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Okay.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Okay? Pierre, do you know the answer for that? We have different insurance...

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Well, we... Yes. We got different insurance. We got one for our fuel tank that we got presently on site, and that's... It's, I think, the coverage, it's around five million dollars (5 M$) to clean up the site if we have to. The cost for that is, it's around twenty-five (25) to thirty-five thousand dollars (35 000$) a year, just for that part.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

And what does it cover? I mean, like a car insurance, I am covered for up to much, and there is a deductible.

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Yes. We do have a deductible, like all the insurance, we... Everybody have, even for your house, you have one. It's the same principle. But the cost covered on that is the cleanup of the site, put it back as it was before any contamination.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Okay.

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

So if whatever thing happen, and, but before that will happen, first, as Caroline said, we have daily inspections, so we know before it happens. That's very important. And the second thing, all our tanks

are double-walled, to meet the Quebec regulations, as they ask for it. And we put membranes, and the fuel, the big fuel farm that we'll have on the exploration will have membranes that will stop any leak too (inaudible).

So we'll have two and three protections to control anything that could happen.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

So what is the square kilometres of that membrane?

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Oh, it's very small, it's... The tank farm is, I would say it's about a hundred and fifty feet by seventy-five feet (150' X 75'), something like that.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

And you mentioned this is just for exploration.

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Just exploration.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

What is the cost of the insurance to an operational company?

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

It's hard to know presently, because it's... The first thing we have to think about is the... Before going to the production phases, first we have to

decide if we're going to the production phases first. Second, we have to design for our needs, which we don't know presently. That's why we're going underground.

If you ask me that question in two years from now, roughly, I will be able to answer it, but for now it's very hard, because we don't know the size of the, eventually, the mine itself, depending of the exploration.

And thirdly, it will depend, too, depending of the size and the design of the mine and the underground, then we'll have to get the new license from the CNSC before anything could be done, and the CNSC has to approve the design, as they said in their slide.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

So...

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

So, we have a lot of steps before knowing those things.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

And until when will the community be able to ask questions?

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Now the... For presently, today, it's mainly for

the exploration, as we told everybody, and it's only for the exploration phases, only. As the CNSC told you, and as we already told you in the presentation, we'll restart from scratch everything and all the hearing for the mine.

So, before going any step further extra from the exploration, we'll meet again several times to explain the project, and we'll have several hearing programs to hear your concerns and with the people concerned, with the CNSC and the other Panels, before going any step in the production phases. So it's a long procedure before that.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Okay. Just one last comment. BP. They were drilling for fuel, oil, for a long time. Right? And...

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

I think so.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Oil has been a marketable product for a very very long time too. So, if we compare that to uranium mining or drilling, do we have enough to assume a risk for? And I'm asking that question to everybody here.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

We are not talking the same thing anyway. It's...

It's not... It's no comparison between oil and what we are doing here. It's a small operation, and I... I don't see your point, here. It's no comparison at all.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

There is always surprises.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Ah! A mine... Life is a surprise. This is the reason why we are happy. Oh yes, but you don't have to say that, you know, it's... Yes. We are here, and your brothers in Saskatoon also have been there for thirty (30) years without problems.

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

Hello. Okay. The Chair had suggested a small, well, short break. 'Cause we've been sitting here since the past two, and so we're gonna take a ten minute (10 min) break. We will continue with the questions, and the people standing up will be permitted to speak and ask questions.

Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:

I gotta be on the road...

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

(Inaudible) at the back. What?

Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:

One of these... I gotta be on the road. So, I want

to ask my questions before I leave. I gotta get the road... I gotta head out to Val d'Or, so...

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

Okay. Go ahead. After your question...

Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:

It's gonna be...

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

... we'll take the break. Go ahead.

Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:

Yes. Pretty fast. My questions will be directed to Strateco Resources. So, on the statement you guys made, you talked about fifteen percent (15%) quota of Cree workers out of the work force of a hundred and eighty (180) workers, which means around thirty percent (30%) of the potential (inaudible) were Crees. The questions are, what kinds of jobs would these be for the Crees, and what kind of training will be provided for each of these job categories? That's one of my questions.

And the other one, maybe you can jot it down, so what do you mean when you say you will favour Cree employment, favour employment for Crees with equal competence and qualifications? It's on page 180 of your report.

And my last question would be, for each year,

since two thousand and six (2006), can you provide the number of workers at the camp, and the proportion of Crees? And where were the non-Crees from, as well. So...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Okay. Since two thousand and six (2006), we started with about... Normally we have, we started with twenty (20) employees, and Jimmy McLeod was providing the camp and everything. Two thousand and six (2006), okay? And the... It was... We had one drill, and we did a small drilling program. This was two thousand and six (2006). And as I said, Jimmy McLeod was supplying the different stuff, you know, the fuel and all that. And in two thousand and seven (2007) we started our big camp we have there, for fifty (50) employees.

And then, we started to do work, we are working a lot with the Coonishish family, and they're supplying the fuel, they're supplying... They are working also with the road construction, the winter road with Karsa. They are in kind of a joint venture with Karsa. And we just gave the contract to Ascan, you know, for the catering, for a four million dollar (4 M$) contract, for the next two three years. And this is owned by the

community, you know? Part. And the...

So, to answer your first question is the... We have always about three (3) four (4) Crees on the site, okay, our objective is to go to fifteen percent (15%) during the exploration phase. Because one thing to be said is the, to get the license, the CNSC asked us to get a contractor. The contractor is from Saskatoon, is Tyson. Because they have expertise with uranium, you know, it's... No contractor from the area was meeting that criteria with expertise from uranium.

We will have, as Cameco is doing in Saskatoon, a formation program. This, all the formation program is ready. Okay? This was a lot of technical people formation, you know? We have to start from scratch. And Tyson has a formation program. We are talking on health and safety control, technical, environmental. That is... That is, will create a new formation. This doesn't exist in Quebec, you know? It's a new industry.

So, really, our objective is to get fifteen percent (15%), eventually going to twenty-five percent (25%), an objective Cameco has in the north, and they never reached that objective. But the catering, you know, job and surface, a lot of

are Cree. And our objective is fifteen percent (15%). We'll reach it, I know, Troilus has always problem to meet those. But the formation, we'll have a lot of new jobs.

As you saw, the water treatment plant has to be put in place, and formation of the technicians to take water control, you know, and tests. We see very Cree. And when you go underground, you know, if the people want to get the formation, you know, to control, the different kinds of control technicians, and naturally the miners also.

Tyson, out of Saskatoon, you know, it's not economic for us at all to bring people from Saskatoon because they have the experience. So an extensive formation program would be put in place very very soon. But we will not start that until we have the license to do it. And so we have to do another process, maybe late August or September, where the people will put their reports and questions, and then we have the technical in November, with the CNSC, around November, the... for the license.

So, that means we will not start before December or January two thousand... at the best, two thousand and eleven (2011). But people has to

be in place before we can start. The water treatment plant, the technicians taking that, and this can be done with, we hope, with the people from the community here, give them the formation. We have to form. Those job doesn't exist in Quebec, actually, you know? So it's better for us to have a very good, to keep people working here in the area, you know?

Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:

So, on all the training you're talking about, now, the formation, "toute la formation", basically, you'll be delivering in-house, or be outsourcing your training?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Ah, we will... For sure, we'll outsource some. As for the radiation control, stuff like that, you know, we will have people coming and form our own people on site, you know? Here or in Chibougamau, depending who can offer this formation program, you know? But for sure, if we can have the facilities here in Mistissini, we'll use the facility which is offered. We tried, up to now, to use much facility as we can. As the air strip, you know, the slash and everything, it's all the people from Mistissini working on it. And the, on the survey also, we saw

one of your teams here, on the road, and the... What is the name? Horizon, Horizon? Horus? Horus? I know we have a lot of Cree people who have worked on our site for Horus, you know, the survey company? So we try to do our best. But it's a new technology, and we have a lot of formation to give, and we have our formation program in place, we have a lot of volume on the forma...

The training has to... People have to be in place before we can even start. So... But we need the license to start it, you know? It's a lot of money, and we don't waste our time and your time, and say we form you, and there, it's no job possible because we cannot go forward.

But at the exploration phase, we will have to have, to form people. But when we start, we start with people from Saskatoon, because they have the expertise, the top guys, and there they will form people here with the time. We start with one phase, in the waste, we will not have access to the ore before two years, roughly, but every procedure has to be in place. So that is kind of training period before, really, we have access to the ore in three years from now, or eighteen (18) months.

So, we'll have the time to do a formation.

Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:
Why I ask these questions is basically, I think you'll be dealing with me, 'cause I work with the Cree Human Resources Development. So that's why I'm trying to learn more about the project too, so...
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
We have an office we just opened here in Mistissini, and we have one with Daniel in Chibougamau, and the... You know, we really want to develop that relation. We have since two thousand and six (2006). It's not new, it's not a newborn. We know the importance to have the support from the community, and we know we cannot convince everybody, then they will be for the project, so it's impossible, you know. But we expect, then, people, with the way we have worked in the last three years, will pay out at a certain point.

Because people know exactly the Taliman or the tribe lines of the elders in the area, we know they have, I will say good support of the project.
Mr. ABEL TRAPPER:
I thank you very much.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
Thank you.
Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

(in Cree) Thank you. We'll have a short break, I mentioned, for people to have refreshments and snacks. (in Cree) The tradition dictates that guests and non-residents be served first, so they should all go and help themselves first. That's guests and non-residents of Mistissini. And then others can help themselves to the refreshments. (in Cree) Ten minute (10 min) break. (in Cree)

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you, Philip.

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION

_____

RESUMPTION OF THE SESSION

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

... public session information concerning this project and the processes. With, also with the presence of the review bodies, the proponent, the regulatory bodies as well. (in Cree) We shall continue with the question session and comment session. So, just, anybody who wishes to ask a question or make a comment, just take one of the microphones. Proceed. Please remember to give your name before speaking. Thank you.

Mrs. ELISABETH ROBINSON:

Okay. It's working now, hey? My name is Elisabeth

Robinson, I'm a public health physician, a doctor, I work with the Cree Health Board, and I have done so for quite a few years. Too many. I don't want to reveal how many. And I work out of Montreal right now, but I have worked in Fort George and Mistassini as well, but quite a few years ago.

So I have a couple of questions, and also, I just want to say that, you know, I do think the whole idea of uranium, nuclear, radioactivity, it's scary. And it should not be minimized. We have to be very, very careful with that. And we have to get very informed about this. Because when we think about these things, we think about Hiroshima, we think about that horrible bomb that was dropped on Japan, and we think about Tchernobyl. And those were very major incidents in the history of our plant, that we would never want to have happen again.

So, I don't think just going around and saying it's safe, it's safe, it's safe, you know, we have to weigh the risks and the benefits of this. And mining is a dangerous industry. We know that. And uranium mining, in the past, did cause lung cancer. And it caused lung cancer, it increased the rates of lung cancer among Navajo miners in the U.S.,

where uranium was mined in the fifties (50s) and sixties (60s).

Now personally, I think that the technology has advanced, and we can ventilate mines properly to get the radon out of them, so that the risk of lung cancer to miners is no longer a problem. But we have to be very vigilant.

So, because of, I think there is a potential for spills of various kinds and for major accidents. And one kind of accident or spill that concerns me has to... And you mentioned it tonight. That the fuels, and the storing of the fuel, the fossil fuels and the transport of the fossil fuels. So, my question is, did you look into using hydropower instead of fossil fuels to power your system and the ventilators and all that stuff?

And my second question is about the chemicals used in the water treatment. You talked about acids, and bases, and... I'd like to know a little bit more about that. So those are my questions.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I will answer...

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Will you give some comments on this?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I will answer the first question...

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

... and I will ask...

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Go ahead.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

... one of my colleagues to answer about the chemical part of the water treatment plant. Regarding the use of fuel, for the exploration phase, we have no choice, because it's a short period of time, and Hydro-Québec has made a study for us and it is very expensive. It's over a hundred and fifty million dollars (150 M$) to bring the power lines on site. So, it will not be economic.

But as you... On the video, you saw that we plan, we had tests, and we are starting extensive tests to have a windmill on the project. And we expect to use a windmill, normally, in the best-case scenario, you can save thirty (30), maximum forty percent (40%) of your time on the windmill. But at least, we will save some issues with the

fuel.

And also, having the permanent road, the extension of the Road 167, and part of the environmental impact study, we'll minimize or storage fuel on the site. We will use the... We will have tankers, as you are coming here, you know, we will travel on the road, and the... It will be a lot safer than a winter road.

But for, we are planning to have a windmill, you saw in the video, and we are, we'll start to carry additional tests to see if it's possible.

To answer your second question, I will ask Grant to talk about the water treatment plant.

Mr. GRANT FEASBY:

Thank you. My name is Grant Feasby. The chemicals that would be used in the water treatment plant for the exploration phase would be barium chloride, barium to remove small amounts of radium, and perhaps either some lime or a flocculent that would not cause any hazard to fish.

Mrs. ELISABETH ROBINSON:

Okay, thanks. I just want to mention something, finally, about radon. I know that isn't the subject really of... Radon in people's homes is not the subject of this Panel. But the Public Health people

in Quebec have done quite a lot of work on that, and in our department, my colleague Mathieu Trépanier has actually measured radon in some houses in two Cree communities, and I... He's away on holiday now, and I don't want to say too much about it, but I imagine we'll be continuing that. So, if people have any concerns or questions about that, feel free to ask me.

Mr. ROD QUINN:

Hello. My name is Rod Quinn, and I work on behalf of... I work with Hubert, actually, with the local Environment Department, on behalf of the Cree Nation of Mistissini. This question is directed towards Strateco, it's specifically oriented towards the project's economics.

You're basing your project economics on... Well I've read the Scott and Wilson study released April two thousand and ten (2010), a preliminary assessment of the Matoush Project, and you're basing your economics on the fact that the price of uranium was at seventy-five dollars per pound (75$/lb), your actual cost of extraction for this resource is forty-seven dollars per pound (47$/lb), and the current uranium price in market is forty-one dollars per pound (41$/lb).

So my question is, how does this project make sense to you? Would you be losing money per pound on every, on all the uranium? And the secondary question is how can this community be comfortable with the fact that this company will be able to afford to complete this underground exploration work and then clean up the site once it's done? I know you've addressed it a little bit, but I think it's important that the community does hear how you want to go about that.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I will answer the question. Regarding the economics of the project, we have the, in the scoping study, we have a section we call marketing, and the expert, which is from France, Sachi Davis, she estimated the price of uranium between sixty (60) and ninety (90) by two thousand and thirteen (2013). Okay?

The actual long-term price... The spot price is not a reality for the producer. It's mainly the, we call a long-term price, which is actually at fifty-eight dollars (58$). Fifty-eight dollars (58$).

And in the operating costs, we have operating costs between twenty-three (23) and twenty-five

(25), twenty-six dollars (26$), depending the Canadian exchange rate. We are using pretty low, eighty-five (85), and so the production cost is between twenty-five (25) and, twenty-three (23) and twenty-seven dollars (27$), depending the exchange rate you are taking.

So, on operating at sixty dollars (60$), you know, or making money, in the scooping you have, I can give you a copy, a sensitivity table, and the project is very economic. This is done with three hundred and forty-two million dollars (342 M$) investment project, three hundred and forty-two (342), and the, also with a discount rate of ten percent (10%) for the annuity, you know? So, that gives you... For us, the rate of return is around forty-one percent (41%), with the assumption it's seventy-five (75).

The... If you are using at sixty (60), which is actually, the rate of return is going down to about eighteen percent (18%), which is the minimum we are looking for. But we are so far from the... This project, as we are talking, is the highest grade in the world outside Athabasca. Per example, our grade is six thousand ppm (6 000 ppm), and Len was referring to a mine in Africa, the Rosenberg,

and the grade is two hundred (200), three hundred ppm (300 ppm). And so our grade is a lot higher, we're at six thousand ppm (6 000 ppm), than what they are mining in Africa. It's the reason why we can make money.

The price actually is very low. Actually, at forty dollars (40$), forty-one (41), the spot price. But long-term stay at fifty-eight (58), so the project is economic. But we will have to see with the bank. We are doing a bankable feasibility study to see all the assumptions, including the investment of three hundred and forty million dollars (340 M$). We think it's very high, because we are talking operation about seven hundred tons (700 t) per day. And for the mill, for a seven hundred ton (700 t) per day mill, we are talking two hundred million dollars (200 M$) in the scooping study.

And actually, as you know, Osisko is doing a huge mill in Malartic, open pit, fifty-five thousand tons (55 000 t) per day for two hundred and sixty million dollars (260 M$). So, I think we have some room there. I built a mill at three thousand tons (3 000 t) per day, base metal, for about forty million dollars (40 M$). So, we have to

take our consultants' figures, and the...

So that, for us, the economic is there, you know? If we're not making money, no other project will make money, except in Saskatchewan.

On the question of how you can protect, or how the company will finance it, we have no choice. Before even we can start the decline, we have to put the guarantee, if it's five or four or six million dollars (6 M$), has to be in the hands of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, for sure, and eventually, in the closure, the mine closure, if we are going, actually we are talking thirty million dollars (30 M$). Thirty million dollars (30 M$). So, that means a lot of money has to be guaranteed before we can go. And the possibility to do that is to have partners, or, depending, with the license, there is a big milestone in our story of company, so we can estimate that the share price will give us a possibility to finance the project. We can borrow money from banks if the economic...

The section, the exploration phase we are doing, we call that also a bankable feasibility study to prove the assumptions we are using. So, on this, if we are not making money, except in Saskatchewan, I don't see any other producing

project would make money, you know? It is a very good grade.

Mr. ROD QUINN:

I still haven't heard an answer to my questions I asked earlier. I don't think anybody has heard an answer to what's safe about being exposed to carcinogenic radioactivity through uranium mining. And the cancers it causes. Can you please give an answer on that?

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

I... I'll try to answer that as best as I can. As I mentioned, we also will have a radiation protection specialist here at the next hearing, who will be a lot more well versed than I am on the health effects. But perhaps one thing we need to say is, I don't think anyone here has said that it can't be dangerous. We wouldn't be here as a regulator if it weren't dangerous. That's the reason why we regulate it.

Safety is not based just on whether something can cause an effect or not. Safety is based on how you manage it. A simple analogy is, if you drive your car at three hundred miles per hour (300 mph) and you smash into a post, you're probably gonna have a problem. So that's why we have laws that say

you can't go three hundred miles an hour (300 mph).

So the issue of safety is gonna be based on what measures do you have to ensure that you keep exposures to levels that are acceptable.

One of the other analogies I guess I can make is, one of my colleagues here at the table was mentioning, is if you take something like bleach. We know that you use bleach for your clothes to whiten it, make it nice and white, but we also know you use bleach to sterilize water so it's safe to drink. But bleach is actually quite dangerous. And I would not recommend you drink a cup of bleach. 'Cause it probably wouldn't be very good for you. But if I take a little bit of bleach and I put it in water, I can actually make that water safe to drink.

Now again, it may not be a completely fair comparison, but the whole idea on safety is it's not just on the basis of whether something is dangerous or not. I agree, there certainly is all kinds of studies that have shown that there are potential effects as a result of exposure to radiation. That's why we regulate it. That's why we try to keep things limited. To keep the exposures down as low as possible.

The other thing maybe I didn't mention is that we set regulatory limits. The regulatory limit is one milliSievert per year (1 mSv/yr) to a member of the public. There is no one in Canada that gets anywhere near one milliSievert per year (1 mSv/yr) exposure. Anywhere. Whether it's a nuclear power plant, whether it's a uranium mining mill, and the reason why is 'cause we, as a regulator, believe in a principle called ALARA. And that means as low as reasonably achievable.

So, that means that if you can take measures that are reasonable, to make sure that the exposures are much less than one milliSievert (1 mS), that's what we expect. That's what we hold people accountable to. You can look at the reports, our reports are available, you can find out what the exposures to the public are. You can also find out what the exposures are to workers. We set a limit of a hundred millisieverts per year (100 mSv/yr), twenty millisieverts per year (20 mSv/yr) averaged over five (5) years, fifty millisieverts (50 mSv) in one year.

Those are all fancy numbers, but the big thing is, is that we don't let them get anywhere near that. We expect people to take appropriate measures

to keep the exposures as low as possible. That's ALARA. That's one thing we pride ourselves in as a regulator. We're very demanding, and we expect it, and we hold them to account.

I can tell you we've had situations where a mine was almost shut down. No worker had ever exceeded the regulatory limit. But it was clearly obvious that that company was not taking adequate measures to keep those exposures as low as possible. And we threatened to shut them down. And you can be guaranteed that when you threaten a company to shut down, they suddenly start adjusting their attitude. And we've done that, and we've made it happen, and if you look at it, you see the exposure is going down.

So, I want to make sure people understand we're not saying that there aren't dangers. That's why they have to be managed, that's why they have to be controlled. And that's a big part of what our role is as a regulator.

So, if there is any... If you're getting this impression that there is absolutely, this is totally safe and that you can do whatever you want with it, that's totally wrong. That would be very very misleading. It can be dangerous if it's not

handled properly. That's why we regulate it, and that's why we put the controls that we put in place.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

My name is Ramsey Hart, I'm the Canada program coordinator with Mining Watch Canada. We're not big fans of uranium mining at Mining Watch, for a variety of reasons, from mining to, all the way down to fuel cycle. One of our biggest concerns is around long-term risks associated with tailings management, and as a person from CNSC just mentioned, that these things are dangerous if they're not regulated over the long term, and so our concern is who will be looking after tailings in a hundred (100) or a thousand (1 000) years, when they're still toxic?

And I was very interested in Strateco sort of passing comment about looking at alternatives for managing tailings that don't require "impelments", and I was wondering if that could be elaborated on, and I'd also like to know why that's not in the EIS. Or if it is, direct me to it 'cause I didn't see, but I'll admit I haven't had time to thoroughly go through all of it, so...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

No, it's not in the EI. Because it's not in this phase of work, the exploration phase. We don't have any tailings. We are not taking a bulk sample.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

The directive clearly indicates that you need to look at issues regarding a mine, not just the exploration.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

This is the reason why we have produced the video here. I don't know if you saw it. And no, it's... To answer the question here, is the... You're right. In the directive we received in January or February two thousand and nine (2009), the document you mentioned, they were talking about that issue, and we are answering that also. One of the ninety (90) questions we received from the Canadian Agency, or the COFEX-South, we received ninety (90) questions, including that question. And to be able to give you some information, because the answer, we cannot answer. You know? We cannot answer it. Because we don't know what kind of tailings, or what kind of ore, the exact ore.

We have to go and do the exploration work on it. And to explain, we have agreed with the people here to have prepared a video, and what I said is

the generic view of the video, because we don't know exactly. We know that will be an open pit, we know the size, a little bit, of the open pit, it's no tailing pans, it's strictly, now, open pit, a small open pit, to put about two million tons (2 M t). Actually, our resources are one point six million tons (1.6 M t). And the... Of ore. And the sub...

But we have to go through this first phase of exploration to answer the question about the tailings, what kind of product we will reject, and this is one of the ninety (90) questions we have to answer in... And in the next meeting, when you will come here, the answer will be there. But the answer will be, really, we don't know. Because we are not at that phase. We are here for an exploration phase.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

I get your point. Thanks. So this is a question, I guess, for the Panel, then. Are those ninety (90) questions available? Can we look at them? We'd also be very interested in seeing Health Canada's concerns about sufficiency. In other panel reviews that I've been involved in, there has been a very transparent back-and-forth between federal

regulatories and interested agencies and the proponent in terms of the sufficiency. Whether or not we all have, everybody in this room, and many many more people that are interested and concerned about this project, have enough information in order to really evaluate what's being proposed. And from my reading of the requirements, and my reading, my preliminary reading of the EIS, I don't think we do have that information that was required by the directive.

So, is the Panel gonna do a basic sufficiency determination and make that information public? I guess you already have with the ninety (90) questions, but this is the first I've heard about the ninety (90) questions and about Health Canada's concerns around the adequacy of the information.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Well, indeed, after the submission of the environmental impact statement, both Panels, as well as regulatory agencies and departments, have gone through it and made what you call a determination analysis, is that what you said? We tried to compare the guidelines with the actual impact assessment, and we've identified some areas where the information was not provided, or where

the information was not provided in details.

So the Federal Review Panel has released, I think it's a month ago, a list of questions, and as I said earlier, we have a website where all the information is available, you can go to the website and have a look at the questions, and, well, the requirement for additional information, this Panel, the Federal Review Panel, has sent to the proponent a similar exercise that is presently underway, with the COMEX, and I will leave the Chairman of the COMEX to explain...

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:

Benoit, just before you pass the microphone to Pierre for the Federal Review Panel, the questions and comments will be posted, we expect soon. The document has to be translated in English before it's posted on the website.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

Okay.

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:

But as soon as the document is in both languages, it will be posted.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

So, it's not there yet. Just 'cause...

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:

It's not there yet.
Mr. RAMSEY HART:
Okay. Good. 'Cause I had looked. I am aware of the website, and I am trying to follow it, but I'm also busy in looking at many different projects, so... I thought maybe I had missed it, but I haven't. It hasn't been posted yet.
Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:
No no.
Mr. RAMSEY HART:
Okay. Thanks.
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
But if you want a French version of it, because the document was written in French...
Mr. RAMSEY HART:
J'attendrai la traduction. Merci.
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
Okay.
Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
Okay. On our side, we are working on, you know, and it will be concluded probably this week. However, we have a different way to proceed. And to explain the processes, I will ask Daniel Berrouard to give you some details, because we have an obligation to make report to the administrator, provincial

administrator, on the James Bay Convention, before... Okay.

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Okay. Simple. In fact, like Pierre said just before, we will transmit to the provincial administrator, probably after this session of information, in the next week, our supplementary questions. In fact, we will have questions to ask to proponent. After that, the provincial administrator will transmit to the proponent our questions. So, at that time, we will wait the answer from the proponent. And this document will be public when the provincial administrator will transmit to the proponent.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

And, I guess my final question, I'm not sure it's Mining Watch's place to ask this, but I think it needs to be asked, is, is this, in a fall meeting, the extent of the Crown's duty to consult, in your constitutional obligations to consult with the Mistissini Cree, and if not, what other measures are you proposing?

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

No, it's different. It's...

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

Oh you're in the James Bay, so it's all falling in that ca...

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Yes. It's included...

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

Right.

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

... in the process of chapter 22 of the James Bay.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

Okay. Right.

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Yes.

Mr. RAMSEY HART:

I'd also just like to reiterate the fellow's concerns about the uranium price, and especially for the people of Mistissini, if they're hoping to get revenues generating from this project in the long-term.

We don't agree with the proponent's assessment of the long-term trajectory of uranium and the future of the nuclear industry. We don't think it's necessarily going in that direction. You can make up your own minds about that. But I think it's important to evaluate that, to not take their word

for a long-term increase in price. You just need to look at a graph of the uranium price, which wasn't included in their uranium document. But there is a sharp spike in the price during the eighties (80s) and nineties (90s), and it's crashed since then, and it's currently trajecting down. Thanks very much.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Maybe a small comment. I would like to recall that this fall coming, next fall, we will have some public hearings, specially to take note on the point as you mentioned, and the people of Mistissini will be able, at that time, to give to us other comments or to tell to us if they are for the project or against the project, and the reason why.

As we mentioned at the beginning of this morning... this afternoon, today, you know, it was a public information meeting. Generally speaking. Yes. And at the fall, it will be a public hearing. And it will be for your people the occasion to transmit your official opinion or... Exact. On different subjects.

Okay. Next question. Sir.

Mr. WILLIAM MIAMSCUM:

Hi.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

And after you, after, madame, you will have the opportunity. Sir, go ahead.

Mr. WILLIAM MIAMSCUM:

Yes. My name is William Miamscum. I'm a member of this community. I was having a little bit of difficulty with the language of this. I was originally informed this was going to be an information session provided by Strateco. And then I'm hearing words like the next public hearing. Is this a public hearing? Is this an information strategy? And if... I listened very well to the report information that was given by Strateco. And I was a little puzzled.

Within that report, there are contained the results of the environmental impact assessment study. My question is, if the review, the environmental watchdogs have not yet answered to that environmental study, why is Strateco using that information to give to the general public? It's misleading.

I mean, when you tell the people that are, the results of our studies say that the prevailing winds, they blow away whatever contaminants are in

the air away from Mistissini, away from Chibougamau, that environmental impact study has not even been reviewed yet. We haven't had a chance to kick it around yet. And yet you're using that information in your public consultations with the people. That's my question. Thank you.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
I can make a comment. We filed the environmental impact study in November two thousand and nine (2009), which is seven (7) months ago. And this has been accessible here, in the Council office. And what we are presenting here is what we got. Okay? And we... The risk assessment, our experts show they had negligible risks that were used. And based on the information we have, following that we received, as I said, ninety (90) questions, the CNSC sent us some questions on January the fifteenth (15th), two (2) months later, and normally, in the process, forty-five (45) days after we have filed our environmental impact study, they have this session today. Okay? This session was supposed to be held forty-five (45) days. This is the (inaudible) norms, I will say.

And, but, for many reasons, they had delay and

delay, and we got the questions from CNSC on January the fifteenth (15th). We started to answer the questions. Pierre Groulx started to answer, and then we received, about a month ago, ninety (90) questions from the Federal Agency, and we expect, within the next few weeks, from the COMEX.

But the base, the base line, we started in two thousand and six (2006), we have spent about five million dollars (5 M$) on different studies. So, this is the information we are giving you today. But as some people mentioned, they have questions. They have questions about direction of wind, you know, more criteria, questions about the birds, questions about the mine process, and we, it was answered and we don't know yet, but they answered all the questions.

But the session today, it's in the norms, it's not misleading, it's based on the information we have. It's... And as I said, that was supposed to be held forty-five (45) days after the filing of, in November. And the... And today, we have more information because we started to answer the ninety (90) questions, we expect to finish answer those ninety (90) questions sometime in July, to be able to give. We distribute to different consultants,

and (inaudible), they are asking that question, this is not clear, they want a little bit more information here and there.

But the conclusion, for me, will not change, you know? That will not change. They'll have more information, but this is not, really not misleading. It's strictly a session, information session, and when we will have the public hearing, and when the Mining Watch, and the federal government gave about sixty-five thousand dollars (65 000$) to different groups in total, to hire the experts and revise our application, and some made comments, and the fellow with Mining Watch said, "Hey, you missed that part. The question that I've been asking to you and you didn't answer", that's true. But this has been repeated, that same question, because we don't know. We'll say, we don't know, with the information we have, the next phase, if we go there.

But the last thing we want to do is misleading the population here.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

Yes sir. Call it democracy, all those hearings and all those information sessions that you had were actually held in between one (13h00) and five

(17h00). Now I know on the "res", no one works, but actually it's not the case, and so I would like to know, and monsieur Benoit Théberge can maybe answer this question, as to whether or not we will have the next meeting at a decent time, that is after work hours. Monsieur Théberge?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
Mr. President...
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
It's not up to monsieur Théberge to answer that question.
Mr. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
Well, maybe it is the Band who has to answer.
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
Yes. We are the Panels who planned this, and during the preparation of this, we wanted to consult with the commu... the Band mana... the Band itself, and the management of the community. And indeed, we thought that we would need a long period of time to address various questions, so this is why, after consulting with the community, the Band management, we... It was suggested to start earlier. So we made the decision to come here and open the meeting at two o'clock (14h00).

We are here today, and we are going to listen to the questions. Even if it is eight o'clock (20h00). People are welcome, and they can come here, and as I said, this is a decision that was made by Panel, by both Panels, after having consulted with the local authorities.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:
So I guess we will have to address the local authorities. Another thing is that you say that people can go and consult the "rapport d'impact", which has only eight thousand (8 000) pages in a very specific language to geology or whatnot. And I don't think that most people here have that type of knowledge, and a lot of people do not speak English. So I think that... I haven't heard many translation going on this afternoon. Thank you.
Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
This is a concern that we received. Indeed, it is always a challenge to make sure that these thick studies are synthesized and put in lay man terms. There is probably a need for that in this kind of project, most certainly, and we welcome your comment.
Mrs. ROBIN CAMPBELL:

Good evening. My name is Robin Campbell. My question is geared towards the proponent. The review process is just beginning, and many people in Mistissini haven't even learned about the project, or fully understand the review process it is going through. So there is no way that they would be able to form an opinion either way, on whether it is a good thing or a bad thing for the community. And yet, Strateco has already stated publicly that it has the full support of local aboriginal Cree Nation people, as well as the local residents of Chibougamau.

The same holds true for the issue of worker absence from family life, that you admit is a negative project impact, but of low importance, because very little concern was shown for the subject during the community's pre-consultation process.

So my question is, you only did one open house in the community in late two thousand and eight (2008), along with a few focus groups with elders and Taliman. How can you say the community, as a whole, supports the project, or has no concern for the issue of how workers' absence for two weeks at a time will affect families?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I will start to answer the question, and I will ask Jean-Pierre Lachance, who is really in charge of the relations with the community, started in two thousand and six (2006), to explain.

I don't think we can say we have a full support from the population, you know? It's not our... I think we have support from part of the population in Mistissini, the people living in the area where the project is. We have identified people who are supporting, some Taliman, elders over there. And the... But they have an article in the Nation, I was really saying, then, no, you know, we expect to have maybe fifty (50), sixty (60) persons' support eventually, but it's impossible to get a hundred percent (100%) of support from any population. It's impossible, you know? This is not democracy.

And I think, then, we have to have information, and it's what Jean-Pierre did since two thousand and six (2006), it's what Strateco did in two thousand and six (2006). So Jean-Pierre, if you can answer the question, please?

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Yes. Thank you for your answer. Well, first of all,

you're right, we were here for the open house, and forums in December two thousand and eight (2008). Previous to that, we had several presentations with the Band. As always, families were there all the time, and in February two thousand and eight (2008), two thousand and nine (2009), which is very very important, because we believe that the support or not of this project starts where, right there, on the land, where the Taliman and their families are. And I think we've put our efforts.

You could ask if there are representatives of the families here tonight, except maybe Peter, because he's working with us, so it's not, maybe it's not good. But we've done our efforts. And I will give you a good example that, with the efforts we're putting together. It's why we opened this office in Mistissini. This is why we opened the office in Chibougamau. This is why Daniel Bergeron was named. He's from Chibougamau. He's not from Mistissini, but he's known this area here. He knows the people.

But to make sure we could get closer to the people, to the people from Mistissini, for the people going from here to Temiscamie up to Matoush, we retained the services of Peter. And lately, I

could maybe get the right answer from Daniel or, and probably better from Peter, they visited, together, everybody along the road. From Mistissini up to La Perche, and name it. So I guess we do put our efforts. It's not perfect yet, but we will continue and reinforce.

It's a top priority for Strateco to communicate with the people. In order, eventually, to get their support or what. But also, I want to point out that sometimes, because we're the, let's say the promoter, the proponent, we're being said, "Well, of course, you're... that's what, you're saying this. We want to hear it from somebody else."

Then, through the learning together, the Chief, the Band, I guess, and Chibougamau, the four Chiefs, all from Saskatchewan, for me, I think it was fantastic to be able to have your brothers right down here in Mistissini and tell you what they lived, what they went through. Working thirty-five (35) years... Like Guy was mentioning before, in uranium mines, they're happy people, they have... It's good economic for them, they're healthy.

Well, I think it's an indirect way. But if the

proponent will do something like this, it will not, it will have not been well received, I think.

So, I could keep on going like this for fifteen minutes (15 min), but, are you satisfied with the answer?

Mrs. ROBIN CAMPBELL:

Yes. Thank you very much.

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Thank you.

Mrs. ROBIN CAMPBELL:

My second question is, what is the status of the potential advisory counsel that is referenced in the environmental impact assessment document?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I can start to answer, and I will ask Jean-Pierre again to finish. We... I will say a year ago, we spoke with the, I think it's the Chief, or the Band, to try to put together a group, you know, for discussion with us. It's very very hard. It's very hard, you know, to get people to sit and discuss about, or to organize a committee, a committee of people to see discussion. We know we will have to have one, but up to now, with help with Peter and Daniel, they are in place now in full time. We are, they are not in Montreal or elsewhere.

So, we have to put that things together, you know, and we try to work. But you know a lot more than me, because you are living here. It's not easy to ask people to sit around a table and be... put that together. But this is a commitment we took, and we have no choice, you know? We will have to have a group of people sit, to sit with us and discuss different subjects, you know? Formation, job, the business creation, business support. This is all a request we got, and the only way we can go is have a committee of five, six, seven people, depending who you will select, and sit with us and discuss about financial compensation and... You know, they have different things to start.

This is coming... We are ready to do it now, and it's a commitment, but it's more when a mine is into production, and some people believe will not make money, so they have not enough money to share. But I really believe, then, that project is good, it will be good for the community.

So, Jean-Pierre, do you want to add something on this?

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Yes, Guy, thanks. Yes indeed, we have been, let's say, on track for, to create this committee, like

Guy was just saying, for about two years now. Well, first of all, you have to choose the right people. And I've personally talked with Chief Longchap several occasions. Well, I guess it was, the decision, it was, timing is everything. And that's where we are now.

You ask your questions tonight, and I can tell you that just a few weeks ago, I was... Daniel can say we're... That's... We are there, in the next months, we want to create this committee, but like Guy mentioned, we cannot be twenty-five (25) people on this. So it's... We have to turn around. Daniel will be looking through, I don't want to name the person, but try to help to find the right people that could represent the entire community. Not only the... There is a (inaudible), it's very important.

Remember, in December two thousand and eight (2008), there was supposed to be a focus group with the (inaudible) people. There was nobody. Nobody came. But it's not because nobody came that we don't care. Daniel, again, with Peter, they addressed that with Marlene and how... Who could we talk to, to be able to get closure to the (inaudible).

Daniel, I think again, last week, he had a

meeting with somebody here in Mistissini, just regarding this. So we're keeping track, and the committee will be created. I won't make any promise when, but we are working on this.

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

I have a question for you, monsieur. We just talked about the Dene people. How come that the Dene... Monsieur Jean-Pierre, I think your name is? Yes? The Dene people, if they did so good, how come that they were so poor that they had to put their meat into the mine shaft, and that they were left without electricity or propane stoves and fridges?

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Well, is this... How many years ago, that happened?

Mrs. ÉLÈNE HÉBERT:

Well, you should ask you friend monsieur Déranger.

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Unfortunately, I did not attend at this presentation, the four Chiefs were here. Well, I'm... I guess if you're saying it, it's true, but I don't know. I could not, I cannot answer your question, because I didn't hear about that. But I would say perhaps this is one exception. 'Cause I could tell you, I was coming back from a major operation, but I had dinner with people from

running together and the Chiefs before they came here. I wasn't here at the presentation. I was not... I didn't have to be here.

But I can assure you that the Chiefs said that they were... They were really, their communities really did benefit of the uranium mining surrounding, like for Cameco, rabbit ears and so on, or commercial fishing. So I thought it was pretty positive. So what you're... I'm not really aware what, precisely what you're asking.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Just a moment please.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Okay. Okay, yes.

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE AWASHISH:

All right. My name is Anne-Marie Awashish, and I am very new to this uranium idea, this uranium issue, if you want. But I thought that it would be a good time to share with you, when I hear that you're having problems setting up a committee and all this, I think it's a good time to share with you our experience, let's say, the community experience with mining in a general way.

I came here in nineteen seventy (1970). So I do have a little historical background. And at that

particular time, and the late Chief Jimmy Miamscum could tell you, that when a mining company came and wanted to set the place, and when they did on Campbell Point, they never asked any authorization, they never asked the Crees for any opinion. They just set the mine, left the tailings there, and years after, people, it's common knowledge that the Oujé-Bougoumou people had a much higher rate of cancer than other people in the territory. At, let's say, an earlier time.

In around nineteen seventy-two (1972), the Campbell Mine, I guess, decided that they did want to have some Crees involved, and they presented a training program for underground mining. And as a matter of fact, I think some of the people that are sitting here took that course, and I think it was something like ten (10) or twelve (12) people from Mistissini and Oujé-Bougoumou, took the training with Campbell for underground mining. And to my knowledge, ten (10) years later, there wasn't one person that worked underground.

As we move along through history, the mining industry around Chibougamau went down, the forestry took over, the agreement was signed, and there wasn't much relation between the mining industry

and the Crees again. Until recently, with the Troilus Project, which was probably the first agreement which included the Crees at many different levels.

With that agreement in Troilus, it was an agreement which impacted family, and there was some involvement of the Cree Nation. But I can say that because it was a first, it had its weaknesses and its strength. But it was the beginning of getting some form of consultation from the people on establishing mining.

With the uranium, I think it's another step, we're going in the same direction, except that it's a lot more complicated. Because it's an industry that's highly regulated, immediately it brings up all the fear issues. And I was thinking about that, and I was talking to Peter recently, I said, the way I see it is, there is a number of fears that are related to the use of uranium. When you talk about... There is only eighteen (18) reactors in Canada, and how many people sitting in this room have seen maybe more than one or two?

If you travel to Europe, the landscape is filled with uranium, I mean, nuclear reactors. And that's how they get their power. But of course, us,

with Hydro-Québec, no need for... no need for the nuclear reactors.

The second thing from, again from Tchernobyl, and the past history, and how the industry, let's say... Well, I imagine there are other sets of regulations for the actual exploration there, the actual running of the nuclear... I'm losing (inaudible) here...

Anyways, what we see now, it's the first time where we're actually seeing a project coming for the actual exploration of the mine. And I was here when the people came from Saskatchewan. And of course, they shared their experience, which, as was mentioned, that was, seemed to be out, and if you weigh it, seemed to have been quite positive.

The only thing that they were very concerned about is the experience of the past. They talked a lot about Uranium City, and the tailings that were left there, and were not being dealt with by the government yet. And those still constitute a risk. And they're having a very difficult time to get the government to actually address this issue.

Now, my... Let's say if I have one question, we're talking about a very preliminary part of this project phase. We're talking about exploration. And

we're putting a lot of energy in thinking what are the risks in exploration. Then we're talking about the second phase, the operation. And we're also talking about the evaluation and the risks.

But one thing struck my ear. This mine will operate for ten (10) years. And in ten (10) years, okay, the works will be done to shut down, and I don't remember the term that you used, there, to either renaturalize the environment, but who takes over? And I guess the question goes to you. Once the mine is no longer in operation, because I think that's a big issue, because when there is no longer a mine, and the mining company to be responsible, who deals with the not likely situation?

And I heard a person before talk about, make an analogy to the crisis happening in the Mexican Gulf. And it's funny, because I had that thought. And I didn't have the thought because of the industry per se, but because of how complaisant the company was in not thinking about the risk, and going ahead with the exploration.

So, let's just say my question, the safeguard has to be there, in some way, long after the operations are shut down.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you madame. Who wants to express some comments? We made comments and passed the word only for ten (10) years, only for ten (10) years, and then I will, they will continue to answer, a gentleman from CNSC. It's kind of rule of thumbs, in mining. You always develop your project for eight to ten (10) years. You establish the capacity of the mill for eight to ten (10) years. But this is what we have, we had last year.

As you are maybe aware, we are doing a tremendous exploration program this year and next year. We're drilling one hundred and twenty thousand metres (120 000 m) of drilling additional, we are doing, to increase the resources. The structure is about fifteen kilometres (15 km) long. We have explored one point two kilometre (1.2 km).

But the point, for us, is by two thousand and eleven (2011), we'll decide what the size of the mill. Actually, ten (10) years or eight years is seven hundred tons (700 t) a day. It's... A mine, it's a rule of thumb that you develop your mill capacity or mine capacity for ten (10) years. This is, we hope that we'll be there fifteen (15) and twenty (20) and forty (40) years, you know? But normally, when you start, you always... This is a

rule of thumb in mining. You always talk ten (10) years. And eventually, we hope, with the exploration program we are doing actually and next year, we hope to go for fifteen (15), twenty (20) years.

But those pounds, you know, we will not prove it, it's just to establish they are there. Eventually, when you start to mine the first year, you try to replace your reserve, you have (inaudible) during that year. And when we are talking ten (10) years is really to follow the rules of the industry in general, and talk eight, ten (10) years.

And then, to answer your question about what's happening after ten (10) years, I think a gentleman from the CNSC can answer that.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

With regards to what happens after operations, they'll go through what we call decommissioning, the rehabilitation and the cleaning up of the site. They'll actually maintain a license, so even though they're not operating anymore... In fact, we have... I'm speaking now for Modern Minds. Uranium City is somewhat a historic site, and we can talk about all kinds of historic mines and the problems

that we've been encountering with those, but speaking about the ones today, they get a decommissioning license, and they'll continue to monitor it, and they've gotta be able to demonstrate that what they had predicted and the effects that they were expecting to see are being demonstrated, and they won't be released from their license until they can demonstrate that.

And after that time period would go by, what would happen is the Government would then assume responsibility, and there would continue to be monitoring over the longer term. But the company would have to provide funds to cover those costs, to provide that ongoing monitoring.

But basically, they can't... Because that's one thing, right? At one time they operate a mine, and then once it was done, they would leave. They can't do that now. There is these financial guarantees that are quite substantial, that hold them there. They'll continue to have a decommissioning license. We have one mine, for instance, that was decommissioned, I think it's two thousand and four (2004), so it's been decommissioned now for six years, and there is still people on the site that are continuing to

take samples and monitor and verify that what they were expecting to see is exactly what they're seeing.

So, there is a longer whole point. They won't be released until it could be demonstrated, and then there is a transfer over to a Government, normally provincial Government, but it depends on the different situations.

There is no set time limit, actually. It's not like there is a, you know, you've got your operating license and done your ten (10) years. It depends. It'll be case by case. And it depends on when they did all their... when they applied for their license to decommission. They have to figure out what their effects are, and when they plan on observing them, and then there needs to be a sufficient period of time to be able to see what's going on. So it could take quite a number of years, actually.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you. Gentleman, your question.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

My colleague was talking about the economic benefits concerning a uranium mine. Prior to... After you guys came, my colleagues and I showed the

Taliman of the affected area a DVD called "Uranium" by Eric Matheson? Eric Matheson. And in this DVD, this happened in Elliot Lake Ontario, for our people to understand, and the mine promised them economic benefits from this mine. And they were promised a whole bunch of different things.

In that DVD, and if you want to see it, you can see myself or my colleague here, we can get together and show it to you. But it showed... Remember how it was twenty-five (25) years ago here, with the log houses? Well that's what those people were living in after the uranium mine left. They were promised medical benefits, they didn't get any. A lot of their waterway is contaminated from the tailings from that mine in Ontario in Elliot Lake. A lot of their people are now... It takes about twenty (20) years before the cancer, some of the cancers begin to be known. But a lot of them are getting cancers now. They were told no, it won't happen, from the mining companies.

So, these guys are telling us that we're gonna have economic benefits, that we're gonna get jobs, but do you really want to work in a place where you're gonna be exposed to "carcenic" radioactivity? Where you're likely, cancer, a

couple of years down the road? Do you want to expose our people and the other Quebec people? Because if you look at their map on the air flow, most of that air is flowing right into Lac St-Jean, of our Quebec brothers and sisters over there, exposing them to radioactivity. Do you want that? I don't want that for us. I don't want it for them.

And in this DVD we have, those people in Elliot Lake, today, are still living in poverty. No economic benefits. Even though they were promised by the mines. Are we gonna face the same thing from your promises? From this mine that happened at Elliot Lake? Is that what we're gonna receive from our people? Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you for your comments. Other questions?

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Can I have a response, please?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Well, would you precise your question?

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

I did. I asked you a question. My question was, are we gonna receive the same type of response that the natives of Elliot Lake received, that the mining companies promised them, but never fulfilled? Will

that happen to us also? Can I have a response?
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
It's hard to answer to that, because I know that Elliot Lake area is very, it's a place where a lot of people retire, because the quality of life there, it's (inaudible) and a lot of people from Toronto are retiring in this area. And I don't know about the First Nations people, but I know this is a very good... They had a referendum just before Christmas, and people were asking, because they have an exploration program going over there. And they got support from local population. But I cannot talk for the people. I don't know them.

So, for us, you know, what's the promise they made thirty (30) years ago, regulations have changed, and your people here... You know, I worked here in nineteen sixty-eight (1968), across the channel. Nineteen sixty-eight (1968). Forty (40) years ago. Okay? And I will tell you, the place here has changed a lot, you know? It's the first time in forty (40) years I was coming here. Just across, I was living in a tent across the channel. And the... But people here are very well-organized. You know, you just see the quality of the infrastructure.

A lot of people are with the James Bay Treaty, you know, and people are very well-organized and protected. You see, someone mentioned about the Troilus. Yes, some... This was a first, really, agreement between a mining company, and Troilus, they missed some commitments and they have to pay for it, you know? And I imagine that they will sit with us, they will remember the Troilus Agreement, and they will try to, then us, put the guarantee and we'll respect it, you know?

This... The past is the past, and the future is the future. I don't need any... Nothing good in the past, you know, it's experience. You have to learn from the past. But the future, it's something else, you know? It's today. We start today, and based on the experience from Troilus, based on Elliot Lake, the bad experience they got over there. But things have changed. And you have to follow that very closely. It's the reason why the Committee has to be there, and they have lawyers now, you know? They had no lawyers in... I don't know. But Elliot Lake. Today, it has changed. It's my answer.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Yes indeed, we cannot rewrite history. But we can

learn from it. And that's why there is so many reference to other situations. That is a statement.

Now I would like to tell people that saying they invested five million (5 M), you know, to accommodate the requests of the people, that doesn't impress me at all. Ask them what percentage of their total, total budget. Because some companies, they might hide it somewhere, under a different name. So five million dollars (5 M$) doesn't impress me.

Now the question is, they foresee an increase in the price. Now there are two factors that may encourage them to speculate on it. The scarcity of the product, which could be other country, enforcing stricter law, and it can also be an increase in the demand. And because of the number of reactors overseas, yes indeed, the demand will increase.

The question is, why is there a decline in production? What are the factors that justify your statement?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

You have to remember my statements. I did, I made so much tonight. Which one?

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

The statement that there will be speculation, okay, that the price will rise from forty-something to ninety (90). What are the factors that your company is taking into consideration?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

They have a lot of... It's not me saying that, it's some expert. You refer, you have your own expert, you know, I have my own expert. And the point is, the demand. The demand for the generation of clean energy. The China... I've been in China three years ago, and the air is brown. Okay? They are using coal to produce their energy. And China, they have one point three billion (1.3 G) people, about five hundred (500) are, start to be what they call industrial, and more and more people, they are building cities of twenty million (20 M) people every year in China, you know?

India is the same. They are one point two billion (1.2 G) people. And those guys need energy. If you want to protect the nature, and for sure the only way you can get clean energy and massive energy is nuclear energy. Okay? And the.... If you go solar panels, windmills, I will say windmills, you know, twenty (20), thirty (30) at the best, Hydro-Québec is thirty (30), their parks, thirty

percent (30%) efficiency, you will never invest your own money in something which efficiency is only twenty (20) or thirty percent (30%). Never, never.

So, windmills, you know, it's good, but it's not "efficace", you know? It's not "efficace" at all. It's twenty (20), thirty percent (30%)...

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

It's still in its infancy, sir.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Excuse me?

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

Windmill. It's still in its infancy.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes but it's still, it's only twenty (20), thirty (30), forty (40), we hope to have forty percent (40%) efficiency on our site.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

But you said that you would consider windmills to supply the production. Didn't you?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Can I answer your question, please? Okay? And the windmill is, it's a part... It's not "efficace". We will say maybe thirty (30), forty percent (40%) is better than nothing, okay, for us. But industrial

civilization cannot live on that.

So China, India, even the States, they left... they lift the ban on nuclear power, you know, after Three Mile Island, they had a ban, they cancelled forty (40) reactors. Now they're rebuilding it. Okay? Obama just announced fifty-four billion dollars (51 G$) loan guarantee for nuclear energy.

In Germany, they had a ban on nuclear power. They just reproduced their nuclear power. So it's a future, and the demand, when you see all the projections, actually the supply from mines is one hundred million pounds (100 M lb) per year. One hundred seven million pounds (107 M lb) per year. The demand is two hundred million pounds (200 M lb). And the projection talks about four hundred million pounds (400 M lb). And they have no more mines.

This project, if ever it's going into production, will be the first in North America to go into production in four years from now, five years from now. So we are long... So they have very shortage. When you have a shortage of something, the price normally increases. And you don't wait the gold price at twelve hundred dollars (1 200$) to start to develop a gold mine. You start when

it's lower, you do the same thing.

The targers, our experts are saying, you know, with the demand, the construction almost, they doubled the reactors, about four hundred (400), they will go, from two hundred and thirty (230). And the demand is there, you know?

So it's the reason it's not speculation, it's really based on future demand. This is strictly supply and demand. Supply and demand.

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

This is regarding the developing country. Now what is the record for China in regard to environment protection?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

They will do now with nuclear power. They will do. If you go there, you know, the air is brown. And they have no choice. And it's so bizarre. Some people here, in Quebec, are talking that in Canada we have two provinces who have a ban. Okay? Nova Scotia and B.C. And it's the two provinces who produce coal. And Nova Scotia, eighty percent (80%) of their electricity is coming from coal. Okay? It's the most polluted energy you can find on the plant.

And by means, you know, the two only provinces

who have a ban on the expiration of uranium are B.C., who produce coal, and Nova Scotia, who are using eighty percent (80%) energy is coming from coal, it is one of the largest coal producers in Canada. So, you know, they don't have uranium. So it's very easy to be, ask a ban on it, you know?

So this is, for me, the future of uranium is very bright, and this is a time to look at it, this is a time to look at it, it's not, you know, it's almost perfect location to have this kind of project, you know?

Mrs. CLAUDINE CHOLETTE:

I would just like to point out that where they have a ban, they are coastal. Meaning that they could access the tide effect to harness energy. Of course, this would take more time than windmills. But those provinces, it is an opportunity for them to invest in something else. And you know as well as I do that being aware, or sensitive to environment doesn't arrive from one day to the other. It's a culture that needs to be developed. A culture.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you. Someone else?

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Yes. Well, good afternoon, folks. My name is Andrew Coon. I work for the Tourism Office as a tourism coordinator. First, I'll put on my, you can say my tourism hat, and I'd like to welcome all of you to Mistissini. All the first-time visitors. I hope that you are impressed by what you see.

You know that the general media sources, Internet, TV, radio, whatever, has always produced a negative image of a native person. I hope what you see today... This community has worked hard in the past to... it is what it is today. And I hope that when you go home, you'll have more positive comments about the reserve, more than negative.

I have a few questions that I'm gonna ask, and after I ask my questions, I'll put on my hat as a regular community member, and put my opinion forth. The questions I have concerning tourism, in Matoush exploration project, the environment assessment does not include an assessment of the upgrading of the current winter road access, making it to an all-weather road access.

The question is: have you met or talked with the Cree Outfitting and Tourism Association to get their perspective on the impact of the all-weather road tourism in the area, the benefits?

And the second question is: have you talked with the representatives from the Provincial Government about the potential impact on the planned Albanel-Témiscamie-Otish Mountain National Park? Those are the questions, two questions I have right now.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Who wants answer to maybe the first question? Yes.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

As you know, I met with COTA, Cree Outfitting and Tourism Association.

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

About the... About the question of the permanent road.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Yes.

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Of course, like I said before, the project is submitted to the process, we have emitted guidelines, (inaudible) statement to the proponent, to Transport Québec, and he will have to consider those aspects. The aspect of tourism.

On the other question about...

Mr. ANDREW COON:

The other question is, have you met, or have you

talked with representatives from the government on the, the members that are sitting on the Albanel-Témiscamie-Otish Mountain National Park?

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Okay.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

You know, there is a plant park open. Actually, I would say I'm one of the representatives on that committee.

Mr. DANIEL BERROUARD:

Okay. And for those questions, you make the link with the Matoush Project and the (inaudible). I would say that of course, we consider this aspect in our supplementary questions that we have to ask to the proponent, and I suppose that the proponent has met the people from the park.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, we have withdrawn our demand in the park. For the all-winter road. All-season road. The four-season road. We have withdrawn it about two months ago, Jean-Pierre? And that was to help the Minister of Transportation to go to the park. And because we are, we'll say, not a public authority, we are, I will say a private party, and a private party has not the right, except to have exemptions, or you

have to go to the "Conseil" of the "Ministres".

So, to accelerate the process, we withdrew, withdraw our request to build a road to the park. And so we will wait for Road 167 to be completed. So, I hope it will be at a certain point. But I'm pretty sure all your group will be part of the consultations. They have been going for three years now.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Yes. But, another question I had is concerning the base line data for surface and ground water. This question is for Strateco. There is a lot of... In the statement, you said there is a lot of seasonal variability with the surface water. And your sampling took place at two points in one year. Do you feel you have enough surface and ground water data, and can Strateco provide the community with simplified information on this subject?

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

Hi. I'm Chantal Rossignol from Golder Associates, and we worked on the impact assessment. There was some surface water that was analyzed at different seasons within one year, to have all the seasons over a year.

In our impact assessment, we say that there is

some variability in the concentrations. What we don't know right now is, is that variability related to the season, or can we expect that variability over the whole year? And that will only be, I mean, we'll only know the results of that once more data is taken at the site.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Ask an elder that question. They can... They'll have an answer. Now, I'll put my hat on as, here, community member. Not as a tourism coordinator. I'd say I value more the water, the land, my culture, and the air I breathe. I value that more than a fifty... I believe you said a fifty-eight pound (58 lb) of uranium.

What I'm saying to you today, with my work, I do a lot of travel. I can say the Tourism Office, Mistissini Tourism Office is in contact with approximately one hundred thousand (100 000) people per year. How? Through trade shows. We do six trade shows per year. In Quebec, and in the States, and in Ontario.

I do... I met with a lot of people at the government level. For my work. I've had comments about uranium. I actually met a former representative of Strateco in Montreal in February.

And he talked to me about the potential Matoush Project. So, I gave him my concerns. And after a discussion, he told me, "You have a good head on your head. On your body. He says, you have good reason why you can always say no to uranium mining."

I'm not against development or mining. Except for uranium. For me, uranium is a threat to the people, to my culture, and that's something personally I don't tolerate. So, I'm here to say I'm against your project. Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Other questions? Yes sir?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE:

Oh! You want to go first?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay, go ahead.

Mr. ROD QUINN:

Is this thing on? Yes, okay. My name is Rod Quinn, I was up here before. I have one more question. It basically deals with the impact study, and further on in the study, it does state that one of the biggest concerns is going to be the effluent released into the lakes. So, this is probably one of the biggest concerns.

So, in the impact study, it basically says that the flow will be approximately a hundred cubic metres per hour (100 m;/hr), selected as the maximum volume that'll be emptied into the containment pond. And treated on the site.

So my question is, how do you arrive at the figure of a hundred cubic metres per hour (100 m;/hr), okay, as the maximum required capacity for your on-site treatment facility? Is there any data to support this? And what if you have to treat more? What if these projections don't adequately represent how much water you're gonna have to drain out of that hole to get the uranium out?

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Okay. First, the hundred cubic metres an hour (100 m;/hr) came from our consultant who designed the plan. That's with the experience he had in the west, which was the worse, worse case he ever had.

Mr. ROD QUINN:

In the west?

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

In the west.

Mr. ROD QUINN:

Okay.

Mr. PIERRE H. TERREAULT:

Okay? That's the basic design of the plan. The... If we got more water than we could treat, as you suggest, the exploration ramp has an extension, at the bottom of the ramp, that will take the overflow of all the water. And the last resource is to shut down the ramp, to make sure that no water will go in the lake before being treated. And that's already in one of the programs we got, and we submit. To make sure that everything is under control before do anything else. Yes.

Mr. PETER COONISHISH:
(in Cree). Our local economic development is very urgent right now. It's very urgent. Any development... (in Cree) And I would challenge it again and again. (in Cree)

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
Your question, sir?

Mr. THOMAS COON:
I think we're coming to the end. Before you all run off, I gotta say my concerns. First, I want to thank you...

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:
What is your name, sir?

Mr. THOMAS COON:

Thomas Coon. I'm the vice-president of Cree Trappers Association. First, I want to thank you all, Strateco, for the presentation. The Health Canada. My fear a little bit is going down, but it's not gone yet. The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission people, thank you, and especially to COFEX and COMEX.

Section 22 of the Agreement is very important. Those bodies are supposed to protect the environment. And I hope you do your job. Specially with the uranium. Scary, scary project.

There is a lot of uncertainty about this project. I'm not convinced, me, as an individual, as a Cree, it's okay. Uranium is okay, uranium is safe, your life gone without the uranium. I'm not sure. I'm still not sure how I will vote. I have a vote yes or no for the project. There is a lot of confusion that... There is still uncertainty in many of the people here in the community. We don't know enough about uranium. I can understand the proponent. Their job is to promote the project.

Sometimes I worry. Sometimes I feel I have (inaudible), that the economic concerns supersedes other concerns. The almighty dollar speaks. Sometimes that scares me.

I have a simple question, and I want a simple answer. Maybe it could be one of the conditions that be set to the promoter. There is a lot of misunderstanding yet, people don't know enough about uranium mining. There is also, you hear on the floor, there is a lot of mistrust. But to correct that mistrust, I have an idea. Maybe to clarify that misunderstanding. Maybe to ease that fear that people have about uranium. I have a suggestion.

Can the promoter finance a special project, the Cree Nation of Mistissini, and the project is if Mistissini wants to have their own expert analyze the data, including the ongoing monitoring environmental, can the promoter finance an independent assessment of Cree Nation of Mistissini, so they can get their own experts? You talk about your experts. So, Mistissini can have its own experts assess all the data. If I have nothing to hide, I will give you that. If Strateco has nothing to hide, they should provide that funding to Cree Nation of Mistissini, so they can hire their own expert to assess all that data. And hopefully, that it would erase that fear that people have about uranium.

It's a simple question, a simple answer.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I think the...

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Yes, Mr. Hébert.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

The Canadian Federal Agency has provided an amount of forty-four thousand (44 000), forty-five thousand dollars (45 000$) for the community to hire... Maybe I'm wrong, maybe it's not enough. I will ask the question to the Federal Agency. I know they have an amount of money, forty-four thousand (44 000) or forty-five thousand dollars (45 000$) which has been allowed to your community to hire the expert to revise the... Maybe I'm wrong. And then I will answer... ask the question, and then I will come back about Strateco with you.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

Madame Anne-Marie Gaudet will provide...

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:

Just to answer your question, yes, that's correct, the Federal... The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency has provided some funding for the

participation and the review process.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

But to the Mistissini... I saw an amount of forty-four (44), forty-five thousand dollars (45 000$), if I remember...

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:

It was distributed amongst several applicants, several...

Mr. ROD QUINN:

Actually, Thomas was actually directing the question so that it would work in a way that the funding would come to someone, for someone to go up and do some sampling, as the project is going on. So, funds have been made available in the exploration stage for someone to go over documentation and make sure that it's being interpreted properly.

His question pertains more or less to, can we have someone from this community represent this community in the way and capacity that they can go up to where you're working and have a look at the environment? Maybe take some testing, and just make sure all is well, you know, and... It would put the community at ease somewhat more than it would now.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Is this your question? I don't... It's not the way I understand that, but if it's your question, I will answer.

Mr. THOMAS COON:

Yes, in a way. 'Cause I want to assure the people of Mistissini the information that you provide is correct. And that's not full of lies, like somebody else said. I want to correct that lying business. I don't like people when they lie. But in order to make sure that you don't lie, I want to have an expert to look at that information you provide to the Cree Nation of Mistissini.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Yes, his...

Mr. THOMAS COON:

So I need an independent expert for the Cree Nation of Mistissini. But in order to hire an expert, they're very expensive. I need some funding. Can the promoter, as an honest partner to the Cree Nation of Mistissini, provide the funding, so we can analyze your information? And if the project is approved, it's gonna be more important, once the actual mine is there. We have to do a very serious monitoring on the environmental aspects on a daily, weekly, monthly basis.

We suffered from mines before in Chibougamau. Look what happened to the town of Chapais. Just two summers ago. That little dike broke. And everything went down the river. To Waswanipi River, to Waswanipi Lake. We don't want to have another environmental disaster like that in EUC. The whole agreement, all the components of the agreement was to sign, to protect the land, the people and the environment. That's what the James Bay Agreement is all about, and especially section 22 is supposed to do that. Is supposed to protect that.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I understand the question, I think so. So, to answer your first... They have money available. They have forty-five (45) to revise the specific, today, what we have filed on November two thousand and nine (2009) and the answer of the questions on the website which will be published within the next two or three next months. Okay? So money is available for that, and I don't know who got that money, the forty thousand dollars (40 000$), in your community. Because someone has the money to hire experts. Maybe we can do some research to find and indicate to you who has got the money to hire the expert. Okay. So this is the first point.

To answer the second point, the committee we are talking to, you know, to the six, seven, eight, ten (10) people at the committee, we can finance a part of it, or this committee will be... Some people at that committee will have the responsibility to do some surveys, take water samples, do exactly what you propose, you know? And this can be financed by the company. So we have no problem, because we were ready to finance a part of the committee.

But the committee has to be looked independent also. You know, this, nobody, we don't want people from the population to come and say, "Yes, committee is found by Strateco", you know? It's, you know, it's easy to say. But we are ready to do our part of it.

But, to answer your first question regarding the trust you can have in our study we did, and as we have not lied at all, is the... We will find out who got your money... the money. Because forty thousand dollars (40 000$), you have enough money to hire the expert to read the documents we have, you know? And the... So this is, I have no problem at all. But the money is already available. The money is... I don't know if you have been paid for,

who got the money, but someone here got part of the money.

Mrs. ANNE-MARIE GAUDET:

Okay. Maybe I can specify. Three groups got some funding: the Cree Nation of Mistissini got funding, the Cree Trappers Association also received funding, and the Cree Nation of Nemaska. They were the three groups that received funding within this program. That's following an examination by an independent committee who evaluated the applications submitted, so it's... It's a thorough process, and it's...

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

And that money is to hire the experts to review, independent experts selected by your community, and to do exactly the job you are asking to do. So we have to find out who are the experts they hired, you know?

And I know other funds, Mining Watch and other groups have received money, you know, to hire the experts. They're coming with conclusions and recommendations for, and within the next two or three months. But money, forty thousand dollars (40 000$), you can pay several good experts to revise a couple of good documents. It's a good

document, it's... It's thick, I will say. A thick document.

But the money is there, and I have no problem at all to say, well, we'll finance the follow-up of the project. Because this is a commitment we have already made to the organization committee.

But again, if you want to take the lead to organize that group, you know, we'll be very very happy, you know, to talk to you, or Daniel, or Peter, we'll talk to you and say bring names of people you want to see on that committee. I will not select the people for you. You know your people. And we are ready to finance a part of it, you know? This is part of the deal.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

I was wondering if maybe I could comment, if you would permit me? I just want...

Mr. THOMAS COON:

Go ahead.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

Yes. I just want to comment on... One analogy you should always look at is what's going on in the province of Saskatchewan, that's been mining uranium for a number of years. Because they do have some things in place, and I'm just tabling these

things more for consideration.

One thing you'll tend to observe at the uranium mines in northern Saskatchewan is the workers that are actually involved in radiation protection and environmental protection often come from the northern communities.

The other thing you tend to observe is they also have what they call an environment quality committee, which is a committee that has representation, I think maybe this is a bit of this advisory committee but I'm not sure.

The other thing, there are also provisions with the province of Saskatchewan, where they do a sampling program that is funded by the province, that has the community participating and going out and actually taking water samples from the receiving from the lakes and rivers.

So there are all kinds of options out there, that don't all rely on the proponent to be doing it. So, there are different options there, and I think those should be explored, and they should be looked at a little bit further. We're not the ones who set those things up, of course, but these are options that are there to help the communities to be a little bit more involved, and to help build

that confidence that, have them directly participating in some of the sampling work, and in some of this work, to just provide that reassurance that helps deal with building credibility and trust.

The other thing I'd like to mention is maybe the CNSC needs to do more work, but Cherry mentioned it a while ago, my colleague, that we believe we're here for you. We don't, you know, we're not here to be proponents for the industry. We review all their work. We review to make sure that it's correct, and make sure that it's acceptable. And we're quite demanding with that.

So we do provide an independent assessment. Perhaps we need to do more to show you what we do, but I also want to point out that we are independent, and that's our job. We're here to deal with safety, and we want to make sure that these facilities are safe, and that your concerns are addressed.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

I was asked to ask you what was the name of that program that you just mentioned. Provincial.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

I have to check.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Okay.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

What is it? The Athabaska Working Group, I think? The Athabasca Working Group.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Atha... Working Group. Okay, thank you. My question, I'm one of the official opponents to the uranium mining with the Mistissini opposition to this uranium mining, and we don't see any of this money. We're small. What monies can we access to bring in our own experts? 'Cause I don't know the lady very well, who, she says, I called her a liar, but I just went by your own information, what you told me, and our people will work with me on that, or even this uranium, Strateco will want to work with us and give us money, which I highly doubt, but... We don't have money.

I mean, I do my own research, and I just take what I learn and bring it to here, and in great opposition to this uranium mine. Because of the devastating effects to radio and nuclear... radiation. But I don't have no money. And we had... Where is my colleague? She stepped out. We had a little bit of money to do some little opposition

signs that we can put on our cars, that we did ourselves, and we used our own money to put information on uranium mining into every post office. We did it ourselves.

But we don't have... If you look at Strateco, and these guys have five million dollars (5 M$) that they put into this. They offer this community forty-four thousand (44 000). You can only do so much. And then, part of the community doesn't even receive anything from that.

So, where is the fairness in that?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay. Other questions?

Mr LEN TAYLOR:

Where is the response? Where is the fairness in that? I would like the response.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

What you said?

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

I asked, where is the fairness in us, 'cause we're part of this community. We live here, we work here. Yes, we oppose uranium mining. We don't have the five million dollars (5 M$) that you have to do an assessment. To do our own independent assessment. We don't have that money. The Band has some money,

but we didn't receive anything from that. Ever see, what forty-four thousand (44 000) according to... What's your name, sir?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

Guy Hébert.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Guy Hébert?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

No relation.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

No? And, but, you know... I'm with a small group, we... We'd like to bring in some people that we think would help us in our position. So we need... Again, I say, where is the fairness in that?

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I think this is more an opinion of you, because the money was there, and you have some process, you were able to ask money, your community has received some money, and they have, I know, a procedure to ask for the money. I don't know the procedure.

And by the way, we have spent five million dollars (5 M$) on the environmental impact study, but we spent another five million dollars (5 M$) on the license. So, it's a total of ten million dollars (10 M$) for an exploration company to come

here and try to prove this project can be safe...
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
Well, can't be safe.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
... and the ten million dollars (10 M$)... It's true. We said five million dollars (5 M$), this is strictly for the environmental impact study. But we have another five million dollars (5 M$) which has been spent on the technical side of the...
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
Hum, hum.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
... of the project, which is the license, which is also (inaudible).
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
Hum, hum.
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
So it's a lot of money, I agree with you. But, you know, it's... I'm sorry about your potential to get the money, but...
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
We have asked for money from the Band...
Mr. GUY HÉBERT:
You understand that (inaudible) money from us.
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

We have asked money from the Band, and to bring in some people, and we never got a response. We couldn't bring in the people we wanted to bring in. So, you know, we're up against a stone wall. And yet, we live here.

Mr. GUY HÉBERT:

I cannot answer to that.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay. Next. Yes madame.

Mrs. PAMELA McLEOD:

Just hang on. I'm a little short, so... The mike is too high for me. I'm Pamela McLeod, I'm a member of the community, and I guess, just to kind of... I was gonna address the same kind of question where, if we can get a third party, unbiased party to sort of present us with the other side of the story, the other results, similar kind of thing.

But I believe it's the responsibility of our own local leaders. If we, as community members, want to see that, want to get that kind of information, then we don't have the money, necessarily, to go and get a study done, but can we not mandate our own local Chief and leaders to present that to us as well too? I don't think it's the responsibility of Strateco and their experts to

do that.

But that's, I think that's one thing that I want to see. I'm neither for or against it either, but I have a lot of my own concerns as an individual about the project itself. And so, we hear a lot of the, of your side of the story, and I want to hear more about the other as well, too.

Now, one, I think one of the concerns that I have, more of a long-term thing, I guess, and a question is these nuclear power plants or whatnot, do they... Are you aware of... Well, you must know, but do they have... Have they found, as far as I understand they don't have proper ways of storing all the waste yet from these power plants, and I'm thinking long-term, if, once the mine is over ten (10) years, once it's closed or whatever, is there that possibility that that waste will be stored in those mines?

'Cause I think of a situation like China, where they manufacture a lot of these electronics or whatnot, right, and it's shipped over to us. Once they're done, once their waste, their garbage is no longer useful, they're shipped right back to China. I saw this in a documentary.

So, I get... I mean, maybe it's a little far-

fetched, but I'm a little concerned that, you know, so many years down the road, nuclear waste is gonna be coming back to our territory because this is where they got it from. So I don't know if anybody would have an idea how to answer that.

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

For, with regards to waste management, all radioactive wastes are safely stored. Right now, in Canada, there is a proposal for a disposal facility called a deep geological repository, located near the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station.

In addition, with regards to actual fuel from the reactors, which may be a bit more related to your specific question, there is a program in place for a long-term solution for nuclear fuel, used nuclear fuel. It's managed through the Nuclear Waste Management Organization. I think the best bet is if you have access to the Internet, NWMO is the organization. There is a proposal put forth for final management of fuel waste, nuclear fuel.

There is nothing in Canada, by the way, any proposal or any consideration of taking used fuel from other countries and bringing it back to Canada for disposal. All countries, pretty well, are managing their radioactive waste independently.

Mr. THOMAS COON:
I guess, to try to simplify my simple question, there are two sides to every story. There are two sides to every coin. Why I need an expert, 'cause uranium is a very technical and complicated, way beyond my little brain to understand all the issues surrounding uranium.

The promoter, Strateco, has only presented one side of the story of uranium. But I wanted to get an expert to tell me the other side of the story about uranium. So I can feel a little more comfortable when we talk about uranium. That's why I was putting that question forward. There are two sides to every story. There is one side, Strateco about uranium, but we need to hear the other side. The pros and cons of uranium. To simplify my question.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
Thank you. Next question.

Mr. CLAUDE COONISHISH:
My name is Claude Coonishish. I want to talk... (in Cree). I'm gonna speak in Cree. (in Cree) That's three (3) years ago? (in Cree) Thank you.

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:
(in Cree) I think we'll just, to summarize what the

question is, basically, it's the question about presence of governmental leaders, particularly on the Cree side, everyone is (inaudible) represent Cree people, whether at the local level or at the regional level, and there was some concern about their absence here, or they should be present.

And my comment was simply to inform people, or address the question, simply, that we are independent bodies up here. We're not here to speak for Quebec, I'm not here... We're not here to speak for the Cree Nation at all either. Either at a local level, or a regional level. We're not here to speak for the Government of Canada as well.

We're here to conduct, participate in an independent review of this project. We are independent bodies in that sense. We're here to advise the government. Submit a report with our findings and recommendations on the impacts of this project, proposed project. We do not make a decision whether this project will proceed or not. The governmental authorities will make that decision. They will take into account our findings and recommendations. (in Cree)

The process, of course, permits anybody, or any individual or representative from local or

regional authorities to participate. As it was mentioned before, there will be further consultations. Probably this fall. We will be conducting public hearings on, specifically on the impacts of this project. And anybody can participate in those sessions. Individuals, or local regional Cree authority representatives, so forth.

But that doesn't stop, as well as anybody or individual, nor any representative at the local regional Cree authorities, in submitting their views and comments at any time in the review process. The review bodies have their own offices, their website, to submit any comments, questions. (in Cree)

So that's basically... I wanted to make a distinction between the review bodies here and the governmental bodies. We are merely advisory bodies, we recommend to the governmental authorities, the governmental authorities will make the final decisions.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you, Philip. Yes sir?

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Yes. I had a question on the fish sampling. In your

statement, it seems that you did your sampling in areas where the community members don't fish. Why? Well, because there aren't many fish. If you go to places where the fish are, there is not a question.

First of all, does the Taliman agree with the choice of lakes and rivers that you chose for your fish sampling? And do you feel you have done enough sampling of the local fish population?

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

The local study area for the fish sampling is based on lakes that we thought were most likely to have an impact from the (inaudible). And then we sampled a number of lakes within that local study area.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Okay. When I look at the map, where the exploration will take place where the potential underground mine will be, you have two lakes on both sides. If you look at the watersheds of that lake, they fall into Temiscamie River. Temiscamie River falls to Albanel Lake. Albanel Lake falls to Mistassini Lake. So, did you get the Taliman's choice too, or was it about just a thought, these would be the lakes that we should sample?

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

Well, it wasn't just a thought. We did review the

project area. The project, at the stage that it was, when we looked at it, and based on our experience, we set up a local study area and looked at lakes within that local study area.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

So my question is... Your answer is no, you did not include Taliman?

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

No. We did include Taliman... No we didn't. Well, we included, we came for the, for open houses in December, and we had discussions with them. I think, I'm trying to remember if our local study area was set up then. But we don't think that we'll have impacts beyond the local study area. So, you know...

Mr. ANDREW COON:

No. Well, let me say, then, your expert, so-called expert, bypassed a major step. In two thousand and three (2003), we did a fish study on Mistassini Lake, including Rupert River and Chené River, and Papas. What did we do? We used people from Mistissini to get their knowledge of the lake, to do the sampling, to do the study. You chose a so-called expert, thought about it.

Did you include sampling on the northern of

the Temiscamie River? There is other lakes I can tell you, indicator. Albanel Lake. Did you do a fish sampling there? A sampling? If you had a smart expert, he would.

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

I'll communicate your opinion to the expert. But as I said, the sampling is based on the area where we think that the impact is likely to occur, and not beyond that point.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

How did you... How did you determine the impact? How? Like what... What made you say, okay, I think that lake will be impacted, I think that lake will be impacted? What was the motive, what was the...

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

It's based on our experience and our knowledge of the area as we're looking at it and as the project is moving ahead. And...

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Your knowledge of the area?

Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:

Our knowledge of the area as it's coming. When we looked at it in the first hand, we based our local study area on our expert's experience. We had public, we had open houses, as well as focus

groups. We saw that, obviously, water quality and fish were an issue of concern, and then, once we had the project information, based on the baseline, then we analyzed the impacts.

Once we looked at the impacts, then, what we look at is the dilution of the effluent, as is mentioned in the impact assessment.

Mr. ANDREW COON:

Okay. I can honestly... I don't know what to say about this, okay, but...

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

Can I... Can I say something? As part of the answer, I believe that through the process of fish sampling and, well, all through the process of the environmental impact study, the local, on the trap line, the Taliman were involved in the process. They were... They had been talked. We can ask, maybe, to their... I can say here there is Claude, Claude Coonishish, maybe Peter, they can say... Well, I'm pretty sure they were involved. Maybe not at the exact spot where to take the samples...

Mr. ANDREW COON:

So you say yes, she says no.

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

No no no.

Mr. ANDREW COON:
Who is...
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
I'm saying, like, Chantal is working with Golder, you know? They did the sampling. I'm working with Strateco. We did not do the sampling. Take the samples. But however, I know that through the process, there were people from Golder who went on the field and talked with the locals. And when I say the locals, I'm talking about the people from the trap lines.

Mr. ANDREW COON:
Okay.
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
But if you...
Mr. ANDREW COON:
We are going to do another fish study anyways.
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
If... If... If...
Mr. ANDREW COON:
That's...
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
If you want, if you want, we'll... I can dig into this and eventually give you the right answer.

Mr. ANDREW COON:
I would like to... I want to, first of all, I want to see who did it. Who is the biologist who actually did the study, the sampling. I know a lot of biologists in Quebec, that do studies, okay? And I can tell you who is crooked, who is not. So, give me a name, whatever.
Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:
The people that were involved in the fish assessment and the fish sampling, it's indicated in our project team, in our impact assessment, which is included in its entirety in Strateco's EIA, and we have the project team, and we have the specialists that are divided per specialty.
So if you look under fish and fish habitat, you will find the people that worked on that program.
Mr. ANDREW COON:
So, in the future, I'm talking about the future, when we see impact on a fish, who do we go after?
Mrs. CHANTAL ROSSIGNOL:
What person?
Mr. ANDREW COON:
Who? Do we go after Golder, or Strateco? Whoever. We are gonna see impacts.

Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
Well, I... Let's put it this way. In the future, because as Guy mentioned before, there will be other impact studies or stuff like this. But I can assure you that you... Maybe not you personally, but we will make sure that through the Committee or anyhow, there will be some people from here, from Mistissini, but, that they're not biased, you know? Like, neutral people. And that they will be involved.
Mr. ANDREW COON:
Okay. Let me... Can you inform me personally, or can you inform the office...
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
I will... I will...
Mr. ANDREW COON:
... where is this sample, because here, I can...
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
I will be (inaudible).
Mr. ANDREW COON:
I can actually, I can provide the community whatever your biologist, that can do a real study. Hey, maybe somebody that can be on the side, somebody that can speak on our behalf.
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:

I will...
Mr. ANDREW COON:
Instead of Strateco, or Golder, a Golder representative.
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
We will be... We will be happy to provide you with the information. I'd like to have your directions, coordinates, name?
Mr. ANDREW COON:
Sure. Thank you.
Mr. JEAN-PIERRE LACHANCE:
It would be a pleasure.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:
Thank you sir. Yes sir.
Mr. LEN TAYLOR:
I just want to elaborate a little bit more on what he's saying, and then I want to share something from my book here.

You said you used a biologist who has done the work there. A few years ago, in the very same area, my brother-in-law, Alfred Coonkum, he... they're were gonna build a road. They had built a road, actually. They built a winter road in that area. Alfred told them not to build in a specific area

where the snow accumulates deeply, because, he told them, "If you build in this area, you're gonna have to spend lots of money on snow removal." They didn't listen to him.

He knows the land. Our people have lived on this land for thousands of years. They pass that knowledge down to us, as the future generations who are gonna live off the land and utilize it. And (inaudible) biologist said no, it wouldn't happen.

They didn't listen to our elders, and it ended up costing more money. Same thing that you are saying, madame Chantal, and that my friend is saying there.

Now, to just change a little bit, concerning the fish, you, in your environmental assessment, have said that there is gonna be a negligible impact on the environment, the fish, and so forth. Okay?

This book which I have here, and I've shown this to other... I've read from this book at other times when we've had these discussions. And in it, this has to do with the mining in Saskatchewan. And the impact, the environmental impact that this had on the wildlife.

I'm gonna go show you the fish, but first,

there is a picture in here of a two-headed moose that was born that way because of the uranium tailings that the elders saw drinking from those waters. A two-headed moose. That's the first time I've ever seen a picture of a two-headed moose.

In this picture, there is a fish that is totally blind. Because of uranium mining and tailings. On page 115 of this book, it talks about the toxicity of nuclear radioactive in the plants and animals. In the fish, the radio isotopes in plants and fish are thousands of times greater than in levels of the surrounding water. And the (inaudible) of uptake is isotopes, and it's species-specific.

For example, in the three aquatic plants, water lilly, the concentration of uranium is greatest at fourteen thousand (14 000) times. In the fish, in the bones of the fish, the radiation level is eleven thousand (11 000) times greater than in the lake itself, and in the flesh of the fish, it's six thousand five hundred (6 500) times more radioactive. Yet, they tell us that there is no negligible impact.

This is scientific information. This isn't something, you know... Other scientists have

proved, in the Saskatchewan area of Wollaston, where the first, one of the first... not the first, but one of the first uranium mining areas in Canada. And it shows that there is a great environmental impact.

If you read further in this book, right where the tailings come out from the mill, there is a little creek. And in that creek, there is no, zero plankton, phytoplankton. Everything was destroyed. And this guy is shaking his head and saying it's not true, but it's documented here, in books, and other books like it.

And they actually, in this book here, they talk about taking live fish, placing it in the very same creek where those effluents were released into the environment, and them fish lived for only ninety-six hours (96 hr). How can there be no environmental impact?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you for your comments.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Can I have a response, please?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Other questions?

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

You keep ignoring my question, and you keep... I want a response on how can there be no environmental impact.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

I'm sorry. Then would you repeat, please, your question?

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

How can there be no environmental impact in the study, when in other areas in Canada, here in this country that we call our home, shows explicitly that there is an environmental impact. How can they say there is none?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay.

Mr. LEN TAYLOR:

Can I have a response, please?

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you.

Mr. GRANT FEASBY:

I'd like to answer...

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Who wants to answer this question?

Mr. GRANT FEASBY:

I'd like to answer the question about, or the

comments about contamination in fish, particularly in northern Saskatchewan.

This phenomenon has been studied extensively by experts who could be credibly said to be independent, from the University of Saskatchewan and Saskatchewan Research Council in the northern area around Uranium City. And I'm not aware of any findings affecting the fish coming from the old Gunner tailings pile or from the El Dorado's Beaver Lodge operation, the downstream operations. So, I think the allegations are a bit extreme, and maybe misplaced.

In addition, one of the mines, the Gunner mine particularly, there is a pit that was flooded from Lake Athabasca, and fish migrated into that. And this was a captured fish population in uranium mine. And they were extensively studied. And the allegations, again, about accumulated radioactivity, I don't believe, were reported from this independent study by those scientists. Other effects, lack of nutrition and so on, yes. Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Other questions? Yes madame.

Mrs. SOPHIE GUNNER:

I have a concern. I don't really need an answer. I don't demand an answer, 'cause I believe that no man in this room can answer me. No expert. I am a member of this community, I am a mother too. The most important role that I have is grandmother. The little guy that was running around here is my grandson.

Everyone in this room, or everyone that came today came for a reason. I thank everybody that came from the outside, all the visitors that came with your reports to try and, I guess try and quiet the storms within us about the fears that we have about this project. And as a grandmother, I do have a lot of fears.

My husband is a Taliman, and we have three camps on the Temiscamie River, and we're always there. And it's a serene place to be. It's like paradise, when I go there. Whenever I'm troubled or things bother me, I like to go there. I find healing and the peacefulness of the land and the waterways.

I came today, I believe your name is Guy, and, your name is Guy? Okay. You know, grandmas say "guy". But you said something about things from the past. Not to talk about things from the past. But

we could learn from the past. And to look more into the future.

My concern is about the future of that little guy that was running around here. 'Cause there will be a day when my husband will transfer the territory to that little guy. And the way the land is right now, undisturbed, healthy, uncontaminated, I just hope that when that day comes, when that guy, that little guy that was running around here, the land will be like that. Uncontamined and healthy.

The animals are healthy, the water is good to drink from. Like right now, when we go up the river, you can dip your cup in the river and drink water. I don't have to buy bottled water. That's how fresh it is. And that's the concern I have.

Now, even if I ask you or anybody in this room, will that land be in the same state it is today when I transfer it to my grandson? I'm speaking from my heart, because no man can answer me and say yes, it will be in that state.

You all must have children and grandchildren. And you want the best for them. And that's the same I want for my grandson. I want them to get something from us, or from my husband, something

they inherit from us that's good and clean, and uncontaminated. That's all I ask. That's the state I want the land to be when I transfer it to them.

We're not gonna be around, probably. We're all middle-agers, and some of us are elders. But that's all I ask. I don't expect an answer, I don't need anybody's money. I always used to think that, you know, I used to tell my kids, "People that have dollar signs in their eyes don't see clearly." So that's why today I say I don't want anybody's money. I want the land the way it is.

With no disrespect to anybody or any report, that's all I ask. And I don't demand any answer today. 'Cause I believe nobody can answer me. Nobody can give an answer into the future. Nobody. No man can. Only God knows. And that's... That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Thank you madame, for your reflections. And also the dreams you have for your small son. Thank you. Other comments or questions?

Mr. HUBERT PETAWABANO:

Okay. I was here earlier. My question will be directed to CNS, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission. Maybe Strateco might want to throw in

their answer too.

My question is, now, what is the safe exposure level from uranium dust being spread out by the wind in the vicinity of the site over time? What is the safe level? Or is there a safe level?

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

The safe level for dust concentrations will be based, like, on how much exposure you would get, radiation exposure from the dust. So, there are limits. I can't specify the actual numbers, I don't have the numbers in hand, I'm not sure they're gonna be easy for people to understand anyways, but they're dust concentrations, based on those dust concentrations you would get a radiation exposure, the combination of exposure from, if you were drinking water, or breathing the air, or all the different ways that you could get exposure to radiation, has got to stay below that one milliSievert (1 mSv) limit that we've mentioned before. That's the regulatory limit.

So you have to add up all the different potential sources, and it's gotta be below one. Does that answer your question? I'm not sure if that helps you.

Mr. HUBERT PETAWABANO:

Well, I'll just add another... It's almost a similar question, but maybe you might get another shot. The next part would be, is what is the difference in the uranium dust exposure level between the proposed exploration stage and potentially, when you have the operations, assuming you have operations, during the mining phase? So, how much... How much more, yes? Did you get it?

Mr. JEAN LeCLAIR:

Yes, I'm just trying to figure out how to answer your question. Because the potential dust exposure will depend on how much production there is going on at the mine at the time. There is certainly a difference between exploration and a full operation, because during an operation, they would be bringing ore up to surface, and working with the ore. That's gonna generate some dust.

The one thing we can say, though, is that we know, we measure dust rates around existing mines. Again, I use the Saskatchewan situation 'cause it's the operating mines right now. And what you tend to see is the dust concentrations will drop rather quickly as you move away, and the main reason is quite simple, is that uranium dust is actually very heavy. Uranium is a very very heavy material. So it

doesn't go very far. It would tend to drop out and will drop on the surface around the mine site. And then that would get measure, and if there is a need to clean that up, they would do that.

But generally, what you see is dust concentrations in particular are gonna drop very very quickly. So they're gonna be very close to where the ore stock pile is, is where you're gonna see dust. But from a very short distance from there, you would see the dust concentrations drop rather quickly. That's what we see at the current operating mines.

Mr. HUBERT PETAWABANO:

Thank you.

Mr. PIERRE MERCIER:

Okay. Next? Other question? If not, no more questions, with your permission, I would ask to, by COMEX colleagues, if they have some comments or a small word to add. Robert? Brian? No comments or word? I don't know, Benoit, if your members have some words to add? No? No.

Then, as co-chairman with Benoit and Philip Awashish, I would like to thank again, first of all, Chief Longchap for his presence this

afternoon, and also, I would like to thank the people working for the community, who have facilitated the organization of this meeting today. And my thanks, evidently, on behalf of all my colleagues.

It's for you, people living in Mistissini, ladies and gentlemen who have sacrified, I will say, quasi a day, you know, to pass this day with us to try to understand, to receive more information, and we are "conscient" that probably you will have still other questions eventually.

Feel free to contact the promoter or the committees here, to try to have some explanation or information on the specific parts.

I didn't understand, you know, all Philip said, and you understand that, but I'm sure that Philip explained, has explained to you the role of our committee and the COFEX-South Committee. And I would like to add also our thanks, all the people with us, coming from la Commission Nucléaire Canadienne, or Santé Canada, and also, I would like to express our thanks for the people coming from Strateco.

I understand, as you have understood, that that is their role to give to the population all

the information on this project. And they tried to answer to your questions, and probably they will continue to answer. And as Philip mentioned, in the fall coming, we will come back here to... Yes. To have some public hearings. Des audiences publiques, in French. And it will be another occasion to express their point of view.

Then, I don't know, Benoit, if you have some words to add? Alors, the last word will be for Philip.

Mr. BENOIT TAILLON:

I concur with you, and I just want to ask Philip to say a few words in conclusion.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. PHILIP AWASHISH:

(in Cree) Peter, Thomas, closing prayer? One of you do the closing prayer? Thomas? Okay. Thomas? Thomas will formally close this session with a closing prayer.

CLOSING PRAYER

Mr. THOMAS COON:

I'm gonna say the Lord's prayer in Cree, and the evening prayer in English. (in Cree) Lighten our darkness (inaudible) oh Lord, and by thy good mercy defend us from all perils and dangers of this

night. For the love thy only son, our saviour Jesus Christ, amen.

_____