





immoral: a strong word, but one that I use advisedly. It is immoral, in 2011, to be taking, taking, taking, largely for southern benefit, and without local return. And finally, I express this concern for balanced treatment as Progress moves onwards, because I sense a certain political inevitability around the Lower Churchill Project.

Hence I express my equivocation for the Project, which I suspect also represents the voices of many others in this population. Years ago I confronted a vigorous critic of our lively military industry, who was visiting this community. He wondered rhetorically, after a frustrating discussion, who would win, and who would lose, ten years hence, if that industry went ahead? My prompt answer to him was: Everyone. We would all win in economic success, employment, expansion and Allied rapport, and we would all lose in the disappearance of our rural innocence and untouched territory, and with added noise, stress, social turmoil, and other side-effects. The Panel can only listen, study and recommend to both Governments, but we look to you for a quality of input that brings careful judgment and rationality to the advice for the final decisions around this Project.

I would like to thank you and your Secretariat for this opportunity to speak in generalities in your closing days of the Labrador Hearings, and for the efficiency and reliability with which this Assessment is being performed.

<original signed by>

Thank you for listening.

Susan Felsberg, April 2 2011