

QUESTIONS ASKED AT THE SEABRIDGE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING:

Annita McPhee, former President of the Tahltan Nation in British Columbia:

In the wake of the worst environmental disaster in Canadian history at the Mount Polley Mine in B.C., Seabridge is still planning to use the same risky, discredited tailings dam technology at KSM. Our territory doesn't need any more Mount Polleys.

The Mount Polley expert panel predicted two more tailings dam failures every ten years in BC if the industry doesn't change.

Why is KSM willing to put the wellbeing of our communities at unnecessary risk, along with those of investors and shareholders, when experts have made it clear that this type of technology will inevitably lead to more failures?

Will Seabridge adapt its KSM project so that it complies with the recommendations for dry tailings of the expert panel?

Frederick Olsen Jr., Organized Village of Kasaan Tribal Vice President and a representative of a group of southeast Alaska Tribes who live downstream of the proposed KSM Mine:

We're here to express our deep concern about this project and the unprecedented risks it poses to our people.

The Environmental Impact Statement predicts that the mine could result in water pollution in the Unuk River all the way to the Alaska border - 24 km away. Like the proposed Pebble Mine, this type of risk is unacceptable.

Our Tribes are calling for an International Joint Commission review to address transboundary pollution and Alaska's congressional delegation has asked Secretary of State John Kerry for a bilateral review of this project.

My question today: Given the concerns of Alaska Tribes, will Seabridge publicly support an International Joint Commission Review?

Bonnie Gestring, Earthworks, a U.S. non-profit organization dedicated to protecting communities and the environment against the adverse impacts of mining:

PricewaterhouseCoopers issued a report this month that forecasts a prolonged period of low metal prices and questions the ability of multi-billion projects, like KSM, to attract financing. Only the leanest projects will survive, yet KSM is anything but lean, and the risks are considerable with its remote location; lack of infrastructure; unprecedented water management and treatment requirements.

With good reason, the KSM proposal is compared to the Pebble proposal in southwest Alaska. Anglo American, one of the world's largest and richest metal mining companies withdrew from Pebble. Why should, KSM, which presents similar risks, fare differently?