

# PUBLIC HEARING

## WHITES POINT QUARRY AND MARINE TERMINAL PROJECT

### JOINT REVIEW PANEL

---

#### V O L U M E 6

---

HELD BEFORE: Dr. Robert Fournier (Chair)  
Dr. Jill Grant (Member)  
Dr. Gunter Muecke (Member)

PLACE HEARD: Digby, Nova Scotia

DATE HEARD: Friday, June 22, 2007

PRESENTERS: -Bilcon of Nova Scotia  
Mr. Paul Buxton  
-Natural Resources of Canada  
Dr. Miroslav Nastev  
-Nova Scotia Dept of Environment and Labour  
Mr. John Drage  
-Atlantic Canada Chapter, Sierra Club of Cda  
Mr. Stephen Hazel  
-St. Croix Estuary Project (ACAP - St. Croix)  
Mr. Arthur MacKay  
-Father Danny Mills  
-Ms. Jill Klein  
-Mr. Rob Buckland-Nicks  
-Mr. Lawrence Outhouse

---

Recorded by: A.S.A.P. Reporting Services Inc.  
200 Elgin Street, Suite 1004 Ottawa, Ontario K2P 1L5  
130 King Street W., Suite 1800 Toronto, Ontario M5X 1E3  
613-564-2727 (Ottawa Office) / 416-861-8720 (Toronto Office)  
613-564-7756 (Ottawa Fax) / 416-946-1693 (Toronto Fax)  
1-888-661-2727 (Toll Free)

Per: H el ene Boudreau-Laforge, CCR

1                   Mr. Buxton, I'd like to say in the  
2 strongest possible terms how disappointed the Panel is with  
3 your presentation this morning. This process, you've told  
4 us repeatedly this process has been underway since 2002.  
5 That's five years. From the time of the first scoping  
6 session to the present is two and a half years.

7                   And you have seen fit to bring to us a  
8 moving target for analysis. You've changed the diagrams,  
9 changed the model which you're using, and you do that at the  
10 very last minute. I think it's totally inappropriate.

11                   It would seem to me that the people  
12 here, sitting here, the community, as well as the Panel, has  
13 the right to expect a reasonably well-developed plan which  
14 they can judge and gauge in terms of the future.

15                   To change it at the last minute, and  
16 then to suggest that it's going to continue to change, I  
17 think is not reassuring at all.

18                   And I think, and I have to agree with  
19 some of the comments that I've heard, is that it seems  
20 totally inappropriate to present it to us as a moving  
21 target, ask us to evaluate it, and in the same words to tell  
22 us that it's going to change again, and again, and again.

23                   You've had two and a half years to look  
24 at this process. It would seem to me, as a Panel member I  
25 would've thought that we would be looking at something that