

**Hydro Workers Need Houses; First Nations Citizens Can Live in Trailers: Final Submission to
the Clean Environment Commission on the Keeyask Generating Station**

Prepared for the Concerned Fox Lake Grassroots Citizens
by Peter Kulchyski

With assistance from:
Noah Massan
Ivan Moose
Agnieszka Pawlowska-Mainville
Dr. Stephan McLachlan

January 2014

Concerned Fox Lake Grassroots Citizens Organization (CFLGC)
c/o Agnieszka Pawlowska-Mainville, Coordinator
60 Harrowby Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R2M 0G9
agnespawlowska@hotmail.com

Introduction

In its terms of reference, the Clean Environment Commission as asked “whether an Environment Act licence should be issued to Keeyask Hydropower Limited Partnership for the Keeyask Generation Project”. Respectfully, it is the considered opinion of the Concerned Fox Lake Grassroots Citizens (CFLGC) that such a **license should not be issued, or that issuance of the license should be delayed until specified conditions are met.**

Although much was made of the fact that a ‘new era’ and ‘moving forward’ are now on the agenda, it is the view of the CFLGC that as proposed, the Keeyask project represents a continuation of past patterns that have seen repugnant environmental and social damage. This past damage must be clearly and definitively addressed before Manitoba Hydro and its partners are given license to move ahead with new projects.

At the outset a few comments must be made regarding the argument that, given community votes in favour of the projects, any questioning of the value of these projects amounts to unwarranted paternalism and implicit or explicit denigration of First Nations leaders. It is the position of the CFLGC that:

1. We represent community voices that have been marginalized by the bureaucratic processes imposed by Manitoba Hydro;
2. The community leaders and communities have been presented with virtually no choice except a ‘take it or leave it’ scenario in which they support the project or get nothing at all;
3. The voting for these projects meets a very low democratic standard (it was dispiriting and surprising to hear at various points the Indian Act cited as the legitimization for this standard).
4. The community support for this project, was based on the outcomes of studies conducted prior to Keeyask, most notably, the Social, Cultural, Human Impact Project Report, which was not heard by the CEC nor seen by many members of the Makeso Sakahican community

On the environmental side, while good quality work was conducted in two of the four communities involved in the partnership collecting Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge, there is little if any evidence that this work had any significant impact on the overall environmental assessment, which was almost entirely science based. The science itself was not subject to peer review, not conducted independently and was characterized by independent experts like Dr McLachlan and Dr Luttermann as consistently too ‘optimistic’ in its assessments of any impacts and mitigations. Species at risk, including woodland caribou and lake sturgeon, are especially vulnerable because of their low population numbers and will have their remaining habitats further eroded by the project. Moreover, any impacts on other species not deemed ‘valued’ will simply be trampled upon, or even ignored. Important ecological areas, like riparian riversides, have been ignored, and upstream impacts or impacts beyond the immediate footprint of the project have been largely ignored or simply assumed to be common enough throughout the boreal zone as to be expendable. To date, an independent comprehensive environmental assessment has not been conducted. Baseline for Keeyask is the already disturbed environment, one that has already been substantially altered by past development and the the Keeyask project will be super-imposed on this disrupted environment (Pimicikamak and Noble & Gunn presentations). While Manitoba Hydro maintains that its EIS for the Keeyask project involves such an assessment, it is clearly not independent and therefore somewhat like allowing the criminal to assess the impact of their crime.

In closing, Manitoba Hydro stressed the overall innovation and importance of the monitoring program. If it is so important, why are its overall features being left to be designed outside the public scrutiny of the CEC process. If it is so important, why is it not already underway, since camp and road construction has already been undertaken. Furthermore and most troubling, any recommendations of the Monitoring Advisory Group can be overturned by a general partner controlled by majority membership appointed by Manitoba Hydro. The current structure allows that group to decide that financial exigency (and given the history does any factor ever weigh stronger for Manitoba Hydro?) should outweigh the inconvenience involved in delaying driving a metal rod through the graves of great grand mothers.

The social impacts of the project also demand a cumulative impact review that assesses the social suffering created by past projects and offers serious mitigation plans before the new project begins. Fox Lake members experience firsthand how the construction and operation of these northern hydroelectric projects continues to bring forth life-altering changes to the water, land and traditional way of life for First Nations members living in the area of the proposed Keeyask project. No one appears ready to deny that in northern Manitoba the end result of decades of Manitoba Hydro involvement have been material impoverishment of First Nations communities, poor to atrocious local infrastructures, and widespread, indeed normative, social suffering. All these projects came with promises of ‘prosperity’ for local people, it should be noted. The issue is most starkly evident in housing. One of the single most striking sentences in the documentation is the casual response to the CECs final question regarding ‘repurposing’ camp living structures for local use, in which Manitoba Hydro states that ‘modular units’ can be provided as a more cost effective solution. Given the enormous funds and efforts Manitoba Hydro spends on houses for its own workers, on the creation of northern suburban high standard living conditions, this is entirely revealing of their commitment to the community partners. ‘Trailers for them, houses for us’ is the past, present and future vision of Manitoba Hydro for northern Cree communities. It is in the interest of common human decency that such an approach must not be allowed to continue and such an attitude not allowed to stand. Please refer to the CFLGC presentation from December 9 and 10th, 2013 for photographs comparing housing for Fox Lake members and for Manitoba Hydro workers.

Of course, the Partnership will maintain that the new Agreement will eventually provide financial resources – over the next 100 years – that will lead to the eventual end of this situation. Such an argument does not stand close scrutiny. In the first place, we know of Agreements that exist and offer a better model. The Peace of the Braves offered Quebec First Nations substantial funding without requiring any investment or debt obligation: merely an agreement to allow those projects to proceed. No one in Quebec has ever suggested that the Manitoba Agreements are better for a simple reason: they are not. In Manitoba, we are requiring First Nations to use desperately needed existing resources and to take on debt in order to gain, eventually, either a comparatively low risk-free remuneration or risk-based possibly higher (possibly non existent) investment profit. The assessments conducted on behalf of the Consumers Association of Canada by Drs Buckland and O’Gorman show not a theoretical model but a mathematical model of how inadequate the final results are likely to be. In seeing this project proceed there is no way one can say that the next generation in these communities will not continue to live in dire poverty (while Manitoba Hydro employees enjoy all modern conveniences run off subsidized power). Perhaps the promise that sometime in the distance future profits will finally flow will be enough to make it bearable. We are doubtful.

It should be noted that the poverty will no longer be alleviated by a cultural and material tie to the land,

which will now be severed. No amount of travel to distant harvesting areas will mitigate the loss of among the last community adjacent hunting, trapping, fishing and harvesting grounds. We found it poignant to hear the youth from Fox Lake Cree Nation note that it was many days travel away from their community before they could fish for brook trout. An ancient way of life is now making its last stand and there should be no illusions about this. The much vaunted 'moving forward' also means 'leaving behind', what is being left are the elements of intangible and tangible cultural heritage that are integral to the distinct culture of *Inninuwak* and have over thousands of years proven to be the flexible basis of *mino-pimatisiwin*, the *Inninuwak* understanding of the good life. There is no price that can be put on this loss.

Finally, the impacts of the dam construction phase must be discussed. While there will be a wage employment boom, and perhaps some business development opportunities, there will also be a racially stratified workforce, dangerous strangers brought into the region, sexual assault and harassment of local Indigenous women. In our view the costs of this brief period of industrial activity outweigh the benefits, and this has been shown by construction projects all across the Canadian north including previous projects conducted by Manitoba Hydro; we have yet to see a single exemplar of unqualified success for a project of this sort.

The CEC is also asked what conditions should be attached to a license. We do refer the CEC to recommendations made in our three expert reports, as submitted by Kulchyski, McLachlan, and Pawlowska-Mainville . In what follows we will make specific points regarding the environmental, social, human health and economic issues we have determined are serious problem areas associated with the project. In appropriate circumstances we recommend possible conditions that could ameliorate the issue.

Environmental Issues

1. Aboriginal knowledge has not been sufficiently attended to. While some effort went into gathering ATK, the CFLGC was in part formed because Elders from the Fox Lake Cree Nation felt their views were being filtered. Mr Massan has reported that attendance at 'core group' Elder's meetings dropped off considerably in the period of project preparation. None of the Manitoba Hydro science based experts appeared to have a background in working with Elders and their reports show very little (or no) consideration to ATK. It is very likely that as the project proceeds and as Elders see their knowledge being given little credence, their participation will actually decrease and ATK will become even less of an influence in the future monitoring and mitigation phases.

We recommend a three-track process as suggested by Dr McLachlan, in which systematic efforts are made to bring the two forms of knowledge together and provides mechanisms for conflict-resolution. We also recommend a decision-making process that includes equal participation of First Nations and Manitoba Hydro at all stages; anything less only ensures that serious conflicts will always be resolved in favour of Manitoba Hydro.

2. The arguments made by scientists employed by Manitoba Hydro were in many cases not credible, involving as they did overarching assurances that a massive industrial project changing the seasonal behavior of a major river, flooding land, and involving roads, transmission lines, quarries, camps, and massively increased human presence, would after relatively small mitigation efforts have 'neutral impacts' on the identified valued ecological

components of the region. Indeed, in some cases they had the audacity to argue that this mitigation and rehabilitation would actually leave lake sturgeon populations better off?!

A process of producing independent, refereed assessments at arms length from the proponents must be found in order to ensure credibility of the process and the knowledge produced by it.

3. Trading local environmental catastrophe to help avoid global warming runs counter to any defensible ecological ethics.

Manitoba Hydro and its partners should not portray their activities as ‘clean and green’, but publically accept that it is engaged in profit-based destruction of land.

4. It is unacceptable that the monitoring plans, presented with such seriously intoned force during Manitoba Hydro’s closing arguments, are not already in place, do not allow equal voice of First Nations partners in the final decision making process, and have no independent assessments of ongoing impacts.

At a minimum, monitoring plans should be established and implemented before camp and road construction begins. Fox Lake community members argue that monitoring of construction activity occurring at the Keeyask site is in dire need of supervision already. This monitoring should be also be expanded to include a wider diversity of animals and plants that are culturally and economically important to the partner First Nations. The impacts of development for mercury contamination of these species should also be monitored, many of which are excluded from systematic evaluation in the EIS. Monitoring plans should allow equal decision-making powers on behalf of First Nations and Manitoba Hydro. It should be clear that any serious unforeseen heritage or environmental impacts can be used to immediately halt the activity that produces the impact, regardless of the cost.

5. The absence of rehabilitation plans at this stage of project development, coupled with the refusal to engage in rehabilitation for previous projects, leaves a clear impression that Manitoba Hydro is simply not interested in incurring the costs of rehabilitation. By Manitoba Hydro’s own admission past rehabilitation efforts have been minimal at best, and in most cases nonexistent.

A comprehensive rehabilitation plan integrating past projects and the Keeyask project should be carefully established and implemented. A set funding pocket should be established that sets aside appropriate funds to work for rehabilitation and eventual reconstruction of the socio-ecological landscape. These efforts should meaningfully include the partnering First Nations at every stage of the process.

6. Manitoba Hydro’s own efforts do not amount to the sort of cumulative impacts assessment that the Clean Environment Commission, and the Manitoba Government, as well as several intervenor groups, have been calling for. There is little or no discussion in the EIS of impacts from previous projects.

A more meaningful cumulative assessment, using a three-track process and conducted at arm’s length from Manitoba Hydro, must be completed before this or other projects are to be started. The very design of these projects should take into account the result of such a review.

Social Issues

1. If results of past actions are any measure, Manitoba Hydro has a dismal, indeed repugnant, record when it comes to sharing financial benefits with First Nations and creating prosperity in northern Indigenous communities. The issue is particularly acute because Manitoba Hydro has created very high standard communities for its own employees.

Manitoba Hydro should provide material evidence that it will no longer allow the well being of Indigenous communities to be collateral damage in its project and profit picture, but immediately devoting serious resources to local Indigenous community infrastructures: build houses, pave roads and build community facilities that rival the facilities used by its own employees. Such an effort should precede or go in tandem with new dam construction.

2. Housing is a particularly sensitive issue, especially where affluent communities are being built immediately next to impoverished ones. Very simply, it is not acceptable that Manitoba Hydro or the Partnership contemplate inexpensive 'modular units' and full electric rate charges for First Nations citizens and houses with subsidized heating charges for its own employees. It has created, is continuing to create, and this project will exacerbate, a gross inequality at the local level and at the broader, north/south, level. This issue is aggravated by the fact that there is a housing crisis, at least in Tataskweyak, and that poor housing conditions prevail in each of the partner First Nations communities.

Manitoba Hydro must establish a policy where for every house it builds for an employee, it will build a similar quality house for First Nations, allocated among the partner communities in a process they decide upon. It must furthermore agree to build houses in an amount that will match its existing housing stock over a ten-year period. Therefore, it must commit to ensuring that there are at least an equal number of Manitoba Hydro employee quality houses available to First Nations family by 2024. In our view, this must be a condition of licencing a new dam, as anything less will pass on the issue to future generations and continue to perpetuate a morally reprehensible situation.

3. Although Manitoba Hydro clearly believes it is doing everything it can and treating the situation of local Indigenous women's vulnerability with great seriousness, in our view they have not gone far beyond what has been done in previous projects. Indeed, as presented by Mr Moose, strategies proposed by Manitoba Hydro for mitigating anticipated impacts differ little from past and almost entirely unsuccessful attempts. Mixed results here will mean young women's lives will be ruined.

A specific meeting of local Indigenous women and independent academics and experts with knowledge of the issues should be called and held before the project begins to develop an action plan for Indigenous women; a significant budget to support such a plan should be allocated in advance. One practice not contemplated in the current arrangement is a walk-home program. Such a program would have saved young women in the past and should be contemplated as part of the action plan.

4. Manitoba Hydro should be providing rather than 'reducing' "opportunities to use Cree language" at the job site (5-204). The CFLGC recommends that all signs, notices and

infrastructure plans should be at least bilingual, English and Inninuwon. Employment opportunities for translators would be created and linguistic competence in Cree for the youth and in-coming workers would only be beneficial. Inninuwon signs could also serve as a reminder on whose lands the Project is to be built.

5. Intangible cultural heritage should be an integral element of the assessment of impacts and mitigations. Manitoba Hydro had not contracted anyone with expertise in this field; its cultural heritage work is confined to material culture using approaches that are largely outdated.

The Inninuwak in Northern Manitoba have a rich heritage that is unique to the world. Many continue to live a hunting based culture, relying on their skills and knowledges of their lands to harvest resources and live according to the cultural values and protocols passed on to them by previous generations. The 2003 UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*, should be used as a guiding principle in the environmental process, regulations and monitoring of the Keeyask, and other projects. Elders and harvesters - ie, the "living cultural heritage" should be involved in the process of establishing protective measures as they can provide continuity, education, capacity; they can also reinforce the language and Inninuwak identity. Transparency, *mino pimatisiwin* and traditional knowledge can be used to bolster the science and manage the common resources. Community-led inventorying could instigate new policies on ICH management issues.

It took generations to learn and to understand the landscape around the Keeyask Rapids; and it will take a lot of new history to understand and learn to navigate the re-created or another landscape after this disturbance. Once the environment of the area is lost; the knowledge of the area is lost and few may have the opportunity to learn what was there. Therefore, the Partnership must develop a process to develop baseline knowledge of intangible cultural heritage in the communities, to assess the impacts of the project, to monitor the impact and to mitigate the impact as presented by Ms Pawlowska-Mainville. Mitigation programs could include funding Elders on the model of the Japanese 'living cultural treasure' model, or funding traditional harvesters on the model of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement (1975).

6. *Mino pimatisiwin*, 'the good life', 'a life in balance with the land', is never associated with large, environmentally devastating, industrial energy projects.

Just as the project is not 'clean and green', it does not reflect the traditional *Inniniwak* value and concept of *mino-pimatisiwin*. It does a disservice to traditional knowledge to deploy the term in this way and it should not be used in connection with any aspect of the Keeyask project. The conclusion that the "adverse [effects] for both construction and operation will not be significant" (CEC Keeyask- Panel 4 -heritage p.74) is not consistent with the evidence shown from the traditional users and harvesters of the resource areas who continue to have a strong attachment to the area.

Health Issues

1. Although valuable traditional knowledge (TK) has been gathered, there are no baseline data

of the role of country food in the local diet; food security and food sovereignty issues have not been directly considered in spite of their everyday importance to local people.

The Makeso Sakahican Inninuwak argue that there was extensive loss of caribou from hydro development (CFLGC 2013; FLER 2012:48; *Ninan* 2012:88). With the arrival of hydro and the loss of caribou, the Inninuwak had to rely on moose for meat. Hydro electric development has not only changed the diet of the Inninuwak from the 1950s and on, they have destroyed much of the caribou and the knowledge associated with caribou. Adding yet another project to the area, would superimpose on the fragility of the caribou, the sturgeon and other animals; a study of the local diet can serve as an indicator of the cumulative impacts of hydro development. Consequently, base line data on the use and value of country food should be gathered before construction begins, ideally through processes overseen by the First Nation partners.

2. Although Manitoba Hydro insists that it has consulted with leading experts and taken mercury contamination seriously, it acknowledges that its actions will lead to mercury contamination while minimizing the impact, on the one hand, while on the other using a 'public communication' strategy as its main mitigation. It will tell people who have relied all their lives on fish, not to eat fish. It will not monitor levels of mercury in humans. This is truly reprehensible, since the risk mercury contamination poses to human health is grave and can hardly be understated.

Any individual living in a partner community should be tested if they desire at the proponent's expense at least once per year for the first twenty years of the project, and only subsequently if material for concern has shown up on any tests. Again, this mercury monitoring program should developed in collaboration with and controlled by partner First Nations.

3. A comprehensive and cumulative public health and well being survey has not been conducted as part of this process, though Fox Lake Cree Nation did sponsor a research project - the SCHIP (Social, Cultural and Health Impacts Project) Report which was subsequently suppressed. The implications of the Keeyask project on the First Nation's health and wellbeing have not been assessed in a systematic, inclusive and culturally appropriate way.

A base line study on health and wellbeing should be conducted, with the results made public. Monitoring and follow-up studies, as well at the original study, should be conducted as noted above in a systematic, inclusive and culturally appropriate manner and the results should be made publically available.

Economic Issues

1. The current Partnership Model is not the industry best practice from a First Nations perspective. The Partnership Model involves investment of badly needed resources and incurring of debt in the hope of securing moderate or more substantial gains in the future. The Peace of the Braves in Quebec involved a substantial payment of funds before project construction on an annual basis, in order to secure agreement of First Nations communities to the project. No capital costs, debts or investments were needed by the local First Nations

in order to gain the benefits of the Peace of the Braves.

This project should not go ahead unless communities are given a voting option that presents them with a choice between the two models. The partner communities should be given such a choice in any future projects. The provincial government should consider meeting with all hydro-affected communities in Manitoba, and with Manitoba Hydro and the federal government at a single table, to negotiate a broad modern treaty that would secure appropriate, long-needed benefits allowing the communities to finally begin to move away from the ‘mass unemployment and poverty’ that has been created by previous Hydro projects and that, without remediation and a new model, will be created by future ones. Previous agreements including the Partnership Agreements could be subsumed into the new treaty.

2. Communities are now required to use funds allocated to remediate previous social and environmental damage in order to secure benefits from the Partnership Agreement, as well as to take on debt financed by Manitoba Hydro. This significantly reduces for a lengthy period funding that is needed to alleviate desperate local circumstances.

All funding for participation in the Partnership should be secured from outside of the existing pockets of financial resources available to the First Nations partners.

3. Current training and employment plans for First Nations citizens on the project do not take into account the debilitating impacts of a racially stratified work force. Manitoba Hydro’s methods for counting Indigenous workers effectively hides the fact that many are employed for short periods of time, often leaving the workplace because of explicit and implicit racism, condoned by a structure in which all the highest paying supervisory positions are engaged in by non-Natives, who may or may not be sympathetic to the plight of local Indigenous workers.

Much more needs to be done to ensure Indigenous workers in supervisory, management and technical positions. The fact that the Wuskwatim dam was built, leading to Keeyask and then possibly to Conawapa, should have allowed Manitoba Hydro time to develop such a skilled local workforce. The reason it has not is lack of will. The issue affects all Indigenous workers on the site, and no camp will have a successful participation experience of Indigenous workers until this issue is addressed.

Conclusions

We have tried to keep our comments and this report brief so as not to add to the mountains of material that the CEC must assess, and to focus on the main goals. Everything we have said can recognizably be substantiated through what was said in the hearings. The Kulchyski, McLachlan and Pawlowska-Mainville Expert Reports are available on the CEC website, and we invite the CEC and the public to review the CFLGC transcripts and the grassroots First Nations presentations from December 9 and 10, 2013 for a more thorough revision.

We have a few recommendations about the hearings process. In the first instance, we have worried that the increasing legal orientation of the process should not develop in such a way that community groups such as the CFLGC are excluded. Citizen’s groups, which may take some time to learn the process and

may overstep the bounds of discussion, still play a crucial role in these deliberations. We were very happy with the consideration that the CEC paid to our own interventions, presentations and cross-examinations and understood in all areas where we were overruled or procedurally creating problems. We hope that it will continue to support any groups that come forward in the future.

We also think that the silos of decision-making need to be broken down and a global or comprehensive process, that incorporates Aboriginal and treaty rights, social and environmental impacts, financial arrangements and economic viability of any specific project should be undertaken. We believe that the CEC is the most appropriate vehicle for such a responsibility and has the experience and most appropriate structure.

The process in both the affected northern communities and in Winnipeg should allow for the use of circle sharing, open ended discussions, normally each might be one day in length, to allow direct participation of Elders and cultural teachers in a manner that is culturally appropriate. We believe that the seating format of the hearings ought to be changed for one or two days during the hearings so that Elders, public speakers and citizens can present their views in a seating scheme that is more conducive to a dialogue. We feel better and stronger community evidence could be ascertained from such a format change.

Finally, we turn again to our overarching recommendation that the Keeyask Project not be granted a licence. The CFLGC does not understand the need for hurry. Why does the dam need to be built before monitoring and rehabilitation structures are in place? Why is the in service date written in stone? Either the power is needed and will be needed by southern buyers, in which case a start date can be delayed, or it won't be, in which case the river can be saved. In our view, so many things need to and can be proven before this project takes place: instead of hypotheticals about sturgeon reintroductions, it can be tested, instead of debates about woodland caribou habitat, the issue can be determined; instead of hoping for a federal training program for a dam not yet approved, it could be secured; instead of forcing communities to wait on benefits, a new agreement could be discussed. As noted above, in its response to Question 24 of the CEC's final question concerning repurposing of camp facilities for community use, Manitoba Hydro said "Economic analysis indicates that purchasing a new Ready to Move home (modular built) today is more cost effective and addresses the immediate housing requirement than waiting for project completion to re-purpose the old buildings." A Ready to Move home (modular unit) are very nice words used to describe a trailer, the current main form of housing in existence in all of the partner and Hydro affected communities.

For all the sincerity, for all the studies, for all the talk, it is beyond question that Manitoba Hydro will continue to build stand alone, high quality houses for its northern employees, and all that is contemplated for their First Nations neighbors and partners are what they have now: substandard trailers. We title our final report with a reference to this hypocrisy, one we believe flies in the face of the values of most Manitobans. Until this social travesty is redressed, we do not believe Manitoba Hydro should gain a license for any future projects.

APPENDIX 1

Ivan Moose - Closing Argument

With all due respect to current Chief and Council, I believe critical issues are not given the weight deserved, glossed over, or at worst ignored. As the CEC may know, or not know, the people of Fox Lake that reside in Gillam, Bird and elsewhere are a product of Hydro development at its worst. Hydro development undertaken at time when the human rights of First Nations people were sorely lacking. It is with this historical relationship with Hydro that Fox Lake gauges how it should proceed in current and future development. Previous Hydro development brought a social and human disruption that can be likened to communities in war zones.

In my community of Gillam and Bird, during the construction of the Kettle Rapids, Limestone and Conawapa dam, there have been beatings, rape, forced removal of elders, destruction of homes, moving of graves, and a hostile hydro town that was bent on removing the people of Fox Lake from Gillam. There has yet to be a single criminal charge laid for criminal offences that happened during this time. Fox Lake knows, singularly, the drastic adverse affects of Hydro Development. Regardless of what supporters of the Keeyask Project may say, Manitoba Hydro, at the end of the day, will not understand our plight and will therefore insist they have done all that can be done.

The home language of the Fox Lake people is dying off and we find that in our community the younger generations cannot converse with their grandparents and the grandparents cannot speak with the younger generations without the aid of a translator. As [Ms. Pawlowska-Mainville] said in her report, why not support our Inninowin, the Cree language and make all signs and announcements in both English and Cree so that we promote and not destroy our language and our identity, which is already endangered, along with our lands. The millennia of knowledge, tradition, customs and mores are no longer naturally communicated in order that we may survive as the strong people we were.

It is true that Fox Lake has negotiated and signed an agreement for past effects, but the signing of that agreement and the monies therewith does not erase the suffering of the community members. In order for the people of Fox Lake to prepare for future development, heal past wounds a project to measure in some fashion the state of the community members was developed. This project is key for Fox Lake members in order that we fully benefit and not get further hurts from future development.

The Social, Cultural, Health Impact Project (SCHIP) was specifically designed and implemented by Fox Lake for what it saw as it's purposed. The current document is being attacked by people that do not want to see the findings come out, because some of the findings are difficult to hear, such as incest in our own community, in the findings rapes are identified, as are criminal actions by people that were associated the with construction of the Kettle Rapids, Limestone and Conawapa dams. I truly believe the SCHIP document will bring out true costs of Hydro development and that is something these current supporters of Keeyask do not want to hear or nor do they want others to hear. Our community's support for the Keeyask project was based on the finding of this study!! And, since the findings of this report continue to be hidden and ignored, we are withdrawing our support for this project until the findings of this report are made available to the public. When Fox Lake undertook to negotiate on its own behalf, key to the support of the Keeyask Dam was that we would be fully prepared. SCHIP is instrumental to this preparedness.

Finally, if this project is allowed to go forward without the community members of Fox Lake feeling they are prepared to move forward, we will witness the compete destruction of what little is left of Fox Lake's social, cultural and moral fabric.

I want you all to know that I grew up there when all this stuff was happening. How many of those speaking against me can say the same?

