



**Dear Community and Neighbours,**

We, as a community, have never wavered from our original, very public, position: THAT NO REASONABLE PERSON WOULD EVER LOCATE A QUARRY on the proposed site on the 11th Concession East. The veracity of this statement was readily evident to many qualified,

REASONABLE people and the evidence before us has solidified this reality. Despite this, as a community we have been thrust into a process, that is expensive, time consuming and, at times, seems arbitrary and biased. But it is a process that we cannot ignore, for it is the very air we breathe, the water we drink, and the place we call home that is on the line.

Perhaps the greatest issue before us is, why, if something fails to meet the threshold of reason on the face of it, does ANY community have to endure the distress and indignity of undertaking to defend that which is patently obvious. This is a question that requires investigating, but today, I must provide an appropriate response to the many calls and emails I received regarding this 3rd Public Haul Route meeting.

As far as this January 9th meeting goes, the major concerns raised were that the arrangements offered by St. Mary's

- 1) ***failed to meet the minimum criteria of open and equal access for a public meeting,***
- 2) ***violated privacy rights by suggesting any kind of registration was required and***
- 3) ***that the structure of the public exchange process, by using a pre-programmed agenda with hired moderators, would be, without exception, prejudicial.***

In my position as a democratically elected official, having sworn an oath of office, it is incumbent upon me to ensure that I uphold and protect the right to public participation. It is not an option for me - it is an unquestioned obligation.

It is also not the place of the applicant, CART or anyone else to attempt to limit or redefine public participation in a fight, not just for a minimum quality of life, but for the very essence of life - the air we breathe and our precious water.

For those of you who expressed concerns regarding privacy issues, when looked at in its entirety, there is every reason to believe that any personal information,

can, and will, be used to build profiles or other psychometrics used in Behavioural Targeting campaigns. I do not wish to over simplify or under emphasize the significance of this issue so allow me to get back to this in a moment.

Finally, regarding the concern that a programmed workshop would inevitably lead to the production of prejudicial data over which we would have no subsequent control. When requested to do so, Mr. Moroz provided me with a draft copy of the workshop booklet. I have had an opportunity to review the material and my initial observations are:

**1) It is misleading.**

Its very structure presumes that, REGARDLESS OF HOW UNREASONABLE SITE SELECTION is believed to be, citizens should be expected to rank, essentially, which limb they would like cut off first in this death by a thousand cuts.

This entire proposed operation has an enormous annual carbon footprint and the trucking is only one of many factors. This is just one reason the workbooks are completely misleading. It is not possible for anyone, let alone a pre-selected small group of individuals, to determine whether, by way of example, the loss of aquatic habitat should be of more or less importance than creatures being killed by trucks. Everything and everyone is at risk.

**2) It is shameful.**

The very hallmark of an enlightened and just society is its ability to defend the rights of those least able to defend themselves yet, the workbook, in several instances, uses a 'negative option' approach in an attempt to have residents diminish the protection afforded to those areas with the fewest homes.

If you recall my comments earlier about collecting data for profiling and psychometric purposes, this is certainly one way to identify those that do not value the very fabric of rural life - strength of community, from those that would take a stand - not just for themselves - for the good of the community.

Rural communities have a constitutional and human right to protect their culture and their values. It is reprehensible and shameful to put any community member in a position of having to choose their own survival at the expense of their neighbour's. I believe I speak for the vast majority when I say, WE STAND TOGETHER AS ONE COMMUNITY.

Furthermore, this is a blatant, and not particularly clever, attempt at 'social engineering'.

**Social Engineering:**

A collection of techniques used to manipulate people into performing actions or divulging confidential information.