

Attention: BAPE QC

Les enjeux de la filière uranifère au Québec

Subject: Uranium Mining in Quebec

6211-08-012

Date: Oct 29, 2014 for Public Hearing in Kipawa, Nov 19th, 2014

Hello, my name is Carmen Monette and I am a long time resident and lover of Lake Kipawa, and I am vehemently against uranium mining and rare earth mining as it relates. Kipawa Lake, its rivers and watersheds along with the surrounding environment and wildlife, are very important and valuable resources. These are natural and pristine ecosystems that must be protected and never put at risk for any reason.

The reason we asked for an audience here in Kipawa is because we are currently under the threat of Canada's first Rare Earth Mines (uranium associated), Matamec Mining Company. While many citizens have voiced their concern and opposition, many feel betrayed by their Municipal council and Matamec. For instance when an information session was organized in Kipawa by APART (<https://www.facebook.com/Avenirdesressourcetemis/posts/1503073206582301>), Matamec declined an invitation; the council of Temiscamingue was also not in attendance, in fact, only two municipal officials from Temiscamingue area were there. When a group of us citizens attended a local municipal meeting, the mayor basically laughed at our concerns for the risks that this project could bring to the community. As for the BAPE audience, how many from the MRC mayors are submitting their claims of its safety since they voted in approval of it? Also, the MRC was recently quoted in the following article (<http://www.lafrontiere.ca/2014/10/28/les-audiences-du-bape-se-tiendront-a-eagle-village>) regarding the BAPE process;

The opportunity to submit a brief on the uranium industry was rejected by the Council of Mayors Témiscamingue last September. "Considering the timelines, available internal resources and the complexity of issues at the uranium, we decided to focus our energies on other things during the month of September and October," confirmed Tomy Boucher, assistant general manager at the MRC.

Also worth noting: From BAPE (same article above) "The interest of the southern sector compared to the rest of Témiscamingue motivated this decision. (to hold an audience in Kipawa).

"We looked for Val d'Or, Rouyn or Ville-Marie to the city where we would go, taking into account the number of submissions, said Louise Bourdages, Communications Advisor at BAPE. In Val d'Or, there was one, for Ville-Marie and Rouyn, there were three and Kipawa, there were eight with too many requests for oral presentations. The Commission has decided to go where there were more people who had come forward to speak and a more concerned population."

I think a major consideration to combined municipalities in areas like ours needs to be re-evaluated. The MRC table of Mayors is fundamentally flawed. These are pretty much closed door meetings where it is hardly feasible for citizens in all municipalities to attend. Some would have to drive hours. And also alarming, was the news (<http://www.lafrontiere.ca/2014/03/25/le-prefet-reclame-des-reglements-pour-les-journalistes>) that states by "Arnaud Warolin, Prefect of the MRC de Témiscamingue has not digested the flood of criticism has prompted the repeal of a regulation by the board. This regulation provides for fines ranging from \$ 200 to \$ 1,000 in case of recurrence for any member of the public which records the council meeting, or does not pose the question in the prescribed manner"

Where there are areas that can be greatly affected by major decisions such as this, I think there needs to be a referendum and ONLY in THE area effected. As a citizen of Kipawa, with proposed mines threatening to destroy our area I personally couldn't care less what a resident or mayor is Bearn, or Val Dor thinks about something this important that affects us and OUR area so drastically. Having said that, I have no idea why they would have voted to support such projects in the first place considering this effects their watershed as well. I have to ask how much the population from Ville Marie up to Rouyn and Val Dor are aware of the real risks and implications?

I also think that the Rights of all Natives must be first and foremost respected as they are the true protectors of mother earth. So why should such an important issue be put in the hands of 16 mayors, 14 out of which are not even in the area effected? Who cannot even be bothered to participate in such important proceedings? The system is not geared for public opinion. If not for this BAPE process when would our voices be heard?

Many of us depend on this area is which is rich in fishing and hunting. With the risks that Uranium mining poses this will surely all be destroyed. Even if the fish and animals don't die, they will carry toxins. Who would want to then consume these resources? What about the water and plants? We depend on these resources to exist. If we had to move, who will buy our homes? And Pay to relocate us? What will happen to the community here if we all had to move away from our loved homes. As many, along with myself, will have to do if this ever comes into effect.

As Canadians, we have a right to breathe clean air and drink clean water. I would like to think that the wildlife would also share this right and that the environment also has rights. In Canada, there has been since 1977 a partial environmental bill of rights in place in Quebec, in the Environment Quality Act (EQA).

Quebec legislation provides that every person has a right to a healthy environment and to its protection and gives individuals recourse to the Superior Court, where an injunction may be granted to BP-281E

(This and other links listed are Public and OFFICIAL documents of Canada)

AN ENVIRONMENTAL BILL OF RIGHTS FOR CANADA

Prepared by: Kristen Douglas, Law and Government Division

<http://publications.gc.ca/Collection-R/LoPBdP/BP/bp281-e.htm>

November 1991 **prohibit any act that interferes with the right to a healthy environment.**(43)

“In The Environmental Rights Revolution, David Boyd, one of Canada's leading environmental lawyers, answers this question by moving beyond theoretical debate to measure the practical effects of enshrining the right to a healthy environment in constitutions.”

Environment on the Political Agenda

<http://wcel.org/sites/default/files/publications/Enhancing%20Environmental%20Protection%20In%20The%20Canadian%20Constitution.pdf>

“A Constitutional Commitment to the Environment

It is often said that when the Fathers of Confederation drafted the terms of Canada's confederation in 1867 the environment was not mentioned because the term 'environment' was not used at that time. In 1991, however, it certainly cannot be said that the environment is an unknown concept. In fact, concern for protection of the environment is now a mainstream Canadian value. The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment has stated:

“Never before have people been as concerned about the state of the environment in which they live. And, unfortunately, never in history has there been as much reason for concern. We discover almost daily how much harm we have inflicted on the environment and how much needs to be done to preserve it for future generations.

Consequently, Canadians are making unprecedented demands on their government to preserve, protect and repair all aspects of the environment. Canada's federal, provincial and territorial governments are being asked to work together in addressing the large number of environmental issues being introduced to the public agenda. Canadians want their governments to make the environment a high priority on their political agendas ...”

I also agree that “Canadians are not alone in wanting to put environmental concerns on the political agenda. “

CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982 (80) - CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

"Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived "

Here are some of the effects of Uranium Mining as listed on Fact sheet for Uranium mining and Human Health (<http://www.ippnw.org/pdf/uranium-factsheet4.pdf>) That should be considered as violations against our basic fundamental rights to a healthy and secure life. These risks risk not only our health but our security. How secure are we living with this risk in our backyards, how secure do we feel that we won't have to relocate and sell our homes.....? At a significant loss no doubt.

I, personally, would feel betrayed by Quebec if this right was taken away and replaced by everyday fear and concern by the risks and dangers imposed by Uranium mining. I am sure I am not alone.

Clean AIR and SAFE drinking Water are NECESSARY to live, and should NOT be up for POLITICAL debate and negotiation. What kind of society have we become that we have to fight the Gov't to protect life?

HEALTH EFFECTS OF URANIUM MINING: (<http://www.ippnw.org/pdf/uranium-factsheet4.pdf>)

“Uranium ore is relatively harmless, as long as it remains outside of the body, because it only contains a little pure uranium. BUT through the mechanical extraction of uranium ore from the rock around it, miners and the environment are exposed not only to fine particles of uranium but also radon, a by-product of uranium in the form of radioactive gas.”

“The inhalation of uranium particles and radon can cause cancer, particularly in the lung. It was already proved in the 1920s that contamination with radon gas caused bronchial and lung cancer. Uranium is highly toxic and attacks the inner organs, such as the kidneys. Studies show that uranium causes birth defects in fetuses and infants and that the risk of leukemia is increased. Uranium mutates human DNA and chromosomes and deforms them.

Health risks are not only caused by uranium. Uranium is radioactive and therefore instable, it changes and decays into other elements. Radon and Polonium are just as toxic as their parent element

In 2007, the Strahlentelex information service names the following diseases that are scientifically proven through studies to have been caused by exposition to radon, uranium and decay elements of uranium:

- Bronchial and lung cancer
- Leukemia and other blood diseases
- Cancer of the bone marrow, stomach, liver, intestine, gall bladder, kidney and skin
- Psychological disorders and birth defects”

“WHAT ARE THE HEALTH RISKS POSED BY URANIUM MINING FOR THE LOCAL POPULATION”

Not only natural uranium from the ore gives off radioactivity, serious health risks are posed by the heaps, tailings and evaporation ponds. The left over rock itself is radioactive, the slurry and the chemicals used to make “yellow cake” are highly toxic. One of the dangers that the tailings pose is the contamination of groundwater through the porous separating layer, erosion and seeping rainwater. Another danger is caused by the insufficient covering over the tailings. Erosion through wind carries radioactive and radon many kilometers away from the heaps. (ALSO, many areas such as ours here in Kipawa Quebec are located on Earthquake zones??)

The immense amount of water that is required by uranium mining represents another problem.

- Uranium mining uses a vast amount of our precious water. At which time I refer you to Quebec’s Water Management Hearings, BAPE 2000.
http://www.mddelcc.gouv.qc.ca/milieu_agri/agricole/publi/hearings.pdf “

“The Water Management Hearings / A consultation process on freshwater... “

These hearings concluded that “Québec’s renewable freshwater resources account for 3% of the world’s total reserves. To preserve the Abundance and quality of this resource, the Québec government launched an initiative in the late nineties to develop a water management policy based on principles of sustainable development. One of the key steps in this process was an extensive series of public hearings conducted in 1999–2000 by the Commission sur la gestion de l’eau au Québec (Québec water management commission), which was set up by the Bureau d’audiences publiques sur l’environnement (BAPE, or office for public hearings on the environment). A brief description of BAPE is presented in Box 1. All of Québec’s administrative regions were visited twice by the Commission, first to provide the public with information on various water-related issues and, second to receive proposals from individuals and groups interested in water management and the protection of both public health

and aquatic ecosystems. During the hearings, the Commission held a total of 143 public sessions, received 379 briefs and heard over a thousand citizens and stakeholders. “

Then then confirm that “this process led to a comprehensive report by the Commission entitled L’eau, ressource à protéger, à partager et à mettre en valeur (Water, a resource to protect, share and develop) (BAPE, 2000). The report addressed strategic issues related to freshwater management (massive exports of freshwater, commercial use of groundwater and the privatizing of water services); presented a description of regional concerns and priorities regarding freshwater; and emphasized the importance of involving native people in developing Québec water policy. It also identified the various issues and objectives related to water and aquatic ecosystem management, as well as possible actions and measures that could be included in a water policy.

As a general recommendation, the Commission stressed the importance of adopting an integrated water management approach at the watershed level, notably for the St. Lawrence River and its tributaries.”

I now ask where is the follow up on this?

I would also like to refer you to the following article by Maude Barlow, *National Chairperson of the Council of Canadians and considered Canada’s ambassador for Water*, as posted by the Council of Canadians. Where she states: (<http://canadians.org/blog/human-race-needs-new-water-ethic>) I also invite you to read many of her other articles and books regarding Canadian water and rights.

- **Human race needs new water ethic - February 28, 2014**

In this article Ms. Barlow explains how the world is running out of accessible clean water. And how humanity is polluting, mismanaging and displacing our finite freshwater sources at an alarming rate. It also claims that by the year 2030, global demand for water will outstrip supply by 40 percent.

She also notes that Five hundred scientists recently told UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon that the collective abuse of water has caused the planet to enter “a new geologic age” and that the majority of the planet’s population lives within 31 miles of an endangered water source. And taking our water crisis seriously will change everything.

The best part of this article, which I wish to share is the fact that she agrees that at least one of four principles that should be honored is the fact that , “ water is a human right and must be more equitably shared. And more importantly, I also agree that water has and should have rights. We do not own the water, it belongs to our planet. Water is a source of life. We need it to survive. It is essential to life and earth and its ecosystems.

RISKS AND DANGERS OF URANIUM MINING con’t:

The following is a video and transcript from Dr. Gordon Edwards, President – Canadian Coalition on Nuclear Responsibility. www.ccnr.org and <https://www.facebook.com/video.php?v=361944400496596>

In the above video, Dr. Edwards states that “Mining Tailings are not just ANY toxic waste, and that the Uranium mining companies are in business to make money, the health of humans and the impact on the environment are

not their priority. “ That is a fact. Profits are a company’s priority and can even be the rule that holds them accountable to their very board of directors.

Dr. Edwards also states that “when a mining company opens a uranium ore body, they open a Pandora’s box, not only do you have uranium in the ground, but you also have a dozen bi-products that are MORE radio toxic than the uranium itself. Some of the most DANGEROUS materials known to scientists; Radium, Radon Gas, Polonium-210. All of which are fearful killers of human health and the Environment as well. If they are dispersed into the environment they are definitely bad news.”

He goes on to say that “Mining companies must also STOP leaving 85% of radio activity behind as waste, and then say bye bye, it’s your problem now”. “Unless they can find a way to take away the Thorium 230, which has a 76,000 year half-life and the Radium 226, which has a 1600 year half-life Uranium can NOT be safely mined. Removing the above would reduce the effects from HUNDREDS of THOUSANDS of YEARS to a FEW HUNDRED YEARS”. Still A LONG LONG TIME.

Uranium mining should not be allowed based on the significance alone, but especially unless they develop technology that is able to extract all long lived radio nuclides,

More on Dr Gordon Edwards can be found at: http://akiomatsumura.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/bio-notes_11_08.pdf

ADDITIONAL INFO REGARDING THE RISKS AND DANGERS OF URANIUM MINING:

PUBLIC Source of research: <http://motherearth.org/pages/node/182>

Dangers of Uranium

Uranium mining, milling, and nuclear testing carries with it serious health and environmental dangers. Native American communities have unequally suffered the burden of these consequences since the beginning of U.S. uranium operations

Nuclear power is currently being marketed as a solution to the energy crisis and global warming. This has spawned an increase in the demand and price of uranium, which has resulted in a global growth of mines at an alarming pace. Mines in the United States, which have been closed since the end of the cold war, are now being considered for reopening. These past mines caused serious health and environmental damage to the surrounding peoples and lands, and many of the mines’ radioactive waste has still not been properly cleaned up. The continuation of these mines’ operations would mean devastation for the local peoples.

Nuclear power is not a solution for anything, and causes more harm than good. The problems that it and uranium mining creates are vast, and carries with it long term consequences.

Nuclear power is not in any way energy efficient. Each step in the “nuclear chain” including the mining, milling and enrichment of uranium, the construction of nuclear power plants, and the treatment and storage of nuclear waste are incredibly energy intensive- and much of this energy is supplied by fossil fuels. In comparison to wind

energy, nuclear power releases 3-4 times more CO₂ per unit of energy produced taking account of the whole fuel cycle.

Uranium mining poses huge health risks to its workers. They are exposed to dust and radioactive radon gas, presenting a lung cancer hazard. Among underground uranium miners however, it is estimated that 70% of lung cancer deaths in non-smoking miners and 40% of lung cancer deaths in smoking miners are due to exposure to radon progeny.

“Mining causes serious environmental and health damage to surrounding land and populations. During mining operations, large volumes of contaminated water are pumped out of the mine and are often released to rivers and lakes,” (OR unsafe tailings ponds) “ spreading into the environment. Ventilation of the mines releases radioactive dust and radon gas, increasing the lung cancer risk of residents living nearby. Piles of so-called waste rock often contain elevated concentrations of radionuclides when compared to normal rock. These piles continue to threaten people and the environment after the shutdown of mines due to their release of radon gas and seepage water containing radioactive and toxic materials .”

The above problems caused by uranium mining are just a fraction of its negative impacts. The number of people to truly benefit from uranium mining is very slim in comparison to the large amount of peoples it harms.

Please visit The official journal of the College of FAMILY PHYSICIANS of Canada:

<http://www.cfp.ca/content/59/5/469> To read more on the following topics and their negative impacts and

Irrefutable Evidence :

“Uranium mining and health”

“Toxic profile

“Radioactivity of uranium

“Uranium mining

From my research it must be concluded that:

Uranium mining has many negative and long term effects. It is also evident that many of our doctors are extremely concerned about the resulting health effects of uranium mining. Especially, since there are no

“Acceptable Doses?”

According to all scientific evidence, there is no such thing as a "safe dose" of radiation. Every dose of radiation will cause a corresponding increase in cancers and other diseases. Spreading a given dose out to a larger number of people -- so that each individual dose is smaller -- does not reduce the number of resulting illnesses. In fact, in the case of alpha radiation, there is very strong evidence from many different quarters that spreading a dose out

among more people actually increases the total number of cancers and other diseases. Uranium and most of its by-products, including thorium, radium, radon and most of the radon daughters fall into this category of alpha-

To review or for more information on the above please visit: <http://www.nuclearfreeplanet.org/uranium-the-deadliest-metal-dr-gordon-edwards-president-of-ccnr.html>

Lastly,

The following is taken directly from a **PUBLIC** report released by Matamec, A Metals Mining Exploration Company, dated Jan 31, 2013 by Golder Associates. Ref #020-12-1222-0009-ref-rev 2 (Pages 11 & 12)

MAIN POTENTIAL EFFECTS (Some of the Physical and biological Environments listed by Matamec)

- Potential changes in soil and/or water quality due to spills (oil and/or other contaminants).
- Potential changes in the quality and availability of surface water due to variations in runoff, higher concentration of suspended solids associated with potential erosion and substance, and potential contamination by effluents.
- Potential changes to air quality due to dust and contaminant emission from operating activities
- Potential changes in noise and vibrations caused by operating activities
- Potential losses and changes in vegetation and wetlands caused by the implementation of the new project infrastructures (e.g., especially the open-pit, the waste rock piles and tailings)
- Potential losses and changes in fish populations and their habitats through the implementation of new project infrastructures (e.g., especially the open-pit, tailing, waste rock piles. And construction over or in proximity to water bodies); effluents and effects associated with drainage and erosion.
- Potential losses and changes in wildlife and bird habitats caused by the construction of new infrastructure (especially the open-pit, the water rock piles and tailings); disturbances by humans as well as noise and vibration. Those impacts could potentially impact migratory bird species in the area.
- Potential changes in the current and planned land and resource use by Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people.
- Potential effects on historic and archaeological sites
- Potential effects on the health and safety of communities and workers
- Potential risks of spilling of chemical product transported from Ontario.”

Are these potential effects listed by Metamec themselves something that we are willing or prepared to live with? What on earth could possibly be worth any of these risks?

According to **the PUBLIC site** <http://www.world-nuclear.org/info/Nuclear-Fuel-Cycle/Uranium-Resources/Uranium-From-Rare-Earths-Deposits/> “ A large amount of uranium is in rare earths deposits, and may be extracted as a by-product. “

“Uranium and Rare earth mines are the source of significant toxics that risk being released into the environment, including radioactive elements and the poorly understood rare earth elements.” Not to mention, that our area would be the first in Canada, a guinea pig experience. It must also be noted that there are no existing regulatory regimes regarding rare earth mining and none exist in Quebec or Canada.

Metal Mining and Effluent regulations do not limit the release of several of the potentially harmful substances that could be released during rare earth mining. Most of the current mining regulations and laws were written before rare earth mining became an interest.

Furthermore, the Ministry of Sustainable Development, Environment, Wildlife and Parks, along with the Province of Quebec have recently announced their plans to proceed with the creation of the Opemican Park project situated on the Kipawa Lake, Gordon Creek, Lake Temiscaming and the Ottawa river, which are located downstream of the proposed mine site. For this park to be worth the investment, it must attract visitors. How many individuals will want to vacation downstream of a potentially toxic and radioactive rare earth mine? Quebec is known for its beautiful environment and parks. Does the left hand know what the right hand is doing?

Rare Earth Mines are known to be 17 chemical elements that are being used in many things from computers and cell phones to catalytic converters and fluorescent lighting. With worldwide demand for rare earths constantly growing, we are all being placed in a situation where the rational is that we must comply because what is being mined is needed and more important than nature and life itself. That a few jobs and some short term benefits can possibly outweigh any risks to our area, our resources and our wildlife? Let’s not ignore who will really get rich. While we don’t have all of the answers, we must look for alternative solutions. Or do without. We should also consider and possibly philosophize about why these metals are in the earth to begin with? Is it possible that they are there for a more important reason unknown to man? That they are an important and fundamental, as yet un known, part of the Earth’s DNA?

Kipawa Lake, as well as many other lakes In Quebec , are very important freshwater resources and ecological entities that must be protected at all cost. Thousands visit this lake alone, each year to hunt, fish and vacation. These tourist dollars help stimulate the local economy. Anyone who has visited this lake is aware that its value and appeal lies in its unspoiled nature.

While some may be in “favor” of an “Environmentally Safe” mine, there really is NO such thing in Uranium or Rare Earth Mining. There are other well-documented environmental degradation results from other Uranium/ Rare Earth Mining outside of Canada that should prove reason enough for concern. For these reasons it is imperative that the public be completely informed and have the maximum opportunity to prevent this type of mine from exploiting our area, or any area in Quebec, or Canada as far as that goes, for a potentially devastating short term financial gain. No studies or safe guards can be a 100% guarantee that Lake Kipawa and the surrounding wildlife will be safe. Again, even with all the safe guards available, accidents happen, floods, earthquakes. And we are sitting on one of Quebec’s major earthquake zones. The following sites prove these points from historical data:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Western_Quebec_Seismic_Zone) and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_earthquakes_in_Canada

- *1935 Timiskaming earthquake: At the epicenter of the 1935 Timiskaming earthquake, cracks in gravel and sand could be seen. Almost all chimneys were damaged or destroyed, and some cracks developed in brick walls. These conditions persisted 110 km away from the epicenter. The next day, Tee Lake (close to the epicenter) was clouded. It is suspected that sediment which was previously undisturbed was shaken up by the earthquake. This event scored a 7 on the Modified Mercalli Scale.[1]*
- *The 2000 Kipawa earthquake struck Quebec and Ontario, Canada with a moment magnitude of 5.2 at 6:22 a.m. on Saturday, January 1.[1] It occurred in the Western Quebec Seismic Zone.*
- *The main shock epicenter was located in Lake Kipawa about 10 km (6 mi) north of Témiscaming in southwestern Quebec and 70 km (43 mi) northeast of North Bay, Ontario.[1][2] The shaking associated with this earthquake was strongest within 50 km (31 mi) of the epicenter.[1] It was felt in Témiscaming, North Bay and as far away as Toronto, making it one of the most significant earthquakes in Canada in 2000.[2][3] The earthquake was triggered by major thrust faults associated with the Ottawa-Bonnechere Graben.[2] A total of 17 aftershocks were recorded.*
- *Minor damage was reported during this earthquake, including fallen light objects, a damaged ventilation pipe and fractures in plaster.*
- *The earthquake's epicenter was very close to the epicenter of the 1935 Timiskaming earthquake and lies in a group of 76 located earthquakes since 1935.*

What is the threat to fish and game? The proposed Kipawa open-pit mine, related structures, tailings storage and processing plant are all within the Kipawa Lake water catchment basin. “Uranium and Rare earth mining is a lot more harmful to the environment than other types of mining,” says Christina Moreau, A fisheries and aquatic sciences master’s student. “And this particular project is being fast-tracked to meet market demand.” Moreau has started a petition to stop the mine. “Even if they have the best safety precautions, accidents do happen,” she says. “They’re using very hazardous acids and bases for their processing. Then there’s the potential contamination from the ore itself.” According to Mining Watch Canada spokesperson Ramsey Hart, rare earth mines are almost always associated with elevated levels of thorium and uranium. “The mining and processing of the ore provides a much greater possibility of those radioactive materials being released into the environment,” Hart says. As well, light, noise and traffic from the mining operation will undoubtedly disrupt wildlife, he says.

And what about all of the trucks transporting these dangerous products and chemicals?

SOCIETY’S TRUST in Government and Regulations

Some may argue that Environmental studies could determine this to be a safe and prosperous venture for all concerned. This demands blind trust and faith in reports and studies released by government officials. Do we

trust them enough to risk **IRREVERSABLE** damage to our natural environment, to our water? History has proven that government officials, politicians and corporations are vulnerable to corruption and capable of deceit. We must ask ourselves: **Is everything for sale? Profit at any cost in the name of progress?**

<http://www.canadians.org/schedule2> " What is Schedule 2? (as posted by the Council of Canadians): It says that Schedule 2 is an inconspicuous name for legislation that is responsible for the destruction of freshwater bodies in Canada. Schedule 2 is a loophole in the Metal Mining Effluent Regulation (MMER) of the federal Fisheries Act that allows metal mining corporations to use lakes and rivers as toxic dump sites. Once added to Schedule 2, healthy freshwater lakes lose all environmental protections. Then in 2006, under the Harper government, two lakes in Newfoundland and Labrador were approved for destruction using the MMER loophole and a precedent was set that would put the future of all lakes and rivers throughout the country in jeopardy. Since then, Environment Canada has released a list of 13 natural water bodies that mining corporations have applied to use as toxic dumpsites – or what the companies refer to as "tailings impoundment areas." Numerous bodies of water have already been approved for destruction. **How does this affect us here in Quebec? Can this happen here?"**

Trust in our Gov't and regulations are low at best. We watch environmental disaster after disaster that cannot be un-done. With no one really ever held accountable. How does it help that The Gov't, under Harper's regime have massacred environmental protection in Canada, silenced scientists, and reduced over 1.5 million protected lakes and rivers to 82 protected lakes and rivers!! Many scientists have compared the war on environmental science to the rise of fascism in the 1930s. www.huffingtonpost.ca/cap-trevor-greene/science-cuts-canada

As we watch the news we see more and more examples of the destruction of our health and environment. The recent tailings spill for example. We have less reason to trust and to risk. Let's not be next in the headlines.

Mount Polley: If there aren't already enough disastrous and heart breaking examples, Mount Polley alone should be enough to discourage any possibility of uranium mining! **The following is quoted from the below public article.**

As written in this letter of opinion: (<http://www.vancouverobserver.com/opinion/letter-editor-heads-must-roll-over-mount-poll>) "Heads need to roll for this. We have never had anything like this happen in our province.

It took our Premier nearly four days to come out of hiding and go to the disaster site. Yet she's had plenty of time this summer to interfere in the teacher negotiations and write letters about the conflict in the Middle East."

"The Environment Minister's office couldn't tell us when she would make a statement, or even if she would. The Minister of Mines tells us in one breath that he's so upset he's losing sleep, and in the next, tries to tell us that inspections haven't been cut for the last five years. But he neglects to mention his party has been government for the past fourteen years! Or that this company has had 14 inspections and five warnings before the disaster. "

"First Nations reps had to chase the company for 5-6 hours to get any response, even though Imperial had signed an agreement to inform them immediately if something happened on the mine, which is in traditional territory. And when they finally did connect with Imperial, they were met with "chaos" in the office and no indication that the company had any kind of contingency plan for dealing with this type of event."

Carmen Monette, Brief for BAPE Hearing in Kipawa Qc, RE: Uranium Mining.

“Imperial Metals' president now tells us the water is nearly safe to drink and there is likely no damage to aquatic life, even though dead fish, with peeling skin, are floating everywhere. Forgive us if we don't believe him. “

This is why I fight so vehemently when it comes to these corporations...their lack of response is disgusting and speaks for itself. Our land and water is at stake and as for jobs...wake up foreign workers are already here...China's coming.”

We are seeing more and more sites such as; #StandAgainstUranium #Uraniumfreefuture emerge on social media. This is because people are waking up and are against any further destroying of our environment and our health. There are any World Wide movements and protests proving that people are waking up and putting the environment first and the list keeps growing. People are not willing to stick their heads in the sand anymore and let Politicians and Corporations continue to have free reign. Those days are gone. Global organizing and political activism have united people in ways previously impossible thanks to social media.

As quoted in this recent article:

<http://www.journaldemontreal.com/2014/10/06/fronde-massive-a-linternational-contre-luranium-du-quebec>

Translation: URANIUM QUEBEC

Massive slingshot against international uranium Quebec

BAPE will this week receive a full case of 500 memories all strongly opposed to uranium mining in Quebec.

"The movement is taking a scale rarely seen," said Ugo Lapointe of the Coalition for Quebec to have a better appearance. Signed by citizens from across Quebec, these memories are asking the public hearings on the environment Bureau (BAPE) recommends ban uranium industry in Quebec, as is the case in British Columbia.

In particular, they argue that the economic value of the ore would not compensate for the dangers it presents, given the drastic fall in prices since the nuclear accident at Fukushima, Japan.

"The risks posed by uranium to the ecosystem and way of life are too high. The burden on future generations is unacceptable, "insists the Grand Chief of the Crees, Matthew Coon Come.

If no uranium mine is currently operating in Quebec, exploration is it a reality, particularly in Cree territory in the region of James Bay. The Grand Council of the Crees counted no less than 114 exploration operations between 2011 and 2013, all against the will of the indigenous communities.

Cree in global campaign

Currently in Berlin, Team Leader Coon Come launch a world tour to raise international experts against the uranium exploitation in Quebec. The delegation will include Austria, India and Australia, the largest uranium producer in the world.

Everywhere, Cris present a short film illustrating eventful risks posed by radioactive ore to the environment and health, but also the ancestral attachment of indigenous land.

This is the first time a Canadian First Nation participated in this competition. Smooth Yellow Oscar for the year, Wolverine features a young guide who cry concerned that uranium mines contaminate lakes and streams, jeopardizing the health of the Cree and Quebec.

<http://www.quebecmeilleuremine.org/communiqué/uranium-rapport-risques-et-impacts>

Uranium mines:

A new report from the Public Health confirms the risks and long-term impacts statement - QMM submitted by August 25, 2014 "Quebec, August 25, 2014. While the Office of Public Hearings on the Environment (BAPE) will soon resume its work on the issues of uranium mining in Quebec, a new report from the Department of Public Health Shore North confirms a number of risks and impacts of uranium mining to long-term health and the environment. This is the second time in less than six months as an agency of the Quebec public health issues of concern regarding the risks and impacts of uranium mining (see study by the National Institute of Public Health Quebec published last April). "

"After four and a half years of work, the report of the Department of Public Health of the North Shore is not at all reassuring and confirms many of the concerns of citizens, physician groups, First Nations and municipalities face the impacts of uranium mining, "said Ugo Lapointe, spokesperson for the Coalition for Quebec to have a better appearance.

The Directorate of Public Health, North Shore (DSP-CN) confirms that "environmental contamination from a uranium mine site can extend over long distances" (p.19). One of the main environmental concerns is "the dispersion of radionuclides" (p.35), that is to say, radioactive contaminants that represent "health risks" in the short and long term if human populations and animals are exposed. DSP-CN also emphasizes "the presence of chemical contaminants," including the potential toxicological effects "add" radioactive contaminants "to increase the health impacts" (p.19).

DSP-CN sends "serious reservations" about "the duration of environmental monitoring" and "the ability to measure the long-term impacts" (p.12). It is the same "for tailings management and decommissioning of mine sites" (p.12), especially "when one considers that these residues remain contaminated for thousands of years," says DSP-CN.

About the risks of cancer, the report of the DSP-CN summarizes the main findings of the study INSPQ published last April, that "the risks to the health of uranium miners are well documented," with "an increased risk of lung cancer" (p.21, INSPQ study). For leukemia and genetic defects, INSPQ "suspect" an increased risk, but can not conclude with certainty (p.IV, INSPQ study). DSP-CN also advocates the precautionary principle and "the pursuit of research" (p.18) regarding these risks still poorly documented scientifically.

Just as the study by the National Institute of Public Health (INSPQ), the DSP-CN concludes that "the most modern uranium mines, even, are not immune to failure" (p.39) that could result in major impacts to the environment and surrounding populations.

Carmen Monette, Brief for BAPE Hearing in Kipawa Qc, RE: Uranium Mining.

For more information:

Ugo Lapointe, Quebec Coalition looks better, 514-708-0134

· Dr. Isabelle Gingras and Dr. Eric Notebaert, Canadian Association of Physicians for the Environment, 418-965-6814 or 514-978-6262

How can Uranium Mining be still considered after all of this information?

Why are they even allowed to explore while there is a moratorium? I think they are putting the cart before the horse. The Environment should never be compromised without complete legal AND social acceptability. Then they cry about the money they invested and assume society should be responsible for their loss. What kind of damage is done in the exploration phase? This is hard to prove since many are not even notified beforehand.

According to Quebec's Mining Act, Bill 70: "The mining act must be interpreted in a manner consistent with the duty to consult FIRST NATIONS communities. Our First Nations were never consulted and it was the First Nations chiefs who had to contact them. Laws and regulations are not respected even in their conception stages.

Has our need for natural resources exceeded our need for clean air and water? Our respect for the environment and our First Nations depleted?

In addition to the above information and stories, here are a couple more examples of why more and more of us no longer trust or have faith in the Gov't or the system. (Just go online and search for groups on facebook, youtube and many others to get an understanding of how people are really feeling about many important issues). And one would have to assume massive trust in the above in order to support any further destruction of our environment in the name of profit. **Especially concerning Uranium.** Also, there is little faith in "Monitoring" systems as they have been proven in many cases to be insufficient, unhelpful and in some cases non-existent. Here in Kipawa alone we have an organization called the "OBVT". Its goal is to protect Lake Kipawa and it even has a moratorium on new development. (that did not stop the miner's exploration though...) But for instance this group with the MRC is responsible for the regulations of septic systems on this lake. **BUT** they cannot enforce or follow up or MONITOR because there is **NO budget** for that. As is the case in many Gov't situations. Another fact we are all well aware of.

In a time where Mainstream Media has become a joke and Social media is a popular method for sharing real news, people are no longer willing to put Blind Faith in their Government or in Corporations. There is too much at stake and enough has already been risked and destroyed. As for mainstream media, is this not an important matter to be plastered all over the news. When we turn on Canada AM why are we not hearing about this? Instead we are being told what color of nail polish is in style this season..... How many Canadians and Quebecers are still unaware of this wolf at their door? If a threat of this nature was coming from another source it would probably all over the news and then some, with each reporter's spin of things of course. Again, social media is helping in this regard as well. How about these headlines:

- Canada ranks low on Environment Protection. (<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/canada-dead-last-in-oecd-ranking-for-environmental-protection/article15484134/>) "Canada has fallen behind in a global ranking on international development initiatives and ranks last when it comes to environmental

protection. Canada dropped from 12th place last year and did far worse in the environmental protection category, where it ranked 27th. Every other country made progress in this area except Canada, the centre said in a report on the rankings. Why is this the last step in a developer's process to gain approval for a project and the only official device which allows the public to influence the proposal before approval for construction is granted. The BAPE process brings public concerns to the attention of the ministry of Parks the environment and sustainable development. The current Minister will meet with a committee of ministers in the cabinet where the final decision on the future of the project will be made. Many of us are very concerned that this is just a rubber-stamp meant to pay lip-service to environmental concerns, ignoring, or neglecting to identify poor attempts by the developer to appease environmental critics. "

I would like to ask? Are any of the Ministers in the above mentioned committee lobbied by the Uranium Mining companies or other interested and vested parties?

- The current Harper regime seems to have a sincere disrespect for Scientist and the Environment. Watch this episode of W5 (<http://www.cbc.ca/fifth/episodes/2013-2014/the-silence-of-the-labs>) Scientists across the country are expressing growing alarm that federal cutbacks to research programs monitoring areas that range from climate change and ocean habitats to public health will deprive Canadians of crucial information. In the past five years the federal government has dismissed more than 2,000 scientists, and hundreds of programs and world-renowned research facilities have lost their funding. Programs that monitored things such as smoke stack emissions, food inspections, oil spills, water quality and climate change have been drastically cut or shut down.

(<http://www.ctvnews.ca/politics/90-of-government-scientists-feel-they-can-t-speak-freely-union-survey-1.1506580>)

OTTAWA -- A large survey of science professionals in the federal public service has found that almost 25 per cent of respondents say they have been directly asked to exclude or alter information for "non-scientific reasons." Some 71 per cent of those surveyed said political interference is compromising policy development based on scientific evidence, and almost half of those who took part said they were aware of cases in which their department or agency suppressed information.

The study, entitled "The Big Chill," was commissioned by the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, and paints a disturbing picture of government scientists who feel they are being muzzled.

Read more: <http://www.ctvnews.ca/politics/90-of-government-scientists-feel-they-can-t-speak-freely-union-survey-1.1506580#ixzz3HYYh2u4p>

Most scary is the fact that Canada has gone from 2.5 Million protected Rivers and Lakes, and now has approximately Protected rivers and Lakes. Please watch!

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uto85c33DLQ>)

- Chapter 4—Implementation of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012
Audit at a Glance **(AS TAKEN DIRECTLY FROM THE FOLLOWING official and public SITES)**

http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/att_e_39879.html

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Acs6CDNFVdA>

The audit examined three responsible authorities: the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, the National Energy Board, and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, and whether they have put in place systems, practices, and procedures to support effective environmental assessments under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 (CEAA 2012). This audit covers the period from July 2012 to July 2014.

CEAA 2012 is still in its early stages of implementation. As such, we focused on key aspects of the Act that are relevant at this stage; namely, processes for identifying projects requiring environmental assessment and processes for public and Aboriginal participation. We also looked at processes for implementing the substitution and equivalency provisions of the Act and some aspects of the cumulative effects assessment.

What they found is listed next.

“Designating projects

Overall, we found that the Agency’s rationale for identification of projects for environmental assessment is unclear, specifically in making its recommendations to designate projects that may require an assessment, its process for supporting case-by-case designation of projects, and its screening process for determining which projects will undergo an assessment. As well, most of the Agency’s processes and the rationales on which recommendations are based are not made public. As the intent of the new legislation is to focus on projects that have the greatest potential for significant adverse environmental effects, it is important for the Agency to have a clear, transparent basis for identifying those projects.

The rationale to identify projects for environmental assessment is unclear (see paragraphs 4.21-4.26)

Recommendation. To support future reviews of the Regulations Designating Physical Activities, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency should develop criteria to recommend changes to the Regulations. The Agency should also develop a clear process to support its recommendations for the case-by-case designation of projects. The Agency’s criteria and processes should also be made public.

It is not always clear how the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency has reached its screening decisions (see paragraphs 4.27-4.30)

Recommendation. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency should clearly outline and explain how, in its screening process, various criteria and inputs are considered to support its screening decisions. This information should also be made public.”

“Public and Aboriginal participation

Overall, we found that mechanisms such as guidance, processes, and some funding programs are in place to assist public participation in environmental assessment processes. We noted that the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency’s guidance to review panels does not include any interpretation of interested parties. We also noted that some of its tools were not available to the public. We noted that the provisions of the National Energy Board Act differ from CEAA 2012 with respect to public participation and that guidance regarding participation needs to be established for offshore drilling projects. Aboriginal groups and other stakeholders interviewed and surveyed as part of the audit raised concerns over their capacity to participate in a meaningful manner. In the context of federal environmental assessments, the purpose of public participation is to ensure that those who must make decisions during and after the environmental assessment process are well informed, and that the public has had the opportunity to participate in a meaningful way.

Mechanisms for public and Aboriginal participation are in place but there are gaps (see paragraph 4.33)

Publication of the Agency’s guidance would increase transparency (see paragraphs 4.34-4.36)

Recommendation. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency should develop a systematic process for engaging with Aboriginal peoples on policy issues. The Agency should also make publicly available its detailed working guidance such as, but not limited to, guidance on Aboriginal consultation, environmental assessment by a review panel, and the basis on which screening decisions are determined. The guidance made available should inform Aboriginal groups and stakeholders, as well as proponents on how the Agency carries out its obligations under CEAA 2012.”

Recommendation. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency should provide general guidance to review panels to assist them in determining who may participate in public hearings and in what capacity.

National Energy Board public participation guidance does not refer to CEAA 2012 (see paragraphs 4.40-4.43)

Recommendation. The National Energy Board should update its guidance to ensure consistency with the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012. This guidance should include clarity regarding criteria and decision making for its standing tests and levels of participation.

There is no public participation guidance in place for offshore drilling projects (see paragraphs 4.44-4.46)

Recommendation. The National Energy Board should put in place guidance on public participation for projects designated under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012 that are also regulated by the Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act. This should be developed and put in place before any offshore drilling applications are filed with the Board.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission has updated its practices for public participation (see paragraphs 4.47-4.49)

Some Aboriginal and stakeholder groups are concerned about their capacity to participate (see paragraphs 4.50-4.53)

Recommendation. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, the National Energy Board, and the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission should assess whether their public and Aboriginal participation processes and time frames provide Aboriginal groups and the public with an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way and to ensure that their concerns are taken into consideration for reviewing projects that may affect them. Where necessary, measures to resolve issues related to these processes should be identified and implemented.”

“Working with other jurisdictions

Overall, we found that the Agency has ensured that conditions were in place for substituting provincial environmental assessment processes for federal ones.

Conditions for substitution have been established (see paragraphs 4.59-4.61)”

“Assessing cumulative effects

Overall, we found that each of the three responsible authorities have developed or are developing some guidance for assessing cumulative effects. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency’s and Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission’s technical guidance is still in draft while the National Energy Board still needs to put in place guidance for offshore drilling projects. We also noted that CEAA 2012 has provisions for the carrying out of regional studies, an important step that, once completed will help in understanding the effects of multiple projects (existing and future) in a given region.

Guidance on the assessment of cumulative effects is not yet finalized (see paragraphs 4.65-4.67)

Recommendation. The National Energy Board should further develop and update its cumulative effects guidance for projects regulated under the Canada Oil and Gas Operations Act and designated under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2012.

The Agency is exploring the potential for regional studies (see paragraphs 4.68-4.69)

Response

The audited entities agree with our recommendations, and have responded (see List of Recommendations).”

“Why they did this audit

According to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, an environmental assessment should be conducted as early as possible in the planning stage of a project. This is done so that the proponent can consider the analysis in the proposed plans, including incorporation of mitigation measures to address adverse environmental effects.

CEAA 2012 was introduced as part of the government’s Responsible Resource Development plan, which aimed to make the review process for major projects more predictable and timely, reduce duplication among various levels of government, strengthen environmental protection, and enhance consultations with Aboriginal peoples. The intent of the new legislation was to focus on projects that have the greatest potential for significant adverse environmental effects in areas under federal jurisdiction.”

Details of the audit

Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

National Energy Board

Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission

Completion date 31 July 2014

Tabling date 7 October 2014

Related audits Chapter 1—Applying the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, 2009 Fall Report of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development

For more information: Ghislain Desjardins / Manager, Media Relations

Tel.: 613 952 0213, extension 6292 / E-mail: infomedia@oag-bvg.gc.ca / Twitter: CESD_CEDD

“What does they say about our current system?: Really? Am I a terrorist because I care about my environment and am willing to do whatever I can to protect it. A terrorist? What have the times comes to? Is this what money and power are turning our society in to? Are our rights being respected? Our voices?

“It is highly probable that environmentalists will continue to mount direct actions targeting Canada's energy sector, specifically the petroleum sub-sector and the fossil and nuclear fueled electricity generating facilities, with the objectives of: influencing government energy policy, interfering within the energy regulatory process and forcing the energy industry to cease its operations that harm the environment,” .

So will Uranium be the next “essential” for the Canadian economy? Will we have to then just sit back and accept this or risk being called a radical terrorist? We will no longer have a right to protest or gather without being suspected of being criminals? Will we not have a right to protect our environment as it effects our lives and the lives of our families?

“Taken into consideration with the [report’s] conclusion that stress the threat of ‘unlawful incursions’, the document underlines that the major concern from these national security agencies is the disruption of business operations -- not terrorism.”

- Foreign Workers Program..... how many jobs would even be created for actual Canadians? This is yet another reason people are fed up and no trusting of many industries.

So when all is said and done, I ask you all what percentage of risk to human life, wildlife and our precious environment would be acceptable? In the name of profit? What percentage?

How much is my life worth? The lives of my children and grandchildren? And future generations?

How much for life of the animals who have no voice for themselves in this?

As I watch my grandchildren swimming in this lake as my children did and as I did, I can’t help but cry when I look at and wonder if this will end. Wonder how could this be happening? Why is this happening? I have spent over a year already worrying and researching and fighting. Time better spent with my family and pets.

Review all of the facts listed above and remember that Uranium mining has LONG term effects, from HUNDRED’S to THOUSAND’S of years. How many generations is that? Also remember that the damage from this type of mining is IRREVERSABLE. Please, just say NO to Uranium mining!

I have given much information above and all related links. If after all of this, and others testimonies Quebec allows Uranium mining then we will know for sure who and what is more important and that the system is very broken and biased towards economics and greed and material things than to actual life.

Again, we must stop treating our planet like we have another one to go to!

I will join all Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal groups is calling for a PERMANENT Moratorium on Uranium Mining!

Lastly, I would like to leave you with this quote.

“Someday the earth will weep, she will beg for her life, she will cry with tears of blood. You will make a choice, if you will help her or let her die, and when she dies, you too will die.” Chiefs John Hollow Horn, Oglala Lakota

Carmen Monette, Brief for BAPE Hearing in Kipawa Qc, RE: Uranium Mining.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,

Carmen Monette

Kipawa, QC

Please note that much of the above information is taken directly from actual professional a published documentation. I have tried to use quotes and links to refer to each section in my research material.

**While some of the facts on Uranium mining and its dangers might be repeated from time to time, I wanted to prove multiple opinions and sources with official documentation.*