

Joint Review Panel
Application for the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
NEB
444 Seventh Ave. SW
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 0X8

November 18, 2013

Dear Members of the Joint Review Panel:

This letter is to express my objections to the way the JRP, through its lawyer handled my latest Notice of Motion #24.

I posted it on November 13 on the JRP website. I had contacted [redacted] on November 4, asking if it was still possible to file a Notice of Motion after the proceedings were closed. She diligently communicated her findings on November 5 and gave me useful legal references for filing the motion. While it was easy to post it on November 13 on the JRP website, difficulties with my g-mail prevented me to send it to all intervenors as required. These difficulties arose about 6 months ago when some changes in the g-mail program prevented me from copying the 232 e-mail addresses, something I was able to do before. [redacted], Regulatory Officer with the NEB, helped me many times and without any hesitation in the past, for doing such, so it was in good faith that I requested her to do so for #24 in an e-mail to her. I also left her a phone message. I was surprised to receive a phone call from [redacted] on November 14, telling me she had been instructed by the lawyer to NOT forward the document on my behalf because the proceedings were closed and that I was on my own for sending the Notice of Motion to all intervenors..

I phoned [redacted] on November 15. She simply replied she could neither let me know if she had instructed [redacted] or not to help me, nor comment on it, because it was client/lawyer privilege.

I contend that to give instructions to not help an intervenor trying to follow the requirements to perform her duties is nothing short of an obstruction. It is in sharp contrast with previous relationships with the Panel which showed so much patience towards intervenors like me without legal support, and the Panel's staff who was lauded by all for their outstanding performance in trying to help us go through the process. Why then, at this late date, this seeming desire to impede?

I ask the Panel to explain the reasons for this change.

Sincerely,